

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

# Baselines: Current and Future Transit and Demographic Trends

---

California Statewide Transit Strategic Plan

July 2011



# Table of Contents

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>Current and Future Trends in Transit and Demographics .....</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Transit Funding in California .....</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>California &amp; Federal Law on Strategic Transit Planning .....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Regional Coordination &amp; Interregional Connectivity .....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Non-Traditional Transit and Infrastructure.....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Performance Measures.....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Specialized Transit .....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Outreach, Marketing &amp; Technology.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<b>CURRENT AND FUTURE TRENDS IN TRANSIT AND DEMOGRAPHICS.....</b>	<b>5</b>
TRANSIT TRENDS.....	5
<i>Statewide Transit Revenues and Expenses .....</i>	<i>5</i>
Transportation Development Act.....	5
Transit Revenue in California .....	5
Operating Expenses.....	6
<i>Statewide Transit Service.....</i>	<i>7</i>
Mode Share .....	7
Supply, Demand, and Costs.....	7
Regional Performance .....	8
Supply.....	8
<i>Transit Costs and Use.....</i>	<i>10</i>
California Compared to the United States .....	10
Transit and Vehicle Miles Traveled.....	10
DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS IN CALIFORNIA .....	11
Population Growth .....	11
Increasing Population of Individuals under the Driving Age, and Persons over 65 .....	12
Projected Growth in People below the California Driving Age.....	12
Projected Growth in Persons over 65.....	12
Geographic Trends .....	13
Future Implications of Land Use Planning on Transit Use .....	13
<i>Conclusions .....</i>	<i>13</i>
Transit Trends.....	13
Demographic Trends .....	14
The Future .....	14
<b>TRANSIT FUNDING IN CALIFORNIA .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<i>Federal Transit Funds.....</i>	<i>15</i>
FTA (5304) .....	15
FTA Urbanized Area Funds (5307) .....	15
FTA Capital Program Funds aka New Start Program (5309) .....	16
<i>State and Local Funds .....</i>	<i>16</i>
Transportation Development Act funds (TDA).....	16
Public Transportation Account (PTA) .....	16
Transportation Investment Fund (TIF) .....	17

Proposition 1B—PTMISEA .....	17
Other State Funding .....	17
Earnings from Operations .....	17
Fares .....	18
Advertising .....	18
Leases .....	18
Contracted Servic .....	18
Parking.....	18
<i>State and Local Fund Sources outside California</i> .....	19
Petroleum Business Taxes .....	19
Vehicle Excise Tax.....	19
Payroll taxes .....	19
Income taxes .....	19
<i>Funding Challenges</i> .....	19
<i>Summary</i> .....	19
<b>CALIFORNIA &amp; FEDERAL LAW ON STRATEGIC TRANSIT PLANNING.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<i>Greenhouse Gas Reduction</i> .....	20
Assembly Bill 32 and Senate Bill 375 .....	20
California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) .....	21
<i>Air-Quality Mandates for Transit Operators</i> .....	21
<i>Bond Initiatives</i> .....	21
Proposition 1A-- High-Speed Rail .....	21
Proposition 1B (The Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006) .....	22
Proposition 1C (The Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006).....	22
Proposition 116 (The Clean Air and Transportation Improvement Act of 1990).....	22
Assembly Bill 105.....	22
<i>The California Transportation Plan (CTP)</i> .....	22
Senate Bill 391.....	22
<i>Federal Disability Law</i> .....	23
Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA).....	23
Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) .....	23
Public Transportation for Elderly in Low or No Regular Service .....	23
<i>Challenges and Opportunities</i> .....	23
<i>Conclusion</i> .....	23
<b>REGIONAL COORDINATION &amp; INTERREGIONAL CONNECTIVITY .....</b>	<b>25</b>
REGIONAL COORDINATION .....	25
<i>Route Coordination</i> .....	25
<i>Northern California Urban Transit Strategies</i> .....	25
San Francisco Municipal Transit Authority .....	25
<i>Southern California Urban Transit Strategies</i> .....	25
Omnitrans.....	25
<i>Rural Transit</i> .....	26
<i>Fare Coordination</i> .....	26
<i>Regional Rail</i> .....	27
Regions in California have also coordinated to provide regional and commuter rail services.....	27
BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT (BART) .....	27
Metrolink.....	27

