Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District

STAFF REPORT

TO: AC Transit Board of Directors
FROM: Michael A. Hursh, General Manager
SUBJECT: Transbay Fare Proposal Decision

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDED ACTION(S):

Consider the adoption of Resolution No. 18-012 approving the Transbay Fare Schedule effective July 1, 2018, approving the Title VI Fare Equity Analysis, determining that the fare adjustment is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act, and directing staff to amend Board Policy 333 (Fare Policy: Fares, Fare Structure, and Fare Increases).

BACKGROUND/RATIONALE:

Staff requests the Board to adopt Resolution 18-012 which approves the proposed Transbay Fare schedule. The proposed fare schedule is shown in Exhibit A and the Title VI Fare Equity Analysis is shown in Exhibit B to Attachment 1. The first increase in the proposed fare schedule would occur on July 1, 2018, to roughly coincide with the opening of the new Salesforce Transit Center, the introduction of double-decker buses into the District’s Transbay fleet, and implementation of the Transbay Tomorrow service plan shortly afterward in August. Further fare increases through FY 2022-23 would bring Transbay fares more in line with other commuter or Transbay fares on other regionals services.

The Title VI fare equity analysis (in Exhibit B to Attachment 1) found that the proposals did not carry any disparate impacts on populations of color or disproportionate burdens on low-income populations.

Also included as Attachment 3 is the updated findings from the Transbay Tomorrow Passenger Survey which has been referenced in the discussion on the Transbay Fare proposal. The survey received about 2,000 entries and included questions regarding Transbay fare payment. A few relevant findings are as follows:

- 81% of respondents pay for their trip using eCash on Clipper, while only 13% use the Transbay 31-Day Pass on Clipper.
- 60% of respondents are willing or neutral to pay higher fares for more service.
- 63% of respondents have a household income of $100K or more, with 22% earning $200K or more. Only 11% have a household income less than $50,000.

BUDGETARY/FISCAL IMPACT:

In developing the Proposed Fare Schedule, staff aimed to keep the Transbay farebox recovery ratio at the same or better than the current 24 percent. The proposed fare increase scenarios would generate an additional $4.2 million by FY 2022-23 which would be used to pay down the
capital funding commitment to the Salesforce Transit Center. Accordingly, the farebox recovery ratio for the District’s Transbay service would be approximately (based on various assumptions) 25.5 percent by FY 2022-23.

**ADVANTAGES/DISADVANTAGES:**

The advantages to approving the Resolution and the fare increase proposal are:

- It will allow the District to continue to provide high quality Transbay service
- Maintain the current fare recovery ratio achieved by Transbay service so that it does not require increased subsidy
- Allow the District to begin paying off the remainder of its capital commitment to the TJPA

Not approving the fare increase also means that the deficits shown in the 10-year financial projections presented to the Board will increase because the current revenue projections are based on the fare increase proposal.

The main disadvantage to approving the resolution is that the large fare increase in the first year may result in a decrease in Transbay riders. Prior fare increases have shown, however, that the immediate ridership decrease generally dissipates and permanent ridership losses are minimal and erased by future ridership growth.

**ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS:**

The Board could also consider approval of some portion of the current proposal. For example, the first two years of the five year proposal could be adopted. In addition to approving all or part of the proposed fare structure, if the Board desires to pursue an alternate fare structure, such as a zone-based fare, it could direct staff to gather research and develop recommendations for the Board to consider at a future meeting. Proposals for any such alternate fare structure would likely be subject to further public hearings. Any alteration to the current proposals will require staff to conduct a new Title VI fare equity analysis and present it to the Board of Directors for their consideration and approval before the fare proposal may be implemented.

**Zone-Based Fare**

Staff has continued to look at the feasibility of a zone-based fare for Transbay. The current Clipper® system can handle charging different fares by route without cost to AC Transit or significant programming lead-time. Future Clipper® technology will likely be able to take actual distance into account. Establishment of rational fare zones that work with the current and future Clipper® systems is key, considering Transbay routes vary in length, direction and local miles versus freeway miles. Staff would need to develop criteria that address these variations when creating the zones. Other fare structure considerations to be developed are the 31-day pass price structure, the possibility of “upgrades” from one zone to another, how to price EasyPass, the additional staff time and resources needed to manage a zone-based fare, system, and the significant internal and external communications required to roll-out a new system.
In preliminary discussions with MTC regarding zone-based fare, any changes to the fare structure outside of adjusting the single-ride fare by route would require a change order and carry an extra cost. In addition, establishing multiple price points for existing fare products, such as the 31-day pass, is not possible under the current Clipper® program. As a result, AC Transit would need to carefully price the 31-day pass under a zone-based fare system.

