



REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

PUBLIC HEARING

RECEIVE PUBLIC COMMENT

ON PROPOSALS TO:

ESTABLISH A TOLL FOR CARPOOLS;

INCREASE MULTI-AXLE VEHICLE TOLLS; AND,

EFFECT CHANGES TO GOLDEN GATE TRANSIT COMMUTE BUS SERVICE

MAY 14, 2010

The Board of Directors of the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District (District) held a public hearing in the Board Room, Administration Building, Toll Plaza, San Francisco, CA, on Friday, May 14, 2010, at 9:30 a.m., for the purpose of receiving public comment on proposals regarding transit changes and toll rate changes.

Directors Present (16): Directors Campos, Dufty, Elsbernd, Grosboll, Kerns, McGlashan, Moylan, Newhouse Segal, Pahre, Sanders, Snyder, Sobel and Stroeh; First Vice President Reilly; Second Vice President Eddie; President Boro

Directors Absent (3): Directors Chu, Newhouse Segal and Stroeh

Staff Present: General Manager Celia G. Kupersmith; District Engineer Denis J. Mulligan; Secretary of the District Janet S. Tarantino; Attorney David J. Miller; Deputy General Manager/Bridge Division Kary H. Witt; Deputy General Manager/Bus Transit Division Teri W. Mantony; Deputy General Manager/Ferry Transit Division James P. Swindler; Deputy General Manager/Administration and Development Z. Wayne Johnson; Acting Auditor-Controller and Procurement and Retail Operations Director Lori Murray; Public Affairs Director Mary C. Currie; Electronic Revenue Collection Program Manager David Dick; Executive Assistant to the General Manager Amorette Ko; Assistant Clerk of the Board Patsy Whala

Visitors Present: Sprague Terplan, San Francisco County resident; Anthony Gheraldi, Sonoma County Airport Express; Grace Hughes, Marin Airporter

1. Purpose of Public Hearing

The public hearing was conducted by President Boro, who announced that the purpose of the public hearing is to receive public comment on proposals regarding transit changes and toll rate changes.

PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING TRANSIT CHANGES AND TOLL RATE CHANGES MAY 14, 2010/PAGE 2

2. Public Outreach

District Secretary Janet Tarantino reported that in compliance with District policy, notices were mailed to organizations and individuals on the District's mailing list and copies were posted in various locations on District properties. Also, in compliance with Resolution No. 2010-013, adopted on February 12, 2010, legal notices were published in the following publications: the *Marin Independent Journal*, the *San Francisco Examiner* and the *Santa Rosa Press Democrat* on Tuesday, April 20, 2010, and again on May 4, 2010. Additional public outreach was undertaken, as follows:

- Three Community Workshops were held, as follows:
 - 1) County of Marin on April 7, 2010;
 - 2) County of Sonoma on April 13, 2010; and,
 - 3) City and County of San Francisco on April 15, 2010;
- Press releases were issued to targeted media outlets and posted to the District's web site on March 12, 2010;
- Display ads were placed in the *San Francisco Chronicle*, *Marin Independent Journal*, *Santa Rosa Press Democrat*, *La Voz*, *Petaluma Argus Courier*, *San Francisco Examiner* and the *Commuter Times* between April 29, 2010 through May 13, 2010;
- The Public Hearing notice and staff report were posted on the District's web site and on www.511.org;
- E-mail updates were sent to subscribers on March 15, March 30, April 5, April 21 and May 5, 2010;
- Posters were placed at the Golden Gate Bridge Toll Plaza, and posters in English and Spanish were placed on Golden Gate Transit buses and ferries, at bus stops and at ferry terminals;
- A courtesy mailing was sent to the California Trucking Association for distribution to their constituents in March 2010;
- Handouts were provided in toll lanes to all carpoolers and drivers of multi-axle vehicles between March and May 2010;
- A Notice was placed in the FasTrak statements in March and April 2010; and,
- Notifications were placed on the District's social media pages (Twitter and Facebook) between April and May 2010.

The Attorney for the District confirmed that the above-described public outreach met the legal requirements for calling a public hearing.

3. Staff Presentations

a. Carpool and Multi-Axle Vehicle Tolls

President Boro called upon Electronic Revenue Collection Program Manager David Dick to present staff's recommendation to establish a toll for carpools and to increase multi-axle vehicle tolls.

**PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING TRANSIT CHANGES AND TOLL RATE CHANGES
MAY 14, 2010/PAGE 3**

Mr. Dick summarized the staff report, stating that it is being proposed that a toll be established for carpools at a toll rate of \$3.00, 50% of the current cash toll rate of \$6.00, effective July 1, 2010. Carpools are two-axle vehicles, with 3 or more passengers, motorcycles and buses during the District's carpool hours, which are between the hours of 5:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m., and 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., Mondays through Fridays. The proposed carpool toll would not apply on New Year's Day, President's Day, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Thanksgiving and Christmas. Presently, clean air vehicles with white California DMV Clean Air decals qualify for the carpool toll during the District's carpool hours. It is proposed that these Clean Air vehicles continue to be considered carpools under the District's toll policy and receive the carpool toll discount of 50%. Vehicles with yellow California DMV Clean Air decals do not currently receive a carpool discount and will continue to be treated as regular vehicles. The report further stated that vehicles eligible for the carpool toll will be required to register with FasTrak® and use a transponder to pay their toll. A copy of the staff report outlining the proposed changes is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

Mr. Dick then reported on the proposal to increase the multi-axle vehicle toll for vehicles with three or more axles, as follows: 1) a \$5.00 per axle toll for vehicles with 3+ axles, paying with FasTrak®, with a 7-axle maximum toll of \$35.00; and, 2) a \$6.00 per axle toll for vehicles with 3+ axles, paying with cash, with a 7-axle maximum toll of \$42.00, with 50% of the increase to be implemented on July 1, 2011, and the remaining 50% of the increase to be implemented on July 1, 2012.

Further, Mr. Dick pointed out that the carpool toll is projected to generate \$1.3 million in annual toll revenues in FY 10/11, and the increase in the multi-axle vehicle toll is projected to generate approximately \$600,000.00 in additional toll revenues in FY 11/12, and \$1.2 million upon full implementation in FY 12/13. Mr. Dick noted that a one-time cost of approximately \$80,000.00 will be required to reformat the District's toll collection system.

Mr. Dick further stated that after the close of public comment period (close of business on Friday, May 14, 2010), staff will consider all comments received, and then prepare a recommendation to the Board on the proposals to establish a carpool toll and increase the multi-axle vehicle toll.

Discussion ensued, including the following the comments and inquiries:

- Director Pahre requested clarification regarding the requirement that the carpool vehicles stop in a staffed lane. In response, Mr. Dick responded in the affirmative. Mr. Dick noted that there is not a way to electronically ascertain if a vehicle is a carpool.
- Director Grosboll made the following comments and inquiries:
 - He inquired as to how staff developed the multi-axle vehicle toll rate increases. In response, Mr. Dick stated that staff thought it would be sensible to implement a toll policy similar to the one recently approved by BATA in order to maintain consistency throughout the region. Mr. Dick noted that staff does not expect any significant increase in multi-axle vehicle traffic across the Golden Gate Bridge as a result of this change.

**PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING TRANSIT CHANGES AND TOLL RATE CHANGES
MAY 14, 2010/PAGE 4**

- He inquired as whether the District toll rates for multi-axle vehicles were the same as those for the seven state-owned Bay Area bridges previous to the current action taken by BATA. In response, Mr. Dick stated that currently the multi-axle toll rates are different, but upon implementation of the proposed increase in the multi-axle vehicle toll rates, they will be same with the exception of the \$1.00 FasTrak® discount given at the Golden Gate Bridge.
- Director McGlashan inquired as to whether the District matches the BATA exclusion payment of tolls for transportation companies operating under the Public Utilities Commission (PUC) designation of public convenience. In response, Mr. Dick answered in the negative. Mr. Dick reiterated that the only vehicles that have toll exemption are laid out in the *Master Ordinance*, which includes Golden Gate Transit, San Francisco MUNI on weekends and Golden Gate National Recreation Area vehicles. In addition, Ms. Kupersmith stated that staff's rationale for the recommendation to increase the toll rates for multi-axle vehicles was to mirror the new toll rates approved by BATA that will go into effect on July 1, 2011. She briefly outlined BATA's policy that allows buses to have free toll passage across the State-owned bridges in accordance with the PUC regulations. She noted that the Golden Gate Bridge is separate from the California State Department of Transportation (Caltrans) bridges in regards to toll structures, vehicle occupancy for carpools and carpool hours. Ms. Kupersmith also stated that quite a few tour buses cross the Golden Gate Bridge and they are treated as a carpool during the specified carpool hours, and treated as a multi-axle vehicle during the non-carpool hours. Alternatively, Ms. Kupersmith talked about how staff is exploring the possibility of modifying the proposed increase in multi-axle vehicle toll rates for public convenience buses, such as the airport shuttles.
- Director Eddie inquired as to whether the tolls paid by Marin Airporter are figured into the current fees paid by the Marin Airporter for the lease of property at the Larkspur Landing. In response, Ms. Kupersmith answered in the negative and stated that the fees paid for the lease property are handled as a real estate matter as opposed to the tolls which are handled as a transit matter.

b. Transit Changes

President Boro called upon Acting Director of Planning Ron Downing to present staff's recommendation to effect changes to Golden Gate Transit (GGT) commute bus service. A copy of the staff report is available in the Office of the District Secretary and on the District's web site.

Mr. Downing summarized the staff report, stating that the proposed changes to GGT commute bus service include specific routes that either have trips or segments with low ridership or are duplicative with other GGT routes that have available capacity. Mr. Downing noted that, if approved, the transit service changes would be effective September 12, 2010, and that the proposed changes have an estimated five-year savings of \$8.8 million. A copy of the staff report outlining the proposed changes is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING TRANSIT CHANGES AND TOLL RATE CHANGES MAY 14, 2010/PAGE 5

Mr. Downing stated that the Board adopted a policy that dictates a productivity standard of 20 regional passengers per trip. He further stated that Board policy requires that a public process be undertaken when a reduction in service is being proposed that exceeds 25% of service on a given route. He reported that, although the proposed reductions to Routes 72 and 76 do not exceed the 25% threshold, these particular routes are included in the public review process because all direct commute service from Sonoma County to the San Francisco Civic Center area is proposed to be eliminated. He also stated that passengers who wish to access the San Francisco Civic Center area will need to transfer at the Golden Gate Bridge Toll Plaza.

Mr. Downing further stated that after the close of public comment period (close of business on Friday, May 14, 2010), staff will consider all comments received, and then prepare a recommendation to the Board on the proposal to effect changes to GGT commute bus service. Mr. Downing noted that, if approved, the transit service changes would be effective September 12, 2010.

Discussion ensued, including the following comments and inquiries:

- Director Kerns inquired as to whether staff examined closely the option of reducing the amount of trips as opposed to completely eliminating routes. In response, Mr. Downing stated that staff is considering that option in evaluating the performance of these routes while striving to achieve the District's financial goal. In addition, Ms. Kupersmith stated that staff will present a final report to the Board for approval that will show the cost of keeping these trips in service. Ms. Kupersmith reiterated that Board policy dictates that routes with less than 20 passengers be eliminated; however, the Board can exercise authority over said policy to keep the routes in service.
- Director Snyder inquired as to what percentage of the service reductions can provide for an estimated one-year net savings of up to \$1.4 million. In response, Mr. Downing stated that the proposed service reductions are approximately five percent of the District's regional and basic service, with an overall three percent when factoring in the Marin Local bus service.

4. Public Comments

President Boro then opened the public hearing to receive public comment, noting that all comments will be entered into the record. He announced the following public comment procedures, noting that (1) there is a three-minute limit for each speaker; (2) the District Secretary will keep track of the time of each speaker; and, (3) while speaking into the microphone, the speaker should state his or her name, and if representing an organization, state the full name of the organization.

**PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING TRANSIT CHANGES AND TOLL RATE CHANGES
MAY 14, 2010/PAGE 6**

a. Oral Comments

1. Sprague Terplan, San Francisco County resident expressed concerns that the GGT service has continued to decline over the years and stated that it appears that there are more cars on the road as a result. Mr. Terplan requested that the District utilize innovative steps to cut down traffic congestion. He stated that it is disconcerting to see empty, out of service buses driving northbound out of San Francisco and would like to see those buses used in replacement of the reduction in service. He expressed support for the carpool toll and suggested that the District eliminate the \$1.00 discount for FasTrak.
2. Anthony Geraldi, Sonoma County Airport Express expressed opposition to the multi-axle toll increase and described the service his company provides. Mr. Geraldi stated that the multi-axle toll increase will have negative impact on his business due to increased costs. He noted that Caltrans recognizes his bus as public services transport and issues tickets to his company to get free passage. He also stated that he will likely reroute the bus to travel over the San Francisco/Oakland Bay Bridge.
3. Grace Hughes, Marin Airporter expressed opposition to the multi-axle toll increase stating that it will increase Marin Airporter's expenses by \$100,000.00 and have a possible negative impact on employee wages, benefits and transit services. Ms. Hughes acknowledged the financial crisis in the transit industry due to declining ridership and higher operating costs. She described the services that the Marin Airporter provides, including reducing congestion and pollution, while providing a necessary service to the public. She commended the District for considering a policy similar to BATA regarding free tollway for public services transport buses.

b. Written Comments: As of Thursday, May 13, 2010, at 4:30 p.m., the District received the following written comments:

1. Establish a Carpool
98 comments were received by the District, of those comments:
 - 6 comments expressed support for a carpool toll increase;
 - 24 comments expressed support for alternatives to the carpool toll increase;
 - 66 comments expressed opposition to a carpool toll increase;
 - and,
 - 3 general comments.
2. Increase Multi-Axle Vehicle Tolls
2 comments were received by the District, of those comments:
 - 2 comments expressed opposition to the multi-axle vehicle toll increase.

**PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING TRANSIT CHANGES AND TOLL RATE CHANGES
MAY 14, 2010/PAGE 7**

3. Effect Changes to Golden Gate Transit Commute Bus Service

181 comments were received by the District.

- 110 comments expressed opposition to the bus service changes;
- 1 comment expressed support for the bus service changes;
- 29 comments expressed support for alternatives to the bus service changes;
- 17 comments made no statement of opposition to or support for the bus service changes; and,
- 24 comments were not related to the bus service changes.

5. Closing Remarks

Janet Tarantino stated that the deadline for receiving written comments on these proposals is Friday, May 14, 2010, at 4:30 p.m. Following the deadline for comments, staff will develop reports that will include a summary of public comments, as well as the staff recommendation for each of these proposals. The report regarding transit changes will be presented to the Transportation Committee at its special meeting of Thursday, May 27, 2010. The report regarding toll rate changes will be presented to the Finance-Auditing Committee at its meeting of Friday, May 28, 2010. It is anticipated that both Committees will forward recommendations to the Board of Directors for consideration at its meeting of Friday, May 28, 2010. All meetings will be held in the Board Room, Administration Building, Golden Gate Bridge Toll Plaza, San Francisco, CA, beginning at 10:00 a.m. The staff reports will be available for the public to view on Monday, May 24, 2010, by 4:30 p.m.

6. Conclusion

All business having been concluded, the public hearing was closed at 10:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Janet S. Tarantino
Secretary of the District

JST:PLW:plw

Attachments: Exhibit 1, *Approve Actions Relative to Establishing a Carpool Toll and Increasing the Multi-Axle Vehicle Toll Rates on the Golden Gate Bridge*; and, Exhibit 2, *Approve Actions Relative to Changes to Golden Gate Transit Commute Bus Service*.

