To: Finance-Auditing Committee/Committee of the Whole
Meeting of March 23, 2023
From: Ron Downing, Director of Planning
Kellee J. Hopper, Deputy General Manager, Administration and Development
Joseph M. Wire, Auditor-Controller
Denis J. Mulligan, General Manager
Subject: $\quad$ APPROVE FISCAL YEARS 2023/2024 - 2027/2028 FIVE-YEAR FARE PROGRAM, AMEND THE MASTER ORDINANCE, APPROVE TITLE VI ANALYSIS, AND ADOPT NOTICE OF EXEMPTION

## Recommendation

The Finance-Auditing Committee recommends that the Board of Directors:

1. Approve the Fiscal Years 2023/24-2027/28 Five-Year Fare Program, containing Option 2 for both Golden Gate Transit (GGT) bus and Golden Gate Ferry (GGF) fares;
2. Amend the Master Ordinance accordingly;
3. Approve the associated Title VI Equity Analysis; and,
4. Authorize the Filing of a Notice of Exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

If approved, the proposed Fare Program will increase fares for the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District's (District) Regional Bus, Ferry, and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant complementary paratransit service effective July 1, 2023, with the exception of GGF special event fares to Oracle Park and Chase Center, which will be addressed in a separate future action.

This matter will be presented to the Board of Directors at its March 24, 2023, meeting for appropriate action.

## Summary

Financial projections reviewed by the Finance-Auditing Committee in October 2022 show that the District currently faces a five-year projected deficit of $\$ 423$ million, assuming a return of full prepandemic transit service levels. The deficit is reduced to $\$ 187$ million over five years, assuming a "low expenditure growth" scenario that more closely tracks current transit service levels. Even if trends in southbound crossings and transit ridership reverted to pre-COVID patterns during the
next five years, the cost of running a full service of transit operations would be $\$ 177$ million higher than the revenues generated from those services.

## Annual Fare Increases Will Offset a Percentage of Increased Expenses

In December 2022, the Board adopted the final Short-Range Transit Plan, which contains a $25 \%$ farebox recovery goal for bus service and a $40 \%$ farebox recovery goal for ferry service. However, due to the pandemic and the resulting loss in riders, farebox recovery rates during Fiscal Year (FY) $21 / 22$ were $7.0 \%$ for bus and $17.2 \%$ for ferry.

In light of lagging ridership returns in the wake of COVID-19, the proposed fare scenarios were not designed to reach the Board's farebox recovery targets at this time. Rather, staff developed multiple scenarios to: (1) enact modest, incremental fare increases over the life of the Five-Year Fare Program, instead of a single large increase; (2) keep the rate of increases low to moderate to facilitate ridership recovery, and (3) attempt to increase fare revenue at a rate similar to the incremental increases in GGT and GGF expenses, which are primarily driven by salary, medical insurance and fuel costs, coupled with asset depreciation.

Four options were approved by the Board to be brought forward for public review and comment. Because there are slight differences in the options as applied to GGT bus and GGF ferry fares, the four options are described by mode below:

## Scenarios for Bus Fare Changes

The Board approved seeking public comment on the following four possible scenarios to increase GGT bus fares:

1) Increase cash fares for all GGT bus trips (including local trips in all counties, and trips between the East Bay and San Francisco) by $\$ 0.25$ each year;
2) Increase cash fares for regional bus trips between the North Bay and San Francisco by $\$ 0.25$ each year, with changes in Local and East Bay Fares as outlined below;
3) Increase cash fares for regional bus trips between the North Bay and San Francisco by three percent (3\%) each year, with changes in Local and East Bay Fares as outlined below;
4) Increase cash fares for regional bus trips between the North Bay and San Francisco by four percent (4\%) each year, with changes in Local and East Bay Fares as outlined below;

Under each of the four scenarios:

- The existing discount for adult customers paying with Clipper cards and the Clipper mobile app would continue at 20 percent (except for Marin Local fares as discussed below).
- Fares for customers who qualify for youth, senior, persons with disabilities, and Medicare discounts would continue to be $50 \%$ of adult cash fares when paid with cash, a Clipper card, or the Clipper mobile app.
- Fares for low-income riders who pay via the region's means-based Clipper START program would continue to be $50 \%$ of adult cash fares.


## Proposed Changes in Local and East Bay Fares for Scenarios 2, 3 and 4

Local fares (for trips within a single county) and fares between Marin County and the East Bay would change under Scenarios 2, 3 and 4 as follows:

- Marin County local fares would continue to mirror Marin Transit's fare policy. Future adjustments by Marin Transit would be incorporated into GGT fares through a separate Board action.
- Sonoma County adult local cash fares would be decreased to reduce the gap between GGT fares and the fares of overlapping local transit systems. The adult cash fare would be lowered from $\$ 5.00$ to $\$ 3.00$ in the first year of the program and remain as such for the remaining four years of the program. Adult Clipper fares would be lowered from $\$ 4.00$ to $\$ 2.40$. These reduced local fares would be maintained for the duration of the proposed Five-Year Fare Program, with one exception: Should local fares be increased by the other operators in Sonoma County, the GGT local fares would be increased to correspond to the new fares adopted by the local transit operators, again, through separate Board action.
- Fares for trips within the East Bay and travel between the East Bay and San Francisco would continue to match the BART Early Bird Express program fares. The GGT fares would be adjusted to match changes to BART fares for the duration of the program, again, with separate Board action, if necessary.
- Fares increases for trips within San Francisco would mirror the increases for regional bus trips between the North Bay and San Francisco (e.g., $\$ 0.25$ under Scenario 2, three percent under Scenario 3, or four percent under Scenario 4).

In scenarios 2, 3 and 4, based on long-standing practice, local fares for travel within Marin County would continue to be aligned with the fares established by Marin Transit. These fares would be adjusted only if Marin Transit changes its fares. GGT carries approximately 220,000 local passengers annually in Marin County. The current 10\% Clipper discount off the adult cash fare would continue unless and until Marin Transit changes its discount.

Local fares for travel within Sonoma County traditionally have been set to discourage local riders from taking up seats for longer-distance regional (intercounty) riders and to encourage them to travel instead on service provided by local transit systems. GGT local fares are currently $\$ 5.00$ cash or $\$ 4.00$ (reflecting a $20 \%$ discount) for Clipper card users. This is significantly higher than the $\$ 1.50$ to $\$ 2.10$ charged to ride local systems in Sonoma County. While the number of local riders on GGT is low in Sonoma County, the District has received requests to reduce fares for those who must rely on GGT instead of the local systems. This is especially true for low-income riders who may use GGT at times of day when the local systems have reduced service levels or are not in operation at all.

GGT buses typically have excess capacity available during off-peak times, and a modest increase in local riders would not have a negative impact on the availability of seating for intercounty riders. In scenarios 2, 3 and 4, staff estimates the fiscal impact of reducing local fares within Sonoma County to be minimal due to the low number of local riders, approximately 28,000 annually. In addition, any revenue decrease could be offset by attracting new riders who were previously pricesensitive to GGT.

The District has partnered with BART since 2019 to operate two Early Bird Express lines that connect the East Bay with San Francisco during early morning hours when the BART system is closed to accommodate the Transbay Tube seismic retrofit project. These bus trips are subsidized by BART.

As part of the contract with BART, the District observes a fare policy for affected trip types that is lower than the GGT fares that would otherwise be charged. As a function of observing these fares, all East Bay local and East Bay to San Francisco GGT trips paid with Clipper must also be set at these lower fares. Approximately 3,441 East Bay local and 159 East Bay to San Francisco riders used GGT last year.

BART has indicated that these early morning bus trips may continue indefinitely to provide BART more flexibility with its operational needs. As a result, in scenarios 2,3 and 4 , the Clipper fares for East Bay local rides as well as East Bay to San Francisco fares will be held at $\$ 2.00$ for local travel within the East Bay, and $\$ 3.50$ for travel between the East Bay and San Francisco. These rates would increase only if BART increases its fares. This proposal also would extend the reduced rates to fares paid with cash on regular GGT service, to provide a clearer fare policy to riders in the same three scenarios.

## Proposed Paratransit Fare Changes

Paratransit fares would continue to be set at twice the price of adult bus cash fares, as allowed by federal law. Due to the nature of the District's paratransit service, which requires long deadhead moves to pick up passengers and low intercounty demand, these are expensive trips to provide. For example, it costs more than $\$ 260$ to transport a customer from Santa Rosa to San Francisco, for which they currently pay $\$ 28.00$. Intercounty paratransit fares currently cover only about $9 \%$ of operating costs. Paratransit fares also would be subject to corresponding increases associated with the four GGT fare change scenarios above.

## Scenarios for Ferry Fare Changes

The Board also approved seeking public comment on the following four possible scenarios to increase GGF ferry fares:

1) Increase all GGF fares (Clipper, single use ride tickets and Group fares) by $\$ 0.25$ each year;
2) Increase GGF Clipper adult fares and increase Group fares by $\$ 0.25$ each year, and reduce the means-based fares as outlined below;
3) Increase GGF Clipper adult fares and increase Group fares by three percent (3\%) each year, and reduce the means-based fares as outlined below;
4) Increase GGF Clipper adult fares and Group fares by four percent (4\%) each year, and reduce the means-based fares as outlined below.

Customers who qualify for youth, senior, persons with disabilities, and Medicare discounts would continue to receive a $50 \%$ discount off adult single ride ticket prices.

Ferry single ride tickets, which are commonly used by tourists riding the District's Sausalito ferries, represent approximately $35 \%$ of annual GGF revenue. In scenarios 2, 3 and 4, it is proposed that the existing prices of single ride tickets remain unchanged, except for a one-time $\$ 0.50$ increase for the Larkspur Ferry in the first year. This would standardize the single ride ticket prices at $\$ 14.00$ for the Larkspur, Sausalito, and Tiburon routes, and cap the fare at $\$ 7.00$ for riders who qualify for the youth, senior, persons with disabilities, and Medicare discounts. This change would keep the fare from increasing for approximately 67,000 one-way passenger trips each year.

## Means-Based Ferry Fare Change for Scenarios 2, 3 and 4

Currently, participants in the Bay Area's means-based Clipper START program receive a $50 \%$ discount from the adult single ride ferry fares. However, single ride ticket prices are considerably higher than Clipper fares on GGF, so the discount these customers receive is not significantly different from the adult Clipper fares available to other riders.

Scenarios 2, 3 and 4 propose that the $50 \%$ Clipper START ferry discount be based on Clipper fares and not the fares for single ride tickets. This will lower the cost of ferry trips for low-income residents. For example, the current Sausalito fare would drop from $\$ 7(50 \%$ of $\$ 14)$ to $\$ 3.75(50 \%$ of $\$ 7.50$ ) under Clipper START.

Staff estimates the fiscal impact of reducing Clipper START fares to be minimal due to low patronage, estimated at 3,700 one-way passenger trips yearly. Approximately $78 \%$ of the Clipper START usage is on the Larkspur route ( 2,900 one-way passenger trips), $10 \%$ on the Sausalito route ( 380 one-way passenger trips), $6 \%$ on the Tiburon route ( 230 one-way passenger trips), and $5 \%$ on the Angel Island route (190 one-way passenger trips). These riders would see a $54 \%$ to $63 \%$ reduction in their one-way fare depending on which ferry route they use. Any revenue decreases associated with offering a greater Clipper START discount might be offset by an increase in new riders.

## Ferry Group Fares

Group fares for non-profit/educational group travel on GGF were established by the Board in February 2022. These fares offer a more affordable means of travel, particularly to Angel Island, and were set at $\$ 4.50$ for Youths/Seniors/Persons with Disabilities or Medicare card holders or $\$ 7.00$ for adults traveling as a group. Ferry group fares represent approximately $2 \%$ of total fare revenues for GGF and subject to increase under each of the four scenarios above.

## Angel Island State Park Entrance Fees

California State Parks currently charges a fee of $\$ 1.00$ or $\$ 1.50$ for all visitors going to and coming from Angel Island State Park. These entrance fees are currently paid by the District and are meant
to be passed through to park visitors. However, in implementing Angel Island Service, the District had technical impediments to adding the park fee to the existing single use fares, so only riders who pay with an adult Clipper card are paying the $\$ 1.50$ park fee in addition to the District's regular Clipper fare. Scenarios 2, 3 and 4 would update this practice to add the entrance fee for everyone who uses GGF to access the park. The amount paid by customers for single use fares (but not Clipper adult or Group fares) would increase by $\$ 1.00$ or $\$ 1.50$, depending on fare type, to include the park entrance fee. This fee is passed through to California State Parks and does not represent revenue to the District.

## Option 2 is Recommended for Adoption

In consideration of public comments and the Board's adopted goals, it is recommended that the Board adopt Option 2 for Golden Gate Transit bus fares and Golden Gate Ferry fares. Option 2 meets the goals of maintaining modest fare increases of $\$ 0.25$ each year for adult cash fares over the life of the Five-Year Fare Program and keeps the rate of increases low to moderate to facilitate ridership recovery. Furthermore, Option 2 provides for more affordable fares for low-income riders traveling locally within Sonoma County, within the East Bay, and from the East Bay to San Francisco; maintains conformity with Marin Transit's fares for local travel within Marin County; and provides for greater affordability for low-income riders on Golden Gate Ferry. The average fare increase per passenger boarding per year is $\$ 0.10$ for bus, $\$ 0.18$ for ferry, and $\$ 0.13$ overall when new discounts and non-adult fares are taken into consideration. The fiscal impact of Option 2 , based on current ridership with modest growth, is shown in the table below.

| Option 2 Fare Changes | Five-Year Net | Average Annual Net | Average Annual |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Recommended for Adoption | Revenue Impact | Revenue Impact | \% Fare Increase |
| Bus | $\$ 1,300,000$ | $\$ 260,000$ | $1.6 \%$ |
| Ferry | $\$ 1,700,000$ | $\$ 340,000$ | $1.7 \%$ |
| Grand Total | $\$ 3,000,000$ | $\$ 600,000$ | $1.6 \%$ |

In consideration of public comments received and the Board's adopted goals, it is recommended that the Board adopt Option 2 for Golden Gate Transit bus fares and Golden Gate Ferry fares. Option 2 meets the goals of maintaining modest fare increases of $\$ 0.25$ each year over the life of the Five-Year Fare Program and keeps the rate of increases low to moderate to facilitate ridership recovery. Furthermore, Option 2 provides for more affordable fares for low-income riders traveling locally within Sonoma County, within the East Bay, and between the East Bay and San Francisco; maintains conformity with Marin Transit's fares for local travel within Marin County; and provides for greater affordability for low-income riders on Golden Gate Ferry. Appendix A shows current fares effective July 1, 2021, and the new fares to be implemented under Option 2 effective each year from July 1, 2023, through July 1, 2027, if approved.

