1. Overview

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is responsible for ensuring that its funding recipients fully comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, in their planning and implementation processes. Pursuant to (Title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53), as amended, AC Transit is the designated recipient of funds under FTA sections (5307 and 5309).

As the designated federal funds recipient, AC Transit District’s 2003 Title VI Update Report has been prepared in accordance with FTA Circular dated May 26, 1988. This report serves as an update to the 1999 Title VI Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District Report with the purpose to assess compliance of the District, its subrecipients, and contractors with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This Title VI Update Report covers the years 2000 to 2003.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Section 601 states:

“No persons in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance.”

It is AC Transit’s responsibility to ensure that all transit service, and access to its facilities is equitably distributed and provided without regard to race, color, or national origin. It is also the goal of AC Transit to ensure equal opportunities to all persons without regard to race, color, or national origin to participate in all local, subregional and regional transit planning and decision-making processes under the District’s control.

Over the past few years, the District has undertaken many steps to further its commitment to Environmental Justice principles. In November, 2000, the District hosted a forum on Environmental Justice in Transportation for the San Francisco Bay area. It was the first such conference in the region. Also in 2000, the District adopted Resolution 2033: Affirming the Commitment of the Alameda Contra-Costa Transit District to Social and Environmental Justice, and to Involvement of the People of Alameda and Contra-Costa Counties in Making Decisions Pertaining to Transit Policy, Service Design, and Operations (see Appendix A for Resolution text).
2. General Reporting Requirements

All federal funding recipients are required to maintain and provide information regarding any active lawsuits. Documentation includes: descriptions of all pending applications for financial assistance provided by federal agencies; summaries of all of the civil rights compliance review activities conducted in the review period; fixed facility impact analyses assessing the effects to minority communities; and finally, the FTA and DOT Civil Right Assurances.

2.1 List of Any Active Lawsuits or Complaints

There is one pending case of alleged discrimination based on race and mental disability. A verdict was assigned to the case and a signed judgement is expected soon. Case information includes:

**Case:** John Revels v AC Transit and Esdras Gonzalez  
**Case Number:** 837151-5  
**Court:** Alameda County Superior Court--Unlimited Jurisdiction  
**Allegations:** Race, sex, and Disability Discrimination--Claimant alleges that he was ejected from a District bus and physically assaulted because of his race, sex, and mental disability.  
**Finding:** The case was tried April 15-25, 2003. The trial court granted nonsuit on the race and sex discrimination claims, finding that plaintiff had not produced evidence sufficient to prove his case as to these claims. The mental disability discrimination claims were then submitted to a jury, which returned a verdict finding no liability on the part of AC Transit and its bus driver.  
**Date of Finding:** Verdict rendered April 25, 2003.  
**Status:** Awaiting signed judgment

2.2 Description of All Pending Applications for Financial Assistance

As the grant recipient for funds received under Programs 5307 and 5309, AC Transit has attached a list of grant receipts for FY 00-03 as Appendix B.

2.3 Civil Rights Compliance Review Activities

The Federal Transit Administration conducted a Title VI review of the District in May 2003. AC Transit is awaiting the results of the review.

2.4 FTA Civil Rights Assurance

The FTA Civil Right Assurance is incorporated into the annual Certifications and Assurances submitted annually to FTA through the Transportation Electronic Award and Management System (TEAM) but is also attached as Appendix C.

2.5 Non-Discrimination on the Basis of Disability

A Department of Transportation Assurance Concerning Nondiscrimination on the basis of disability is included as Appendix D.
2.6 Impact Analysis of Service Plans and Fixed Facilities

Title IV requires, “for construction projects, a fixed facility impact analysis to assess the effects on minority communities. If this information has been prepared as a result of an environmental impact statement, the applicant recipient, or subrecipient should reference the relevant information by document, page numbers, and date of submission to FTA.”

As a result of FTA requirements, environmental impact analyses include:

- A project history and background for each construction project or service plan within the document;
- A discussion of the potential impacts on minority communities and minority-owned businesses during and after construction;
- A discussion on all potential negative environmental impacts, such as noise, air or water pollution;
- A list of minority owned businesses and households affected by construction projects;
- A description of other significant impacts on minority communities, such as: increased traffic, reduction in parking availability, etc; and
- A description of the relocation program and/or other measures adopted by the applicant used to mitigate identified adverse social, economic, or environmental effects of the proposed construction project or service plan.

The District has only had four projects that would fall into this category during the reporting years. However, there have been a number of transit service development projects undertaken during this period that the District has included within this section. Due to the scope of the service development projects and plans, the District has conducted environmental during the planning stage to determine the environmental consequences of the projects. This also demonstrates the District’s commitment to Environmental and Social Equity issues during all phases of the project’s development.

The projects undertaken by AC Transit included as part of this analysis differ in nature, purpose and time of completion, and include:

- AC Transit Fremont-Newark Transit Redevelopment Plan (plan completed March 2000).
- AC Transit Service Deployment Plan (plan completed May 2000).
- San Pablo Bus Stop Improvements (construction underway).
- Berkeley, Oakland, and San Leandro Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) (Major Investment Study completed August 2001; EIS currently underway)
- Eastmont Mall Transit Center (construction completed March 2001).
- Advertising Shelter Program (ongoing)

Information for this report was obtained from various documents submitted to FTA/FHWA or state and local agencies, with statistics compiled by the appropriate municipal departments. These documents include:

2.6.1 AC Transit Fremont-Newark Transit Development Plan

History and Background
AC Transit’s Fremont-Newark Transit Development Plan (TDP) proposed changes to bus routes in Special Transit District 2, serving the cities of Fremont and Newark (or transfer points in Union City), in order to better meet current demand within existing budgetary constraints. The District 2 bus network currently supports 11,500 daily AC Transit boardings in its service area. Multiple routes run along the main service area arteries, while others circulate through the residential areas.

AC Transit’s Newark-Fremont Transit Development Plan (TDP) realigned bus routes within the cities of Fremont and Newark including its connecting routes to Union City. Union City’s intra-city bus service is provided by the municipal owned Union City Transit System while AC Transit provides inter-city connections for regional service.

Impacts on the Minority Community/ Businesses

Impact B.1: Changes in service proposed by the TDP would not create significant socioeconomic effects within AC Transit’s Special District 2. (Less than Significant)

Although household incomes are higher in the Union City, Newark and Fremont area as compared to other areas of Alameda County, the average household has more persons compared to other cities. However, District 2’s minority status stands at 55.5% of the total population and mirrors the rest of the service area. (see Table 1). In addition, because incomes are generally higher, those with lower incomes could be at a greater disadvantage in the area. As a result, those that use AC Transit could be in real need of efficient, reliable service that connects to schools, government facilities, and transportation centers.
Table 1: Transit District 2, Racial Composition (Census, 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Name</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>African Am</th>
<th>Am Indian</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian/Pacific</th>
<th>Latino/Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>.51%</td>
<td>36.95%</td>
<td>.40%</td>
<td>13.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>52.22%</td>
<td>4.01%</td>
<td>.64%</td>
<td>21.30%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>28.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union City</td>
<td>30.20%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>.53%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>.91%</td>
<td>23.95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Fremont-Newark TDP continues its tradition of neighborhood-based bus service, but expands transit options in almost every instance (see Appendix E). The TDP provides more routes and greater connectivity to transit centers, and therefore, better links to regional transportation. Moreover, by using a grid that builds on segments with heavy use, along with overlays and secondary routes instead of incremental additions, the TDP assures that all neighborhoods on the service area have equal access to bus service.