Agenda Item No. 4

To: Finance-Auditing Committee/Committee of the Whole
Meeting of May 28, 2010

From: Joseph M. Wire, Auditor-Controller
Celia G. Kupersmith, General Manager

Subject: **APPROVE ACTIONS RELATIVE TO ESTABLISHING A CARPOOL
TOLL AND INCREASING THE MULTI-AXLE VEHICLE TOLL RATES
ON THE GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE**

Recommendation

The Finance-Auditing Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve the following actions relative to establishing a carpool toll and increasing the multi-axle vehicle toll rates on the Golden Gate Bridge, as follows:

1. Establish a carpool toll rate at 50% of the cash toll for two-axle vehicles, effective July 1, 2010. This toll is only effective during the District's carpool hours and collected via FasTrak, and applies to two-axle vehicles with three or more occupants, motorcycles, and buses;
2. Increase the toll rates for multi-axle vehicles with three or more axles, consisting of a cash toll rate of \$6 per axle, capped at a maximum cash toll of \$42, and a discounted FasTrak toll rate of \$5 per axle, capped at a maximum FasTrak rate of \$35, to be implemented in two phases - the first increase to take effect July 1, 2011, and the second increase to take effect July 1, 2012; with the understanding that staff is directed to investigate and report back to the Board on the legality, fiscal impact, and operational aspects of creating a new toll classification category for privately operated, California Public Utilities Commission certificated providers of regularly scheduled bus transportation services from established points in Sonoma and Marin Counties to the San Francisco International and Oakland International Airports under which such vehicles would continue to be treated as carpools during designated carpool hours and during all other hours of the day would pay a reduced per axle toll rate equivalent to 50 percent of the otherwise applicable two-axle toll;
3. Amend Master Ordinance 2010, as outlined in Attachment A, accordingly;
4. Find and declare that these toll increases are necessary for the purposes of: (a) meeting operating expenses; (b) purchasing or leasing supplies, equipment or materials; (c) meeting financial reserve needs and requirements; and (d) obtaining funds for capital projects necessary to maintain service within existing service areas, and therefore these tolls are exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act under Section 21080(b)(8) of the Public Resources Code; and,
5. File Notices of Exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Summary

The staff recommendation above originated in the Financial Plan for Achieving Long-Term Financial Stability (Plan) approved by the Board on October 30, 2009. The Plan identifies 33

Exhibit 1/Page 2

initiatives that will address the \$132 million five-year projected deficit that the District faces. The carpool vehicle toll is initiative #23 in the Plan; the multi-axle vehicle toll provides additional revenue to address the deficit.

The recommendations will help return the District to stable financial footing, and maintain a toll incentive for carpools and clean air vehicles while requiring their financial support of District operations and maintenance. The recommendations will also align the Golden Gate Bridge with industry norms regarding discount toll policies and eliminate multi-axle vehicle toll disparities with the state-owned bridges.

On February 12 the Board authorized implementing a public review process for the proposed carpool toll and increased multi-axle vehicle toll rates, and instructed staff to report on the results of this process. At the Board's direction staff held three community open houses on April 7, 13 and 14 and conducted two public hearings on May 12 and 14. The public comments and staff's responses are summarized in Attachment B.

FasTrak Toll Proposal for Carpool Vehicles

Staff recommends that the Board establish a carpool toll rate at 50% of the cash toll for two-axle vehicles (i.e., \$3.00 for FY 10/11). The carpool toll will apply to two-axle vehicles with three or more occupants, motorcycles, and buses during the District's carpool hours, which are between the hours of 5:00 to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 to 6:00 p.m., Mondays through Fridays. Vehicles will be required to pay the carpool toll with a valid FasTrak transponder and stop in a staffed lane to verify carpool qualification; otherwise, the regular cash or FasTrak toll rate will apply. The proposed carpool toll will not apply on New Year's Day, Presidents' Day, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Thanksgiving, and Christmas, which are the same days that toll free passage of carpools are not available under the current policy.

Clean air vehicles with white California DMV Clean Air decals that currently qualify for toll-free passage during the District's carpool hours will qualify for the discounted FasTrak carpool toll rate as long as California Vehicle Code Sections 5205.5 and 21655.9 remain in effect (these laws are scheduled to expire January 1, 2011). Vehicles will be required to pay with a valid FasTrak transponder and stop in a staffed lane for verification; otherwise, the regular cash or FasTrak toll rate will apply. Vehicles with yellow California DMV Clean Air decals do not currently receive toll-free passage and will continue to be treated as regular vehicles.

Multi-Axle Vehicle Toll Proposal

Staff recommends that the Board approve the following multi-axle vehicle toll rate increases:

- \$5.00 per axle for vehicles with three or more axles paying with FasTrak with a maximum toll of \$35.
- \$6.00 per axle for vehicles with three or more axles paying with cash with a maximum toll of \$42.

Exhibit 1/Page 3

- It is proposed that 50% of the toll increase (rounded down for cash toll payment only) take effect July 1, 2011, and the remaining 50% of the toll increase take effect July 1, 2012, summarized as follows:

Axles	Current		July 1, 2011		July 1, 2012	
	FasTrak Toll	Cash Toll	FasTrak Toll	Cash Toll	FasTrak Toll	Cash Toll
3	\$ 7.50	\$9	\$11.25	\$13	\$15	\$18
4	\$10.00	\$12	\$15.00	\$18	\$20	\$24
5	\$12.50	\$15	\$18.75	\$22	\$25	\$30
6	\$15.00	\$18	\$22.50	\$27	\$30	\$36
7	\$17.50	\$21	\$26.25	\$31	\$35	\$42
8	\$20.00	\$24	\$26.25	\$31	\$35	\$42
9	\$22.50	\$27	\$26.25	\$31	\$35	\$42
10	\$25.00	\$30	\$26.25	\$31	\$35	\$42
11	\$27.50	\$33	\$26.25	\$31	\$35	\$42
12	\$30.00	\$36	\$26.25	\$31	\$35	\$42

Additionally, staff recommends that they be directed to investigate and report back to the Board within the next few months on the legality, fiscal impact, and operational aspects of creating a new toll classification category for privately operated, California Public Utilities Commission certificated providers of regularly scheduled bus transportation services from established points in Sonoma and Marin Counties to the San Francisco International and Oakland International Airports under which such vehicles would continue to be treated as carpools during designated carpool hours and during all other hours of the day would pay a reduced per axle toll rate equivalent to 50 percent of the otherwise applicable two-axle toll.

Summary of Public Involvement

In order to educate the public about the District's financial condition and receive comments and feedback about the proposed toll for carpool vehicles and the multi-axle vehicle toll increase, staff pursued a comprehensive public involvement campaign. Public outreach included the following:

- Three community open houses: San Rafael, April 7; Petaluma, April 13; and Golden Gate Bridge, April 15.
- Two public hearings: Whistlestop Wheels, San Rafael, May 12; Golden Gate Bridge, May 14.
- Notices for the open houses and public hearings were placed in the *San Francisco Chronicle*, *Marin Independent Journal*, *Commuter Times*, *Santa Rosa Press Democrat* and *La Voz* newspapers. Flyers were developed and distributed to carpool and multi-axle vehicles in the toll lanes. Information regarding the open houses was posted on the District's website, Facebook page and broadcasted via the Twitter account. Information regarding the open houses and public hearings was mailed to the California Trucking Association with a request that it be disseminated to their constituents. Posters announcing the open houses and public hearings were also displayed in transit vehicles. Finally, a series of emails were sent to opt-in subscribers informing them of the open houses and public hearings.

Exhibit 1/Page 4

- A press release was issued and interviews given to various Bay Area new media outlets by the Public Affairs Director commencing on February 11, 2010, and continuing through the public outreach period noted above.

Staff presented information and received feedback regarding the proposed transit service cuts at all of the open houses and public hearings listed above.

Overview of Public Comments

At the close of the public hearing period on May 14, 2010, 100 comments offered by 80 individuals and organizations were received by the District.

Of these, 6 comments (6.0%) expressed support for a toll increase and 25 comments (25.0%) suggested alternatives to the toll increase proposal. Sixty-six comments (66.0%) expressed opposition to a toll increase, including 64 comments specifically opposing a toll for carpools and 2 opposing an increased toll for multi-axle vehicles. Three comments (3.0%) made no statement of opposition to or support for a toll increase.

Attachment B provides a summary of these comments, aggregated by main topic, with a staff response below each topic.