## Public Involvement Process for the Proposed Fare Program and Comments Received

Public notification and public comment activities regarding the proposed fare program revisions, including details regarding the scenarios being considered, began immediately after the Public Hearing was approved by the Board on January 27, 2023. Public notification activities to inform bus, ferry and paratransit riders prior to the public hearing on February 23, 2023 at 9:00 a.m. included:

- Two online public meetings (at noon on February 16 and in the evening on February 21) to explain the potential fare program changes, and solicit comments;
- Advertisements in English and Spanish in local publications (San Francisco Chronicle, Santa Rosa Press Democrat, Petaluma Argus Courier, Ukiah Daily Journal, Marin Independent Journal, East Bay News, The Del Norte Triplicate, Pacific Sun, La Voz (which covers all the North Bay Counties that are part of the District except Del Norte County), and La Prensa) announcing the online meetings and the public hearing;
- Press release to local media;
- Social media postings on Facebook and Twitter;
- E-mail blast to customers and community-based organizations;
- Article posted on the District's website; and
- Posters placed on-board the District's buses and ferries and at the San Rafael Transit Center and ferry terminals.

Materials were made available in Spanish and other languages as necessary, following the District's Language Implementation Plan.

## Public Comment Process

Public comments on this proposal could be submitted in several ways:

1. Commenting during online event or the Public Hearing;
2. Sending email to publichearing@goldengate.org; and/or,
3. Sending written comments by mail to the District Secretary.

The District's practice is to treat all comments equally without regard to the manner in which they are submitted or received. Therefore, individuals did not have to attend the public hearing and provide input in person. All comments received through the above methods were considered in staff's development of the final recommendation. Comments needed to be submitted by $4: 30$ p.m. on February 24, 2023.

Prior to the hearing, twenty-four (24) comments were received on the fare increase proposal, including 14 comments specific to the proposal and 10 comments that were not specific to the proposal. Of the 14 comments specific to the proposal, five were in opposition to the proposal, five were in support of one of the proposal options or a hybrid option, three were neither against nor in favor of the proposal, and one suggested an alternative option to the proposal. At the public hearing on February 23, one final public comment was submitted during the public hearing.

Staff responses to comments received in opposition to the proposal, and comments neither in support of nor opposed to the proposal, are shown in Appendix B.

## Title VI Equity Analysis

In accordance with the Federal Transit Administration regulations and guidance implementing Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as well as the District's Title VI Policies, staff conducted a Title VI Equity Analysis to determine whether adoption of the proposed FY 2023/24 - FY

2027/28 Fare Program would result in a disparate impact to minority populations or impose a disproportionate burden on low-income populations using GGT bus service, including paratransit, and/or GGF ferry services. Staff reviewed the proposed fare increases for each fare zone combination and payment type for bus, ferry and ADA complementary paratransit services.

Overall, the analysis concludes that no disproportionate burden on low-income populations nor disparate impact on minority populations will result from the proposed fare increases.

The detailed Title VI Equity Analysis of the proposed fare increase is shown in Appendix C.

## California Environmental Quality Act

Staff concludes that the FY 2023/24 - FY 2027/28 Fare Program is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Section 21080(b)(8) of the Public Resources Code because it is for the purpose 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. Staff recommends that the Board direct the General Manager to file a Notice of Exemption in the offices of the county clerk of Sonoma, Marin, San Francisco and Contra Costa.

## Fiscal Impact

If approved, this five-year fare program is estimated to generate approximately $\$ 3.0$ million in new revenues to support the District's bus, ferry, and ADA paratransit programs.

## Appendices:

- Appendix A: Proposed FY 2023/24-2027/28 Fare Program - Fare Tables
- Appendix B: Public Comments and Staff Responses to the Five-Year Fare Program Proposal
- Appendix C: Title VI Equity Analysis
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Option 2 - \$0.25 Annual Increases for Regional Trips:
Bus - Adult Cash
Year 1

| To/From | SF | South/Central Marin | North Marin | Sonoma | East Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | $\$ 5.25$ | $\$ 8.25$ | $\$ 9.50$ | $\$ 14.25$ | $\$ 3.50$ |
| South/Central Marin | $\$ 8.25$ | $\$ 2.00$ | $\$ 2.00$ | $\$ 9.50$ | $\$ 7.00$ |
| North Marin | $\$ 9.50$ | $\$ 2.00$ | $\$ 2.00$ | $\$ 7.75$ | $\$ 7.00$ |
| Sonoma | $\$ 14.25$ | $\$ 9.50$ | $\$ 7.75$ | $\$ 3.00$ | $\$ 13.00$ |
| East Bay | $\$ 3.50$ | $\$ 7.00$ | $\$ 7.00$ | $\$ 13.00$ | $\$ 2.00$ |

Year 2

| To/From | SF | South/Central Marin | North Marin | Sonoma | East Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | $\$ 5.50$ | $\$ 8.50$ | $\$ 9.75$ | $\$ 14.50$ | $\$ 3.50$ |
| South/Central Marin | $\$ 8.50$ | $\$ 2.00$ | $\$ 2.00$ | $\$ 9.75$ | $\$ 7.25$ |
| North Marin | $\$ 9.75$ | $\$ 2.00$ | $\$ 2.00$ | $\$ 8.00$ | $\$ 7.25$ |
| Sonoma | $\$ 14.50$ | $\$ 9.75$ | $\$ 8.00$ | $\$ 3.00$ | $\$ 13.25$ |
| East Bay | $\$ 3.50$ | $\$ 7.25$ | $\$ 7.25$ | $\$ 13.25$ | $\$ 2.00$ |

Year 3

| To/From | SF | South/Central Marin | North Marin | Sonoma | East Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | $\$ 5.75$ | $\$ 8.75$ | $\$ 10.00$ | $\$ 14.75$ | $\$ 3.50$ |
| South/Central Marin | $\$ 8.75$ | $\$ 2.00$ | $\$ 2.00$ | $\$ 10.00$ | $\$ 7.50$ |
| North Marin | $\$ 10.00$ | $\$ 2.00$ | $\$ 2.00$ | $\$ 8.25$ | $\$ 7.50$ |
| Sonoma | $\$ 14.75$ | $\$ 10.00$ | $\$ 8.25$ | $\$ 3.00$ | $\$ 13.50$ |
| East Bay | $\$ 3.50$ | $\$ 7.50$ | $\$ 7.50$ | $\$ 13.50$ | $\$ 2.00$ |

Year 4

| To/From | SF | South/Central Marin | North Marin | Sonoma | East Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | $\$ 6.00$ | $\$ 9.00$ | $\$ 10.25$ | $\$ 15.00$ | $\$ 3.50$ |
| South/Central Marin | $\$ 9.00$ | $\$ 2.00$ | $\$ 2.00$ | $\$ 10.25$ | $\$ 7.75$ |
| North Marin | $\$ 10.25$ | $\$ 2.00$ | $\$ 2.00$ | $\$ 8.50$ | $\$ 7.75$ |
| Sonoma | $\$ 15.00$ | $\$ 10.25$ | $\$ 8.50$ | $\$ 3.00$ | $\$ 13.75$ |
| East Bay | $\$ 3.50$ | $\$ 7.75$ | $\$ 7.75$ | $\$ 13.75$ | $\$ 2.00$ |

Year 5

| To/From | SF | South/Central Marin | North Marin | Sonoma | East Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | $\$ 6.25$ | $\$ 9.25$ | $\$ 10.50$ | $\$ 15.25$ | $\$ 3.50$ |
| South/Central Marin | $\$ 9.25$ | $\$ 2.00$ | $\$ 2.00$ | $\$ 10.50$ | $\$ 8.00$ |
| North Marin | $\$ 10.50$ | $\$ 2.00$ | $\$ 2.00$ | $\$ 8.75$ | $\$ 8.00$ |
| Sonoma | $\$ 15.25$ | $\$ 10.50$ | $\$ 8.75$ | $\$ 3.00$ | $\$ 14.00$ |
| East Bay | $\$ 3.50$ | $\$ 8.00$ | $\$ 8.00$ | $\$ 14.00$ | $\$ 2.00$ |

Option 2 - \$0.25 Annual Increases for Regional Trips (Continued):
Bus - Adult Clipper
Year 1

| To/From | SF | South/Central Marin | North Marin | Sonoma | East Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | $\$ 4.20$ | $\$ 6.60$ | $\$ 7.60$ | $\$ 11.40$ | $\$ 3.50$ |
| South/Central Marin | $\$ 6.60$ | $\$ 1.80$ | $\$ 1.80$ | $\$ 7.60$ | $\$ 5.60$ |
| North Marin | $\$ 7.60$ | $\$ 1.80$ | $\$ 1.80$ | $\$ 6.20$ | $\$ 5.60$ |
| Sonoma | $\$ 11.40$ | $\$ 7.60$ | $\$ 6.20$ | $\$ 2.40$ | $\$ 10.40$ |
| East Bay | $\$ 3.50$ | $\$ 5.60$ | $\$ 5.60$ | $\$ 10.40$ | $\$ 2.00$ |

Year 2

| To/From | SF | South/Central Marin | North Marin | Sonoma | East Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | $\$ 4.40$ | $\$ 6.80$ | $\$ 7.80$ | $\$ 11.60$ | $\$ 3.50$ |
| South/Central Marin | $\$ 6.80$ | $\$ 1.80$ | $\$ 1.80$ | $\$ 7.80$ | $\$ 5.80$ |
| North Marin | $\$ 7.80$ | $\$ 1.80$ | $\$ 1.80$ | $\$ 6.40$ | $\$ 5.80$ |
| Sonoma | $\$ 11.60$ | $\$ 7.80$ | $\$ 6.40$ | $\$ 2.40$ | $\$ 10.60$ |
| East Bay | $\$ 3.50$ | $\$ 5.80$ | $\$ 5.80$ | $\$ 10.60$ | $\$ 2.00$ |

Year 3

| To/From | SF | South/Central Marin | North Marin | Sonoma | East Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | $\$ 4.60$ | $\$ 7.00$ | $\$ 8.00$ | $\$ 11.80$ | $\$ 3.50$ |
| South/Central Marin | $\$ 7.00$ | $\$ 1.80$ | $\$ 1.80$ | $\$ 8.00$ | $\$ 6.00$ |
| North Marin | $\$ 8.00$ | $\$ 1.80$ | $\$ 1.80$ | $\$ 6.60$ | $\$ 6.00$ |
| Sonoma | $\$ 11.80$ | $\$ 8.00$ | $\$ 6.60$ | $\$ 2.40$ | $\$ 10.80$ |
| East Bay | $\$ 3.50$ | $\$ 6.00$ | $\$ 6.00$ | $\$ 10.80$ | $\$ 2.00$ |

Year 4

| To/From | SF | South/Central Marin | North Marin | Sonoma | East Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | $\$ 4.80$ | $\$ 7.20$ | $\$ 8.20$ | $\$ 12.00$ | $\$ 3.50$ |
| South/Central Marin | $\$ 7.20$ | $\$ 1.80$ | $\$ 1.80$ | $\$ 8.20$ | $\$ 6.20$ |
| North Marin | $\$ 8.20$ | $\$ 1.80$ | $\$ 1.80$ | $\$ 6.80$ | $\$ 6.20$ |
| Sonoma | $\$ 12.00$ | $\$ 8.20$ | $\$ 6.80$ | $\$ 2.40$ | $\$ 11.00$ |
| East Bay | $\$ 3.50$ | $\$ 6.20$ | $\$ 6.20$ | $\$ 11.00$ | $\$ 2.00$ |

Year 5

| To/From | SF | South/Central Marin | North Marin | Sonoma | East Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | $\$ 5.00$ | $\$ 7.40$ | $\$ 8.40$ | $\$ 12.20$ | $\$ 3.50$ |
| South/Central Marin | $\$ 7.40$ | $\$ 1.80$ | $\$ 1.80$ | $\$ 8.40$ | $\$ 6.40$ |
| North Marin | $\$ 8.40$ | $\$ 1.80$ | $\$ 1.80$ | $\$ 7.00$ | $\$ 6.40$ |
| Sonoma | $\$ 12.20$ | $\$ 8.40$ | $\$ 7.00$ | $\$ 2.40$ | $\$ 11.20$ |
| East Bay | $\$ 3.50$ | $\$ 6.40$ | $\$ 6.40$ | $\$ 11.20$ | $\$ 2.00$ |

Option 2-\$0.25 Annual Increases for Regional Trips (Continued):
Bus - Clipper START
Year 1

| To/From | SF | South/Central Marin | North Marin | Sonoma | East Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | $\$ 2.50$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 4.75$ | $\$ 7.00$ | $\$ 3.50$ |
| South/Central Marin | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 4.75$ | $\$ 3.50$ |
| North Marin | $\$ 4.75$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 3.75$ | $\$ 3.50$ |
| Sonoma | $\$ 7.00$ | $\$ 4.75$ | $\$ 3.75$ | $\$ 1.50$ | $\$ 6.50$ |
| East Bay | $\$ 3.50$ | $\$ 3.50$ | $\$ 3.50$ | $\$ 6.50$ | $\$ 2.00$ |

Year 2

| To/From | SF | South/Central Marin | North Marin | Sonoma | East Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | $\$ 2.75$ | $\$ 4.25$ | $\$ 4.75$ | $\$ 7.25$ | $\$ 3.50$ |
| South/Central Marin | $\$ 4.25$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 4.75$ | $\$ 3.50$ |
| North Marin | $\$ 4.75$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 3.50$ |
| Sonoma | $\$ 7.25$ | $\$ 4.75$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 1.50$ | $\$ 6.50$ |
| East Bay | $\$ 3.50$ | $\$ 3.50$ | $\$ 3.50$ | $\$ 6.50$ | $\$ 2.00$ |

Year 3

| To/From | SF | South/Central Marin | North Marin | Sonoma | East Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | $\$ 2.75$ | $\$ 4.25$ | $\$ 5.00$ | $\$ 7.25$ | $\$ 3.50$ |
| South/Central Marin | $\$ 4.25$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 5.00$ | $\$ 3.75$ |
| North Marin | $\$ 5.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 3.75$ |
| Sonoma | $\$ 7.25$ | $\$ 5.00$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 1.50$ | $\$ 6.75$ |
| East Bay | $\$ 3.50$ | $\$ 3.75$ | $\$ 3.75$ | $\$ 6.75$ | $\$ 2.00$ |

Year 4

| To/From | SF | South/Central Marin | North Marin | Sonoma | East Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | $\$ 3.00$ | $\$ 4.50$ | $\$ 5.00$ | $\$ 7.50$ | $\$ 3.50$ |
| South/Central Marin | $\$ 4.50$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 5.00$ | $\$ 3.75$ |
| North Marin | $\$ 5.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 4.25$ | $\$ 3.75$ |
| Sonoma | $\$ 7.50$ | $\$ 5.00$ | $\$ 4.25$ | $\$ 1.50$ | $\$ 6.75$ |
| East Bay | $\$ 3.50$ | $\$ 3.75$ | $\$ 3.75$ | $\$ 6.75$ | $\$ 2.00$ |

Year 5

| To/From | SF | South/Central Marin | North Marin | Sonoma | East Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | $\$ 3.00$ | $\$ 4.50$ | $\$ 5.25$ | $\$ 7.50$ | $\$ 3.50$ |
| South/Central Marin | $\$ 4.50$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 5.25$ | $\$ 4.00$ |
| North Marin | $\$ 5.25$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 4.25$ | $\$ 4.00$ |
| Sonoma | $\$ 7.50$ | $\$ 5.25$ | $\$ 4.25$ | $\$ 1.50$ | $\$ 7.00$ |
| East Bay | $\$ 3.50$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 7.00$ | $\$ 2.00$ |