In almost every instance, the TDP provides more transit options to residents and employees throughout Special Transit District 2, while reaching central transit centers and minimizing travel to smaller neighborhood streets. As a result, no mitigation measures were proposed.

**Potential Negative Environmental Impacts**

All required environmental studies included in the document showed no significant environmental impacts with regard to the Fremont-Newark TDP.

**Other Significant Impacts to the Minority Community**

No other significant impacts on minority households, businesses, community traffic patterns or parking availability occurred as part of the development of the TDP.

**Description of Relocation Process**

Due to the nature of the TDP, no displacement of residents or businesses occurred.

**2.6.2 AC Transit Service Deployment Plan**

**History and Background**

Over twenty transit agencies operate in the nine Bay Area counties, serving a rapidly growing population that has increased approximately 31% in twenty years, from 5.2 million in 1980 to an estimated 6.8 million in 2000. The boom in population has altered settlement patterns resulting in increased housing, living expenses and expanding employment opportunities throughout the region. As a result, development occurs further and further from the urban core areas resulting in increased traffic congestion and a greater dependence on public transit. In turn, the public expects a convenient inter-connected transit option which decreases travel time as well as meets raised expectations and standards.
The Service Deployment Policies provided the framework for a policy-based decision-making style, in contrast to a complaint-based reactive style. The policies were intended to facilitate more coherent and consistent decisions for allocating resources, and assisting the district in reaching its goals. The Service Deployment Plan (SDP) applied the policies to the existing transit system and recommended changes designed to maximize resources and system usefulness.

**Impacts on Minority Community / Businesses**

*Impact B.1.: Changes in service proposed by the AC Transit Service Development Plan (SDP) would not create significant negative socioeconomic effects within AC Transit service area. (Less than Significant)*

During the reporting years of this Title VI update, the District conducted an Initial Study to determine the environmental consequences of implementing the changes envisioned in the plan. The SDP resulted in an increased frequency of local bus service district-wide, particularly on major trunk routes; improved service coverage; and increase system ridership. Moreover, AC Transit continued the tradition of neighborhood-based bus service in this plan. The reorganization and consolidation of routes resulted in the elimination of redundant local bus service on certain street segments.

However, in the great majority of those instances, the segments were short and/or service would was replaced through a new or realigned route. Appendix F reflects these changes and identifies:

- The location and limits of street segments where local bus service was eliminated and no replacement of local service would be available on the same segment.
- Presents the general land uses and community facilities adjacent to those segments.

The discontinued segments occurred over a geographically and demographically diverse area. In virtually all cases where the local bus segment was proposed to be discontinued, other local route(s) were available within a few blocks of the eliminated segment. The SDP also provided formalized service spans accommodating work schedules of populations working non-traditional hours (particularly many lower income jobs) that do not correspond to 9a.m. -5p.m. shifts. These include:

- Trunk route service between 5:00 a.m. and midnight.
- Cross-town and feeder service between 5:00 a.m. and 10 p.m.
- Owl service between midnight and 5:00 a.m.
- Flexible service as required

**Potential Negative Environmental Impacts**

All required environmental studies on the SDP showed no significant environmental impacts, thus identifying no mitigation measures.

**Other Significant Impacts on the Minority Community**

No other significant impacts on minority households, businesses, community traffic patterns or parking availability occurred as part of the SDP.
Description of the Relocation Process

The SDP did not result in the displacement of businesses or residences within communities served by AC Transit. No neighborhood or community boundaries were split or altered by the project. Cohesion of the communities in which changes are implemented were not altered by any physical or psychological separation of residents and/or activities.

2.6.3 San Pablo Avenue Bus Stop Improvements

History and Background

AC Transit installs or updates its transit facilities when grant funds are available. In this case, installation of new bus stop amenities occurred along San Pablo Avenue in the following locations:

- Within Alameda County: Oakland, Emeryville, Berkeley, and Albany.
- Within Contra Costa County: El Cerrito, Richmond, and San Pablo.

Installation of passenger amenities occurred along specified intersections, in both directions along the northbound and southbound routes. These amenities include bus shelters, benches within the shelters, bus flags, light fixtures, trashcans, and informational kiosks within the shelter. Minor changes were made to roadway striping but no significant physical changes in the right-of-way occurred.

Impacts on the Minority Community/ Businesses

This project occurred along a corridor within several minority census tracts and represents an improvement to existing conditions for our patrons. The improvements made minor alterations to structures and facilities on the sidewalk in various locations, but did not change bus routes, land uses, or traffic patterns. As a result the project is categorically exempt. Exemption Status: Categorical Exemption, Class 4, Section 15304, Minor Alteration to Land.

Potential Negative Environmental Impacts

Exemption Status: Categorical Exemption, Class 4, Section 15304, Minor Alteration to Land.

Other Significant Impacts on the Minority Community

Exemption Status: Categorical Exemption, Class 4, Section 15304, Minor Alteration to Land.

Description of the Relocation Process

Exemption Status: Categorical Exemption, Class 4, Section 15304, Minor Alteration to Land.

2.6.4 AC Transit Berkeley/ Oakland/ San Leandro Corridor BRT Major Investment Study (MIS)
History and Background

Four of AC Transit’s top five busiest routes carrying approximately 66,000 riders per day operate in the Berkeley/Oakland/San Leandro Corridor. Of these, 40,000 trips are within the corridor, amounting to nearly 20% of AC Transit’s total daily ridership of about 230,000, comparable to many light rail systems in California.

During the reporting years of this Title VI report, the District completed a Major Investment Study (MIS) to determine the best way to improve this corridor. The AC Transit District Board adopted Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) as the preferred technology for the corridor with the understanding that light rail should be considered as a long-term goal.

Similar to light rail, BRT systems use the existing infrastructure, which lowers construction costs for a completed project. BRT also would employ low floor, low to zero-emission buses instead of the tracks and overhead wires that accompany light rail. BRT offers greater operating flexibility compared to rail, as vehicles are able to leave the guideway and operate on regular streets. Systems like this are in use today in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Ottawa, Canada; and Curitiba, Brazil.

Due to the ridership volume along the corridor and its importance to the vitality of the transit system a purpose and need were established for the project, and include:

- Better accommodate high existing bus ridership.
- Improve speed and reliability of local transit service.
- Increase transit use for under-served markets.
- Reduce auto use and congestion.
- Contribute to transit oriented development.
- Further environmental justice.

Therefore, the BRT system for the corridor will be designed to maximize the possibility of a future upgrade to light rail. The BRT system will include the following features:

- Dedicated transit lane along most of the corridor.
- Traffic signal priority and coordination throughout the corridor.
- Frequent BRT service with a background local service (five to 7.5 minutes between BRT buses).
- BRT stations including shelter, boarding platforms, benches, security features, fare machines, real-time bus arrival information and other amenities.
- Proof of payment ticketing
- Low floor, multi-door, level boarding, clean fuel BRT buses.
Impacts on the Minority Community/ Business

The corridor under study is primarily an inner-city route that serves densely populated neighborhoods. The local residents rely more heavily on public transit and make shorter trips than suburban riders. The census tracts along the corridor are all classified as minority tracts as defined by the FTA (see Appendix G for the corridor location and compare to Appendix H-7 which classifies census tracts by race).