Fiscal Impact

Implementation of the toll for carpool vehicles on July 1, 2010, is projected to generate \$1.2 million in additional annual toll revenues in FY 10/11, impacting 2.3% of southbound traffic or an estimated 433,000 vehicles annually. Implementation of the first half of the multi-axle vehicle toll increase on July 1, 2011, is projected to generate approximately \$600,000 in additional annual toll revenues, impacting 0.75% of southbound traffic or an estimated 137,000 vehicles annually; total additional toll revenues in FY 11/12 are estimated to be \$1.8 million. Implementation of the remainder of the multi-axle vehicle toll increase on July 1, 2012, is projected to generate approximately \$600,000 in additional annual toll revenue, resulting in \$2.4 million in total additional toll revenues in FY 12/13.

Attachment A: *Proposed Ordinance*

Attachment B: *Summary of Public Comments and Staff Responses*

**Proposed Ordinance
Proposed Amendments to
Golden Gate Bridge 2010 Master Ordinance
Carpool and Multi-Axle Vehicle Toll**

II. GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE AND APPROACHES

B. BRIDGE TOLL RATES - to be amended in its entirety as follows:

1. GENERAL. The Bridge toll rates, southbound only, for all vehicles shall be based on the total number of axles of the vehicle, or connected combination of vehicles, as follows:

Effective through June 30, 2011:

Vehicle Type	Cash Toll	FasTrak Toll
2-Axle	\$6.00	\$5.00
3-Axles	\$9.00	\$7.50
4-Axles	\$12.00	\$10.00
5-Axles	\$15.00	\$12.50
6-Axles	\$18.00	\$15.00
7-Axles	\$21.00	\$17.50
8-Axles	\$24.00	\$20.00
9-Axles	\$27.00	\$22.50
10-Axles	\$30.00	\$25.00
11-Axles	\$33.00	\$27.50
12-Axles	\$36.00	\$30.00

Effective July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012:

Vehicle Type	Cash Toll	FasTrak Toll
2-Axle	\$6.00	\$5.00
3-Axles	\$13.00	\$11.25
4-Axles	\$18.00	\$15.00
5-Axles	\$22.00	\$18.75
6-Axles	\$27.00	\$22.50
7-Axles or More	\$31.00	\$26.25

Effective July 1, 2012:

Vehicle Type	Cash Toll	FasTrak Toll
2-Axle	\$6.00	\$5.00
3-Axles	\$18.00	\$15.00
4-Axles	\$24.00	\$20.00
5-Axles	\$30.00	\$25.00
6-Axles	\$36.00	\$30.00
7-Axles or More	\$42.00	\$35.00

2. **REDUCED TOLL FOR DESIGNATED VEHICLES DURING COMMUTE HOURS.** A reduced toll rate, calculated at 50% of the base cash toll for two-axle vehicles, is available between the hours of 5:00 to 9:00 a.m., and 4:00 to 6:00 p.m., Mondays through Fridays, excluding the following holidays: New Year's Day; Presidents' Day (third Monday in February); Memorial Day (last Monday in May); Independence Day (July 4); Labor Day; Thanksgiving Day; and Christmas Day. The reduced toll applies to carpools, motorcycles, and buses. All vehicles that qualify for the reduced toll shall be registered with a FasTrak account in good standing and the reduced toll shall be paid with a valid transponder. Vehicles must stop in a staffed toll lane to verify eligibility in order to qualify for the reduced toll rate.

Only vehicles that bear a DMV issued WHITE Clean Air Vehicle decal, that allows the vehicle to be operated by a single occupant in High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes are eligible for the reduced toll, for as long as California Vehicle Code Sections 5205.5 and 21655.9 remain in effect. Vehicles bearing the YELLOW Clean Air Vehicle are not eligible for the reduced toll.

3. **TOLL RATES FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES.** The applicable toll for a two-axle vehicle in which an eligible person with disabilities is either the operator or a passenger shall be 50% of the base cash toll for two-axle vehicles, upon presentation of a valid District-issued identification card by the person with disabilities. The discount toll is not available for vehicles with more than two axles. The provisions of Section I.B.1, "Bridge Discount for Persons with Disabilities," shall apply.

F. EXEMPTIONS FROM TOLLS - to be amended in its entirety as follows:

No toll shall be charged to the following classifications of traffic:

1. Vehicles of members of the California Highway Patrol, while traveling in official patrol vehicles and on duty policing the Bridge and District facilities.
2. Vehicles of the United States Government required to be passed free of charge under the terms of Public Law 255-78th Congress.
3. Pedestrians and bicyclists on East and West sidewalks.
4. Vehicles in funeral procession of a person who dies while on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States.
5. Vehicles of the United States Park Police while crossing the Bridge on official business.
6. Vehicles of officers and enlisted personnel of the U.S. Coast Guard, while engaged in the performance of their official duties, with the understanding that civilian Coast Guard employees are excluded from the toll-free privilege; with the further

understanding that the U.S. Coast Guard will be subject to the same rules that apply to other branches of the military with regard to toll-free privileges on the Golden Gate Bridge.

7. Buses operated by the Municipal Railway of the City and County of San Francisco, on Saturdays and Sundays, when providing scheduled service to Forts Cronkite and Baker within the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.
8. Vehicles of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA), with government license plates, while crossing the Bridge on official business, with the understanding that commute trips are excluded from the toll-free privilege, that all GGNRA employees utilizing toll free passage must obtain a District photo ID card at a cost of \$6.00 per card that must be handed to the toll collector each trip, that all GGNRA vehicles must be equipped with ETC transponders to receive toll free passage, and that any GGNRA employee who misuses this privilege will have this privilege revoked, and with the further understanding that staff will maintain a computer record of the time and date of each toll-free crossing authorized by this provision, and staff will monitor such use and report periodically to the Board.
9. Emergency vehicles such as police, fire, and ambulances when responding to incidents on the Bridge and approaches, or police vehicles when involved in pursuits that require crossing the Bridge.

To receive the toll exemption, qualified vehicles, with the exception of emergency vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles, must stop in a staffed lane to allow the toll collector to classify the transaction correctly.

Staff Responses to General Categories of Public Comments

Summary

At the close of the public hearing period on May 14, 2010, 100 comments offered by 80 individuals and organizations were received by the District.

Of these, 6 comments (6.0%) expressed support for a toll increase and 25 comments (25.0%) suggested alternatives to the toll increase proposal. 66 comments (66.0%) expressed opposition to a toll increase, including 64 comments specifically in opposition to a toll for carpools and 2 in opposition to an increased toll for multi-axle vehicles. 3 comments (3.0%) made no statement of opposition to or support for a toll increase.

The following provides a summary of these comments, aggregated by main topic, with a staff response below each comment.

Comments on the Toll Proposal

Comments Made in Support of Raising Bridge Tolls

The District received 6 comments in support of the carpool and multi-axle vehicle toll increase proposal.

Comments Made as an Alternative to the Toll Proposal

25 comments expressed support for the following alternatives to the Toll Proposal, as addressed below.

Comment: Institute Bridge Tolls for Bicycles, Pedestrians and Fees for Visiting the Golden Gate Bridge (11)

Additional toll collection resources are required to implement any bicycle and pedestrian tolling. The District Board has previously determined such a toll is not under consideration.

The District is continuing to evaluate the feasibility of raising revenues for visitors to the Golden Gate Bridge.

Comment: Further Increase Bridge Tolls for Cash Customers (3)

The base cash toll and FasTrak discount toll rates for the Golden Gate Bridge were last increased on September 2, 2008, further increases in the cash toll rate are not currently under considerations. The District's Financial Plan also recognizes the increase in efficiency by collecting tolls electronically. Future proposals will consider the feasibility of these toll collection methods.

Comment: Raise Bridge Tolls Only Under Certain Conditions (11)

Several comments received from the public indicate support for a toll increase with conditions other than those listed above. These qualifications include concurrently revising carpool policies

Exhibit 1, Page 9

(e.g., increasing vehicle occupancy, exemptions for low/zero emission vehicles), instituting a toll for northbound traffic, and increasing violation rates for speeding on the Golden Gate Bridge.

Comments Made in Opposition to Raising the Bridge Tolls

The District received 66 comments in opposition to the toll proposal. Several of these comments included specific reasons for opposition, as addressed below.