Option 2-\$0.25 Annual Increases for Regional Trips (Continued):
Bus - Youth/Seniors/Persons with Disabilities/Medicare
Year 1

| To/From | SF | South/Central Marin | North Marin | Sonoma | East Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | $\$ 2.50$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 4.75$ | $\$ 7.00$ | $\$ 1.75$ |
| South/Central Marin | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 4.75$ | $\$ 3.50$ |
| North Marin | $\$ 4.75$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 3.75$ | $\$ 3.50$ |
| Sonoma | $\$ 7.00$ | $\$ 4.75$ | $\$ 3.75$ | $\$ 1.50$ | $\$ 6.50$ |
| East Bay | $\$ 1.75$ | $\$ 3.50$ | $\$ 3.50$ | $\$ 6.50$ | $\$ 1.00$ |

Year 2

| To/From | SF | South/Central Marin | North Marin | Sonoma | East Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | $\$ 2.75$ | $\$ 4.25$ | $\$ 4.75$ | $\$ 7.25$ | $\$ 1.75$ |
| South/Central Marin | $\$ 4.25$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 4.75$ | $\$ 3.50$ |
| North Marin | $\$ 4.75$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 3.50$ |
| Sonoma | $\$ 7.25$ | $\$ 4.75$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 1.50$ | $\$ 6.50$ |
| East Bay | $\$ 1.75$ | $\$ 3.50$ | $\$ 3.50$ | $\$ 6.50$ | $\$ 1.00$ |

Year 3

| To/From | SF | South/Central Marin | North Marin | Sonoma | East Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | $\$ 2.75$ | $\$ 4.25$ | $\$ 5.00$ | $\$ 7.25$ | $\$ 1.75$ |
| South/Central Marin | $\$ 4.25$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 5.00$ | $\$ 3.75$ |
| North Marin | $\$ 5.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 3.75$ |
| Sonoma | $\$ 7.25$ | $\$ 5.00$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 1.50$ | $\$ 6.75$ |
| East Bay | $\$ 1.75$ | $\$ 3.75$ | $\$ 3.75$ | $\$ 6.75$ | $\$ 1.00$ |

Year 4

| To/From | SF | South/Central Marin | North Marin | Sonoma | East Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | $\$ 3.00$ | $\$ 4.50$ | $\$ 5.00$ | $\$ 7.50$ | $\$ 1.75$ |
| South/Central Marin | $\$ 4.50$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 5.00$ | $\$ 3.75$ |
| North Marin | $\$ 5.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 4.25$ | $\$ 3.75$ |
| Sonoma | $\$ 7.50$ | $\$ 5.00$ | $\$ 4.25$ | $\$ 1.50$ | $\$ 6.75$ |
| East Bay | $\$ 1.75$ | $\$ 3.75$ | $\$ 3.75$ | $\$ 6.75$ | $\$ 1.00$ |

Year 5

| To/From | SF | South/Central Marin | North Marin | Sonoma | East Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | $\$ 3.00$ | $\$ 4.50$ | $\$ 5.25$ | $\$ 7.50$ | $\$ 1.75$ |
| South/Central Marin | $\$ 4.50$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 5.25$ | $\$ 4.00$ |
| North Marin | $\$ 5.25$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ | $\$ 4.25$ | $\$ 4.00$ |
| Sonoma | $\$ 7.50$ | $\$ 5.25$ | $\$ 4.25$ | $\$ 1.50$ | $\$ 7.00$ |
| East Bay | $\$ 1.75$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 7.00$ | $\$ 1.00$ |

[^0]Option 2 - \$0.25 Annual Increases for Regional Trips (Continued):

Paratransit
Year 1

| To/From | SF | South/Central Marin | North Marin | Sonoma | East Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | N/A | $\$ 16.50$ | $\$ 19.00$ | $\$ 28.50$ | $\$ 7.00$ |
| South/Central Marin | $\$ 16.50$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 19.00$ | $\$ 14.00$ |
| North Marin | $\$ 19.00$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 15.50$ | $\$ 14.00$ |
| Sonoma | $\$ 28.50$ | $\$ 19.00$ | $\$ 15.50$ | $\$ 6.00$ | $\$ 26.00$ |
| East Bay | $\$ 7.00$ | $\$ 14.00$ | $\$ 14.00$ | $\$ 26.00$ | N/A |

Year 2

| To/From | SF | South/Central Marin | North Marin | Sonoma | East Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | N/A | $\$ 17.00$ | $\$ 19.50$ | $\$ 29.00$ | $\$ 7.00$ |
| South/Central Marin | $\$ 17.00$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 19.50$ | $\$ 14.50$ |
| North Marin | $\$ 19.50$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 16.00$ | $\$ 14.50$ |
| Sonoma | $\$ 29.00$ | $\$ 19.50$ | $\$ 16.00$ | $\$ 6.00$ | $\$ 26.50$ |
| East Bay | $\$ 7.00$ | $\$ 14.50$ | $\$ 14.50$ | $\$ 26.50$ | N/A |

Year 3

| To/From | SF | South/Central Marin | North Marin | Sonoma | East Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | N/A | $\$ 17.50$ | $\$ 20.00$ | $\$ 29.50$ | $\$ 7.00$ |
| South/Central Marin | $\$ 17.50$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 20.00$ | $\$ 15.00$ |
| North Marin | $\$ 20.00$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 16.50$ | $\$ 15.00$ |
| Sonoma | $\$ 29.50$ | $\$ 20.00$ | $\$ 16.50$ | $\$ 6.00$ | $\$ 27.00$ |
| East Bay | $\$ 7.00$ | $\$ 15.00$ | $\$ 15.00$ | $\$ 27.00$ | N/A |

Year 4

| To/From | SF | South/Central Marin | North Marin | Sonoma | East Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | N/A | $\$ 18.00$ | $\$ 20.50$ | $\$ 30.00$ | $\$ 7.00$ |
| South/Central Marin | $\$ 18.00$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 20.50$ | $\$ 15.50$ |
| North Marin | $\$ 20.50$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 17.00$ | $\$ 15.50$ |
| Sonoma | $\$ 30.00$ | $\$ 20.50$ | $\$ 17.00$ | $\$ 6.00$ | $\$ 27.50$ |
| East Bay | $\$ 7.00$ | $\$ 15.50$ | $\$ 15.50$ | $\$ 27.50$ | N/A |

Year 5

| To/From | SF | South/Central Marin | North Marin | Sonoma | East Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SF | N/A | $\$ 18.50$ | $\$ 21.00$ | $\$ 30.50$ | $\$ 7.00$ |
| South/Central Marin | $\$ 18.50$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 21.00$ | $\$ 16.00$ |
| North Marin | $\$ 21.00$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 17.50$ | $\$ 16.00$ |
| Sonoma | $\$ 30.50$ | $\$ 21.00$ | $\$ 17.50$ | $\$ 6.00$ | $\$ 28.00$ |
| East Bay | $\$ 7.00$ | $\$ 16.00$ | $\$ 16.00$ | $\$ 28.00$ | N/A |

Option 2-\$0.25 Annual Increases for Regional Trips (Continued):
Ferry
Year 1

| Route | Adult Single Ride | Adult Clipper | ${ }^{*}$ Clipper START | **Y/S/D/M |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Angel Island | $\$ 15.50$ | $\$ 9.25$ | $\$ 5.40$ | $\$ 8.00$ |
| Larkspur | $\$ 14.00$ | $\$ 8.75$ | $\$ 4.40$ | $\$ 7.00$ |
| Sausalito | $\$ 14.00$ | $\$ 7.75$ | $\$ 3.90$ | $\$ 7.00$ |
| Tiburon | $\$ 14.00$ | $\$ 7.75$ | $\$ 3.90$ | $\$ 7.00$ |


| Group - Adult | $\$ 7.25$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Group $-* * Y / \mathrm{S} / \mathrm{D} / \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 4.75$ |

Year 2

| Route | Adult Single Ride | Adult Clipper | ${ }^{*}$ Clipper START | ${ }^{* *} \mathrm{Y} / \mathrm{S} / \mathrm{D} / \mathrm{M}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Angel Island | $\$ 15.50$ | $\$ 9.50$ | $\$ 5.50$ | $\$ 8.00$ |
| Larkspur | $\$ 14.00$ | $\$ 9.00$ | $\$ 4.50$ | $\$ 7.00$ |
| Sausalito | $\$ 14.00$ | $\$ 8.00$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 7.00$ |
| Tiburon | $\$ 14.00$ | $\$ 8.00$ | $\$ 4.00$ | $\$ 7.00$ |


| Group - Adult | $\$ 7.50$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Group $-* * \mathrm{Y} / \mathrm{S} / \mathrm{D} / \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 5.00$ |

Year 3

| Route | Adult Single Ride | Adult Clipper | ${ }^{*}$ Clipper START | **Y/S/D/M |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Angel Island | $\$ 15.50$ | $\$ 9.75$ | $\$ 5.65$ | $\$ 8.00$ |
| Larkspur | $\$ 14.00$ | $\$ 9.25$ | $\$ 4.65$ | $\$ 7.00$ |
| Sausalito | $\$ 14.00$ | $\$ 8.25$ | $\$ 4.15$ | $\$ 7.00$ |
| Tiburon | $\$ 14.00$ | $\$ 8.25$ | $\$ 4.15$ | $\$ 7.00$ |


| Group - Adult | $\$ 7.75$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Group $-* * \mathrm{Y} / \mathrm{S} / \mathrm{D} / \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 5.25$ |

*Clipper Start = Means Based
** $\mathrm{Y}=$ Youth, $\mathrm{S}=$ Seniors, $\mathrm{D}=$ Persons with Disabilities, $\mathrm{M}=$ Medicare
Year 4

| Route | Adult Single Ride | Adult Clipper | ${ }^{*}$ Clipper START | ${ }^{* *} \mathrm{Y} / \mathrm{S} / \mathrm{D} / \mathrm{M}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Angel Island | $\$ 15.50$ | $\$ 10.00$ | $\$ 5.75$ | $\$ 8.00$ |
| Larkspur | $\$ 14.00$ | $\$ 9.50$ | $\$ 4.75$ | $\$ 7.00$ |
| Sausalito | $\$ 14.00$ | $\$ 8.50$ | $\$ 4.25$ | $\$ 7.00$ |
| Tiburon | $\$ 14.00$ | $\$ 8.50$ | $\$ 4.25$ | $\$ 7.00$ |


| Group - Adult | $\$ 8.00$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Group $-* * \mathrm{Y} / \mathrm{S} / \mathrm{D} / \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 5.50$ |

## Option 2-\$0.25 Annual Increases for Regional Trips (Continued):

Ferry (Continued)
Year 5

| Route | Adult Single Ride | Adult Clipper | ${ }^{*}$ Clipper START | ${ }^{* *} / 2 / \mathrm{Y} / \mathrm{D} / \mathrm{M}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Angel Island | $\$ 15.50$ | $\$ 10.25$ | $\$ 5.90$ | $\$ 8.00$ |
| Larkspur | $\$ 14.00$ | $\$ 9.75$ | $\$ 4.90$ | $\$ 7.00$ |
| Sausalito | $\$ 14.00$ | $\$ 8.75$ | $\$ 4.40$ | $\$ 7.00$ |
| Tiburon | $\$ 14.00$ | $\$ 8.75$ | $\$ 4.40$ | $\$ 7.00$ |


| Group - Adult | $\$ 8.25$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Group $-* * \mathrm{Y} / \mathrm{S} / \mathrm{D} / \mathrm{M}$ | $\$ 5.75$ |

$*$ Clipper Start $=$ Means Based
$* * Y=$ Youth, $\mathrm{S}=$ Seniors, $\mathrm{D}=$ Persons with Disabilities, $\mathrm{M}=$ Medicare

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## Attachment B <br> Staff Responses to Public Comments Received

## Summary

At the close of the comment period on February 24, 2023, the District received comments from 24 unique commenting individuals, including written and electronic comments. Of these commenting individuals, 14 comments were applicable to the Proposed Five-Year Fare Program, while 10 were not relevant to the Proposal. Out of the 24 comments, 5 comments ( $21 \%$ ) expressed opposition to the proposed fare program and 5 comments ( $21 \%$ ) expressed support for the proposed fare program. A total of 3 comments ( $12.5 \%$ ) were neither in support nor in opposition, and 1 comment (4\%) suggested an alternative to the proposal.

## Comments Received

## Comments Made in Support of the Proposal

The District received 5 comments in support of the fare proposal.

## Comments Made Neither in Support nor Opposed to the Proposal

The District received 3 comments neither in support nor opposed to the fare program.

## Comments Made in Opposition to the Proposal

The District received 5 comments in opposition to the fare increase proposal.

## Comment Made in Support of Alternate Proposal

The District received 1 comment in support of an alternate fare increase proposal.

## Responses to Comments

## Responses to Comments Made in Opposition to the Proposal

## Comment: Raising Fares Will Decrease Ridership and Revenue (1)

Response: Although fare increases typically result in a small reduction of ridership, the overall effect of a fare increase across five years will be net positive revenue, based on calculations projected from the existing ridership baseline and revenue baseline. Fare increases have historically been one of the methods the District has used to continue to provide services and keep pace with inflation, which increases District costs annually.

Comment: Increased Fares Will Be More Expensive Than Driving Across the Bridge (1)
Response: The current IRS reimbursable cost of driving is $\$ 0.655$ per mile, which includes wear and tear, fuel, insurance, and other costs. For example, a 40-mile round trip between San Rafael and San Francisco would cost $\$ 26.20$, plus $\$ 8.75$ toll, and approximately $\$ 25$ for parking in the
downtown area. This $\$ 59.95$ total cost would compare to $\$ 13.20$ in fares on Golden Gate Transit bus service.

Comment: Will Be Too Expensive for Those Who Cannot Work From Home (1)
Response: The current proposed $\$ 0.25$ fare increase is in line with annual wage inflation increases for those currently commuting. This fare would be significantly cheaper than driving, as noted above. A variety of fare discounts are possible for seniors, youth, and persons with disabilities. Discounted Clipper START fares are also available to people who meet certain income criteria. The Clipper START card provides a $50 \%$ discount compared to regular adult fares.

## Comment: Raise Bridge Tolls Instead (1)

Response: Bridge tolls currently are set to increase on July 1, 2023. This increase in revenue has already been accounted for, and it was determined that it will not be sufficient to meet the subsidy required to continue providing existing transit service considering increasing expenses. Historically, bus and ferry fares have had small annual incremental increases to keep pace with inflation.

## Comment: Eliminate Board of Supervisors Bonuses and Reduce Fares (1)

Response: Directors are paid $\$ 50$ per meeting day, up to a maximum of $\$ 5,000$ in a year, except for the President of the Board who, as an ex-officio member of all committees, may be paid up to $\$ 7,500$ in one year. Eliminating these expenses would represent just a small amount of the revenue savings in comparison to the proposed Five-Year Fare Program revenue projections. Directors do not receive any bonuses for their service. Any reduction in fares would result in a decrease in revenue and thus would necessitate a reduction in bus and ferry service to continue with financially self-sustaining operations.