An additional issue to be addressed for a zone-based fare is equity. Based on the distribution of people of color in the District and among Transbay ridership, staff’s initial Title VI analysis finds that a zone-based fare would have a disparate impact on Minority populations. Further work needs to be done to develop an alternate plan that would not carry a discriminatory effect. If staff cannot find a less discriminatory alternative, according to Board Policy 518, the District must identify measures to mitigate the negative impacts of the proposed change.

Pricing and establishing the number of zones under a zone-based fare system will require many considerations. While zone-based fares will address the price inequities under the current fare structure based on distance and travel-time, they will introduce a new set of inequities with different fares for different areas and populations as noted above. Staff could develop a proposal that meets our revenue targets but tries to minimize the “sticker shock” for longer-distance commuters.

Though there are many challenges associated with developing and implementing a zone-based fare system, they are not insurmountable given staff’s understanding of the planning and implementation process, and associated logistics. If directed, staff can bring a zone-based fare proposal to the board for review and consideration this summer, with potential implementation on July 1, 2019.

PRIOR RELEVANT BOARD ACTION/POLICIES:

Board Policy 333 – Fare Policy: Fares, Fare Structure, and Fare Increases
Board Resolution No. 13-046
Board Resolution No. 16-009
Staff Report 16-047 – Board Policy 328- Fare Policy
Staff Report 17-017 – Scheduled Fare Increase -- July 1, 2017
Staff Report 17-030 – Board Policy 333, AC Transit EasyPass Fares for 2017 and 2018
Staff Report 17-234 Transbay Fare Schedule Adjustment
Staff Report 17-234a Transbay Fare Schedule Adjustment
Staff Report 17-234b – Set Transbay Fare Public Hearing
Staff Report 17-234c – Transbay Fare Public Hearing Upgrade Fares
Staff Report 17-234d – Transbay Fare Public Hearing

ATTACHMENTS:

1: Resolution 18-012 with Exhibits A and B
2: Summary of Outreach and Public Comments
3: Transbay Tomorrow Passenger Survey
ALAMEDA-CONTRA COSTA TRANSIT DISTRICT
RESOLUTION NO. 18-012

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE TRANSBAY FARE SCHEDULE EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2018, APPROVING THE TITLE VI FARE EQUITY ANALYSIS, DETERMINING THAT THE FARE ADJUSTMENT IS EXEMPT FROM THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT, AND DIRECTING STAFF TO AMEND BOARD POLICY 333 (FARE POLICY: FARES, FARE STRUCTURE, AND FARE INCREASES)

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors is authorized by Public Utilities Code section 25807 to establish reasonable rates and charges for the operation of the District; and

WHEREAS, Board Policy 333 (Fare Policy: Fares, Fare Structure, and Fare Increases) was adopted on June 22, 2011 and last amended on February 24, 2016; and

WHEREAS, at the August 9, 2017 AC Transit Board meeting, an initial staff proposal for a Transbay service fare increase was first presented; and

WHEREAS, at subsequent meetings on September 24, 2017, November 8, 2017, staff presented further information and refinements of the Transbay fare proposal; and

WHEREAS, at its meeting of December 13, 2017, the Board of Directors set public hearings for January 24, 2018, at 3:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. at 1600 Franklin Street in Oakland, California to consider a proposed adjustment in the Transbay Fare Schedule; and

WHEREAS, notices of the January 24, 2018 public hearing were published in the following major local newspapers: Bay Area News Group (East Bay Times, Argus, Daily Review), Post News Group (Oakland Post, El Mundo), and Sing Tao Daily, as well as detailed information on the District’s website; and

WHEREAS, a brochure, in English, Spanish and Chinese, describing the fare change proposals was placed on the District’s buses, at the Temporary Transbay Terminal, and e-mailed to local government officials in the affected cities and counties; and

WHEREAS, the fare proposal was presented and comments and questions taken at the Transbay Taskforce meeting in San Francisco on January 9, 2018, at 12:00 p.m., and at a community meeting at 1600 Franklin St in Oakland on January 18, 2018, at 6:30 p.m.; and

WHEREAS, on January 24, 2018, the Board of Directors held public hearings at 3:00 p.m. and at 6:00 p.m. at AC Transit’s General Office located at 1600 Franklin Street in Oakland, California and received comments from four speakers and one written comment; and

WHEREAS, approximately 50 additional comments were received via letters, comment forms, voice mail and e-mail before the public hearing and sent to all Directors, as well as placed in a binder in the District Secretary’s Office for review by the Board of Directors; and
WHEREAS, Public Resources Code section 21080(b)(8) and 14 California Code of Regulations section 15273 exempts from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) the establishment, modification, structuring, restructuring, or approval of rates, tolls, fares, or other charges which are for any of the purposes set forth in the exemption provided written findings are made; and

WHEREAS, the required written findings are more particularly set forth in Section 3 below;

NOW THEREFORE, the Board of Directors of the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District does resolve as follows:

Section 1. Adopts the Transbay Fare Schedule attached hereto and incorporated by reference as Exhibit A.