The purpose and need of the project specified improved service for all riders in the corridor. Building a BRT or light rail line would likely support intensified land use development because stations serve as focal points for activity. The project environmental review is currently underway and any negative impacts to the minority community will be identified upon completion of the EIR.

Potential Negative Environmental Impacts

Project environmental review is currently underway. Any negative impacts to the environment will be identified upon completion of the EIR.

Other Significant Impacts on the Minority Community

Project environmental review is currently underway. Any negative impacts to the minority community will be identified upon completion of the EIR.

Description of the Relocation Process

Project environmental review is currently underway. Any relocation impacting the minority community will be identified upon completion of the EIR.

2.6.5 Eastmont Town Center Transit Center

History and Background

The Eastmont Transit Center was constructed as part of the Districts 1991 Comprehensive Service Plan (CSP), which restructured service in the northern cities of Alameda County. The primary goals of the CSP were to increase AC Transit's patronage and modal share in East Bay travel patterns through improved system productivity. To achieve these goals, AC Transit developed a multi-destination route network designed to allow passengers to travel from any one point in the district to any other in a relatively direct manner with a minimum of transfers. Transit centers, such as the Eastmont Town Center, were critical to the success of the CSP due to their role in coordinating service between bus routes. The Eastmont Transit Center was designed to:

- Accommodate several buses at once.
- Permit independent arrival and departure of each bus.
- Provide a safe, pleasant, and convenient location for transfers between buses.
- Provide other amenities for drivers and passengers.
The Transit center is located in the City of Oakland and situated within the northeast parking lot of the Eastmont Town Center Shopping Center. The transit center contains nine bus bays with open-air bus shelters and informational kiosks. Walkways also provide pedestrian safety between bus loading/waiting islands. The facility has a 1,000 square foot building located in the south central portion of the transit center, between the bus bays and the shopping center entrance. The building contains transit-serving retail space, driver restrooms, and a waiting area for patrons. A signature clock tower constructed for the facility is located adjacent to the transit Center. The tower is fifty feet tall and displays identification signs for Eastmont Town Center and AC Transit.

The transit center provides a centralized transfer location at Eastmont Town Center for two bus routes that serve the mall, and seven routes that serve streets in its vicinity. However, there is no increase in the number of bus routes serving the mall or surrounding area.

**Impacts on the Minority Community/ Businesses**

*Impact II. Would the proposal:

- Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?
- Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure?
- Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?*

The project was considered a mitigated negative declaration under California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) standards. This required the district to mitigate any environmental impacts identified in the project’s Initial Study. Upon completion of all mitigation measures the project was given a Negative Declaration.

Because the site is located in a completely urbanized neighborhood of Oakland, the transit center did not induce growth in undeveloped areas by the extension of infrastructure or increase area population. The Eastmont Town Center is located within a minority census tract and serves a population as such. The transit center was located on a previously used parking lot for the Mall and therefore did not displace any housing.

The Transit Center project did not induce renovation and expansion of the mall. However, mall owners plan to renovate and possibly expand the mall with details consistent with the City of Oakland’s economic and community development goals. Any growth in the economic base was considered a beneficial impact and therefore no mitigation measures were required.

**Potential Negative Environmental Impacts**

All required environmental studies included in the document showed no significant environmental impacts in regards to the Eastmont Mall Transit Center Plan.

**Other Significant Impacts on the Minority Community**

No other significant impacts on minority households, businesses, community traffic patterns or parking availability occurred as part of the Eastmont Mall Transit Center Plan.
Description of the Relocation Process
Due to the nature of the Eastmont Transit Center Plan, no displacement of residents or businesses occurred.

2.6.6 Advertising Shelter Program

In 2001, AC Transit participated in an advertising bus shelter program. This program is based on a consortium with several local jurisdictions in the District who select have contracted for the installation and maintenance of Advertising Shelters within their cities. Cities participating in the program reviewed the potential sites and made internal recommendations for the placement of the shelters. AC Transit provided information regarding bus stop locations to assist in their determination. Location easements were granted by the cities for individual sites. No environmental review was conducted by the District, as this is a project conducted by the cities.
3. Program Specific Requirements

3.1 Demographic and Service Profile Maps, Overlays and Charts

Included with this 2003 Title IV update are updated Service Maps reflecting the 2000 Census (as Appendices H-1 to H-4). They identify major streets, highways, fixed transit facilities, major activity centers and all system routes. Appendix H-5 further identifies all transit routes used in the District and Appendix H-6 identifies all census tracts by number in the service area.

3.2 Distribution of Minority Population

In addition to the information presented in the base maps, Appendices H-7 to H-18 also reflect the 2000 Census and adhere to FTA requirements by identifying minority population percentages of total by census tract in our service area.

3.3 Population/ Racial Distribution Chart

As required by the FTA, a population distribution chart is presented as Appendix I and displays the Districts total population, percentages by minority groups, and total minority population for each census tract within the service area. Tables 2 and 3 summarize these statistics.

**Table 2: Minority percentages of total population for the service area (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Pop.</th>
<th>White Total</th>
<th>White %</th>
<th>African Am. Total</th>
<th>African Am. %</th>
<th>American Indian Total</th>
<th>American Indian %</th>
<th>Asian Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,538,850</td>
<td>643,735</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>259,195</td>
<td>17.10%</td>
<td>9,536</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>370,994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asian %</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Is.</th>
<th>% Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Is.</th>
<th>Latino/ Hispanic Total</th>
<th>% Latino/ Hispanic</th>
<th>Other Races Total</th>
<th>% Other Races</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>9,610</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>303,717</td>
<td>19.70%</td>
<td>4,856</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minority Total</th>
<th>% Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>895,115</td>
<td>58.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Race By Percent**

- White
- African American
- American Indian/ Alaskan Native
- Asian
- Native Hawaiian
- Latino
- Other
### Table 3: Percent Ethnicity by City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity % by City</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>% White</th>
<th>% Black</th>
<th>% Asian</th>
<th>% Latino</th>
<th>% Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>73,400</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashland</td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>109,000</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castro Valley</td>
<td>58,200</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherryland/Fairview</td>
<td>24,100</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cerrito</td>
<td>30,200</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeryville</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>209,200</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>131,700</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>43,600</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>405,300</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>111,000</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro</td>
<td>76,400</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo</td>
<td>21,400</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pablo</td>
<td>30,400</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Service Standards and Policies

Service standards and goals (Appendix J) represent desired levels of transit service that relate to the following components of a transit system:

- Frequency – minimum acceptable headway.
- Passenger loads – acceptable maximum number of passengers as a percent of vehicle capacity.
- Route layout/spacing – minimum acceptable distances between routes, depending upon population of employment densities.
- Transfers – as they relate to coordination of routes and convenience of passenger travel.
- Hours of operation – goals for weekday, weekend and holiday service.
- Passenger stops – minimum and maximum distances between passenger stops and placement of bus bays.
- Bus stop treatments – minimum treatments at stops inclusive of signs, shelters, and trash receptacles.

In FY 2000, the District established Service Deployment Policies (as referenced in previous sections) that provided guidance to the District when developing or contracting bus services to meet budget constraints. In developing these policies, great care was taken to ensure that the District’s low income and minority populations would be well served by any proposed changes.

As part of the service policy process, the District’s Board of Directors reviewed analyses that supported the commitment to social equity issues. Maps that depicted low income and/or auto-less households (often a surrogate to poverty or disability) were compared to recommended routing or frequency changes to determine general and/or specific impacts to those populations. In most cases, recommended improvements to the network directly and positively impacted those neighborhoods with the highest concentrations of both low-income and minority households.