## Response to Comment Made Proposing Alternate to the Proposal (1)

## Comment: Exempt Seniors from Fare Increase (1)

Response: There are multiple discount fare categories, including the existing senior discount fares that offer a $50 \%$ discount from the comparable regular adult fares.

## Responses to Comments Made in Support of the Proposal with Responses to Specific FareRelated Comments and Questions (4)

## Comment: Support Option 3 and Option 4 with Fare Capping Suggestion (2)

Response: Golden Gate Transit Bus and Golden Gate Ferry are currently unable to provide fare capping in the current Clipper environment. However, the District will consider various fare options when Clipper 2.0 becomes available in the future.

## Comment: Support Option 1 but Charge Local Riders the Regional Fare (1)

Response: While charging higher fares for local rides in the four counties served by GGT would generate additional revenue for the District, many local riders outside of San Francisco are lowincome and transit dependent. Raising local fares for those riders would create a hardship.

## Comment: Support for Less Than 5 Years and Increase Fares by 5\% (1)

Response: A Five-Year Fare Program is the direction preferred by the District based on prior experience in implementing Fare Programs. A Five-Year Fare Program allows riders to anticipate future expenses and allows the District to better plan for expected fare revenue in future years, as opposed to fares being raised in separate annual programs. A Five-Year Fare Program is also preferred to avoid potentially significant single-year fare increases at much higher rates. While a $5 \%$ fare increase would be more in line with current inflation, it is anticipated that future inflation rates will be lower. For ease of communication with the public, the $\$ 0.25$ annual fare increase (Option 2) is the preferred scenario, which is approximately $3 \%$ for adult fares. It is important to note that local fares in Marin County are set by Marin Transit (MT), and the District follows MT's lead for ease of rider understanding of the fare structure where GGT and MT routes overlap.

## Summary of Comments Not Related to the Proposal

The District received 10 comments unrelated to the proposal. These comments include topics regarding bus schedules and service routing (4), Golden Gate Bridge tolls (2), suggestions for ferry sponsorship (1), suggestions for fare-free days (1), comments on driving costs versus transit costs (1), and a question regarding individual ferry route costs (1).
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# APPENDIX C <br> Title VI Equity Analysis: FY 2023/24-2027/28 Fare Program 

# Presented to the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District Finance Committee of the Board of Directors 

March 23, 2023

## I. Background

The Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District (District) last adopted transit fare increases in 2017, when the Board of Directors (Board) approved a five-year fare program with annual adjustments for the period of July 1, 2017 through June 20, 2022. Fares were not adjusted for Fiscal Year (FY) 2022-23.

Financial projections reviewed by the Finance-Auditing Committee in October 2022 show that the District currently faces a five-year projected deficit of $\$ 423$ million, assuming a return of full prepandemic transit service levels. The deficit is reduced to $\$ 187$ million over five years, assuming a "low expenditure growth" scenario that more closely tracks current transit service levels. Even if trends in southbound crossings and transit ridership reverted to pre-COVID patterns during the next five years, the revenue generated from those services would be significantly short of covering the cost of a full service of transit operations by an estimated $\$ 177$ million.

The current proposal before the Board is to implement a five-year fare program for Golden Gate Transit (GGT) bus services, including regional paratransit services, and Golden Gate Ferry (GGF) services for FY 2023/24 through 2027/28. This proposal addresses two Board-adopted goals: first, to adjust transit fares as a means of continuing transit services with an appropriate level of passenger support; and second, to add approximately $\$ 3.0$ million in new revenue over the fiveyear period to help address the District's projected $\$ 177$ million five-year financial shortfall.

Before the Board can adopt these proposed fare changes, the Board must consider whether the proposed changes will disparately impact minority passengers and/or disproportionately burden low-income passengers. The required components of this Title VI Equity Analysis are set forth in the Federal Transit Administration's regulations and FTA Circular 4702.1B ("Title VI Requirements and Guidelines for Federal Transit Administration Recipients") implementing Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and in the District's Title VI Policies.

## II. Title VI Policies (Adopted August 2013)

The District adopted its Major Service Change, Disparate Impact and Disproportionate Burden Policies (together referred to as "Title VI Policies") on August 9, 2013. These policies set forth the standards used in fare equity analyses. The District's Disparate Impact policy provides:

- The District defines its Disparate Impact Threshold for determining whether the burdens or benefits of a major service change... or a fare adjustment are equitable to be $10 \%$, based on the cumulative impact of the proposed service and/or fare changes. This threshold
applies to the difference of the impacts borne by minority populations compared to the same impacts borne by non-minority populations.

The District's Disproportionate Burden Policy provides:

- The District defines its Disproportionate Burden Threshold for determining whether the burdens or benefits of a major service change... or a fare adjustment are equitable to be $10 \%$, based on the cumulative impact of the proposed service and/or fare changes. This threshold applies to the difference of the impacts borne by low-income populations compared to the same impacts borne by non-low-income populations.


## Public Outreach on Title VI Policies (2013)

Prior to Board adoption of the District's Title VI Policies, public outreach regarding the policy proposals included:

- Informational meetings on July 8, 9 and 10, 2013, in Marin City, Novato and Rohnert Park, respectively, between 4:30 p.m. and 6:30 p.m.
- Legal notices published in the Marin Independent Journal, the San Francisco Examiner and the Santa Rosa Press Democrat on June 18 and 25, 2013
- Signage posted onboard the ferryboats, at the Ferry Terminals, at transit hubs in Marin and Sonoma counties, at major bus stops and at the Customer Service Center at the San Rafael Transit Center
- Display boards, staff report and comment forms, including Spanish translations
- A press release issued and posted to the District's web site on June 17, 2013, including links to the staff report in both English and Spanish
- A public hearing agenda and an associated staff report posted to the District's web site on July 8, 2013
- Information e-blasted to the Bus and Ferry Subscriber's list on June 20 and July 2, 2013
- Information posted to transit-specific social media channels on July 2 and July 8, 2013
- A public hearing agenda mailed to organizations and individuals on the District's mailing list on July 8, 2013, and posted on District bulletin boards.


## Comments Received on Title VI Policies (2013)

Of the comments received by the District, one alerted the District to the need to apply Title VI principles to the allocation of resources between bus and ferry services; one commented on the inconvenience of the time and location of the public hearing, service reliability, and driver attitudes; and another urged the District to reach out to community partners and agencies to get the word out about Title VI-related public hearings.

The resolution evidencing the Board's discussion and approval of the policies is attached as Exhibit A.

## III. Golden Gate Transit Bus, Golden Gate Ferry, and Paratransit Services

The fare change proposal concerns both GGF service and GGT bus service, including regional paratransit services, which are summarized by mode below.

## GGT Bus Services

GGT bus services are generally delineated as "Commute" and "Regional." Generally, "Commute" bus service is peak-period, one-directional service between Sonoma or Marin County to/from San Francisco, plus shuttle-type routes designed specifically to take passengers from their places of origin to/from the primary Commute routes. "Regional" bus service, on the other hand, operates seven days a week over most of the day/night to provide basic mobility throughout the District's service area. More specifically:

- Transbay Commute Service provides commute service during morning and afternoon peakhour periods. Commute routes operate Monday through Friday, except designated holidays, and serve San Francisco, Marin, and Sonoma counties. Commute routes include Routes 114, 132, 154, and 172.
- Transbay Regional Service provides daily service throughout the day and evening between San Francisco, Marin, Sonoma, and Contra Costa counties. Regional routes include Routes 101, 130, 150, and 580. Route 580 service, which operates between Marin and Contra Costa Counties, is supported by Regional Measure 2 (RM2) funds. Route 101 also receives some RM2 funding.


## Golden Gate Ferry Services

The District's GGF service includes six routes between Marin County and San Francisco: Sausalito, Larkspur, Tiburon, Angel Island, and Special Event service to Oracle Park and the Chase Center. Fare changes for the Special Event service are not currently being proposed and are not included in this analysis.

- Sausalito Ferry Service provides daily connections between the Golden Gate Ferry landing in Sausalito and the San Francisco Ferry Terminal. This 5.5 nautical-mile route has been in operation since 1970 and currently provides fourteen crossings on weekdays and ten crossings on weekends and holidays. The service operates between 7:00 am and 7:10 pm on weekdays, and between 10:35 am and 7:20 pm on weekends and holidays.
- Larkspur Ferry Service features an 11.25 nautical-mile route between the Larkspur Ferry Terminal and the San Francisco Ferry Terminal, offering 25 weekday and ten weekend/holiday crossings. Services operate between $6: 40 \mathrm{am}$ and $8: 10 \mathrm{pm}$ on weekdays, and between 8:25 am and 8:00 pm on weekends and holidays.
- Tiburon Ferry Service provides a total of 14 crossings on weekdays and eight on weekends and holidays. GGF began operating this 5.94 nautical-mile route in 2017. This route was previously operated by the Blue and Gold Fleet since 1997 and before that by the Red and White Fleet. Service operates between 6:50 am and $6: 40 \mathrm{pm}$ on weekdays and between 9:30 am and $6: 05 \mathrm{pm}$ on weekends and holidays.
- Angel Island Ferry Service provides a total of eight crossings on weekdays, weekends and holidays. GGF began assumed this 6.73 nautical-mile route from Blue and Gold Fleet in

December 2021. Service operates between $9: 20$ am and $4: 35 \mathrm{pm}$ on weekdays and between 9:30 am and 4:05 pm on weekends and holidays.

- Special Event Service to Oracle Park is offered during all San Francisco Giants' home games and a number of other special events. The 13.1 nautical-mile route between the Larkspur Ferry Terminal and the dock at Oracle Park requires approximately 60 minutes. One round trip is offered for each event served, which typically totals between 80 and 90 trips per year.
- Special Event Service to the Chase Center has been canceled since the beginning of the pandemic, but when in operation it is offered during all Golden State Warriors' home games and a number of other special events. The 13.1 nautical-mile route between the Larkspur Ferry Terminal and the dock at Chase Center requires approximately 60 minutes. One round trip is offered for each event served.


## Paratransit Services operated on behalf of the District

The District provides inter-county paratransit service, to complement GGT regional all-day bus service, through an agreement between the District and Marin Transit, whereby Marin Transit's current paratransit contractor, Transdev, provides complementary paratransit service for GGT regional non-commute routes. Implemented in 1994, the demand-response service is fully compliant with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. The inter-county demandresponse service operates within a three-quarter mile radius of all non-commute GGT routes, providing service coverage corresponding to the fixed-route stops available to the general public. GGT does not offer its own intra-county paratransit service in Marin, San Francisco, or Contra Costa counties, but contributes toward the local coverage within Marin County along its noncommute routes. The District's paratransit services are limited to ADA-qualified passengers, and non-mandated service is not offered.

The District has longstanding arrangements with Sonoma County transit providers such as Sonoma County Transit, Petaluma Transit and Santa Rosa City Bus to provide intra-county paratransit service in Sonoma County. The District, through Transdev, provides only a very limited amount of paratransit coverage during very early morning or very late evening hours, when the listed intracounty providers are not in operation.

Map 1. Golden Gate Transit and Ferry Service Area

IV. Public Outreach for the Proposed FY 23/24 Through 27/28 Fare Program

## Public Notification

Public involvement activities to inform bus, ferry, and paratransit riders of the proposed fare program and solicit comments on four potential scenarios each for bus and ferry began on January 27, 2023 after the Board approved the public hearing to take place on February 23, 2023 at 9:00. Public notification activities prior to the public hearing included:

- Two online public meetings (at noon on February 16 and in the evening on February 21) to explain the proposed fare program and solicit comments. One meeting was held at noon on February 16, 2023, and the second was held in the evening on February 21, 2023;
- Advertisements in English and Spanish in local publications (San Francisco Chronicle, Santa Rosa Press Democrat, Petaluma Argus Courier, Ukiah Daily Journal, Marin Independent Journal, East Bay News, The Del Norte Triplicate, Pacific Sun, La Voz, and

La Prensa) announcing the online meetings and the public hearing. La Voz covers all of the North Bay Counties that are part of the District, except Del Norte County;

- Press releases provided to local media;
- Social media postings on Facebook and Twitter;
- E-mail blast to customers and community-based organizations;
- Article posted on the District's website; and
- Posters placed on board the District's buses and ferries and at the San Rafael Transit Center and ferry terminals.

Materials were available in Spanish and other languages as necessary, following the District's Language Implementation Plan.

## Public Comment Process

Public comments on this proposal could be submitted in several ways:

1. During the online events and at the Public Hearing;
2. By sending email to publichearing@goldengate.org; and/or,
3. By sending written comments to the District Secretary.

The District's practice is to treat all comments equally without regard to the manner in which they are submitted or received. Therefore, individuals do not have to attend the public hearing and provide testimony in person, but rather may comment through email or in writing. All comments received through the above methods have been considered in the final recommendation. The deadline for comments to be submitted was by $4: 30$ p.m. on February 24, 2023. Comments are summarized in Appendix B of the staff report for this item.

## V. Title VI Equity Analysis Methodology

Based on FTA Circular 4702.1B, the District must analyze any available information generated from ridership surveys that indicates whether minority and low-income passengers are more likely to use the payment types subject to the proposed fare changes.

The proposal for the FY 2023/24 through 2027/28 Five-Year Fare Program includes three components:

1. Proposal for fare increases on Golden Gate Transit
2. Proposal for fare increases on Golden Gate Ferry
3. Proposal for fare increases on paratransit services provided by the District

As a result, the District is required to conduct multiple Title VI Equity Analyses to determine whether any elements of the proposal will result in a disparate impact to minority populations or a disproportionate burden on low-income populations, based on the District's Title VI Policies.

Staff developed and applied the following methodology:

## 1. Identify Ridership Data Sources

## a. 2018 Golden Gate Transit and Ferry On-Board Survey

All data on minority and low-income ridership percentages by route for bus and ferry services was derived from the District's 2018 system-wide passenger survey, conducted as part of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) region-wide passenger survey. The consultant selected by MTC and by District staff to conduct this study surveyed all of the District's services, including GGT and GGF. Questionnaires were produced in Spanish and English, and included questions about the trip being taken and demographics.

For the purpose of the disproportionate burden analysis, staff determined riders identifying with having a household income of less than $\$ 75,000$ per year to be low-income. Marin County, where riders on most of GGF and GGT's service reside, has a comparatively high median income ( $\$ 97,815$, from the 2012-2016 American Community Survey). In order to reflect the high cost of living in the San Francisco Bay Area, District staff generally uses $90 \%$ of the median income $\$ 88,034$ - for the service area as the low-income cut-off. Federal poverty standards are not a good fit for an area where the cost of living is so much higher than in most localities. To compare, in 2021, the California State Income Limits that are used to determine eligibility for low-cost housing and other programs gave a range of $\$ 63,950$ for a single-person household to $\$ 120,600$ for an 8person household for the "very low income" designation for Marin County. (There are also "low income" and "extremely low income" categories.) As data was collected in fixed groupings during the District's most recent passenger survey, and $\$ 75,000$ is the closest grouping to $\$ 88,034$, this analysis uses household incomes of $\$ 75,000$ or less as the definition of low-income.