Section 2. Determines that the proposed fare adjustments are exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to section 21080(b)(8) of CEQA and section 15273 of the CEQA Guidelines. Section 15273 of the Guidelines provide as follows:

(a) CEQA does not apply to the establishment, modification, structuring, restructuring, or approval of rates, tolls, fares, or other charges by public agencies which the public agency finds are for the purpose of:

1. Meeting operating expenses, including employee wage rates and fringe benefits,
2. Purchasing or leasing supplies, equipment, or materials,
3. Meeting financial reserve needs and requirements,
4. Obtaining funds for capital projects, necessary to maintain service within existing service areas, or
5. Obtaining funds necessary to maintain such intra-city transfers as are authorized by city charter.

The Board finds and declares that the adjustments set forth in Exhibit A to this Resolution are exempt from CEQA for the reasons stated above supported by the following:

Obligations

1. The District has ongoing operating expenses, which include, but are not limited to existing collective bargaining agreements, costs for providing and maintaining the bus service provided to our customers, costs for paying for debt service and the costs of insurance, utilities and similar items.

2. The District needs to continue to purchase parts, supplies and equipment for the direct and indirect functioning of the organization.
3. The District has an obligation to pay the remaining amount of its $57 million total capital commitment to the construction of the Salesforce Transit Center as specified in the 2008 Lease and Use Agreement between the District and the Transbay Joint Powers Authority.

**Section 3.** Approves the Title VI Fare Equity Analysis set forth as Exhibit B to this Resolution.

**Section 4.** Directs staff to amend Board Policy 333 (Fare Policy: Fares, Fare Structure, and Fare Increases) to reflect the adjustment in Transbay Fares set forth in Exhibit A to this Resolution.

**Section 5.** Staff is authorized and directed to file such documents that may be required by CEQA and Board Policy 525 based on the actions authorized by this Resolution.

**Section 6.** This Resolution supersedes any and all prior Resolutions that are in conflict with its contents.

**Section 7.** This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its passage by four affirmative votes of the Board of Directors.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 28th day of February 2018.

Elsa Ortiz, President

Attest:

Linda A. Nemeroff, District Secretary

I, Linda A. Nemeroff, District Secretary for the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was passed and adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Directors held on the 28th day of February, 2018 by the following roll call vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

Linda A. Nemeroff, District Secretary
Approved as to Form and Content:

Denise C. Standridge, General Counsel
Proposed Transbay Fare Increase Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Adult Single Fare</td>
<td>$ 4.50</td>
<td>$ 5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Increase</td>
<td>$ 1.00</td>
<td>$ 0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth/Senior/Disabled Single Fare</td>
<td>$ 2.20</td>
<td>$ 2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Increase</td>
<td>$ 0.55</td>
<td>$ 0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly (31 day) Adult Pass</td>
<td>$ 162.00</td>
<td>$ 198.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Increase %</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Increase % from Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Increase % per Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upgrade Fares from Local-to-Transbay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth/Senior/Disabled Upgrade Fare</td>
<td>$ 1.10</td>
<td>$ 1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Upgrade Fare</td>
<td>$ 2.25</td>
<td>$ 3.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* AC Transit Board Policy 333 contains a local fare schedule that only extends to FY 2018-19. Upgrade fares beyond that year will be similarly based on the difference between the local and transbay fares, but the exact amounts are to be determined when local fare amounts are set in the future.
TITLE VI FARE EQUITY ANALYSIS FOR TRANSBAY TOMORROW FARE PROPOSALS

On January 24, 2018 the AC Transit Board of Directors will hold a public hearing to receive comment about fare change proposals for Transbay service. Board Policy 518, “Title VI and Environmental Justice Service Review and Compliance Report Policy,” directs staff to undertake a fare equity analysis for all fare change proposals regardless of the amount of increase or decrease. The purpose of the analysis is to determine, prior to implementing changes to the fare system, whether the planned changes will have a disproportionate impact on the basis of race, color, or national origin, or if low-income populations will bear a disproportionate burden of the changes. The fare equity analysis also considered how District staff carried out public engagement to ensure that populations protected by Title VI and associated regulations had sufficient opportunity to hear about the public hearing process and to provide public comment. A detailed description of these public engagement efforts, and the public comment received so far, is contained in Attachment 4 to this staff report.