Comment: Raising Tolls Would Result in Increased Traffic Congestion (18)

The District is concerned that the current multi-axle rates charged at the Golden Gate Bridge could lead to increased multi-axle vehicular traffic by drivers avoiding higher state-owned bridge toll rates. Since multi-axle vehicle crossings only represent 0.72 percent of all southbound traffic, this proposal should not increase multi-axle traffic and congestion on the Golden Gate Bridge.

Vehicles currently qualifying for the carpool toll exemption are required to stop in a staffed lane for toll collector verification. The proposed toll for carpool vehicles will operate in a similar manner as vehicles stop in a staffed lane for manual toll collector verification and the toll is collected electronically via the FasTrak tag. This proposal should not increase congestion or delay on the Golden Gate Bridge.

Comment: Raising Tolls Is Bad Policy and Bad for the Environment (16)

The District supports the use of carpooling as an effective way to reduce traffic congestion while benefiting the environment. The proposal would not eliminate the carpool toll but would encourage carpooling by continuing to provide a substantial discount and eliminate any disparity between the Golden Gate Bridge and Caltrans state-owned toll bridges.

In addition, Golden Gate Transit bus and ferry services were instituted in the 1970s to reduce traffic congestion on the Bridge and provide a public service between San Francisco and North Bay communities. Public transit service averts about 32% of Bridge traffic during the morning peak hours.

The combined effects of supporting carpools during peak hours of congestion and a comprehensive public transit service, has and will continue to benefit the environment.

Comment: Raising Tolls Would Result in Financial Hardship (11)

Currently, carpools with three or more people can cross the Bridge free of charge weekdays 5 to 9 a.m. and 4 to 6 p.m. Currently, the Golden Gate Bridge is the only major toll facility in the USA that provides a 100% discount for carpools. The proposal to provide a 50 percent discount to carpools is based on the premise that although carpooling is an excellent way to reduce traffic congestion and benefits the environment, all vehicles on the Golden Gate Bridge should participate to some degree in its operation and upkeep. Providing a 50 percent discount for carpools is also a common practice for many toll facilities across the USA.

Comment: Raising Tolls for Airport Shuttles Undermines Their Viability as Transit Alternatives to Car Trips to the Regional Airports (2)

The District recognizes the important regional role played by California Public Utilities Commission certificated providers of regularly scheduled bus transportation services from points in Sonoma and Marin Counties to the San Francisco International and Oakland Airports, and agrees that such services complement the regional bus services provided by the District.

Exhibit 1, Page 10

Comment: Better Manage Existing Revenues and/or Reduce Expenses (4)

District management developed a strategic plan to address projected financial shortfalls, including prioritizing needs and identifying opportunities to increase revenues and reduce expenses. The District raised the toll in 2002 and 2008, raises transit fares annually, generates revenues from new sources, and has implemented numerous cost-saving initiatives. In addition, the District has developed a comprehensive five-year financial plan designed to eliminate a projected shortfall of \$132 million.

Comment: Raising Carpool and Multi-axle Tolls Only Generates a Small Increase in Revenue (3)

This toll proposal is only one initiative contained in a comprehensive, multi-year financial plan to eliminate a projected five-year shortfall of \$132 million. Although the projected revenue increase for this specific proposal may be modest, the District needs to address this shortfall as soon as possible in order to avoid an increase in this shortfall.

Comments Not Related to the Toll Proposal

The District received 3 comments that did not relate to either the toll increase or requested additional information pertaining to the toll proposal.

Agenda Item No. 1

To: Transportation Committee/Committee of the Whole
Special Meeting of May 27, 2010

From: Ron Downing, Director of Planning (Acting)
Z. Wayne Johnson, Deputy General Manager, Administration & Development
Teri W. Mantony, Deputy General Manager, Bus Division
Celia G. Kupersmith, General Manager

Subject: **APPROVE ACTIONS RELATIVE TO CHANGES TO GOLDEN GATE
TRANSIT COMMUTE BUS SERVICE**

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee recommends that the Board of Directors approve actions relative to changes to Golden Gate Transit Commute Bus Service, as follows:

1. Effect the following changes to Golden Gate Transit Commute Bus Service:
 - a. Eliminate all service on Route 26 and provide service via new Route 27 with reduced number of trips into Sleepy Hollow;
 - b. Eliminate all service on Route 73 and replace some trips with new express trips on Route 101;
 - c. Eliminate all service on Route 75;
 - d. Reduce service on Routes 44, 72, and 76;
 - e. Eliminate specific segments of Routes 24 and 58;
 - f. Add trips to Route 93 to replace discontinued trips on Routes 72, 73, and 76; and,
2. File Notices of Exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Background

On March 12, the Board authorized staff to proceed with a public review process for a series of proposed changes to Golden Gate Transit commute routes in response to Initiative 9 of the *FY 09/10 Financial Plan for Achieving Long-Term Financial Stability*. The targeted savings under Initiative 9 were \$1.1 million per year. Adopting the changes to Golden Gate Transit commute bus service will help return the District to stable financial footing. The routes identified for changes as proposed by staff had either trips or specific segments with low ridership, and the total package as originally recommended had a potential savings value of approximately \$1.4 million per year.

Summary of Public Outreach

In order to educate the public about the District's financial condition and receive comments and feedback about the proposed Golden Gate Transit commute service reductions, staff pursued a comprehensive public outreach campaign. Public outreach included the following:

Exhibit 2/Page 2

- Three community open houses: San Rafael, April 7; Petaluma, April 13; and Golden Gate Bridge, April 15.
- Two public hearings: Whistlestop Wheels, San Rafael, May 12; Golden Gate Bridge, May 14.
- Notices for the open houses and public hearings were placed in the *San Francisco Chronicle*, *Marin Independent Journal*, *Commuter Times*, *Santa Rosa Press Democrat* and *La Voz* newspapers. Flyers were developed and distributed to carpool and multi-axle vehicles in the toll lanes. Information regarding the open houses was posted on the District's website and broadcast via the District's social media accounts. Posters announcing the open houses and public hearings were also displayed in transit vehicles. Finally, a series of emails was sent to customers who have registered for electronic notification, informing them of the open houses and public hearings.
- A press release was issued and interviews given to various Bay Area news media outlets by the Public Affairs Director commencing on February 11, 2010, and continuing through the public outreach period noted above.

Staff presented information and received feedback regarding the proposed transit service cuts at all open houses and public hearings listed above.

Overview of Public Comments

At the close of the public hearing on May 14, 2010, 201 unique comments had been received by the District.

Of these, 33 comments (16.4%) suggested modifications to the bus service change proposal, and 121 comments (60.2%) expressed opposition to some portion of the proposal. An additional 6 comments (3.0%) expressed general opposition to the proposal. There were 7 comments (3.5%) that made no statement of support for or opposition to the proposal. Finally, 33 comments (16.4%) were not related to the proposal.

Attachment A provides a summary of these comments, aggregated by main topic, with a staff response below each topic.

Revised GGT Commute Service Reduction Proposal

During the public review period, staff continued to collect data on the routes and trips proposed for cancellation through field checks. The supplemental data was used to verify daily GFI farebox data as well as ridership patterns that were the basis for the original staff proposal to reduce service. In the case of Route 73, this data refuted passenger claims that this route is heavily used and, therefore, should be retained. In fact, the majority of Route 73 trips not only duplicate other routes, they are performing below standard on the long-haul portion of the route between the Toll Plaza and Sonoma County. Similar findings were established on Route 24, where 17 comments called for retention of that service because it is needed for commuters, yet field checks found only one-to-three passengers per day using the service for commuting to San Francisco.

Staff has considered public comment received on each route in the proposal and analyzed the impacts of the proposed changes for each route. In some cases, the proposal has not changed, while in others, after considering ridership patterns and whether reasonable service alternatives

exist, the proposal has been modified. In summary, the proposals for three of the routes under consideration have not changed, while the proposals for five routes have been modified.

The revised proposal is summarized in the table below and further detail on the specific changes for each route is provided in Attachment B.