The service policy recommendations reflect the understanding that the routes recommended for the most significant operating and capital improvements transect areas of the District that currently have high proportions of low-income and minority residents. Improving transit service in the urban core and on trunk lines contributes to social equity and environmental justice by improving the mobility of lower income residents.

The most productive corridors in AC Transit’s system – those with the highest level of use and proportionately least reliance on external “subsidies” tend to be located in areas with higher population density and higher degree of transit dependence due to income. Thus, service design policies that place a somewhat greater emphasis on productivity also have the effect of “rewards” higher densities of urban development, and also have economically progressive impacts.

In general, the areas with lower productivity and a corresponding lower density do not have concentrations of individuals who are low-income or minority households that chose to take transit.
3.4.1 Transit System Vision and Goals

AC Transit’s Vision, Mission Statement and Goals aim to convey the District’s prime focus on moving people around the East Bay. They emphasize the local responsibility of the District, while providing a broader vision of its position in the region through improving quality of life and improving congestion.

AC Transit’s vision is to be the mobility manager for the East Bay; allowing anyone to go anywhere they want safely, quickly and efficiently. We have begun internally, by developing Critical Business Outcomes and emphasizing working together to solve problems. The District will develop coalitions that build a Regional perspective for an effective and innovative transportation system. By improving the quality of life, easing congestion and stimulating economic development in the East Bay, the District will become an integral part of the region’s future. The AC Transit Mission is to provide Safe, Convenient, Courteous and Reliable Transit Service.

3.4.2 Vehicle Load

Fixed route service has a vehicle load standard of 125% for local and trunk routes and 100% for Transbay service. Overcrowding on buses is monitored by data collection efforts to routinely provide on-board passenger information, including Automatic Passenger Counters and manual ride checks.

Whenever load standards are exceeded, data collectors’ reports are reviewed by the Service Planning Manager to determine the appropriate mitigating action. The Service Planning Manager can either assign one of the Districts articulated buses or add a relief tripper based upon the availability of equipment and severity of overcrowding.

3.4.3 Vehicle Assignment

With the adoption of the 2001 Short Range Transit Plan, the District adopted a policy aimed at ensuring that neighborhoods would have the most appropriate vehicle for the service in operation, including smaller vehicles for low-density or flexible services, as well as articulated vehicles for high ridership trunk corridors. To make that determination, an assessment of the service area includes: land uses, topography and street configuration, acceptable noise levels, bus ridership and load factors, vehicle durability and maintenance needs, service characteristics and Title VI and Environmental Justice considerations. The mix of fleet also takes into consideration temporal changes in both service and neighborhood activity to assess the most efficient and neighborhood appropriate vehicle for the anticipated services.

Within the District there is an active fleet of 774 wheelchair accessible buses. The fleet consists of a variety of vehicle model years and types: from year 2003 transit coaches to vehicles that are 20 years old. The average age of the fleet is 8.6 years (see table 4).

The District’s ongoing Revenue Vehicle Replacement Program prescribes the replacement of buses and small transit vehicles that have exceeded their useful lives. The program establishes an acceptable life of 12 years for a bus, 16 years for over-the-road coaches and seven years for a small transit vehicle, in line with those established by the Federal Transit Administration and in the Bay Area Region. However, due to
regional and local funding availability, the District is not always able to replace all vehicles at the end of their useful life.

Table 4: Bus Fleet Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Make</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Standing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Gillig 10240/1400</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Gillig 10240/1500</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Flyer 10235/2400</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Flyer 10240/2500</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Flyer 10260/2500</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Flyer Artics 10260/1800</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Gillig 10240/2800</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Gillig 10230/2700</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Gillig 10240/2600</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Flyer Artics 1900</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Eldorado-STV 100</td>
<td>26'</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>NABI 10240/2900</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>NABI 10240/3000</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>NABI 10240/4000</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>MCI 10245/6000</td>
<td>45'</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Van Hool Artics</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>NABI-Low Floor 4000</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Van Hool 1000</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>MCI-Over the Road 6000</td>
<td>45'</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vehicles are replaced according to their age. However, replacement schedules also include moving some buses to different operating divisions to ensure that the average fleet age is similar in each operating division.

3.5 Compliance Activities

Compliance with Title VI is part of the local decision-making process and is also an integral part of ongoing project management responsibilities. All proposed service changes and improvements include a Title VI evaluation to determine impacts on minority communities, individuals, and persons with disabilities. Community meetings are held to discuss potential changes in all areas. AC Transit’s Civil Rights Compliance activities were documented in the 1999 Title VI submittal. Since that submittal, a Civil Rights Compliance Audit was conducted in May 2003. The policy of AC Transit for determining Title VI compliance remains unchanged. The methods of achieving this policy are:

- Establishing procedures for developing and maintaining local standards for compliance with Title VI.
- Establishing internal guidelines for making determination of compliance with Title VI as part of the local decision making process.
- Evaluating systemwide service changes and proposed improvements at the planning and programming stages to determine whether overall benefits and costs of such changes are distributed equally and are non-discriminatory.
- Conducting compliance assessments of FTA-assisted transit services and benefits to assure compliance with requirements in Chapter IV of Circular 4702.1.
- Taking actions on findings and recommendations by reviewing officials.
4 Other Areas of Title VI Consideration

4.1 Changes in Service Features

In 2000, AC Transit adopted Guiding Principles for Service Deployment, which recognize that financial resources are limited. To make the best use of those resources, the principles emphasize that service should be prioritized to those areas with the greatest potential for transit use—meaning that more service should be added to areas with denser population and activity.

The Service Deployment Plan for North Alameda and West Contra Costa Counties complements similar plans in Central and South Alameda County. In 2000, bus service in Fremont and Newark was completely restructured to address needs identified by community leaders in the area. More recently, a two-phase service plan for Hayward, San Leandro and adjacent areas was also approved, with some implementation services beginning in August 2002. As with the Service Deployment Plan, phase 2 of the Central Alameda County plan has been deferred until additional revenues are available.

Phase 1 of the Plan went into effect in the fall of 2003. This phase included the introduction of AC Transit’s first Rapid Bus Project, which significantly improved passenger travel times on San Pablo Avenue from Oakland to San Pablo and travels through predominately minority communities. The plan also included a new line connecting the developing areas west of San Pablo Avenue with downtown Oakland and Alameda. In several areas where ridership was particularly low, the plan called for eliminating service. Other lines were restructured so that areas with light ridership retained bus service, even though passengers were required to transfer to a second bus to reach their destination. For some lines, bus routing remained the same but the frequency of buses was reduced.

Phase 2 of the plan would be implemented at a later date when the economy improves and sales tax revenues reach levels projected when the local sales tax measure was approved. This phase calls for more service enhancements along AC Transit’s high-ridership corridors. Rapid Bus service would be introduced along Telegraph Avenue and International/E.14th Streets within the cities of Berkeley, Oakland and San Leandro. All of these corridors are considered predominately minority, offering significant mobility improvements to its residents.

Following is a list of service improvements occurring between FY’s 2000-2003:

**FY 2000 to 2001:**

**Service Changes:**

**Route 97** did not change greatly; buses now travel to the Union Landing Transit Center on Dyer Street, resulting in a minor route alteration.