The analysis found that the fare proposals do not carry any discriminatory effects on Title VI-protected populations. As per the Board Policy, this fare equity analysis must be presented to the Board of Directors for their consideration and approval before the fare proposal may be implemented.

Methodology

In order to conduct the fare equity analysis, staff generated an “Average Fare,” i.e. the average cost of linked one-way trips for each fare category and for each demographic group, using rider survey data. Because the last system-wide rider survey was conducted in 2012, staff undertook a rider survey aimed at Transbay riders during the summer of 2017 specifically for this purpose.

Staff used the following assumptions to generate the average fare:

1. No one (or only a very small number) rides more than one AC Transit local bus to get to or from their Transbay ride. Because one free local bus ride is included in the Transbay fare, the average fare is therefore made up of the Transbay fare paid by all individual riders.
2. Because there are no Clipper discounts for Transbay fares, nor are any proposed, the analysis assumes everyone within a fare category (i.e. Adult, Youth, Senior, Disabled) pays the same fare regardless of how they pay.
3. The analysis assumes that monthly pass holders use Transbay service 36 times per month. This number was chosen because the Transbay monthly pass cost is based on 36 times the single ride fare.
4. Staff used $50,000 as the cut-off for low-income status in order to assess impacts on low-income riders; that is, anyone who reported their household income as under $50,000 was considered low-income for the purpose of this analysis.

The proposal before the Board recommends only one set of fare changes, consisting of an increase in the next three out of five years; no changes are proposed for FY 2020-21 or for FY 2022-23. Each survey response was assigned a fare based on the category and instrument used. For example, a youth cash payer was assigned a fare of $2.20, an adult Clipper payer was assigned a fare of $4.50, and so
forth. Since there are not many discounted fare instruments for Transbay and there aren’t many who pay a non-adult fare, the average for all respondents ($4.38) is close to the $4.50 base fare. This also means that the proposed percentage changes do not vary too much between different groups.

The results of the average fare analysis were then assessed to see if the fare proposals would result in a disparate impact on the basis of race, color, or national origin, or if low-income populations would bear a disproportionate burden of the proposals.

Findings

The analysis found that the proposed fare changes affected people of color slightly more than non-Hispanic whites; this difference was 0.2% or less. The proposed fare changes affected low-income people slightly more than not low-income people as well; the difference between the effects was 0.26% or less.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Average Fare</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Current FY17/18</td>
<td>FY18/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of Color</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, not Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between Minority &amp; Non-Minority:</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Average Fare</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $50,000</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $50,000</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between Low-Income/Not Low-Income:</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Board Policy 518, “the measure of disparate impact involves a comparison of impacts borne by minority populations compared to impacts borne by non-minority populations. [ ... ] When minority populations or riders as a whole will experience a 15% (or more) greater adverse effect than that borne by the non-minority populations or riders, such changes will be considered to have a disparate impact.” The measure of disproportionate burden involves a similar comparison for low-income and not low-income populations. For each year of proposed change, none of the differences between protected and non-protected riders approached 15%, so there is no finding of disparate impact or disproportionate burden.

Staff investigated the results for statistical significance and found them to be valid. The small sample size for the low-income group (n=108) yielded a 9.5% margin of error, however, given that the largest difference between low-income and not low-income populations is only 0.26%, the range of possible results is -9.24 to +9.76%, still less than the 15% board policy threshold. This supports a conclusion of no discriminatory effects.

Conclusions
Because the differences between the effects of the fare proposals on protected and non-protected populations were substantially less than the thresholds established in Board Policy 518 for finding discriminatory effect, and taking into account the public engagement process undertaken and public comment received, this analysis found that the fare policies will have no disparate impact or disproportionate burden.
Summary of Outreach

Communications Campaign for the Proposed Transbay Fare Increase
Reach current and prospective Transbay riders, and other interested parties to solicit feedback on the proposed Transbay fare increase via the following strategies:

- **Printed (all in English, Spanish, and Chinese)**
  - Car cards
  - Posters displayed at the Transbay Terminal, Customer Service Center and G.O.
  - Brochures on Transbay buses and distributed at the Transbay Terminal
  - Comment Forms
  - Public Hearing Notice and Public Hearing Notice ads in local papers

- **Digital**
  - Press Release
  - Social media posts
  - Flyer
  - eNews on community meetings and Public Hearings (English, Spanish, Chinese)
  - Emails to key stakeholders and elected officials
  - Tri-lingual phone comment line
  - Carousel image linked to designated page on the website
  - Website copy (English, Spanish, Chinese)
  - Presentation prepared for the community meetings
  - Display ads on monitors at the Transbay Terminal

- **Events/Outreach**
  - Transbay Taskforce meeting (1/09/18)
  - Community meeting at the GO (1/18/18)
  - Public Hearings (01/24)
  - Outreach conducted by AC Transit staff at the Transbay Terminal
Public Comments Received

Written comments received will be provided to the Board under separate cover.