**Revised Proposal to Eliminate Golden Gate Transit Commute Service
Low-Performing Segments, Trips or Routes**

ROUTE	ACTION	SAVINGS
Route 24 (Lagunitas/Fairfax/San Francisco):	No Change. Eliminate service between Lagunitas and Fairfax/Manor (1 round trip in each peak). Alternative service is available on the West Marin Stage.	\$41,200
Route 26 (Sleepy Hollow/San Francisco):	Proposal Revised: Eliminate 3 of 5 trips between Sleepy Hollow and San Anselmo Hub (not all trips as originally proposed); all remaining trips to become Route 27 instead of Route 26. Maintain existing level of service provided by Route 26 and 27 between San Anselmo Hub and San Francisco as Route 27 service.	\$40,000
Route 44 (Lucas Valley/San Francisco):	Proposal Revised: Eliminate 2 southbound and 2 northbound trips (not all trips as originally proposed), while retaining 2 trips in each direction. Shorten route to begin and end at Mt. McKinley Road in Lucas Valley.	\$202,000
Route 58 (Novato/Hamilton/San Francisco):	No Change. Eliminate segment to Sunset Pkwy. and Ignacio Blvd. (7 trips)	\$25,500
Route 72 (Santa Rosa/San Francisco):	No Change. Eliminate direct San Francisco Civic Center service (2 trips). Alternative service is available on Route 72 Financial District service with a transfer to Route 93 shuttle service at the Toll Plaza.	\$130,200
Route 73 (Santa Rosa/San Francisco):	Proposal Revised: Eliminate all Route 73 service (7 trips), but operate 2 southbound trips and 1 northbound trip as new Route 101X service (does not eliminate all trips as originally proposed). Service alternative for discontinued trips would be Route 72 or 74 Financial District service with a transfer to Route 93 shuttle service at the Toll Plaza.	\$306,500

Route 75 (Santa Rosa/San Francisco):	No Change. Eliminate all service (6 trips) due to low ridership. Service alternatives would be Route 101 with a transfer to GGT Rts. 45, 49, 70 or 71 to reach final destination.	\$233,000
Route 76 (East Petaluma/San Francisco):	Proposal Revised: No change to proposal to eliminate direct San Francisco Civic Center service (3 trips), but retain 1 Civic Center trip as a Financial District direct trip (does not eliminate all trips as originally proposed). Service alternatives for eliminated trips would be Route 76 Financial District trips with a transfer to Route 93 shuttle service at the Toll Plaza.	\$121,500
Route 93 (GGB Toll Plaza/SF Civic Center):	No Change. Implement new Route 93 shuttle trips to replace direct San Francisco Civic Center trips on Routes 72, 73, and 76.	<\$500
TOTAL NET SAVINGS		\$1,100,000

Costs to Add Back Services Still Recommended for Elimination

As requested by members of the Board of Directors, staff has determined the costs associated with maintaining any of the service still recommended for elimination. This information is shown in Attachment B, where each proposed route change is presented in detail. As noted before, the changes to the original recommendation reflect staff’s best attempt to respond to public comment, retain high-ridership trips as warranted, provide transit service coverage as best possible to provide a transit option, and meet the financial goals in the Strategic Plan, which calls for contributions from both toll payers and transit users, along with staff savings, in order to reach a fiscally balanced condition in the near future.

Title VI Analysis

Staff has examined the impact of these service changes on minority, low-income and disadvantaged communities and documented these in a report. Because these routes are commute services oriented toward trips to and from San Francisco rather than local trips, and the majority of the routes under consideration do not serve communities of concern, it has been determined that there will be no impact to disadvantaged communities under Title VI, if these changes are implemented.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Impacts

Staff has reviewed the possible environmental impacts that would be generated if these service changes were implemented, and summarized these findings in a Notice of Exemption/Record of Findings. This analysis has shown that there are no significant environmental impacts as a result of the proposed changes because the total number of affected passengers is low and most passengers would continue to have a transit option. Total net vehicles crossing the Golden Gate Bridge is estimated to increase by eight during the peak hour between 8:00 and 9:00 a.m., which is an increase of 0.15% over the average daily traffic of 5,300 vehicles for the same time period. At the maximum point along the U.S. 101 corridor where the largest number of affected trips is operating (between the Marinwood and Smith Ranch Road interchanges), there could be a maximum of 7 net vehicle trips per hour. Because many of the bus trips being proposed for cancellation are not full, they do not achieve the same environmental benefit as a fully-utilized

Exhibit 2/Page 5

bus. Emissions are forecast to decrease 1.66 million grams per day (or 1.83 daily tons) as a result of the identified GGT commute bus trips being discontinued.

Therefore, the impact to the environment is minimal and qualifies for a categorical exemption under CEQA.

As a result, it is recommended that the Board approve the filing of Notices of Exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act. This notice states that the changes to Golden Gate Transit commute service have been determined to have “No Significant Impact” to the environment.

Fiscal Impact

If implemented as described, the revised package of service reductions has an estimated one-year net savings impact of approximately \$1.1 million. This package includes maintaining one round trip to Sleepy Hollow on Route 27, two round trips to Lucas Valley on Route 44, one southbound trip on Route 76 between East Petaluma and the San Francisco Financial District, and three trips as Route 101X service that would replace three Route 73 trips.

This represents a decrease over the savings amount in the initial proposal of \$1.4 million, but still meets the target identified under Initiative 9 of the Financial Plan.

Attachment A: Summary of Public Comments and Staff Responses

Attachment B: Analysis of Route Performance and Comments Received

**Staff Responses to General Categories of Public Comment
as of Close of Comment Period (5/14/10, 4:30 p.m.)**

Summary

At the close of the public hearing on May 14, 2010, 201 unique comments were received by the District. Of these, 33 comments (16.4%) suggested modifications to the bus service change proposal, and 121 comments (60.2%) expressed opposition to some portion of the proposal. An additional 6 comments (3.0%) expressed general opposition to the proposal. There were 7 comments (3.5%) that made no statement of support for or opposition to the proposal. Finally, 33 comments (16.4%) were not related to the proposal.

Comments on the Bus Service Change Proposal

Comments Made without Identifying Support of or Opposition to the Proposal

The District received 7 comments that did not state any specific support for or opposition to the bus service change proposal.

Comments Made in Support of the Proposal

The District received one comment supporting the elimination of Route 76 service to the San Francisco Civic Center.

Comments Made as an Alternative to the Proposal

The District received 33 comments in support of the following alternatives to the proposal.

Comment: Keep at Least One Trip on Route 26 (5)

Ridership is insufficient to support operating 5 trips to Sleepy Hollow from San Anselmo Hub. However, staff has determined that eliminating all service will leave Sleepy Hollow without any direct transit service to San Francisco. Staff recommends operating 2 trips (1 trip in each direction) because the reduced service level will better match capacity with ridership while helping to address the District's financial shortfall.

Comment: Keep at Least Some Trips on Route 44 (11)

Route 44 has insufficient ridership to support operating 8 trips to Marinwood and Lucas Valley. However, the elimination of Route 44 will leave these communities without any direct transit service to San Francisco. Recognizing that the District has a financial shortfall to address, staff recommends retaining 4 trips (2 trips in each direction) to better match capacity with ridership. Staff recommends all service west of Mount McKinley Road in Lucas Valley be discontinued due to lack of use.

Comment: Provide Alternative Service to Routes 26 and 44 at Similar Operating Times (5)

Route 26 trips identified for elimination will be replaced by Route 27 trips, so direct alternative service between San Anselmo Hub and San Francisco will be available. Routes 27, 38, and 58 will be available as alternatives to the discontinued trips on Route 44; however, timing of those trips does not necessarily correspond with the Route 44 schedule because they are scheduled for work start and end times in San Francisco.

Comment: *Keep at Least Some Trips on Route 73 (5)*

Route 73 heavily duplicates Financial District service on Routes 72 and 74. However, some trips (one trip in each direction) do not have comparable alternative service. Therefore, staff will consider that some trips be maintained. The trips would be modified slightly and operate as Route 101X.