## b. $\quad 2016$ Telephone Paratransit Users'Survey

A telephone survey was conducted in March 2016 of customers who had used regional paratransit services between Marin, Sonoma, San Francisco, and Contra Costa Counties from December 2015 through February 2016. Customers were asked four questions: frequency of paratransit use, language spoken at home, ethnic identity, and annual income. Out of a total of 314 riders who had used regional paratransit service between December 2015 and February 2016, 144 were called, and 43 surveys were completed. Though the quantity of data gathered is relatively low, staff understands the responses to be representative of the District's paratransit customers, overall.

## 2. Analyze the percent change of the proposed fare adjustment for each fare payment method.

The current proposal would raise all GGT bus, GGF and regional paratransit services fares, except it would lower Clipper Start (low-income fares) on GGF and the fares for local rides in Sonoma County and the East Bay. Accordingly, all fare payment media and fare types were examined for the level of use by low-income and minority patrons. The media and fare types examined were: Adult Cash fare, Adult Clipper fare, Clipper START fare, and Senior/Youth/Disabled ("Discount") fare. Clipper Discount fares were not analyzed separately, but were grouped with cash Discount
fares, as the Discount fare amounts are the same whether the customer pays with cash or Clipper in the proposed fare structure. In addition to these media types, discount group fares were analyzed for the Angel Island ferry.

## 3. Define the term low-income as those with an annual household income at or below

 $\$ 75,000$, which is approximately $\mathbf{9 0 \%}$ of the median for the service area.Marin County, where riders on most of GGF and GGT's service reside, has a comparatively high median income ( $\$ 97,815$, from the 2012-2016 American Community Survey). In the District's most recent Title VI Program, District staff used $\$ 75,000$ for the annual income cut-off for defining low income for Marin County and Sonoma County. This figure is derived by taking $90 \%$ of the median annual income by census tract using the most recent statistics available. For this equity analysis, staff decreased the low-income threshold to $\$ 75,000$, which is the closest income strata break in the survey data, and which provides a more protective assessment of disproportionate burden for lower-income earners.
4. Define the term "minority" to mean those who self-identified as any ethnicity other than "white" alone in the 2018 Golden Gate Transit and Ferry On-Board Survey and the 2016 Paratransit Users' Survey.
5. Use data from the 2018 Golden Gate Transit and Ferry On-Board Survey and 2016 Paratransit Users' Survey, along with current and proposed fares, to determine whether the proposed fare changes will have a disparate impact or disproportionate burden on minority or low-income populations, respectively, based on the District's associated policies.

## VI. Title VI Equity Analysis Findings

Impacts of proposed fare changes were analyzed separately for GGT, GGF, and paratransit, since they constitute separate fare systems. As mentioned in the staff report, the recommended fare change option of the four scenarios proposed to the Board and presented to the public is Option 2: Increase cash fares for all regional bus trips between the North Bay and San Francisco by $\$ 0.25$ each year, with changes in Local and East Bay fares; and increase GGF Clipper adult fares and increase Group fares by $\$ 0.25$ each year and reduce means-based fares. This option also includes continuing to set paratransit fares at twice the price of adult bus cash fares, as permissible by FTA regulations. This is the fare set option that is analyzed below.

## 1. GGT Bus Fare Equity Analysis

As GGT has a complex fare structure with a total of seven zones with varying fares between each zone of origin and destination zone, or zone pair, a relatively complex analysis was required. Fares vary based on three characteristics:

1. The zone pair (origin and destination);
2. The fare category (Adult Cash, Adult Clipper, Clipper START and Discount fares); and
3. The fare media. (Cash vs. Clipper).

Adult category passengers receive a discount when using the Clipper card, so Clipper and cash fares differ. As referenced above, because Senior, Youth, and Disabled category riders are already receiving a discount, the Clipper fare for these categories is not discounted further and is the same as the cash fare. Accordingly, the Discount fare group represents those receiving a Senior, Disabled, or Youth discount whether using cash or Clipper. Clipper START is a means-based fare program that was implemented as part of a Metropolitan Transit Commission (MTC) Pilot program beginning in September 2019.

First, using data from the 2018 Golden Gate Transit and Ferry On-Board Survey, staff compared percentages of minority riders to non-minority riders by fare media and fare payment category, as well as system-wide. For the 2018 On-Board Survey, 551 bus passengers provided responses to income questions, and 614 passengers responded to ethnicity questions for the analysis below. As demonstrated in Table 1, 261 out of 614 Golden Gate Transit riders (42.5\%) self-identified as belonging to an ethnic minority, and 353 ( $57.5 \%$ ) identified as non-minority. The far right column in Table 2 shows that the most frequently used fare payment type on GGT is an adult Clipper fare, used by almost $65 \%$ of all customers. Following that is Adult Cash, used by $22.47 \%$, then Discount fares (Senior, Disabled, and Youth combined), at 9.28\% and finally, Clipper START at $3.25 \%$.

Please note the following: in an effort to conform the analysis to current, post-pandemic conditions, only surveys from Regional service (former routes 30, 40, 70, and 101, corresponding to current routes $130,580,150$, and 101) and Commute service (formerly routes 4, 27, 54, and 72, corresponding to current routes $114,132,154$, and 172) were used for this analysis. Additionally, since Clipper START was not yet in effect in 2018, staff estimated the number of passengers using Clipper START for each zone pair based on current usage patterns shown in Clipper data.

## Table 1: Bus Fare Product Usage—Minority vs. Non-Minority

| Payment Type | Minority | Non-Minority | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cash Adult | 77 | 61 | 138 |
| Discount | 21 | 36 | 57 |
| Clipper Adult | 155 | 244 | 399 |
| Clipper START | 8 | 12 | 20 |
| Total | 261 | 353 | 614 |

Table 2: Bus Fare Product Usage by Percentage-Minority vs. Non-Minority

| Payment Type | Minority | Non-Minority | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cash Adult | $12.54 \%$ | $9.93 \%$ | $22.47 \%$ |
| Discount | $3.42 \%$ | $5.86 \%$ | $9.28 \%$ |
| Clipper Adult | $25.24 \%$ | $39.74 \%$ | $64.98 \%$ |
| Clipper START | $1.3 \%$ | $1.95 \%$ | $3.25 \%$ |
| Total | $42.5 \%$ | $57.48 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ |

Applying the same type of analysis to income status as to minority status, Tables 3 and 4 show that of 551 riders responding to the income question on the survey, 387 or $70.22 \%$ identified themselves as having a household income of $\$ 75,000$ or less and are considered low-income. Further, 164 riders ( $29.76 \%$ ) responded as having an annual income over $\$ 75,000$. Please note that the higher proportion of low-income riders compared to past years is most likely due to changes in ridership as a result of the pandemic.

Table 3: Bus Fare Product Usage-Low-Income vs. Non-Low Income

| Payment Type | Low-Income | Non-Low-Income | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Cash Adult | 97 | 28 | 125 |
| Discount | 26 | 13 | 39 |
| Clipper Adult | 244 | 123 | 367 |
| Clipper START | 20 | 0 | 20 |
| Total | 387 | 164 | 551 |

Table 4: Bus Fare Product Usage by Percentage- Low-Income vs. Non-Low Income

| Payment Type | Low-Income | Non-Low-Income | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Cash Adult | $17.6 \%$ | $5.08 \%$ | $22.68 \%$ |
| Discount | $4.71 \%$ | $2.36 \%$ | $7.07 \%$ |
| Clipper Adult | $44.28 \%$ | $22.32 \%$ | $66.6 \%$ |
| Clipper START | $3.63 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $3.63 \%$ |
| Total | $70.22 \%$ | $29.76 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ |

Next, staff compared the percentage of minority riders vs. non-minority riders and of low-income vs. non-low-income riders using all fare products.

Graph 1 shows the use of each fare payment type for each category of riders: minority, nonminority, low-income, and non-low-income. The data shows that minority riders make payment with cash more predominately than non-minority riders ( $12.54 \%$ versus $9.93 \%$ ). Similarly, lowincome riders make payment with cash more often than non-low-income riders ( $17.6 \%$ versus $5.08 \%$ ). A higher proportion of low-income riders uses the Discount fares than is the case with other categories of riders. An increase in Clipper START fares will impact both minority and nonminority riders about equally, but of course it will impact low-income riders more than non-lowincome riders, since non-low-income riders cannot use Clipper START.

Graph 1: Bus Fare Product Usage Comparison


As a last step, Tables B1 through B5, attached at the end of this report, illustrate the methodology for calculating the cumulative effects of the FY 2023/24 through FY 2024/28 fare increase proposal on GGT passengers. For each year of the fare proposal, the number of respondents in each fare category is multiplied by the existing fare as well as the proposed fares. Those totals are then added up respectively and the difference between the total existing fare and the total proposed fare for each group (including minority passengers, non-minority passengers, low-income passengers and non-low-income passengers), is then translated into a percent change. These percent changes are then compared between low-income and non-low-income passengers and minority and non-minority passengers with each fare type to determine whether the impact of the fare increase is felt proportionally, or rather, whether a disparate impact and/or disproportionate burden exists.

## Table 5: Fiscal Year Corresponding to Impact Tables

Each of these tables represents the impacts of one year of the fare program, as follows:

| B1 | FY 2023/24 |
| :--- | :--- |
| B2 | FY 2024/25 |
| B3 | FY 2025/26 |
| B4 | FY 2026/27 |
| B5 | FY 2027/28 |

In the summary lines at the bottom right of Table B1, the average change in fares per group varies between $\$ 0.13$ and $\$ 0.16$. Comparing the percentage change in fares to the percentage of that group's representation, the variation between the impact on low-income customers is $-1.76 \%$ ( $1.76 \%$ less than their representation among all customers), and the impact on minority customers is $-8.27(8.27 \%$ less than their representation among all customers). Since the threshold for both disparate impact and disproportionate burden set by the District's Policy is $10 \%$, this variance is well below the threshold (and shows that the proposed changes would be less disadvantageous to low-income and minority customers than to non-low-income and non-minority customers).

The tables below lay out the difference in impact for each rider category relative to that category's representation among bus ridership for each year of the program:

Table 6: Bus Fare Impact Summary by Fiscal Year-Low-Income and Non-Low-Income

| Year | \% Low-Income | \% Fare Increase Borne by Low-Income | \% Non- Low- Income | \% Fare <br> Increase  <br> Borne By <br> Non-Low-  <br> Income  <br>   | Difference between Proportional and Anticipated Impact for Low-Income | Disproportionate Burden? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2023/24 | 67.83\% | 66.07\% | 32.17\% | 33.93\% | -1.76\% | No |
| 2024/25 | 67.83\% | 67.26\% | 32.17\% | 32.74\% | -.58\% | No |
| 2025/26 | 67.83\% | 68.38\% | 32.17\% | 31.62\% | .55\% | No |
| 2026/27 | 67.83\% | 68.52\% | 32.17\% | 31.48\% | .69\% | No |
| 2027/28 | 67.83\% | 68.65\% | 32.17\% | 31.35\% | .81\% | No |

Table 7: Bus Fare Impact Summary by Fiscal Year-Minority and Non-Minority

| Year | \% <br> Minority | \% Fare Increase <br> Borne <br> Minority | \% Non- <br> Minority | \% Fare Increase <br> Borne By Non- <br> Minority | Difference <br> between <br> Proportional <br> and <br> Anticipated <br> Impact for <br> Minority |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

For all five years of the fare program, the analysis indicates that the percentage difference between low-income customers' impacts and their representation among GGT ridership varies between $.81 \%$ and $-1.76 \%$, meaning that throughout the program, low-income riders would experience less or only slightly more impact than would be expected based on their presence among riders, depending on the year. In years when low-income customers can be expected to experience a
greater impact, that impact is well below the $10 \%$ threshold. The analysis shows that, for minority riders, whose impact ranges from $-.60 \%$ to $-8.27 \%$ throughout the five years of the program, the proposed fare changes can be expected to impact them proportionally less than would be expected, based on their representation among GGT riders all five years of the proposed fare program. Accordingly, the GGT bus fare program constitutes neither a disparate impact on minority riders nor a disproportionate burden on low-income riders.

## 2. GGF Fare Equity Analysis

Golden Gate Ferry's fare structure is less complicated than Golden Gate Transit's because it does not involve zones. The analysis of the fares is still based on three characteristics:

1. The ferry route (Sausalito, Larkspur, Tiburon or Angel Island);
2. The fare category (Adult vs. Discount, i,e., Senior, Youth and Disabled fares);
3. The fare media: Clipper or Limited Use Tickets (and in the case of Angel Island, discount group fares).

Limited Use Tickets allow passengers to purchase with cash a one-way fare, which is the fare media that replaced cash in 2011. As such, these fares will be represented by the label "Cash" in the tables for brevity's sake. Adult category passengers receive a discount when using the Clipper card, so Clipper and cash fares are different for Adult passengers. Just as with GGT, the Discount fare is the same when paying with cash or when using a Clipper card. The Discount fare group represents those receiving a Senior, Disabled, or Youth discount whether using cash or Clipper. Similar to Bus fares, Clipper START is a means-based fare program that was implemented as part of a MTC Pilot program beginning in September 2019. Since Clipper START fares were not active at the time the 2018 On-Board Survey was taken, Clipper START usage among the four regular ferry routes' ridership was estimated based on Clipper data collected since the beginning of the Clipper START program.

As stated above, Special Event ferry fares are not included in the current fare program proposal and are not analyzed here.

Using data from the 2018 On-Board Survey, supplemented by actual Clipper START usage, staff compared percentages of minority riders to non-minority riders by fare payment category as well as system-wide.

Tables 8 and 9 below show that 1,367 ferry passengers who used a revenue fare product (that is not a transfer or a pass) provided responses to all questions required for the analysis below. 38 Sausalito riders, 116 Larkspur riders, 13 Tiburon riders, and 184 Angel Island riders self-identified as an ethnic minority, representing a total of 351 passengers or $25.6 \%$. 238 Sausalito riders, 497 Larkspur riders, 100 Tiburon riders, and 181 Angel Island riders identified as non-minority, representing a total of 1,016 passengers or $74.3 \%$.