**Route 99** did connect to the Hayward, South Hayward, Union City, and Fremont BART stations. This route is similar to the existing route 21 with an extension to the Fremont
BART station and less deviation off Mission Boulevard. Route 99 has 24-hour service and is one of the major lines in the south county.

**Route 210** replaced current route 37 accessing the Hayward BART station. The new route connects Ohlone College to downtown Fremont via Fremont Boulevard. Service between Decoto Road and Washington Boulevard dovetails with routes 211 and 212 providing 15minute trunk weekdays.

**Route 211** replaced current route 21 and provides the most direct commute between the Union City and Fremont BART stations. Similar to route 210, route 211 provides bus service to the downtown Fremont area via Fremont Boulevard. As a result, service between Decoto Road and Walnut Avenue is dovetailed with route 210 providing 15minute trunk weekdays. A direct connection is scheduled between routes 211 and 212 at Fremont and Mowry.

**Route 212** provides service between industries in south Fremont around Fremont BART while continuing to serve Irvington. The route replaces route 22 with changes including dovetailed service between Mowry Avenue and Washington Boulevard with route 210 providing 15minute trunk weekdays. Direct connections are scheduled between routes 211 and 212 at Fremont and Mowry.

**Route 213** combined services of routes 26 and 29 to Niles and Mowry Avenue. Route 213 serves the northeastern end of Fremont accessing both BART stations. Moreover, the route provides direct access between Fremont BART and the New Park Mall operating 15minute trunk service on weekdays and Saturdays and 30 minute trunk service on Sundays.

**Route 214** is similar to route 213 which provides service between Fremont BART and the New Park Mall. However, route 214 travels down Stevenson Boulevard to the rear of New Park Mall replacing the southern portion of route 20.

**Route 215** provides service from New Park Mall to the areas of Newark, Central Avenue, and Peralta Boulevard toward Fremont BART. From there, the route travels to The School for the Blind and Deaf, on to Stevenson Boulevard, north to Mission Boulevard, east to Driscoll and Osgood Roads, and onto Warm Springs Boulevard.

**Route 217** generally replaces route 28, but does not deviate from main service streets like the 28. Instead route 217 includes a direct route to Ohlone College while providing similar service to the 28 with service to Milpitas.

**Route 218** replaces portions of routes 23 and 30 and travels on Walnut Avenue to Paseo Padre Parkway and southeast on Grimmer to Mission Boulevard. From there, buses travel north on Mission to the College supplying a direct route and added service in the area.

**Route 219** generally replaces portions of routes 21 and 27 providing service along main streets in the Tri-City area along Walnut Avenue, Paseo Padre Parkway, Thornton, Jarvis Avenue, and Newark Boulevard. Route 219 continues service to the Lido Faire Shopping Center and other parts of Newark along certain areas on the border of Union City.
Route 223 provides service form Fremont BART to residential areas near main arteries in Fremont. The upper loop replaces portions of routes 28 and 236 providing service east of the BART station towards The School for the Blind and Deaf. The lower loop replaces portions of routes 25 and 23 providing the same type of service for areas west of the BART station.

Route 231 provides a more streamlined service on one of Fremont’s major roads. Route 231 travels from Union City BART to Irvington Five Corners mainly via Blacow Road and is through-routed replacing portions of route 21.

Route 232 provides service from Union City BART into Newark, the western edge of Fremont, into Irvington and Mission San Jose, and north on Mission Boulevard into Ohlone College. This route supplies added service into southwest Union City, Irvington, Mission San Jose and both Ohlone Campuses, and replaces portions of routes 258, 20, and 235.

Route 233 provides service to New Park Mall via Newark Boulevard, Central Avenue, Cherry and Mowry Avenues. The route also travels along Decoto Road and Highway 84 in Union City. The route adds more comprehensive service in Newark and generally replaces portions of routes 20 and 29.

Route 234 mainly travels along Paseo Padre Parkway across the city of Fremont. From Union City BART, buses along the route travel down Decoto Road onto Paseo Padre then travel up Walnut Avenue to Fremont BART and back onto the Parkway. From there, the route provides service to the southern end of the county near Milpitas. Route 234 generally replaces portions of routes 20, 24, 28, and 22.

Other Changes:

Eastmont Transit Center: In March 2001 Eastmont Transit Center opened for regular operation. All buses operating through 73rd Ave and Foothill/ MacArthur area now operate through the transit center.

Introduction of BART Plus Pass: April 2001, introduction of BART Plus Pass enabled riders of BART, AC Transit, and other carriers to use a single fare card for transit service. Passes were sold on a sliding scale that depended on the cost of the holders BART fares. Passes were valid on AC Transit for half a month at a time.

Amtrak Capitol Corridor Transfer: Transfers received from Capitol Corridor service are now good on any local AC Transit route. Each transfer has cash value of one regular adult fare, may be upgraded for Transbay service, and may be used to transfer to another AC Transit bus for a .25 cent fee.
FY 2001-02:

Service Changes:

Route 328 went into operation in December 2001 providing transit links on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays between the transit transfer center at the Fremont BART Station and Ohlone College. This new bus route operates through Irvington via Paseo Padre Parkway, Grimmer Boulevard, Auto Mall Parkway/Durham Road, and Mission Boulevard.

Route 86 results from a combination with route 83. The route now connects Hayward BART with South Hayward BART with more efficient deviations then prior route 83.

Route 74 operated on a revised route in Richmond beginning 2001 serving the municipality's temporary city hall and the county offices on Hall Avenue near Marina Way South.

Routes 51 and 51M, and 35X are a result of adjustments, planned at the request of Alameda city officials to relocate to operate via Encinal Avenue, rather than on San Jose Avenue, when traveling between High Street and Broadway.

Routes 6, 17, & 57 are rerouted into Emeryville Amtrak, while route 17 is eliminated from Amtrak service.

Other Changes:

New 31 Day Passes: Former adult, youth, Transbay, and Transbay long distance passes were consolidated into a single 31 day magnetic strip pass. The 31-day valid period starts the first time the passenger uses the card and not on the first of the month enabling extreme flexibility to all pass users.

Bus Stop Relocation and Discontinuance: Lines 51, 51A, 51M, 325, & “O”. Coach stops eliminated and no longer in service include:

- Santa Clara Ave. @ Paru both directions
- Santa Clara Ave. @ Schiller both directions
- Santa Clara Ave. @ St. Charles northbound only

Coach stops relocated:

- Santa Clara Ave. @ Stanton St. N/B – from nearside to farside

New coach stop installed:

- Santa Clara Ave. @ Bay St. farside- northbound

City of Berkeley Employee Bus Pass Program: Beginning in December 2001, all authorized City of Berkeley employees and elected officials received the City of Berkeley Employee Bus Pass. Also referred to as the Eco Pass, it has a magnetic strip and is used like the 31-day pass.
FY 2002-03:

Service Changes:

Routes 6/6A: discontinued; some portions incorporated into rerouted Line 9 and new line 19, or covered by existing line 57.

Route 7: operate from Del Norte BART to North Berkeley BART stations via Arlington, Monterey and Sacramento. Span of service is from 6 a.m. to 8:30 p.m. at 40-minute frequency seven days per week.

Route 8: is discontinued. However, the majority of route 8 is served by route 65.

Route 9: most of the current line is combined with Line 65 and a portion of Line 6, with new terminals at Claremont and Ashby; service extended by one hour in the evening and frequency reduced from 15 min to 20 min; service on Sacramento St. to North Berkeley BART discontinued.