Summary of Transbay Task Force Meeting (1/9/18):
Staff presented to a group of approximately 20 members of the public, including BART Board President Robert Raburn. After the presentation, there was about 15 minutes of questions for staff. Questions ranged from information on particular routes, plans for expanded service, status of the Salesforce Transit Center, and other issues. Notably, while there was acknowledgement that the initial year of the proposed fare increase was large, there were no disagreements with the proposal.

Summary of the Community Meeting at the GO (1/18/18):
Staff presented to a group of four members of the public. After the presentation, there were a few questions for staff about Transbay service, but again no negative comments about the fare increase proposal. No written comments were submitted.

Summary of Public Hearings at the GO (1/24/18):
Staff presented at both the 3 PM and 6 PM public hearing times. Four members of the public commented verbally and one written comment was received. All comments received were negative.

Summary of Number and Type of Comments Received

Before the Public Hearings:

- 50 – Emails
- 1 – Phone call
- 3 – Written Comments
- 7 – Verbal Comments from Transbay Meeting – January 9, 2018
Total = 61

At the Public Hearings:

- 1 – Written Comments
- 4 – Verbal Comments
Total = 5

All comments broken into 4 categories:

- Opposed: 56
- Support: 5
- General: 3
- Unrelated: 2
Total = 66
Transbay Tomorrow Passenger Survey

Overview:
In order to support the Transbay Tomorrow project, AC Transit staff conducted field surveying of Transbay riders between May and July 2017. South bay Transbay lines are not considered part of the Transbay Tomorrow project, and so surveying occurred on all Transbay routes except the DB, DB1, M and the U. Riders were asked to provide information regarding their trip method, trip location, fare payment, satisfaction pertaining to existing conditions/service, preferences regarding future resource allocation, as well as basic demographic information. Approximately 2,100 surveys were returned and used for this analysis. Below is an overview of all responses broken down into subcategories Trip Information, Fare Type, Preferences & Trade Offs, Tell us more about you, and Additional Questions or Comments. Information and data from this survey will be used to inform planning around fare and service changes.

Section A: Trip Information
The following information captures purpose of trip, and frequency/method of travel.

Key findings from Section A: Trip Information

- The vast majority (93%) of riders use Transbay for work purposes.
- 65% of respondents ride Transbay service every weekday (5 days per week).
- 72% of respondents travel to San Francisco every weekday.
- 37% of respondents said they use more than one Transbay line.

Q1: What is the purpose of your trip?
Passenger Survey Summary

What is the purpose of your trip? (Circle one) | Percent | Number
---|---|---
Work | 92.6% | 2029
School | 1.7% | 37
Home | 1.5% | 33
Recreation | 2.0% | 43
Other | 2.2% | 49
Skipped | | 37

Analysis: Over 92% of respondents use Transbay for work purposes. About 2% use Transbay for recreational purposes. Less than 2% of riders use Transbay for school purposes.

Q2: How often do you ride AC Transit Transbay lines?

How often do you ride AC Transit Transbay lines? | Percent | Number
---|---|---
Everyday Including Weekends (7 days/week) | 3.1% | 69
Every Weekday (5 days/week) | 65.4% | 1445
Some Weekdays (3-4 days/week) | 18.0% | 397
Some Weekdays and Weekends (3-4 days/week) | 2.6% | 57
Occasionally (less than 3 days/week) | 5.1% | 112
Rarely (a few times a month) | 5.9% | 130
Skipped | | 18

Analysis: 65% of respondents ride Transbay every weekday (5 days per week). 89% of respondents ride Transbay three or more times a week. These trends indicate the majority of riders are continual users and rely on AC Transit as a primary means of travel. Only 6% of surveyed respondents “rarely” use the Transbay service.
Q3: How many days per week do you travel to/from San Francisco?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many days per week do you travel to/from San Francisco?</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyday Including Weekends (7 days/week)</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Weekday (5 days/week)</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>1575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Weekdays (3-4 days/week)</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Weekdays and Weekends (3-4 days/week)</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally (less than 3 days/week)</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely (a few times a month)</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis: 72% of respondents travel to San Francisco every weekday. 89% of respondents travel to San Francisco three or more times a week. These results indicate there is a clear demand for Transbay every weekday.

Given that 72% of respondents said they travel to San Francisco 5 days/week, but only 65% said they ride Transbay that often (previous question), approximately 7% of riders who go to San Francisco every weekday travel there using something other than the AC Transit bus. This gap should be investigated, and might represent an opportunity to capture additional passengers.