Table 8: Ferry Fare Product Usage-Minority vs. Non-Minority

|  | Status | Cash | Discount | Clipper | START | Group | Total |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sausalito | Minority | 5 | 4 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
|  | Non-Minority | 20 | 12 | 206 | 0 | 0 | 238 |
| Larkspur | Minority | 8 | 3 | 105 | 1 | 0 | 117 |
|  | Non-Minority | 24 | 30 | 443 | 1 | 0 | 498 |
| Tiburon | Minority | 1 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
|  | Non-Minority | 5 | 2 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Angel <br> Island | Minority | 23 | 16 | 43 | 1 | 102 | 185 |
|  | Non-Minority | 25 | 16 | 49 | 1 | 91 | 182 |
|  | Total | 111 | 83 | 980 | 4 | 193 | 1371 |

Table 9: Ferry Fare Product Usage by Percentage—Minority vs. Non-Minority

|  | Status | Cash | Discount | Clipper | START | Group | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sausalito | Minority | $0.36 \%$ | $0.29 \%$ | $2.12 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $2.77 \%$ |
|  | Non-Minority | $1.46 \%$ | $0.88 \%$ | $15.03 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $17.37 \%$ |
| Larkspur | Minority | $0.58 \%$ | $0.22 \%$ | $7.66 \%$ | $0.07 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $8.53 \%$ |
|  | Non-Minority | $1.75 \%$ | $2.19 \%$ | $32.31 \%$ | $0.07 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $36.32 \%$ |
| Tiburon | Minority | $0.07 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.88 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.95 \%$ |
|  | Non-Minority | $0.36 \%$ | $0.15 \%$ | $6.78 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $7.29 \%$ |
| Angel <br> Island | Minority | $1.68 \%$ | $1.17 \%$ | $3.14 \%$ | $0.07 \%$ | $7.43 \%$ | $13.49 \%$ |
|  | Non-Minority | $1.82 \%$ | $1.17 \%$ | $3.57 \%$ | $0.07 \%$ | $6.63 \%$ | $13.27 \%$ |
|  | Total | $8.08 \%$ | $6.05 \%$ | $71.49 \%$ | $0.29 \%$ | $14.08 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ |

As with the bus fares analysis, staff compared the percentage of minority riders vs. non-minority riders and overall percentages for passenger ethnicity data for all fare products.

Applying the same type of analysis to income categories as was applied to minority status, Tables 10 and 11 show that 1,170 riders responded to the income question on the survey. Of these passengers, 165 Sausalito riders, 285 Larkspur riders, 39 Tiburon riders, and 47 Angel Island riders identified as having a household income of less than $\$ 75,000$, for a total of 536 passengers or $45.8 \%$ of all ferry riders. In addition, 59 Sausalito riders, 271 Larkspur riders, 53 Tiburon riders, and 251 Angel Island riders for a total of 634 , or $54.2 \%$, responded as having an annual income over $\$ 75,000$.

Table 10: Ferry Fare Product Usage- Low-Income vs. Non-Low Income

|  | Income Status | Cash | Discount | Clipper | START | Group | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sausalito | Low-income | 8 | 2 | 155 | 0 | 0 | 165 |
|  | Non-low-income | 6 | 2 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 59 |
| Larkspur | Low-income | 17 | 13 | 255 | 1 | 0 | 286 |
|  | Non-low-income | 15 | 11 | 245 | 0 | 0 | 271 |
| Tiburon | Low-income | 5 | 1 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
|  | Non-low-income | 1 | 1 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 53 |
| Angel <br> Island | Low-income | 14 | 14 | 17 | 1 | 2 | 48 |
|  | Non-low-income | 35 | 18 | 49 | 0 | 150 | 251 |
|  | Total | 101 | 61 | 856 | 2 | 152 | 1172 |

Table 11: Ferry Fare Product Usage by Percentage- Low-Income vs. Non-Low Income

|  | Income Status | Cash | Discount | Clipper | START | Group | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sausalito | Low-income | $0.68 \%$ | $0.17 \%$ | $13.23 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $14.08 \%$ |
|  | Non-low-income | $0.51 \%$ | $0.17 \%$ | $4.35 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $5.03 \%$ |
| Larkspur | Low-income | $1.45 \%$ | $1.11 \%$ | $21.76 \%$ | $0.09 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $24.41 \%$ |
|  | Non-low-income | $1.28 \%$ | $0.94 \%$ | $20.90 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $23.12 \%$ |
| Tiburon | Low-income | $0.43 \%$ | $0.09 \%$ | $2.82 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $3.33 \%$ |
|  | Non-low-income | $0.09 \%$ | $0.09 \%$ | $4.35 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $4.53 \%$ |
| Angel <br> Island | Low-income | $1.19 \%$ | $1.19 \%$ | $1.45 \%$ | $0.09 \%$ | $0.17 \%$ | $4.09 \%$ |
|  | Non-low-income | $2.99 \%$ | $1.49 \%$ | $4.14 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $12.80 \%$ | $21.42 \%$ |
|  | Total | $8.62 \%$ | $5.25 \%$ | $73.00 \%$ | $0.17 \%$ | $12.97 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ |

Graph 2, below, shows the frequency of use of each fare payment type on ferry by: minority, nonminority, low-income, and non-low-income. Clipper is the dominant fare media for all categories of rider. Group fares are the next most prominent, because they are used by all categories on the Angel Island service and are a popular choice for the school groups that use the service. Limited Use tickets (identified as "Cash") are next in popularity, averaging $4.18 \%$ over all groups, and discount fares are the least used, with an average of $2.82 \%$ over all groups.

## Graph 2: Ferry Fare Product Usage by Minority and Income Status



As a last step in the process of the equity analysis for the ferry fare increase, Tables F1 through F5, attached at the end of this report, illustrate the methodology for calculating how the FY 2023/24 through $2027 / 28$ fare proposal will cumulatively affect Golden Gate Ferry passengers. For each year of the fare program, the number of respondents in each fare category is multiplied by the existing fares as well as the proposed fares.

Those totals (total existing fares and total proposed fares) are then added up respectively and the difference between the total existing fare and the total proposed fare for each group (including minority passengers, non-minority passengers, low-income passengers and non-low-income passengers), is then translated into a percent change. These percent changes are then compared with each passenger type's overall ridership to determine whether the impact of the fare increase is felt proportionally to the overall ridership, or rather, whether a disparate impact or disproportionate burden exists.

## Table 12: Fiscal Year Corresponding to Impact Tables (Ferry)

Each of these tables represents the impacts of one year of the Ferry fare program, as follows:

| F1 | FY 2023/24 |
| :--- | :--- |
| F2 | FY 2024/25 |
| F3 | FY 2025/26 |
| F4 | FY 2026/27 |
| F5 | FY 2027/28 |

In the summary lines at the bottom right of Table F1 (representing the first year of the five-year fare program for ferry fares), the average change in fares per group varies between $\$ .30$ and $\$ .40$.

Comparing the percentage change in fares to the percentage of that group's representation, the variation between the impact on low-income customers is $-5.22 \%$ to $-1.61 \%$ (or $5.22 \%$ to $1.61 \%$ ) less than their representation among all customers), and the impact on minority customers is $.90 \%$ to $5.47 \%$ (or $.90 \%$ to $5.47 \%$ greater than their representation among all customers).

The tables below detail the difference in impact for each rider category from that category's representation among ferry ridership:

Table 13: Ferry Fare Impact Summary by Fiscal Year-
Low-Income and Non-Low-Income
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|}\hline \text { Year } & \text { \% Low } \\ \text { Income } & \begin{array}{l}\text { \%Fare Increase } \\ \text { Borne by Low- } \\ \text { Income }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { \%Non-Low- } \\ \text { Income }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { \% Fare Increase } \\ \text { Borne By Non- } \\ \text { Low-Income }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Difference } \\ \text { between } \\ \text { Proportional } \\ \text { and } \\ \text { Anticipated } \\ \text { Impact for }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Disproportionate } \\ \text { Burden? }\end{array} \\ \hline & & & & \text { Low-Income }\end{array}\right]$

Table 14: Ferry Fare Impact Summary by Fiscal YearMinority and Non-Minority

| Year | \% <br> Minority | \%Fare Increase <br> Borne by <br> Minority | \%Non- <br> Minority | \% Fare <br> Increase Borne <br> By Non- <br> Minority | Difference <br> between <br> Proportional <br> and <br> Anticipated <br> for | Disparate Impact? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Minact for |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2023 / 24$ | $29.78 \%$ | $35.25 \%$ | $70.22 \%$ | $64.75 \%$ | $5.47 \%$ |  |
| $2024 / 25$ | $29.78 \%$ | $32.79 \%$ | $70.22 \%$ | $67.21 \%$ | $3.01 \%$ | No |
| $2025 / 26$ | $29.78 \%$ | $31.70 \%$ | $70.22 \%$ | $68.30 \%$ | $1.92 \%$ | No |
| $2026 / 27$ | $29.78 \%$ | $31.08 \%$ | $70.22 \%$ | $68.92 \%$ | $1.30 \%$ | No |
| $2027 / 28$ | $29.78 \%$ | $30.68 \%$ | $70.22 \%$ | $69.32 \%$ | $0.90 \%$ | No |

For all five years of the fare program, the percentage difference between both minorities' and low income customers' impacts and their representation among GGF ridership varies between $-5.22 \%$ and $5.47 \%$.

As an example, the $-5.22 \%$ difference in Year One of the program means low income riders are less impacted than non-low-income riders. In the first year of the program, the difference between minority customers' fare impact and their presence in the rider populations is $5.47 \%$, which means that minority riders will be relatively more impacted than non-minority riders, but by an amount that is within the $10 \%$ threshold established by the District's Title VI Policies. Over the next four years of the proposed program, these variations continue to fall well within $10 \%$, indicating that the proposed GGF fare program would constitute neither a disparate impact on minority riders nor a disproportionate burden on low-income riders.

## 3. Paratransit Fare Equity Analysis

For paratransit, though there are almost as many zone pairs as in GGT fixed-route service, there is only one fare medium (Cash) and only one fare category (Paratransit).

Staff examined the effects of the paratransit fare proposal on low-income and minority paratransit passengers as compared to low-income and minority riders' proportional representation within the District's entire fixed-route system. Data from the 2016 Paratransit Users' Survey shows the breakdown of paratransit users by ethnic identity and income status. As shown in Table 15, below, $30.95 \%$ of paratransit users surveyed identified as being from an ethnic minority population, and $69.05 \%$ as non-minority. $82.86 \%$ respondents claimed an annual income at or below $\$ 75,000$, and $17.14 \%$ claimed an income higher than $\$ 75,000$. The proportion of paratransit riders identifying as minority is lower than the fixed-route bus minority population ( $30.95 \%$ vs. $42.50 \%$ ) whereas paratransit riders are more likely to be low-income than fixed-route riders ( $82.86 \% \mathrm{vs} .70 .22 \%$ ). As a result, any increase to paratransit fares is likely to impose a disproportionate burden on lowincome riders.

Table 15: Paratransit Survey Data-Minority vs. Non-Minority and Low-Income vs. Non-Low-Income

| Fare Type | \%Minority | \%Non- <br> Minority | Overall <br> (ethnicity) | \%Low- <br> Income | \%Non- <br> Low- <br> Income | Overall \% <br> (Income) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paratransit | $30.95 \%$ | $69.05 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $82.86 \%$ | $17.14 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ |

To determine the cumulative effects of the proposed fare increase, staff performed a comparable analysis to those done for bus and ferry fares: for each year of the fare program, the number of respondents in each rider category is multiplied by the existing fare as well as the proposed fares. Those totals are then added up respectively and the difference between the total existing fare and the total proposed fare for each group (including minority passengers, non-minority passengers, low-income passengers and non-low-income passengers), is then translated into a percent change. These percent changes are then compared with each passenger type's overall ridership on fixedroute service to determine whether the impact of the fare increase is felt proportionally by overall ridership, or rather, whether a disparate impact or disproportionate burden exists.

Table 16: Fiscal Year Corresponding to Impact Tables (Paratransit) Each of these tables represents the impacts of one year of the fare program, as follows:

| P1 | FY 2023/24 |
| :--- | :--- |
| P2 | FY 2024/25 |
| P3 | FY 2025/26 |
| P4 | FY 2026/27 |
| P5 | FY 2027/28 |

As can be seen in Table P1 attached to this report, the difference between the fare burden, or the percent change in paratransit fares, borne by minority paratransit riders (30.95\%) to the percentage of minority passengers in regional fixed-route service ( $41.32 \%$ ) is $-10.37 \%$. This means that minority paratransit riders would experience less of an impact than would be expected based on their proportional fixed-route ridership, well below the District's threshold for determining a disparate impact. Therefore, there is no disparate impact to minority riders with the proposed fare increase on paratransit. Additionally, the discrepancy between the proportion of the fare increase borne by low-income paratransit riders $(60.00 \%)$ and the representation of low-income riders on fixed-route service ( $67.83 \%$ ) is $-7.83 \%$. This means that low-income paratransit riders would experience less of an impact than would be expected based on their proportional the fixed-route ridership. Therefore the proposed fare changes also would present no disproportionate burden on low-income paratransit riders.

The complete analysis results for paratransit fares are below in Tables 17 and 18.

Table 17: Paratransit Fare Impact Summary by Fiscal Year -Low-Income and Non-Low-Income

| Year | \% Low- <br> Income | \% Fare Increase Borne by LowIncome | \% Non- Low- Income | \% Fare Increase Borne By Non-Low-Income | Difference between Proportional and Anticipated Impact for Low-Income | Disproportionate Burden? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2023/24 | 67.83\% | 60.00\% | 32.17\% | 40.00\% | -7.83\% | No |
| 2024/25 | 67.83\% | 61.29\% | 32.17\% | 38.71\% | -6.54\% | No |
| 2025/26 | 67.83\% | 72.31\% | 32.17\% | 27.69\% | 4.48\% | No |
| 2026/27 | 67.83\% | 75.76\% | 32.17\% | 24.24\% | 7.93\% | No |
| 2027/28 | 67.83\% | 77.44\% | 32.17\% | 22.56\% | 9.61\% | No |

Table 18: Paratransit Fare Impact Summary by Fiscal Year Minority and Non-Minority

| Year | \% <br> Minority | \% Fare <br> Increase Borne <br> by Minority | \% Non- <br> Minority | \% Fare <br> Increase Borne <br> By Non- <br> Minority | Difference <br> between <br> Proportional <br> and <br> Anticipated <br> Impact for <br> Minority | Disparate Impact? |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2023 / 24$ | $41.32 \%$ | $30.95 \%$ | $58.68 \%$ | $69.05 \%$ | $-10.37 \%$ |  |
| $2024 / 25$ | $41.32 \%$ | $30.95 \%$ | $58.68 \%$ | $69.05 \%$ | $-10.37 \%$ | No |
| $2025 / 26$ | $41.32 \%$ | $30.95 \%$ | $58.68 \%$ | $69.05 \%$ | $-10.37 \%$ | No |
| $2026 / 27$ | $41.32 \%$ | $30.95 \%$ | $58.68 \%$ | $69.05 \%$ | $-10.37 \%$ | No |
| $2027 / 28$ | $41.32 \%$ | $30.95 \%$ | $58.68 \%$ | $69.05 \%$ | $-10.37 \%$ | No |

During the five years of the proposed fare program, the variance between fare impacts to lowincome riders and their presence among fixed-route transit service users ranges from $-7.83 \%$ in the first year to $9.61 \%$ in the final year. All of these variances fall within the $10 \%$ threshold for determining disproportionate burden, so the Five-Year Fare Program does not constitute a disproportionate burden on low-income paratransit riders.

In addition, for all five years of the proposed fare program, the percentage difference between both minorities' impacts and their representation among the District's bus ridership is $-10.37 \%$. Since this variance falls well within the threshold, the proposed paratransit fare program also would not result in a disparate impact on minority riders.