Route 12: new terminal in downtown Oakland at 11th and Jefferson Sts; commute-hour frequency reduced from 15 min to 20 min; Alameda portion incorporated into new Line 19.

Route 14: rerouted in downtown Oakland on 14th St instead of 11th and 12th Streets between Adeline St. and 1st Ave.

Route 15 changes consist of a realignment of the existing route serving the eastern part of Downtown Oakland. Route 15 operates on the existing line between Berkeley BART and 20th and Broadway, then via new routing at 20th Street onto Lakeside Drive, then Jackson to 11th/12th Streets where it rejoins the current route to the existing terminal at the Montclair Transit Center. Buses operating in the opposite direction follow approximately the same route. Service hours and frequencies remain unchanged.

Route 17: rerouted to stay on Keith Ave. to Broadway, with portion along Presley Way, Chabot Rd., and Patton St. discontinued.

Route 18L (Formally route 52L): operates between UC Village and Rockridge BART via route 52L to Telegraph and Bancroft, then via the extended portion, of route 64, on Telegraph, Alcatraz, and College to Rockridge BART. This eliminated the present one-way loop on route 52L around the college and substituted it with two-way service on the proposed route 18L which operates from 6 a.m. to midnight on weekdays at 15-minute peak hour service and 30-minute off peak. On weekends, the route operates from 8 a.m. through 11:30 p.m. at 30-minute frequency.

Route 19 (New): runs from North Berkeley BART via Sacramento ST., University Ave., and Sixth St.; incorporates portions of line 6 along Hollis St.; line 62 along 7th St., Union St., 10th St., and 11th/12th Sts.; and line 12 via the Posey/Webster Tube and Buena Vista Ave., terminating at Fruitvale BART; operates every 30 minutes form 6am to 9pm weekdays and weekends.
Route 20 (New): route operates between San Pablo, Buchanan, 19th and Broadway along Solano, Shattuck, Bancroft/Durant, Piedmont Crescent, Claremont, College, Pleasant Valley, Piedmont, Summit, Broadway, and 20th/19th streets. It operates from Downtown Oakland to Albany from 5 a.m. to 9 p.m. From 9 p.m. through 11:30 p.m., it operates from Albany to Berkeley. Both portions operate at 30-minute frequencies seven days per week.

Route 21 (New) replaces a portion of line 67 between North Berkeley BART and Terrace Dr./Moeser Lane; operates weekdays from 6:30 am to 9 am, and from 3 pm to 6:30 pm.

Route 40: operates between Center and Shattuck and Eastmont Mall Transit Center via Telegraph, Broadway and Foothill. Span of service and frequency did not change.

Route 42: eliminated. Route 19 will serve Marina Village.

Route 43: operates between Center and Shattuck and Eastmont Mall Transit Center via Shattuck, Broadway and Foothill. Span of service and frequency did not change. Albany/Berkeley portions of the route are be covered by route 20, and the San Leandro end along Bancroft are covered by new route 61.

Route 44: unchanged except for an extension from Fruitvale BART to the segment currently served by route 53.

Route 48: is no longer interlined with route 44 on weekends.

Route 49/49M: rerouted to operate from Fruitvale BART via the Fruitvale bridge and Fernside Dr. to High St., incorporating a discontinued portion of line 51.

Route 50: operates in downtown Oakland from Alameda via Franklin St., 12th St., and Martin Luther King Jr. Way, to a new terminal on 11th St. at Jefferson St., returning to Alameda, operates via Broadway, 7th St., and Webster St.

Route 51: new terminals for all trips at 3rd St. and University Ave. in Berkeley, and Broadway and Blanding St. in Alameda; service to the Berkeley Marina incorporated into Line 9; service on San Jose Ave., High St., and Fernside Blvd. in Alameda discontinued.

Route 52: midday service discontinued, with new service hours between 8:30 am and 9:30 am, and 4:30 pm and 6:00 pm; service north of University Village discontinued.

Route 52L: routing around campus changed to match Line 52, offering two-way service around campus; service north of University Village discontinued.

Route 53/53A: operates only on the existing segment of the route between Fruitvale BART, Lyman and Tiffin Roads. Approximately half of the buses are short turned at MacArthur Blvd. Service hours and frequencies remain unchanged. Service above Fruitvale and MacArthur Blvd is eliminated.

Route 58: extended to serve Oakland Amtrak, replacing service previously provided by Lines 72 and 73.
Route 59/59A: rerouted from Rockridge BART to Montclair, incorporating a portion of the discontinued route 64 and continue on to Lake Merritt BART via “Pill Hill’. The Harbor Dr. portion served previously by route 59A is discontinued, as well as service on Thornhill Dr., and all service south of Lake Merritt BART. Route frequency is reduced from 30 minutes to 40-60 minutes.

Route 62: continues between Fruitvale Bart and 8th and Broadway, then the line will continue via 8th Street into 7th Street to the West Oakland Bart Station. Service to 16th and Wood (old Amtrak Station) is discontinued.

Route 63: rerouted via High St and Encinal Ave. to Broadway. Route 63 offers added some weekend service on Bay Farm Island operating every 30 minutes between 6:30 am and 8:30 p.m. via Robert Davey Jr. Dr., Aughinbaugh WY, Macartney Rd., Maitland Dr., Island Dr. to Park St., and Encinal Ave.

Route 64: discontinued along the portion between Rockridge BART and Montclair and incorporated into route 59.

Route 65: operating form Berkeley BART to the Berkeley Hills with every other weekday trip servicing the Lawrence Hall of Science (LHS) via Euclid Ave., Grizzly Peak Blvd., Senior Ave., Campus and Shasta. Route 65 also incorporates a portion of discontinued route 8 with weekend service to LHS only.

Route 67: shortened to operate from Berkeley BART to Bruce St and Grizzly Peak Blvd. Return trips are rerouted via Beloit and Vassar Ave. while weekday service is extended by one hour in the evening. The route segment operating between Terrace Dr/ Moeser Lane, and North Berkeley BART was discontinued and incorporated into route 21. Direct service between North Berkeley BART and downtown Berkeley was discontinued while weekend trips continue to serve Tilden Park.

Route 72: incorporated into route 76 and rerouted via Robert Miller Dr. instead of Birmingham DR. to Hilltop Mall. A new southern terminal will be constructed at 2nd St. and Broadway, while service to Oakland Amtrak will be replaced by route 58. Frequency is reduced from 20-30 minutes during commute hours.

Route 72L: renamed route 72R.

Route 72M: formerly named route 73 has a new southern terminal at 2nd and Broadway.

Route 72R enhanced route is the new “San Pablo Rapid” and replaces line 72. The route includes faster service between Contra Costa College and Jack London Square. There are fewer stops with 12-minute frequencies and service from 6am-7am on weekdays. The route includes new buses and shelters. Route 72R, offers enhanced express service and speeds up service by 20% compared to the previous travel time. Route 72R service operates from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. at a 12-minute frequency. To accomplish these goals, significant service changes were proposed. The major changes to route 72L (renamed 72R to clearly designate that the Rapid service has been redesigned to reduce travel time) are:
Implementation of a traffic signal priority system for buses
A switch to a fleet of all low-floor, multi-door buses for quicker passenger loading
Provision of electronic bus arrival information at all 72-Rapid stops
The removal of a substantial number of the lightly patronized 72L stops along the Rapid route
Relocation of 72R bus stops to the far side of all intersections

**Route 73**: renamed route 72M.

**Route 76**: extended to serve Hilltop Mall via Birmingham Dr.; Leroy Heights portion discontinued.

**Route 82/82L**: rerouted via 11th/12th Sts in downtown Oakland instead of 14th St., with new northern terminal at 11th and Jefferson Sts., discontinued West Oakland portion served by lines 13, 19, and 62.