Q4: Do you take other Transbay Lines?
Analysis: 62% of Transbay respondents ride only one Transbay line while 38% of respondents use multiple Transbay lines. Often, riders will ride a different Transbay line if that alternative line is in a close geographical area and has a higher frequency. For example, 50% of Line O passengers alternate between the O, the OX or the W. 45% of Line F respondents also take the C, J, or FS.

Section B: Fare Type

The following information is in regards to fare type and method of payment.

Key Findings from Section B:

- The vast majority (92%) of respondents paid the “adult” fare while riding Transbay.
- 81% of respondents paid for their trip using eCash on Clipper.

Q5: Which type of fare did you pay?
Passenger Survey Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which type of fare did you pay?</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>1526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EasyPass or Class Pass</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis:** Passengers were asked to select what type of fare they regularly pay. 92% of people who answered this question paid the “adult” fare while riding Transbay. The second highest percentage paid the “senior” fare at 4%. However 26% of overall respondents who completed this survey skipped this question entirely (572 persons).

### Q6: How did you pay for your trip today?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How did you pay for your trip today?</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Single Ride</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Day Pass plus additional Transbay Fare</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eCash on Clipper</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td>1327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transbay 31-Day Pass on Clipper</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Transit Connection (RTC) Sticker</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Ticket</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis:** Passengers were asked to select their method of payment. A substantial percentage of surveyed riders (27%) did not answer this question.

- 81% of respondents paid for their trip using eCash on Clipper.
- 13% of respondents use the Transbay 31-Day Pass on Clipper.
- 4% of riders paid a Cash Single Ride Fare for their trip.

**Section C: Preferences and Trade-offs**

*The following information is in regards to transportation preferences and system trade-offs.*

**Key Findings from Section C:**

- The majority of respondents (87%) took an AC Transit Transbay line to their destination. BART was the second most common transportation method for respondents.
- When asked why they choose to ride the Transbay bus, 83% of respondents “agreed” or “strongly agreed” to the statement that *Transbay bus stops were conveniently located near their home and/or destination*. This question received the highest satisfaction rate among all questions.
- 42% of respondents “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” with the statement *I do not have to wait long for another Transbay bus, if I missed the prior trip.*
- 64% of respondents felt the Transbay Bus service was reliable in the morning, while 55% of respondents felt it was reliable in the afternoon.
- Transbay passengers ranked “reliability” and “frequency” as their highest preferences for improvements. 53% of the respondents who answered this question ranked “reliability” and “frequency” as #1 or #2.
- Transbay passengers ranked “Transbay service should be widely available even in areas with low Transbay demand” as least important. 66% of respondents ranked this statement last or second to last.
- About half (48%) of respondents were fairly willing to walk farther to a bus stop in order to have faster and more frequent Transbay bus service. This question received the highest number of “fairly willing” and “very willing” responses.
- Respondents were not very willing to drive, walk, bike, or bus to a transit center in order to transfer onto a Transbay bus for faster and more frequent Transbay bus service. Only 30% of respondents were in favor of this statement.
- Respondents were evenly divided about paying higher fares to cover the cost of providing more Transbay bus service to areas that currently have little or no service. 32% of respondents were “fairly willing” or “very willing” to pay higher fares. 40% of respondents were “not very willing” or “not willing at all” to pay higher fares. 28% of respondents were “Neutral”.

*Service Planning*
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Q7: Please check all the Modes of Transportation you would normally take to your final destination.

Please check all the modes of Transportation you would normally take to your final destination | Percent of total responses
--- | ---
AC Transit Transbay Line | 90.8%
BART | 52.2%
Walk | 35.3%
Private Vehicle | 24.2%
Uber/Lyft | 23.8%
AC Transit Local Line | 23.4%
MUNI | 18.8%
Waze Carpool/Scoop/ Casual Carpool/Carpool | 16.2%
Bike | 14.7%
Ferry/water taxis | 12.6%
Private Employer Shuttle | 2.5%
Other | 2.3%
WestCAT | 1.6%
Chariot Shuttle | 1.5%
Sam Trans | 1.1%
Golden Gate | 1.0%
Analysis:

- 91% of respondents normally took an AC Transit Transbay line to their final destination. Almost one in four Transbay riders (23%) reported that they normally take an AC Transit local bus to get to their destinations.

- The second most common mode of transportation to San Francisco was BART, used by 52% of respondents. Walking was the third most common mode (35%), however, walking is likely a first and last mile solution for most commuters. Of the people that selected the carpool category, the majority utilized Waze/casual carpool in the mornings.