## C. Conclusion

## Golden Gate Transit

As can be seen on Tables 6 and 7 on page 12 of this report, the cumulative impact of the proposed fare increase on minority customers remains in the negative percentage range for the length of the fare program. The cumulative impact on low-income customers ranges from $-1.76 \%$ to $.81 \%$. This means that the fiscal impact on minority customers is less than their proportional representation compared to non-minority bus customers. Low-income customers also experience an impact that is within the disproportionate burden threshold set by the District. This demonstrates that there would be neither a disparate impact on minority riders nor a disproportionate burden on lowincome riders resulting from the proposed fare increase.

## Golden Gate Ferry

As shown on Tables 13 and 14 on pages 17 and 18 of this report, the impact of the proposed fare increase on minority and on low-income ferry passengers using regular ferry service varies from the representation in the larger group of ferry passengers by from $-5.22 \%$ to $5.47 \%$ during the length of the fare program. Since these variances are all within the threshold established by the District for disproportionate burden and disparate impact, this demonstrates that there would be neither a disparate impact on minority riders nor a disproportionate burden on low-income riders resulting from the proposed fare increase.

## Paratransit

As shown in Table 17 on page 20 of this report, low-income riders on paratransit bear a fare increase burden ranging from $-7.83 \%$ to $9.61 \%$ relative to low-income riders' presence in bus ridership. These variances all fall within the District's $10 \%$ threshold for determining disproportionate burden. Similarly, when comparing the burden of the fare increases on minority paratransit riders to that of all GGT riders, Table 18 on page 20 demonstrates that the increase in paratransit fares does not create a disparate impact on minority riders, with a variation of $-10.37 \%$ between the burden on minority riders and their representation among the general ridership.

Attachments: Exhibit A: Resolution Adoption of Title VI Policies Disparate Impact-Disproportionate Burden Tables for FY2024-2028 Five-Year Fare Program, Scenario 2: Bus, Ferry and Paratransit
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# GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE, HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT 

RESOLUTION NO. 2013-078

# APPROVE ADOPTION OF POLICIES FOR GOLDEN GATE TRANSIT <br> AND GOLDEN GATE FERRY SERVICE AND FARE CHANGES, <br> UNDER TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964, AS AMENDED 

August 9, 2013
WHEREAS, the Board of Directors (Board) of the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District (District) operates Golden Gate Transit (GGT) bus service and Golden Gate Ferry (GGF) service, both of which are public transportation services that occasionally receive federal funding to maintain or improve service scope and quality; and,

WHEREAS, on November 15, 2012, staff presented the Transportation Committee (Committee) with an overview of Title VI as applied to federal funding recipients, such as the District, subject to the new Circular Order issued by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA); and,

WHEREAS, on February 22, 2013, the Board approved the first action required by the new FTA Circular by adopting the required service standards and policies; and,

WHEREAS, to further comply with the new FTA Circular, the District must establish the following three policies: a Major Service Change Policy, a Disparate Impact Policy and a Disproportionate Burden Policy (Three Policies); and,

WHEREAS, the Three Policies will guide when and how the District analyzes the effects of potential future fare and service changes on minority and low-income populations and, in the event the District finds disparities, the District must evaluate whether there is an alternative that has a more equitable impact; and,

WHEREAS, the new FTA Circular requires transit providers, such as the District, to solicit and consider public input before establishing such policies; and,

WHEREAS, staff presented the Three Policies to the Committee on June 13, 2013, and the Committee recommended and the Board, by Resolution No. 2013-054 at its meeting of June 14, 2013, authorized the setting of a public hearing on a proposal to establish policies for Golden Gate Transit and Golden Gate Ferry Service and for fare changes under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as amended; and,

WHEREAS, the District conducted outreach relative to this proposal, as follows: (1) a press release was issued on July 17, 2013; (2) information was posted on the District's website, emailed to District's opt-in subscription lists and community-based organizations, posted on District's social media sites, and published as advertisements and legal notices in several periodicals including San Francisco Chronicle, Marin Independent Journal and the Santa Rosa Press Democrat; (3) Public Outreach Meetings were held on July 8, 2013 in Marin City, on July 9, 2013 in Novato, and on July 10, 2013 in Rohnert Park; and, (4) Spanish translations of printed materials, website information, and community meetings were available at all public outreach meetings and at the public hearing; and,

WHEREAS, public comments on the Three Policies could be submitted by either attending the public hearing or the public outreach meetings, emailing publichearing@goldengate.org or sending written comments to the District; and,

WHEREAS, due to concerns about Marin City residents not having received sufficient advance notice of the opportunity to comment on the Three Policies, the District extended the comment period by two weeks and held an additional public outreach meeting at the Marin City Library on July 25, 2013; and,

WHEREAS, seven public comments were received by the District as of July 25, 2013, and while several comments were related to the overall topic of Title VI, none of the comments were specific to the Three Policies; and,

WHEREAS, complete copies of the Three Policies and staff's underlying analysis, as well as a summary of the comments received and staff responses, are included herein as Attachments; and,

WHEREAS, the Transportation Committee at its meeting of August 2, 2013, has so recommended; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED that the Board of Directors of the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District hereby approves adoption of policies for Golden Gate Transit and Golden Gate Ferry Service and fare changes, under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, and attached hereto.

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING OF AUGUST 9, 2013

PAGE 3
ADOPTED this $9^{\text {th }}$ day of August 2013, by the following vote of the Board of Directors:
AYES (15): Directors Arnold, Belforte, Breed, Cochran, Fredericks, Moylan, Pahre, Rabbitt, Reilly, Sears, Snyder, Sobel and Theriault; Second Vice President Stroeh; President Eddie
NOES (0): None
ABSENT (4): Directors Campos, Wiener and Yee; First Vice President Grosboll

ATTEST:


Attachment 1 - Three Policies and Analysis
Attachment 2 - Summary of Comments Received and Staff Responses
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# Proposed Title VI Policies Pertaining to Major Service Changes, Disparate Impacts, and Disproportionate Burdens 

## Major Service Change Policy

The District must ensure that its services are provided equitably, without discrimination based on race, color, national origin or socio-economic status. To that end, the District must evaluate potential "major" service changes and all fare changes (except for those specifically exempt in the FTA Title VI Circular, such as Spare-the-Air Days and short-term promotional service demonstrations or fare decreases) for their impact on low-income and minority populations in its service area. Before this can occur, the District must adopt a Major Service Change policy to provide a concrete basis for determining which service changes need to be analyzed for equity.

Staff proposes the following for the District's Major Service Change Policy:

- A major service change is defined as a reduction or increase of 25 percent $(25 \%)$ or more in total vehicle revenue miles in service on any specific route, with the change(s) occurring at one time or over any twenty-four month period.

Staff further proposes the following exemptions such that these changes would not be subject to a Title VI Equity Analysis:

- Changes to service on a route with fewer than 10 total trips in a typical service day are not considered "major" unless service on that route is eliminated completely on any such day.
- The introduction or discontinuation of short- or limited-term service (such as promotional, demonstration, seasonal or emergency service, or service provided as mitigation or diversions for construction or other similar activities) is not considered "major," as long as the service will be/has been operated for no more than twelve months.
- If District-operated transit service is replaced by a different mode or operator providing a service with the same or better headways, fare, transfer options, span of service, and stops served, the change is not considered "major."

The following examples will assist the public in understanding the impact of the proposed policy.

- Example 1: If Route 11 has 20 trips a day, and the District proposes to cancel six of those trips (30\%) in January 2014, then that is a major service change, and a Title VI Equity Analysis must be completed. However, if only four trips are proposed for cancellation ( $20 \%$ ), then no analysis is required. If the District cancels these four trips and then decides to cancel two more trips in January 2015 on this same Route 11, then the percentage will again be $30 \%$ over a twenty-four month period, and an analysis will be required.
- Example 2: If Route 12 has eight trips per day and four trips are proposed for cancellation, then under the proposed policy, a Title VI Analysis is not required because the route has fewer than ten total trips per day. However, if the entire route is proposed for cancellation, then an analysis is required.
- Example 3: If Route 13 is introduced in January 1, 2014 as a demonstration service, and the District proposes to discontinue it effective December 31, 2015, then no analysis
is required when the service is introduced or discontinued. However, if the District proposes to continue the service beyond January 1, 2015, then an analysis is required for it to continue, and for it to be discontinued thereafter.
- Example 4: If Route 14 operated four times a day from Corte Madera to Petaluma, and the District planned to cease operating this trip while another transit system planned to operate the same route four times a day at the same times, with the same or better fares and transfer options, then no analysis would be required.


## Disparate Impact and Disproportionate Burden Policies

When a fare change or major service change is proposed, the District must analyze whether the change will result in a fair distribution of both negative effects (such as service cuts or fare increases) and positive effects (service expansions or fare reductions, such as new discounts).

In the case of the Disparate Impact Policy, the analysis focuses on whether minority riders or residents bear a disproportionately greater burden - or receive a disproportionately lesser benefit - than non-minority riders or residents.

Similarly, in the case of the Disproportionate Burden Policy, the analysis focuses on whether low-income riders or residents bear a disproportionately greater burden - or receive a disproportionately lesser benefit - than non-low-income riders or residents.

## Disparate Impact Policy

In conducting equity analyses, the Disparate Impact policy provides the threshold used to determine whether greater negative impacts - or lesser positive impacts - on minority riders and residents are significant.

If a proposed action would have a negative impact that affects minorities more than nonminorities with a disparity that exceeds the adopted Disparate Impact Threshold, or a benefit that would be available to non-minorities more than minorities with a disparity that exceeds the adopted Disparate Impact Threshold, the District must evaluate whether there is an alternative that has a more equitable impact. If no option with a less disparate effect exists, the District must take measures to mitigate the impact of the proposed action on the affected minority population and demonstrate that a legitimate business purpose cannot otherwise be accomplished.

Staff proposes the following for the District's Disparate Impact Policy:

1. The District defines its Disparate Impact Threshold for determining whether the burdens or benefits of a major service change (as defined in the first part of this document) or a fare adjustment are equitable to be $10 \%$, based on the cumulative impact of the proposed service and/or fare changes. This threshold applies to the difference of the impacts borne by minority populations compared to the same impacts borne by non-minority populations.

The question that must be answered for every major service change and every fare change is: are minority riders more negatively affected (or less positively affected) by this change than riders as a whole? This is determined primarily by calculating the percentage of minority riders on

Golden Gate buses (or ferries, for a ferry service or fare change) and by calculating the percentage of minority riders affected by the change. If minorities represent a higher percentage in the impacted group than in the general ridership as a whole, the question is, how much higher? If the difference is ten percent or higher, then there is a disparate impact. As a secondary aspect of, and important precursor to, this comparative analysis, the District must define the adverse effects and/or benefits being measured for the change in question.

Some hypothetical examples of how the policy could be applied follow:

- Example 1: The District proposes to discontinue Route 16. Fifty percent of Route 16's riders belong to a minority group. If ridership on the District's bus service as a whole is $35 \%$ minority, the difference in the percentage of affected riders who are minorities and the percentage of all bus riders who are minorities is 15 percentage points. That indicates that there is a disparate impact on minority riders, and in this situation, the District would be required to evaluate whether there is an alternative with a less disparate impact on minority riders. If there is no other alternative, the District would need to mitigate the negative impact of the service cancellation on minority riders and demonstrate that the service reduction serves a legitimate business purpose that cannot be accomplished with less impact on minority riders.
- Example 2: The District proposes to raise fares from Zone 4 to Zone 1 by $10 \%$ and the rest of the fares only $5 \%$. Whereas the overall ridership is $35 \%$ minority, if Zone 4 to Zone 1 riders is, for example, $46 \%$ minority, then the difference between the two groups is 11 percentage points, exceeding the $10 \%$ threshold, and there would be a disparate impact. The District would have to seek alternatives with a more equitable impact. If no such alternatives are available, then the District would have to mitigate the impact on minority riders and demonstrate that this fare increase serves a legitimate business purpose that cannot be accomplished in another less-discriminatory way.


## Disproportionate Burden Policy

As with the Disparate Impact Policy, the Disproportionate Burden Policy comes into play when a fare change or major service change is analyzed for its equity. In this case, staff determines whether low-income riders and residents bear a disproportionate burden of the negative effects of - or enjoy a disproportionately low benefit from - the proposed change.

The proposed Disproportionate Burden Policy is very similar to the proposed Disparate Impact Policy and reads as follow:
2. The District defines its Disproportionate Burden Threshold for determining whether the burdens or benefits of a major service change (as defined in the first part of this document) or a fare adjustment are equitable to be $10 \%$, based on the cumulative impact of the proposed service and/or fare changes. This threshold applies to the difference of the impacts borne by low-income populations compared to the same impacts borne by non-low-income populations.

If, in the course of performing a Title VI Equity Analysis, the District finds that a proposed fare or major service change has a negative impact that affects low-income riders as compared to
non-low-income riders with a disparity that exceeds the adopted Disproportionate Burden Threshold, or that benefits non-low-income riders more than low-income riders with a disparity that exceeds the adopted Disproportionate Burden Threshold, the District must evaluate whether there is an alternative that has a more equitable impact. Otherwise, the District must take measures to mitigate the impact of the proposed action on the affected low-income population.

Again, illustrative examples can make the uses of the policy more transparent:

- Example 1: The District proposes to discontinue Route 16. The ridership of Route 16 is $66 \%$ low-income. If ridership on the District's bus service as a whole is $50 \%$ lowincome, then the difference between the low-income ridership of the Route 16 and the overall bus ridership is 16 percentage points, which means this change exceeds the threshold for disproportionate burden, or in other words, that low-income riders are bearing a disproportionate burden of this service change. In this situation, the District would be required to take measures to mitigate or lessen the impact of this change on the low-income riders of Route 16.
- Example 2: The District proposes to cut four trips on Route 21. The ridership of Route 21 is $45 \%$ low-income. If the ridership on the District's bus service as a whole is $50 \%$ low-income, then the difference is negative five percentage points (meaning the affected ridership is five percent less low-income than the overall ridership), and the burden of this change does not fall more on low-income riders than on riders as a whole.
- Example 3: The District proposes to add a new route. The residents of the areas served are $25 \%$ low-income. If the District's ridership as a whole is $50 \%$ low-income, those benefiting from the service addition are $25 \%$ less low-income than the overall ridership. There is a disproportionate benefit, and the District would be required to consider options for mitigating this disproportion.


## Summary of Comments Received and Staff Responses

1. Comment: Special fares for minorities?? Racism of the worst order.

Staff response: The public comment process is not about setting special fares for minorities but instead setting a framework for evaluating the impacts of future service or fare changes on disadvantaged communities.
2. Comment: I have been advocating for Title VI populations in Marin City. In order to get proper notification to minority and low-income populations adequate communication must be provided as an outreach mechanism to ensure against a community not being left out. Inasmuch as this did not happen in Marin City, where both low-income and minority residents were left out with no notification of an Open House on July 8 at the Senior Center, there is a violation of Title VI. I noticed an $81 / 2$ by 11 inches poster (only one hour before the meeting) at the Marin City Hub. This was another disappointment to me and others in our community. Our shuttle service is inadequate for serving our community because of the hilly terrain.