**Route 88**: rerouted via Market St., and 11th/12th Sts., with portions along 18th St and Broadway discontinued, new terminal at Lake Merritt BART.

**Route 91**: schedule adjustment between 5:30 pm-7:30 p.m. on trips from Hayward BART to Chabot College.

**Route 315**: new terminal in downtown Oakland at 11th and Jefferson St.

**Route 325**: discontinued while Alameda/Oakland ferry service is served by route 50.

**Route 354**: discontinued from Fruitvale BART to Super Kmart while all other trips are reassigned to route 54.

**Route A**: new terminal in downtown Oakland at 11th and Jefferson streets.

**Route F**: rerouted via Adeline, Market, 40th and Shellmound streets; service is discontinued from Market/ 40th St to West Grand Ave.

**Changes for the Fremont/ Newark Area:**

**Route 210** is realigned to operate between South Hayward BART and the intersection of Industrial Parkway West and Huntwood Ave via Tennyson Rd.

**Route 212** discontinued weekday service on Cushing Parkway and Northport Loop East and West while maintaining weekend service.

**Route 213** reduced service frequency between Fremont BART and New Park Mall from 15 to 30 minutes.

**Route 214** extended from Lido Faire to Union City BART via Highway 84 and also operates from Filbert St. to Central Ave. Service is discontinued on Enterprise Dr., Willow St, and Central Ave. in Newark with reduced frequencies from 30-60 minutes.

**Route 215** discontinued service from New Park Mall to Fremont BART via Mowry Ave., Cherry St., Central Ave., Dusterberry Way., Peralta Blvd. The Warm Spring segment is
rerouted to operate via Warm Spring Blvd., Warren Ave., Kato Rd., Page Ave., and Millmont Dr. Frequencies reduced from 30-60 minutes with discontinued weekend service.

Route 217 extended its weekday route north from Fremont to Union City BART via Mowry Ave., Mission Blvd., and Decoto Rd. with continued weekend service on the current route only. Frequencies are reduced from 30-60 minutes.

Route 218 reduced frequency from 30-60 minutes.

Route 219 moved from Jarvis Ave. to Gateway Blvd., operating on Gateway Blvd. during commute hours with reduced frequencies from 30-60 minutes.

Route 223 discontinued service

Route 231 discontinued service on Blacow Rd. between Boone Dr. and Fremont Blvd. The route extends to Fremont BART via Boone Dr., Sundale Ct., Capitol Ave., and Mowry Ave., with reduced weekday service from 30-60 minutes while maintaining current weekend service.

Route 232 discontinued service between New Park Mall and Ohlone College via Mowry Blvd., Cherry St., Boyce Rd., Auto Mall Parkway, Durham Rd., and Mission Blvd. The route is extended from New Park Mall to Fremont BART via Mowry Ave., Cherry St., Central Ave., Dusterberry Way, and Peralta Blvd. Added service through the Ardenwood Business Park with reduced service frequency from 30-60 minutes and the introduction of weekend service.

Route 233 discontinued service between Lido Faire and Union City BART via Highway 84. The route is extended from the New Park Mall to Fremont BART via Mowry Ave., with a new bus stop within New Park Mall. Frequencies are reduced from 30-60 minutes.

Route 234 is discontinued.

Route 253 is discontinued.

Route 258 is discontinued.

Route 329 is extended to Laurel Avenue Senior Apartments via Grimmer Blvd., Irvington Ave., Thurston St., Carol Ave., and Chapel Way.

Route U is a new express bus service connecting Fremont BART and Centerville ACE/Amtrak Station with Stanford University via the Dumbarton Bridge (Funded by federal/state grants and Stanford University).

Route SB extended on Hesperian Rd. from Industrial Blvd. to Tennyson Ave., entering I-880 at Tennyson Ave.
Other Changes:

10 Ride Pass- Effective with the September fare increase, 10-ride convenience tickets assumed a new format that included a 10 day pass with magnetic strip.

Free bus pass program – The free pass is available only at schools for middle and high school students who qualify as low income.

New cash fares – Effective September 2002, new cash fares as follows:

Local Cash Fares
- Adult (18-64) $1.50
- Youths (5-17) $0.75
- Seniors/ Disabled $0.75
- Adult Day Pass $5.00
- Youth, Senior, Disabled Day Pass $2.50

Transbay Basic Cash Fares
- Adult (18-64) $3.00 each way
- Youth (5-17) $1.50 each way
- Senior/ Disabled $1.50 each way

Transbay Long Distance Cash Fares
- Adult (18-64) $3.25 each way
- Youth (5-17) $1.60 each way
- Senior/ Disabled $1.60 each way

Transfers:
Transfers now expire two hours from the time they are issued.

Bus to Bus Transfers
- Local $0.25
- Transbay Free

Bus to BART Transfers
- Adults (18-64) Add $1.25
- Youth (5-17) Add $0.55
- Seniors/ Disabled Add $0.55
4.2 Minority Representation on Decision Making Bodies

The Board of Directors of AC Transit is responsible for both the development of policy and oversight of operations. The Board is composed of seven elected representatives, therefore racial breakdown is not required. Five Board members are ward based, serving specific areas within the AC Transit district, and two at large representatives serve the entire service area. The Board currently consists of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AC Transit Board of Directors</th>
<th>Officers of the Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patrisha Piras</td>
<td>Kenneth C. Scheidig/ District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Wallace</td>
<td>Rick Fernandez/ General Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Kaplan</td>
<td>Rose Martinez/ District Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.E. Christian Peeples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Harper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores Jaquez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Bischofberger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Committees of the Board of Directors all consist of various assignments of the Board members. The following is a description of each committee.

The Planning Committee is responsible for reviewing all policies and activities associated with planning, which include the service provided by the District to its customers, budgetary issues, and development of human resources. This Committee deals with the big picture, once items are approved by the Board and are implemented; the follow through resides with the Operations Committee.

The External Affairs Committee is responsible for reviewing all activities associated with marketing, customer services relations with the District's advisory committees, legislation, public information, dealings with other governmental agencies, and private sector partners (employers, community groups, etc.) to promote the District's interest.

The Paratransit committee is responsible for reviewing all activities related to AC Transit's role in the East Bay Paratransit Consortium's (EBPC). The EBPC is a joint project between AC Transit and BART. These activities include fare changes, policy decisions, and monitoring performance. This committee also monitors performance related to accessibility of the fixed route system.

The Finance Committee is responsible for reviewing all issues involving the financing of the District, including but not limited to, budget preparation, potential revenue sources, grants, and auditing services. Activities (both internal and external) include monthly, quarterly and semi-annual financial reports, requests for proposals/awards of contracts/agreements (unless assigned to a "topic" committee), procurement of non-revenue service vehicles and buses, and service reductions and adjustments.

The Operations Committee is responsible for the following areas of review: Following through on policies and activities associated with District services and programs (including administration and operation of the District). The concept of the Operations Committee is to monitor the implementation of items that are developed by the Planning Committee and approved by the Board of Directors.
Accessibility Advisory Committee (AAC)
The Accessibility Advisory Committee is a group of individuals appointed by the Board of Directors that provides input to the AC Transit Board on issues that affect the Disabled Community.