- The survey shows that weekend riders use the various modes of transportation in different ways than weekday riders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Weekday</th>
<th>Weekend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BART</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Vehicle</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uber/Lyft</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Transit Local Line</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Transit Transbay Line</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUNI</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry/water taxis</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waze Carpool/Scoop/Casual Carpool/Carpool</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WestCat</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Employer Shuttle</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service Planning
- More survey respondents ride BART on Weekends than use any other transportation mode (22%), and only 8% of passengers utilize Transbay service during the weekends. More Transbay riders use AC Transit local bus service on weekends (11%) than during the week (6%).
- Transbay riders report that they walk, use a private vehicle, and/or use a ride hailing service such as Uber or Lyft in approximately the same amounts (13%) on weekends.

Q8: Why do you choose to ride the Transbay bus? Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements.

Transbay bus stops are conveniently located near my home and/or destination.

I am looking forward to the opening of the new Transbay Terminal.

I am likely to get a seat on a Transbay bus.

I enjoy the Transbay experience amenities, like the free wi-fi and comfortable seats.

The Transbay bus has a sufficient span of service hours to accommodate my morning and afternoon commutes.

The Transbay bus gets me to my destination in a reasonable amount of time.

The Transbay bus service in the morning is reliable.

The Transbay bus service in the afternoon is reliable.

The scenic view on the Bay Bridge is a deciding factor in my Transbay commute.

Transbay offers a feeling of community that is not available from other modes.

The Transbay 30 day unlimited ride pass makes the Transbay bus more economical than other transit modes.

I do not have to wait long for another Transbay bus, if I missed the prior trip.
Analysis: Passengers were asked why they currently ride AC Transit’s Transbay service. Using a criterion of twelve statements, respondents could individually categorize particular characteristics of the District’s Transbay service.

- Out of all twelve statements, respondents agreed most with Transbay bus stops are conveniently located near my home and/or destination. This question in particular received the highest satisfaction rate among all questions. 83% of respondents “agreed” or “strongly agreed” to this question.
- Respondents disagreed most with the statement I do not have to wait long for another Transbay bus, if I missed the prior trip. 42% of respondents “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” to this option.
- 75% of respondents agreed that they were likely to get a seat on a Transbay bus.
- The statement Transbay offers a feeling of community that is not available from other modes received the highest number of “neutral” responses. 40% of respondents selected “Neutral”
- Respondents felt the Transbay Bus Service was slightly more reliable in the morning compared to the afternoons. 64% of respondents agreed that Transbay service is reliable in the mornings and 55% agreed that Transbay service is reliable in the afternoons.

Q9: How do you think AC Transit can improve Transbay bus service in the future? Please rank the items below in terms of preference from 1 – Most Preferred to 6 – Least Preferred.

The Transbay bus should be more reliably on schedule.

Transbay bus service should be more frequent.

The Transbay bus service should have buses with more seats, like double decker buses.

The Transbay bus stop should be located near my home

I think the Transbay bus should be an all-day service.

Transbay service should be widely available even in areas with low Transbay demand.
Analysis: Respondents were asked to rate different features on how AC Transit can improve in the future given limited resources. Respondents provided ratings on a scale from 1 – Most Preferred to 6 – Least Preferred.

- Most Transbay passengers thought Transbay service should be more reliable and frequent in their ranked preferences. 53% of the respondents who answered this question chose “reliability” or “frequency” as #1 or #2.
- Transbay passengers did not agree that Transbay service should be widely available even in areas with low Transbay demand. 66% of respondents ranked this characteristic last or second to last.

Q10: Transit Trade-Offs The next three questions explore common TRADE-OFFS in transit. All answers are valid, but may lead to different outcomes. It is difficult to achieve all of these characteristics at the same time and we want to understand your preferences to help guide our new plan.

How willing would you be to walk farther to a bus stop in order to have faster and more frequent Transbay bus service?

How willing would you be to drive, walk, bike, or bus to a transit center in order to transfer onto a Transbay bus for faster and more frequent Transbay bus service?

How willing would you be to pay higher fares to cover the cost of providing more Transbay bus service to areas that currently have little or no service?

Analysis: Passengers were asked questions regarding Transit Trade-Offs. Using a criterion of three statements, respondents could individually categorize which trade-offs they would be in favor of moving forward.

- Out of all three statements, respondents were most willing to walk farther to a bus stop in order to have faster and more frequent Transbay bus service. Only 30% of respondents said they would not be willing to walk farther to a bus stop. This question received the highest number of “fairly willing” and “very willing” responses.
- Respondents were not very willing to drive, walk, bike, or bus to a transit center in order to transfer onto a Transbay bus for faster and more frequent Transbay bus
service. Only 30% of respondents said they would be in favor of this statement. This question received the highest number of “Not very willing” and “not willing at all” responses.