Staff response: Given concern about the adequacy of the notification process for Marin City residents, the public comment period was extended by two weeks, additional communications were sent out, notices were posted at all bus stops in that community, and leaflets were handed out to bus riders advising that an additional public outreach meeting was scheduled in Marin City. The proposed policies are specific to regional bus and ferry services operated by the Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District. Shuttle and other fixed route and demand responsive service operated by Marin Transit and policies related to those services are the responsibility of Marin Transit.
3. Comment: I'm glad that you're having an additional comment period for Marin City, but in the future it's important that more advertising and outreach is implemented. Many residents were unaware about the meeting and the comment period.

Staff response: See response to Comment \#2. Future outreach efforts in Marin City will include more extensive communication efforts.
4. Comment: It appears the proposals brought to the hearing are all about raising fares and arguing about whether or not the District can raise some and not others without discrimination. The point should be THERE SHOULD BE NO FARE INCREASES, BUT FARE DECREASES.

Staff response: The proposed policies provide a framework to evaluate future potential service and fare changes. No fare changes are proposed at this time.
5. Comment: The District's Allocation of resources between bus and ferry services needs to be re-evaluated in view of Title VI. There is a disproportionate amount of resources going to wealthy ferry riders and not to low-income bus riders.

Response: Duly noted. The proposed policies do not address specific to the District's allocation of transit resources between modes. The District plans to analyze the demographic characteristics of its ferry and regional bus riderships.
6. Comment: The job of the Golden Gate Transit District is to provide public transportation, in order to reduce automobile traffic and provide a reasonable-cost alternative to driving. The job of the District is transportation, NOT social justice, affirmative action or welfare. All this would do is raise the cost of transportation due to the additional resources needed to determine, implement and monitor these Title VI items. It is ridiculous to put the Transit District into this situation. The $\$ 5,000$ to conduct this initial public hearing will be pocket change to the cost of implementation. The bottom line is stick to your primary objective and tell the feds to make their own determinations that the Transit District is discriminatory, and make them prove it. Focus on serving the communities you service, while keeping costs down, and not on Washington D.C's social justice schemes.

Response: The proposed policies and overall compliance with Title VI is a condition of the District continuing to receive federal financial assistance for its public transportation programs.
7. Comment: I oppose any fare increases for the Golden Gate transit ferries, buses and bridge. The fares are exorbitant as they are now and are a huge burden on the average person's finances. This is supposed to be PUBLIC transportation, not ELITE transportation. It is only affordable to the rich.

Response: The proposed policies are not specific to any fare increase at this time. They will be used to evaluate future fare increase proposals.

# Table B1: Impact table for Bus Fares 2023/2024 
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Table B3: Impact table for Bus Fares 2025/26
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Table B4: Impact table for Bus Fares 2026/27
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Table B5: Impact table for Bus Fares 2027/28
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Table F1: Impact table for Ferry Fares 2023/2024

|  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Change } \\ \text { d Absolute } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Percent | Usage by Group (Number) |  |  |  | Usage by Group (Percent) |  |  |  |  |  | Cumulative Current fare |  |  |  | Cumulative Proposed Fare |  |  |  | Fare Change Experienced by Group |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zone to zone | Payment Method | Passenger Category | Existing | Proposed |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Low } \\ & \text { Income } \end{aligned}$ | Non-Low Income | Minority | NonMinority | Overall | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Low } \\ & \text { Income } \end{aligned}$ | Non-Low Income | Minority | NonMinority | Overall | Income | Non-Low Income | Minority | NonMinority | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Low } \\ \text { Income } \end{array}$ | Non-Low Income | Minority | NonMinority | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { Low } \\ \text { Income } \end{array}$ | Non-Low Income | Minority | NonMinority |
| Sausalito <br> Ferry | Cash | Adult | \$14.00 | \$14.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00\% | 8.00 | 6.00 | 5.00 | 20.00 | 14.0 | 1.33\% | 0.81\% | 0.95\% | 1.61\% | 0.62\% | \$112.00 | \$84.00 | \$70.00 | \$280.00 | \$112.00 | \$84.00 | \$70.00 | \$280.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
|  |  | Discount* | \$7.00 | \$7.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00\% | 2.00 | 2.00 | 4.00 | 12.00 | 4.0 | 0.33\% | 0.27\% | 0.76\% | 0.97\% | 0.18\% | \$14.00 | \$14.00 | \$88.00 | \$84.00 | \$14.00 | \$14.00 | \$28.00 | \$84.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
|  |  | Other |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | 1.07 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.1 | 0.00\% | 0.14\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.05\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Clipper | Adult | \$7.50 | \$7.75 | \$0.25 | 3.33\% | 154.00 | 49.00 | 29.00 | 206.00 | 442.5 | 25.68\% | 6.63\% | 5.51\% | 16.60\% | 19.60\% | \$1,155.00 | \$367.50 | \$217.50 | \$1,545.00 | \$1,193.50 | \$379.75 | \$224.75 | \$1,596.50 | \$38.50 | \$12.25 | \$7.25 | \$51.50 |
|  |  | start | \$7.00 | \$3.90 | -\$3.10 | -44.29\% | 0.25 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.25 | 0.0 | 0.04\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.02\% | 0.00\% | \$1.75 | \$0.00 | \$0.14 | \$1.75 | \$0.98 | \$0.00 | \$0.08 | \$0.98 | -\$0.78 | \$0.00 | -\$0.06 | -\$0.78 |
|  | Other | Adult |  |  |  |  | 3.66 | 0.00 | 10.00 | 19.00 | 10.6 | 0.61\% | 0.00\% | 1.90\% | 1.53\% | 0.47\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Discount |  |  |  |  | 0.38 | 0.00 | 0.38 | 0.00 | 0.8 | 0.06\% | 0.00\% | 0.07\% | 0.00\% | 0.03\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Other |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Cash | Adult | \$13.50 | \$14.00 | \$0.50 | 3.70\% | 17.00 | 15.00 | 8.00 | 24.00 | 59.9 | 2.83\% | 2.03\% | 1.52\% | 1.93\% | 2.65\% | \$229.50 | \$202.50 | \$108.00 | \$324.00 | \$238.00 | \$210.00 | \$112.00 | \$336.00 | \$8.50 | \$7.50 | \$4.00 | \$12.00 |
|  |  | Discount* | \$6.75 | \$7.00 | \$0.25 | 3.70\% | 13.00 | 11.00 | 3.00 | 30.00 | 24.0 | 2.17\% | 1.49\% | 0.57\% | 2.42\% | 1.06\% | \$87.75 | \$74.25 | \$20.25 | \$202.50 | \$91.00 | \$77.00 | \$21.00 | \$210.00 | \$3.25 | \$2.75 | \$0.75 | \$7.50 |
| Larkspur |  | Other |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ferry | Clipper | Adult | \$8.50 | \$8.75 | \$0.25 | 2.94\% | 255.00 | 245.00 | 105.00 | 443.00 | 1129.8 | 42.52\% | 33.15\% | 19.95\% | 35.70\% | 50.04\% | \$2,167.50 | \$2,082.50 | \$892.50 | \$3,765.50 | \$2,231.25 | \$2,143.75 | \$918.75 | \$3,876.25 | \$63.75 | \$61.25 | \$26.25 | \$110.75 |
|  |  | start | \$6.75 | \$4.40 | -\$2.35 | -34.81\% | 1.15 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 1.25 | 2.7 | 0.19\% | 0.00\% | 0.05\% | 0.10\% | 0.12\% | \$7.76 | \$0.00 | \$1.69 | \$8.44 | \$5.06 | \$0.00 | \$1.10 | \$5.50 | -\$2.70 | \$0.00 | -\$0.59 | -\$2.94 |
|  | Other | Adult |  |  |  |  | 5.42 | 2.00 | 1.00 | 24.00 | 19.0 | 0.90\% | 0.27\% | 0.19\% | 1.93\% | 0.84\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Discount |  |  |  |  | 3.41 | 0.00 | 1.37 | 0.00 | 3.4 | 0.57\% | 0.00\% | 0.26\% | 0.00\% | 0.15\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Other |  |  |  |  | 0.68 | 0.00 |  | 0.00 | 2.0 | 0.11\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.09\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Cash | Adult | \$14.00 | \$14.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00\% | 5.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 5.00 | 6.0 | 0.83\% | 0.14\% | 0.19\% | 0.40\% | 0.27\% | \$70.00 | \$14.00 | \$14.00 | \$70.00 | \$70.00 | \$14.00 | \$14.00 | \$70.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
|  |  | Discount* | \$7.00 | \$7.00 | \$0.00 | 0.00\% | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 2.0 | 0.17\% | 0.14\% | 0.00\% | 0.16\% | 0.09\% | \$7.00 | \$7.00 | \$0.00 | \$14.00 | \$7.00 | \$7.00 | \$0.00 | \$14.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
|  |  | Other |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ferry | Clipper | Adult | \$7.50 | \$7.75 | \$0.25 | 3.33\% | 33.00 | 51.00 | 12.18 | 93.00 | 84.0 | 5.50\% | 6.90\% | 2.31\% | 7.50\% | 3.72\% | \$247.50 | \$382.50 | \$91.35 | \$697.50 | \$25.75 | \$395.25 | \$94.40 | \$720.75 | \$8.25 | \$12.75 | \$3.05 | \$23.25 |
|  |  | start | \$7.00 | \$3.90 | -\$3.10 | -44.29\% | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.25 | 0.1 | 0.02\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.02\% | 0.00\% | \$0.74 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$1.75 | \$0.41 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.98 | -\$0.33 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | -\$0.78 |
|  | Other | Adult |  |  |  |  | 1.54 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 3.5 | 0.26\% | 0.27\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.16\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Discount |  |  |  |  | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.2 | 0.03\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.01\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Other |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Cash | Adult | \$14.00 | \$15.50 | \$1.50 | 10.71\% | 28.00 | 70.00 | 45.00 | 49.00 | 98.0 | 4.67\% | 9.47\% | 8.55\% | 3.95\% | 4.34\% | \$392.00 | \$980.00 | \$630.00 | \$686.00 | \$434.00 | \$1,085.00 | \$697.50 | \$759.50 | \$42.00 | \$105.00 | \$67.50 | \$73.50 |
|  |  | Discount* | \$7.00 | \$8.00 | \$1.00 | 14.29\% | 27.00 | 35.00 | 31.00 | 32.00 | 62.0 | 4.50\% | 4.74\% | 5.89\% | 2.58\% | 2.75\% | \$189.00 | \$245.00 | \$217.00 | \$224.00 | \$216.00 | \$280.00 | \$248.00 | \$256.00 | \$27.00 | \$35.00 | \$31.00 | \$32.00 |
| Island |  | Other |  |  |  |  | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ferry | Clipper | Adult | \$9.00 | \$9.25 | \$0.25 | 2.78\% | 21.00 | 61.00 | 63.00 | 60.00 | 82.0 | 3.50\% | 8.25\% | 11.97\% | 4.84\% | 3.63\% | \$189.00 | \$549.00 | \$567.00 | \$540.00 | \$194.25 | \$564.25 | \$582.75 | \$555.00 | \$5.25 | \$15.25 | \$15.75 | \$15.00 |
|  |  | start | \$7.00 | \$5.40 | -\$1.60 | -22.86\% | 1.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 2.00 | 1.0 | 0.17\% | 0.00\% | 0.38\% | 0.16\% | 0.04\% | \$7.00 | \$0.00 | \$14.00 | \$14.00 | \$5.40 | \$0.00 | \$10.80 | \$10.80 | -\$1.60 | \$0.00 | -\$3.20 | -\$3.20 |
|  | Other | Phone | \$9.00 | \$9.25 | \$0.25 | 2.78\% | 13.00 | 36.00 | 23.00 | 37.00 | 49.0 | 2.17\% | 4.87\% | 4.37\% | 2.98\% | 2.17\% | \$117.00 | \$324.00 | \$207.00 | \$333.00 | \$120.25 | \$333.00 | \$212.75 | \$342.25 | \$3.25 | \$9.00 | \$5.75 | \$9.25 |
|  |  | Group | \$4.50 | \$4.75 | \$0.25 | 5.56\% | 4.00 | 150.00 | 181.00 | 181.00 | 154.0 | 0.67\% | 20.30\% | 34.40\% | 14.59\% | 6.82\% | \$18.00 | \$675.00 | \$814.50 | \$814.50 | \$19.00 | \$712.50 | \$859.75 | \$859.75 | \$1.00 | \$37.50 | \$45.25 | \$45.25 |
|  |  | Other |  |  |  |  | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 2.0 | 0.17\% | 0.14\% | 0.19\% | 0.00\% | 0.09\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | TOTALS |  |  |  |  | 599.7 | 739.1 | 526.2 | 1240.8 | 2257.6 | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.00\% | 100.0\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1338.8 |  | 1766.9 |  |  |  | Total Cum | nulative Cur | urrent Fare | \$5,012.50 | \$6,001.25 | [\$3,892.93\| | \$9,605.94 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average Cum | ulative Cur | Urrent Fare | \$8.36 | \$8.12 | \$7.40 | \$7.74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Discount inc | udes Senior, | r, Youth, and | Disabled fars | res paid bot | th in cash an | nd by clipp |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | Cumulative | e Proposed Fare | \$5,207.84 | \$6,299.50 | \$4,095.62 | \$9,978.25 |  |  |  |  |
| "Other" is gen | erally a non | n-cash fare sur | uch as atran | nsfer or an e | emoloye's fr | free rids |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average | Cumulative | e Proposed Fare | \$8.68 | \$8.52 | \$7.78 | 58.04 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | GGF DI DB Ta | Table (Opt3 Yea |  |  |  | Total | Change in | Fare per Group | \$195.35 | \$298.25 | \$202.70 | \$372.31 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average | Change in | Fare per Group | \$0.33 | \$0.40 | 50.39 | \$0.30 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percent | Change in | Fare per Group | 39.58\% | 60.42\% | 35.25\% | 64.75\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Percentage | e Ridership of eac | ach Group (B | Based on all 2 | 2018 Survey | ey Respondents) | 44.80\% | 55.20\% | 29.78\% | 70.22\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Differenc | ce from Exa | xact Proportion | nal Impact | of Fare Change | -5.22\% | 5.22\% | 5.47\% | -5.47\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | dispropor- tionate |  | disparate |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Findings | burden |  | impact |  |

Each group's fare impact varies by around $5 \%$ from its presence in the ridership population, with low-income riders having a $5.22 \%$ lesser impact compared to their representation among riders. Minority riders experience a $5.47 \%$ greater impact than their represestatation among riders.

Table F2: Impact table for Ferry Fares 2024/2025


Table F3: Impact table for Ferry Fares 2025/2026


Table F4: Impact table for Ferry Fares 2026/2027


Table F5: Impact table for Ferry Fares 2027/2028
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Table P1: Paratransit Fare Impacts for FY 2023/24


Table P2: Paratransit Fare Impacts for FY 2024/25


Table P3: Paratransit Fare Impacts for FY 2025/26


Table P4: Paratransit Fare Impacts for FY 2026/27


Table P5: Paratransit Fare Impacts for FY 2027/28
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[^0]:    *Clipper Start = Means Based
    ** $\mathrm{Y}=$ Youth, $\mathrm{S}=$ Seniors, $\mathrm{D}=$ Persons with Disabilities, $\mathrm{M}=$ Medicare