Comment: *Keep at Least Some Trips on Route 75 (7)*

Ridership is insufficient to support operating 6 trips on Route 75. While staff acknowledges that elimination of this route will leave a few passengers without direct alternative service, most passengers will be able to use Route 101, or use Route 101 and another route, to complete their trips.

Comments Made in Opposition to the Proposal

The District received 127 comments in opposition to the bus service change proposal. Of these, 121 comments addressed specific elements of the proposal.

Comment: *Do Not Eliminate Route 24 Service to Lagunitas (17)*

Despite receiving 17 comments on this service, field checks indicate that the portion of Route 24 operating between Fairfax Manor and Lagunitas is used by just 1 to 3 regional passengers per trip on average. Alternative service is available on West Marin Stagecoach Route 68, which operates within a few minutes of the existing Route 24 schedule, and adequate capacity exists to accommodate any displaced passengers. Regional passengers can ride Route 68 to San Anselmo Hub and transfer to Routes 24 or 27 to complete their trips.

Comment: *Route 24 Service to Lagunitas Is Needed for School Children (7)*

An additional 7 comments requested that Route 24 service be retained between Fairfax Manor and Lagunitas for school children. The District's core mission is to provide regional transit service, and providing local bus service for school children does not correspond with this mission. Alternative service is available on West Marin Stagecoach Route 68, which operates within a few minutes of the existing Route 24 schedule, and adequate capacity exists to accommodate any displaced passengers.

Comment: *Do Not Eliminate Route 26 (6)*

Ridership is insufficient to support operating 5 trips to Sleepy Hollow from San Anselmo Hub. However, staff has determined that eliminating all service will leave Sleepy Hollow without any direct transit service to San Francisco. Staff recommends operating 2 trips (1 trip in each direction) because the reduced service level will better match capacity with ridership while helping to address the District's financial shortfall.

Comment: *Do Not Eliminate Route 44 (32)*

Route 44 has insufficient ridership to support operating 8 trips to Marinwood and Lucas Valley. However, the elimination of Route 44 will leave these communities without any direct transit service to San Francisco. Recognizing that the District has a financial shortfall to address, staff recommends retaining 4 trips (2 trips in each direction) to better match capacity with ridership. Staff recommends that all service west of Mount McKinley Road in Lucas Valley be discontinued due to lack of use.

Comment: *Do Not Eliminate Route 58 Service to Ignacio (5)*

Passenger activity along the route segment identified for elimination is low, and the continued operation of Route 58 through Ignacio would be inefficient. Alternative service is

available along portions of the discontinued routing on Route 54. The entire discontinued route segment has alternative service available on Route 51 and with Novato Dial-a-Ride, both of which offer transfers to Route 54 to reach San Francisco.

Comment: Do Not Eliminate Route 72 Service to the San Francisco Civic Center (2)

Route 72 has available capacity to accommodate passengers destined to both the Financial District and the Civic Center. Most service operates to the Financial District because it has higher passenger use. The Civic Center service comes at approximately the same time as the Financial District service, resulting in a duplication of service for long distances. Both destinations can be served at a variety of times by operating all Route 72 service to the Financial District and providing regular connections to the Civic Center via Route 93, eliminating unnecessary duplication while providing passengers with more flexible trip times.

Comment: Do Not Eliminate Route 73 (14)

Route 73 duplicates service provided by Routes 72 and 74 in Sonoma County, resulting in excess passenger capacity for long distances. Because almost all service on Routes 72 and 74 serve the Financial District, a wider variety of trip times can be provided by maintaining service to the Financial District while offering regular service to the Civic Center via Route 93. Staff has identified some Route 73 trips (two southbound and one northbound) that perform well, and staff recommends that these trips continue to serve the Civic Center and be re-designated Route 101X.

Comment: Do Not Eliminate Service to the San Francisco Civic Center on Routes 72 and 73 (4), or on Routes 73 and 76 (1)

As indicated above, service duplication can be reduced and more trip options provided by operating Financial District service on Routes 72, 74, or 76, with service to the Civic Center available via Route 93. The trips identified for elimination have alternative service available on Routes 72, 74, 76, and 93. Staff recommends that 3 trips on Route 73 be maintained with slight modifications and operated as Route 101X, and that one southbound trip on Route 76 be converted to Financial District service.

Comment: Do Not Eliminate Route 75 (19)

Ridership is insufficient to support operating 6 trips on Route 75. While staff acknowledges that elimination of this route will leave a few passengers without direct alternative service, most passengers will be able to use Route 101, or use Route 101 and another route, to complete their trips.

Comment: Do Not Eliminate Route 76 Service to the San Francisco Civic Center (14)

Route 76 has available capacity to accommodate passengers destined to both the Financial District and the Civic Center. Most service operates to the Financial District because it has higher passenger use. Two of the 3 Civic Center trips come at approximately the same time as Financial District trips, resulting in a duplication of service for long distances. Staff recommends maintaining the second southbound Civic Center trip and modifying it to serve the Financial District instead. Operating all Route 76 service to the Financial District and having all Civic Center passengers use Route 93 eliminates unnecessary duplication while providing passengers with more flexible trip times.

Comments Not Related to the Bus Service Change Proposal

The District received 33 comments that did not relate to the bus service change proposal.

Analysis of Route Performance and Comments Received

Route 24

Proposal: No change to the recommendation to eliminate the segment of Route 24 between Lagunitas and Fairfax/Manor.

This segment of Route 24 carries only a very small number of San Francisco commuters. While more than 14 comments were received from individuals who stated that the service should be retained, data collected from field checks has indicated that only one to three passengers travelling to/from San Francisco actually use this segment on any given day. During the school year, the morning trip carries an average of 10 students between Lagunitas and Fairfax. Seven additional comments were received stating that this service should be retained for student travel. These students do not return on Route 24, but instead use a Marin Transit route in the afternoon to return to Lagunitas. It should be noted that providing local student transportation is not within the District's core mission, and instead is the responsibility of local transit providers, such as Marin Transit. Maintaining service on this extension to Lagunitas requires approximately \$41,200 in annual operating cost. Approximately \$8,000 in annual revenue is generated by the combination of commuters and local student riders, leaving a net deficit of \$33,200 per year that would be required if this trip were to be maintained.

Both the morning and afternoon Route 24 trips between Lagunitas and Fairfax/Manor are duplicated by West Marin Stage service that operates at nearly the same time. Marin Transit has indicated that capacity is available on the West Marin Stagecoach to absorb the additional riders. As a result, the proposal to discontinue this segment has not changed.

Route 26

Revised Proposal: Retain one round trip to Sleepy Hollow and operate it as part of Route 27.

Ridership on the five trips on the segment between San Anselmo and Sleepy Hollow averages less than 10 passengers in each direction. There are three southbound morning trips, but only two northbound afternoon trips. The average number of passengers per trip on the southbound trips is 5 per trip, and the same 10 passengers return in the afternoon, distributed over three northbound trips. The last northbound trip typically carries no passengers north of San Anselmo. Although 6 comments were received stating that the service should not be changed, 5 comments asked if retaining one round trip could be considered. The low ridership does not support retaining the current level of service of five total trips. Staff has considered the comment asking to retain one round trip and finds that it has merit because there are no other service alternatives in the community that can easily be reached without driving. Currently, the segment of Route 26 between Sleepy Hollow and San Anselmo costs approximately \$64,000 per year to operate and generates an estimated \$19,500 in annual revenue, resulting in a net deficit of \$42,500. Maintaining one round trip would cost approximately \$25,000 per year. If all of the passengers on the present service use the one round trip that is maintained and the estimated \$19,500 in revenue is applied to the remaining round trip, the net deficit would be \$5,500 per year.

The revised proposal would eliminate the Route 26 designation on two southbound and three northbound trips. One southbound and two northbound trips would be shortened to begin and end at the San Anselmo Hub, and one trip in each direction would be retained to/from Sleepy Hollow. The remaining service would be renumbered as Route 27 trips.