- Respondents were evenly divided about paying higher fares to cover the cost of providing more Transbay bus service to areas that currently have little or no service. 32% of respondents were “fairly willing” or “very willing” to pay higher fares. 40% of respondents were “not very willing” or “not willing at all” to pay higher fares. 25% of respondents were “neutral”.

Section D: Tell us more about you
The following information is in regards to Identity, household income, and language proficiency.

Key Findings from Section D:
Passengers were asked a series of demographic questions designed to help staff make determinations about fare and service equity.

- Race/Ethnicity: Respondents were allowed to mark more than one category to identify their race and ethnicity. 41% of respondents indicated that they were people of color. As is often the case with demographic questions, 21% of respondents did not provide an answer to this question.
- Income: 63% of respondents said they have a household income of $100,000 or more, and 11% of respondents have a household income of less than $50,000. 27% of respondents did not provide an answer to this question.
- Language: Only 3% of respondents speak English less than very well (the legal definition of limited English Proficiency). 39% said they spoke at least some of one of 46 non-English languages.

Q11: How do you identify? (Select all that apply)
How do you identify? (select all that apply) | Percent | Number
--- | --- | ---
White not Latino/Hispanic | 59.1% | 1088
Latino/Hispanic | 7.9% | 146
African American/Black | 7.6% | 140
Asian or Pacific Islander | 22.9% | 421
Other (please specify) | 2.4% | 45
Skipped | | 457

Analysis: Passengers were asked how they identify. Note that 21% of all survey takers did not provide an answer to this question.

- 59% marked “White not Latino/Hispanic”.
- 23% marked “Asian or Pacific Islander”.
- 8% marked “Latino/Hispanic”.
- 8% marked “African American/Black”.

Q12: What is your annual household income?

What is your annual household income? | Percent | Number
--- | --- | ---
$0 - $24,999 | 4.0% | 65
$25,000 - $49,999 | 6.9% | 112
$50,000 - $74,999 | 11.2% | 182
$75,000 - $99,999 | 15.1% | 245
$100,000 - $149,999 | 23.5% | 382
$150,000 - $174,999 | 9.8% | 160
$175,000 - $199,999 | 7.1% | 115
$200,000 or more | 22.4% | 364
Skipped | | 608
Analysis: Passengers were asked their annual household income. A large number of riders (608 or 27%) did not provide a response to this question.

- Transbay riders, in general, have fairly high incomes: 63% of people who answered this question said they have a household income of $100,000 or more; 22% have a household income of $200,000 or more. Only 11% of riders would be considered low-income, with a household income of under $50,000.

- To get a sense about how Transbay riders’ income compares to AC Transit riders as a whole, the last District-wide rider survey conducted in 2012 found that 73% of all weekday and 93% of all weekend riders had household incomes under $50,000.

Q13: How well do you speak English?

![Pie chart showing percentage of responses to Q13]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How well do you speak English?</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Well</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Well</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped</td>
<td></td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis: Passengers were asked how well they spoke English.

- 97% of respondents speak English “Very Well”.
- 3% of respondents speak English “Less than Very Well”; this threshold is the Federal definition of limited English proficiency.
- 10.5% did not answer this question

Q14: Do you speak any languages other than English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you speak any languages other than English?</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>1217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped</td>
<td></td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis: Passengers were asked if they speak a language other than English in order to help identify how best to provide information to riders who don’t speak English very well in their own language. 39% of respondents said they speak a language other than English. Like the previous question about language, 10.5% of riders did not answer this question.

Unfortunately the wide openness of this question doesn’t provide sufficient data. For example, a rider who speaks another language casually but not fluently would be able to respond “yes.” It would have been better to ask “Do you speak a language other than English at home?” or “Is English your primary language?” and follow up with “What other language do you speak?”

Q15: What other languages do you speak?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What other languages do you speak?</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis: This question was asked of people who indicated they spoke any languages other than English; 95% of those persons answered this additional question. As noted above, this question included people who said they spoke English very well and also poorly. Because of the way the question was asked, the data also includes responses from people who spoke a language other than English casually or not very well. It is interesting to note that the
predominate languages are those that are spoken most by residents throughout the AC Transit service area.

Of the 46 other languages indicated by riders, the most common were French (102), German (50), Hindi (33), and Japanese (28).

**Section E: Additional Questions or Comments**

*The following information is in regards to additional comments*

**Key Findings from Section E:**

The three main complaints from the Transbay Tomorrow survey were as follows.

- “Please Fix the NextBus App”
- “Please provide more comfortable seats”
- “Please Fix the Wi-Fi”.
- Other complaints regarding *overcrowded buses* and “no shows” were common as well.