In 2003, the AAC composition was as follows: 7 white, 1 African/American, 1 other. AAC members self-declared their ethnicity.

4.3 Multilingual Facilities

Citizen participation is an integral part of the administration and operation of all transit service provided in the AC Transit service area. Information dissemination is an essential element of the citizen participation process. Communication with existing and potential transit users is achieved in a variety of ways including public meetings and forums. Minority groups are always given particular attention in the information dissemination process.

AC Transit provides a variety of multilingual opportunities for information dissemination assisting non-English speaking individuals who wish to employ our service. Because the AC Transit service area serves a significant Hispanic and Asian population, the system map contains panels that give instructions on how to ride the bus in Spanish and Chinese. Telephone assistance is also provided in Spanish and Chinese. Examples of service change notices are included as Appendices. All materials are also provided on audio tape and Braille as requested.

Public outreach materials (brochures, newspaper ads, signs, and information materials), used in the service planning process are also produced in three languages: English, Spanish, and Chinese. Additionally, the on-board rider profile survey, conducted in 2002-2003, surveyed bus riders in these three languages and was available in Braille and audio tape as requested.

In the year 2000 the District adopted Resolution 2033: Affirming the commitment of the Alameda Contra-Costa Transit District to social and environmental justice. The resolution compels the District to involve the people of Alameda and Contra-Costa counties in making decisions pertaining to transit policy, service design, and operations (see Appendix A for Resolution text).

Additionally, in the year 2001 the District developed a community involvement work plan, which detailed initiatives and development plans to improve upon its existing outreach strategies. The work plan (see Appendix K) identifies all strategies on a detailed timeline.
5.0 Monitoring Procedures for Transit Providers

5.1 Level of Service Compliance Assessment

AC Transit’s fixed-route service is planned and provided without regard to race, color, ethnicity, or national origin. Instead services and facilities are assigned or placed according to service demand and availability of the funding agency. The procedure for examining level of service is described in the FTA Title VI Circular 4702.1. It involves comparing service standards and policies for the system as a whole to individual performances of minority bus routes. A minority bus route is defined as having one-third or more of its mileage operating within minority zones.

Service Profile

During the review period, AC Transit’s 141 bus lines included fixed route service provided on 137 total routes, 28 Transbay routes, and 11 owl routes, operating in the 13 city AC Transit service area. AC Transit currently carries 206,000 daily weekday passengers, or 62 million annually.

The population of Alameda and Contra Costa Counties was 2,450,867, based on the 2000 census. The AC Transit service area encompasses the densely populated western areas of both counties and does not include east county areas. Over 60% of the population of Alameda and Contra Costa Counties reside within the District’s fixed-route service area.

The following population information provides specific ethnic/racial representation for the fixed-route bus service area and both counties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity/Race</th>
<th>AC Service Area</th>
<th>Alameda/Contra Costa Counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>17.10%</td>
<td>11.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>16.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>19.70%</td>
<td>17.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/Pacific Is.</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Minority</strong></td>
<td><strong>58.20%</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.73%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the fall of 2002, Alameda Contra-Costa Transit District (ACT) sponsored an on board survey to gather information on demographics and travel characteristics of its riders. San Francisco State University’s Public Research Institute was contracted to conduct the study. The purpose of the on-board survey was to provide an accurate portrait of AC Transit riders at the system-wide level, by service type, by time of day/time of week, by planning area, and at the route level for the 6 highest volume routes. The 2002 on-board rider profile provided a great deal of information regarding trip making characteristics and passenger satisfaction. The data provided the district with the ability to assess service use while providing an essential tool for Title VI monitoring.
Race/ Ethnicity
Using the 2002 rider profile survey, passenger’s race/ethnicity information is summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ Ethnicity of Passengers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/ Pacific Islander</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/ Hispanic</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Service Components

Using 2000 census data, the level of transit service was measured in every minority and non-minority census tract in the service area. The level of service analysis included the following service indicators:

- Number of available local routes
- Peak Frequency
- Off-peak frequency
- Number of daily trips
- Average age of vehicle

See Appendices L and M, which provide the details of the analysis. The results from the level of service assessment are summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minority Census Tracts</th>
<th>Non-Minority Census Tracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Census Tracts</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average # available routes</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(local only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak frequency (local only)</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-peak frequency (local only)</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average # of daily trips</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(local only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age of vehicle (years)</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This data confirms that the level of service provided is actually slightly better in minority census tracts than in non-minority tracts.
5.2 Quality of Service Compliance Assessment

Passenger Service Ratings

The 2002 on-board survey provided an accurate portrait of service characteristics and demographics. Riders were asked to rate AC Transit service on a variety of measures including punctuality, scheduling, driver courtesy, safety, cleanliness, fares, and overall service satisfaction. The following reflects those findings, which are broken down by classified minority status. (see Appendix N, for service ratings by minorities and non-minorities; transit dependency by ethnicity; and service ratings by transit dependency).

Overall, all riders gave an overall rating of 3, which signifies as a “good” rating on a one through five scale. Minority riders gave a slightly lower overall service rating (3.06) than non-minority riders (3.31). However, there were a few qualitative anomalies by ethnicity that may be explained by issues related to frequency of use.

In general minority riders are more likely to be transit dependent than non-minority groups. Those that use the service often, and rely upon it for the majority of their trip making, see all aspects of the system on a daily basis. Consequently, those riders are more apt to be critical of the system than those who do not use the system as often. When viewing the service ratings by transit dependency, which includes non-minority riders, ratings are also lower than for discretionary riders. (see Appendix N referenced above)

Number of Buses Used to Make Trip by Service Type

One measure of service quality is to examine the number of buses passengers use to make a one-way trip. The following is an analysis from the onboard survey measuring trip characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1.How many buses will it take to complete your one way trip today?</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Af/Amer</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 bus</td>
<td></td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 buses</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 buses</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4+ buses</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, minority populations require more buses to complete their trip than minority populations. This may be due to trip purpose and commute patterns. Because minority populations are more likely to be transit dependant than non-minority populations, they are likely to use the bus to serve a variety of mobility needs other than work-trips to the urban core. As such, additional transferring may be required to access a wider variety of goods and services.
5.3 Transit Travel Pattern Analysis

Title VI requires an analysis of accessibility and quality to key destinations within the transit district service area. To determine whether the quality of service is consistent among different user groups and degree to which transit is responsive to minority needs, the following methodology was used:

- Five of the most popular destinations were selected for the analysis—Kaiser Hospital (Richmond), University of California Berkeley, Downtown Oakland, Chabot College, and New Park Mall (Newark).

- Within a seven-mile radius, for each destination location, 2 minority and 2 non-minority census tracts (20 total) were randomly selected by computer for trip origins.

- An 8:00 a.m. peak arrival time was established for each trip.

- The most efficient local routes were selected for each trip.

Based on the service quality analysis provided in Table 9, minority census tracts are equally or, in several instances, better served than non-minority census tracts. The disparity in cost per trip mile results from longer average trip distances. The most direct local route was selected for each trip.

Detailed analyses of all trips are presented as Appendix O. A summary comparison of the quality of service provided to minority census tracts with non-minority census tracts is provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9: Origin Destination Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Distance (Miles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route Distance (Miles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Distance (Miles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk Time (Minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait Time (Minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Time (Minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Travel Time (Minutes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Transfers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost Per Trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost Per Trip Mile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>