Route 44

Revised Proposal: Retain two trips in each direction to/from Lucas Valley/Marinwood, but eliminate portion of route west of Mt. McKinley Road

Route 44 begins in Lucas Valley and travels via U.S. 101 with stops at freeway bus pads to the San Rafael Transit Center (SRTC). From the SRTC, this route continues express to the San Francisco Financial District. Route 44 duplicates other GGT service at the bus pad stops and at the SRTC. Freeway bus pad stops are also served by other commute routes. Several alternate routes can be used out of SRTC (27, 70 or 101), and two routes (58 and 70) directly serve the freeway pads. Route 44 has an imbalance in patronage between southbound and northbound trips, which indicates that passengers likely use alternate services for their northbound trips. The northbound trips average at or below productivity standards while the southbound trips are higher, reflecting passengers shifting between routes. All southbound trips, however, are below productivity standards. Most riders on Route 44 (71%) can use alternate GGT services, either along the freeway pad stops or at the SRTC.

The District received 32 comments stating opposition to any changes to Route 44. Many of these simply stated that the route should not be changed, while others indicated that they did not want to drive to other GGT services. An additional 11 comments were received requesting that one or two round trips be maintained.

Staff has considered these requests and concluded that two round trips could be maintained, in view of no other reasonable transit option being available within the Lucas Valley or Marinwood communities. However, upon reviewing ridership data, staff found that there is no ridership west of Mt. McKinley Road in Lucas Valley. Because of the lack of ridership on that segment, the route would be shortened to begin and end at Mt. McKinley Road under this revised proposal to retain two trips in each direction.

The cost of keeping all four round trips is approximately \$417,000 per year. That cost would be offset by fare revenues of approximately \$84,000 per year, resulting in a net annual cost of \$333,000. Keeping two round trips would cost approximately \$202,000 per year. If all the passengers on the present four round trips use the two trips that are retained and generate an annual revenue offset of nearly \$84,000, the net annual cost of keeping two round trips is approximately \$118,000.

Route 58

Proposal: No change to the recommendation to eliminate the segment of Route 58 along Ignacio Blvd. and Sunset Parkway in Novato

The segment of Route 58 between downtown Novato and Ignacio via Sunset Parkway averages less than 1 passenger per trip. Passengers who use this segment along Ignacio Blvd. can access alternate service on Route 54 or the remaining portion of Route 58 at the Ignacio stop at Enfrente Road and Salvatore Drive. During the public review process, only two comments were received that requested retention of this segment. Further analysis of the ridership patterns has concluded that 4 of the 7 trips do not have anyone boarding or alighting along this segment. As a result, the proposal to discontinue this segment remains unchanged. The cost of maintaining service along this segment would be \$25,500 per year, with only a negligible amount of fare revenue to offset that cost.

Route 72 San Francisco Civic Center Trips

Proposal: No change to the recommendation to eliminate direct Civic Center trips

There is one southbound and one northbound trip on Route 72 that operate directly to or from the San Francisco Civic Center. These trips average below the productivity standard of 20 passengers per trip, with the southbound trip averaging 16 passengers and the northbound averaging 17. Both trips operate in close proximity to Financial District trips that have available seats. Two comments were received specifically opposing eliminating these trips and four comments were received opposing eliminating both these trips on Route 72 along with eliminating Route 73.

Staff has concluded that the availability of seats on Financial District service combined with a transfer to a Route 93 shuttle is a reasonable option for these passengers. As a result, the proposal to eliminate these trips remains unchanged. If these trips were to be maintained, the cost would be \$130,200 per year with a revenue offset of \$59,000, for a net deficit of \$71,200.

Route 73

Revised Proposal: Retain three trips as “Route 101X” service

Route 73 service consists of four southbound trips and three northbound trips that operate directly to/from the San Francisco Civic Center. There were 18 comments in opposition to eliminating Route 73, and 8 asked that a limited number of trips be retained. The staff proposal in March recommended eliminating three of the four southbound trips and all of the northbound trips. Field checks confirmed that two of four southbound trips perform well below standard on the long-haul portion of the trip from Sonoma County to the Toll Plaza, at 17 and 12 passengers per trip, respectively. The other two southbound trips were recorded as carrying 23 and 39 passengers respectively. The earlier staff analysis already reflected retaining the last southbound trip with 39 passengers and consolidating that trip with another route. In the northbound direction, the first trip averages 23 passengers per trip on the portion between the Toll Plaza and Sonoma County, but the second two trips average less than 16. Adequate capacity exists on Financial District service for these riders. Staff has revised the proposal to retain two southbound trips and one northbound trip, but consolidate them into Route 101. The retained trips would be express trips that would bypass Novato and San Rafael and be designated “Route 101X”, reflecting comments expressed that merely converting these trips into regular Route 101 service would result in a longer travel time. One of these three trips was excluded from the March cost savings analysis because it would have been retained due to high ridership. Keeping the two additional trips is estimated to cost \$191,000 per year, with \$82,000 in annual revenues generated. The net cost would be \$109,000 per year.

Route 75

Proposal: No change to the recommendation to eliminate this route

Route 75 operates three southbound trips and three northbound trips during commute hours between Santa Rosa and San Rafael. The primary destination for this route has been the Marin Civic Center, but some passengers use intermediate stops. Intercounty ridership averages less than 16 passengers per trip, and is well below performance standards. Alternate GGT service is available on Route 101, with a transfer in Novato or at the SRTC required for Marin Civic Center passengers. Passengers using this route for travel to San Rafael from Petaluma, Cotati, Rohnert Park or Santa Rosa can use Route 101.

Exhibit 2, Page 12

Nineteen comments were received opposed to any changes to Route 75, while 7 requested that consideration be given to keeping one round-trip. One of these commenters also suggested that the route be shortened to operate only between Petaluma and San Rafael. Given the low levels of ridership on Route 75 and the continuing decline in ridership, staff has concluded that the viability of this route is questionable. Staff has determined that Route 101 represents a reasonable travel alternative for Route 75 riders, even with a transfer to another route that would be required for some riders to reach their final destination.

In consideration of comments asking that one round-trip on Route 75 be retained, staff has analyzed the potential for operating one trip in each direction only between Petaluma and San Rafael. Retaining one round trip to operate only between Petaluma and San Rafael would cost approximately \$152,400 per year. If half the passengers from all three round trips use the one remaining round trip, \$34,600 in revenue would be generated to offset those costs, resulting in a net annual cost of \$117,400. However, if ridership remains at present levels and no new riders are attracted from other cancelled Route 75 trips, revenue would remain at approximately \$18,000 per year, with a net deficit to keep the one trip of \$134,000 per year.

Route 76 - San Francisco Civic Center Trips

Modified Proposal: Discontinue two low-ridership SF Civic Center Trips; retain one trip as a San Francisco Financial District trip

There are two southbound trips and one northbound trip on Route 76 that operate directly to or from the San Francisco Civic Center. Two of these trips average considerably less than 20 passengers, at 11 and 13 passengers respectively. One operates southbound in the morning and the other is northbound in the afternoon. Both operate in close proximity to Financial District trips that have available seats. The third trip operates southbound in the morning and carries an average of 20 passengers. It operates 20 minutes after and 20 minutes before Financial District service. Eliminating this trip would leave a gap of approximately 40 minutes in the schedule. Financial District trips have available seats. Fourteen comments were received specifically opposing eliminating these trips and one comment was received in support of eliminating these trips due to low ridership. Of the 14 comments opposed to the proposed trip eliminations, two suggested that Financial District trips be eliminated on this route instead of Civic Center trips.

Staff has examined ridership patterns and concluded the Financial District trips on Route 76 perform better than the Civic Center trips, but still have seats available. As a result, discontinuing Financial District trips in order to save Civic Center trips would inconvenience a greater number of passengers. Because the Financial District trips have available seating capacity to absorb Civic Center riders, eliminating direct Civic Center trips combined with a transfer to a Route 93 shuttle is a reasonable option for Civic Center passengers. As a result, the proposal to eliminate these trips remains unchanged. However, staff recommends keeping the second southbound Civic Center trip as a Financial District trip due to the gap in the schedule that would remain if this trip were cancelled outright. As a result, the proposal for Route 76 has been modified to eliminate all direct Civic Center trips, but to retain the second southbound Civic Center trip as a Financial District trip instead at an annual cost of \$76,200. Annual revenues of \$41,000 would offset that cost for a net annual cost of \$35,200.