Additional Regional Rail Lines .....	28
<b>INTERREGIONAL CONNECTIVITY .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<i>Interregional Rail</i> .....	28
<i>Amtrak Intercity Rail</i> .....	28
Altamont Commuter Express .....	30
<i>Interregional Bus Service</i> .....	30
San Joaquin RTD .....	30
Commuter Bus Routes.....	30
Yosemite Area Regional Transportation Authority (YARTS) .....	30
<i>Successes and Barriers to Regional Coordination and Interregional Connectivity</i> .....	31
<i>The Future of Interregional Planning</i> .....	32
California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) .....	32
ACE Altamont Pass planning.....	32
<i>Summary</i> .....	32
<b>NON-TRADITIONAL TRANSIT AND INFRASTRUCTURE .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<i>Bus Rapid Transit</i> .....	33
Examples of Existing BRT in California .....	34
Planned BRT Systems .....	34
BRT Challenges .....	35
BRT Funding .....	36
<i>Shuttles and Vanpools</i> .....	37
Shuttles .....	37
.....	38
Vanpools.....	38
<i>Bicycles and Pedestrians</i> .....	39
Pedestrians.....	39
Bicycles.....	40
<i>Park and Ride</i> .....	42
<i>Challenges and Opportunities</i> .....	43
<i>Transit-Oriented Development</i> .....	43
<i>Conclusion</i> .....	45
<b>PERFORMANCE MEASURES .....</b>	<b>47</b>
<i>Common Performance Measures</i> .....	47
On-time Performance.....	47
Farebox Recovery .....	47
Transit Agency Specific Performance Measures .....	47
Review Procedures .....	48
<i>Conclusion</i> .....	48
<b>SPECIALIZED TRANSIT.....</b>	<b>49</b>
Consolidated Transportation Services Agencies.....	49
Coordinated Services Plans .....	51
Coordinated Services Plan Challenges.....	51
<i>Federal Transit Agency Funding for Specialized Transit</i> .....	52
Section 5310.....	52
Section 5311 .....	52
Section 5316 (JARC).....	53

Section 5317 .....	53
Federal Funding Challenges.....	53
<i>Summary</i> .....	53
<b>OUTREACH, MARKETING &amp; TECHNOLOGY .....</b>	<b>55</b>
<i>Outreach</i> .....	55
<i>Technology</i> .....	57
Websites.....	57
Complementing Technology.....	58
<i>Feedback</i> .....	58
<i>Challenges</i> .....	58
<i>Conclusion</i> .....	59

DRAFT

## Executive Summary

The report provides a basic overview of the current operations, funding, and ridership of public transit agencies in California and identifies some of the opportunities and challenges for coordination of public transit services on a statewide scale. The report is comprised of eight sections. Each section, as will be briefly outlined below, starts by presenting the larger trends and commonalities between different transit agencies in California and concludes with challenges and opportunities.

### Current and Future Trends in Transit and Demographics

The first section of the report provides a description of transit service revenues and expenditure trends of public transit agencies in California. In the second part of the section projected demographic changes, which are expected to influence transit usage are explored. The report concludes that overall in California, transit service grew at a higher rate than transit usage; as such, the costs of providing transit service have increased faster than ridership. The report points out that while California transit operators provided 28% more services in 2009 compared to 2000, operating costs rose by 69%. Based on 2009 data, overall passenger fees comprise the largest portion of revenues at 19.3%, while the highest expense for transit operators was salaries, wages and benefits at 45%. General trends in transit usage and costs show that transit service in California has become less cost effective: costs have increased while ridership per vehicle revenue hour has decreased.

The first section of the report further identifies three demographic trends that correlate with high public transit demand: population size and growth rate, age, and location. Based on California Department of Finance data, researchers found that the number of individuals below the driving age is expected to grow by 42.5 % by 2050; while the over 65-population is expected to increase by 162%. Demographic trends coupled with geographic trends, led the report authors to conclude that strategic planning, interagency coordination, increased interregional connectivity, and new funding sources are essential to meet future transit demand and to reduce vehicle miles traveled.

### Transit Funding in California

This section of the report looks at the funding sources for public transit in California. Three-quarters of funding comes from taxes, fees, and bonds with the remainder coming from operations. While capital funds are split evenly among federal, state, and local government sources, operating funds come from fares and state and local governments. Federal funding is mostly administered by the Federal Transit Administration, with some funds, in the form of grants, also coming from the Department of Homeland Security. State and local government funding comes mostly in the form of excise and fuel taxes and from other sources like bonds, tolls, grants from air quality management districts. Further funding also is generated from fares, advertising, investments, leases, contracting services and parking.

This section also identifies future funding challenges to California public transit agencies. The California Unmet Transit Funding Needs report compared funding and capital and operating needs, and revealed a 10-year unmet operating and maintenance gap of \$22.2 billion and a capital gap of \$42.1 billion (not

including three intercity rail lines owned by Caltrans and operated by Amtrak—Capitol Corridor, Surfliner, and the San Joaquin). Such funding gap needs to be addressed by public transit agencies.

### **California & Federal Law on Strategic Transit Planning**

This section of the report analyses the California and federal mandates driving transit planning. The two main pieces of California state legislation pushing for improvements in public transit are Assembly Bill 32 and Senate Bill 375. The bills aim to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and increasing public transit usage. Although the bills do not directly address the need for more and better-coordinated public transit, this section concludes that legislation can play an important role in moving public transit forward. Air quality regulations coupled with the mandate to connect transportation and land use planning can positively affect transit agencies.

### **Regional Coordination & Interregional Connectivity**

The main tool that public transit agencies have for regional coordination is the Short Range Transportation Plans (SRTP). The report examines one example of regional coordination in Northern California: San Francisco Municipal Transit Authority; and one example in Southern California: Omnibus. Overall, interregional rail coordination is much more successful than bus service, by having graduated fares and being able to reach across wider regions. The main barriers towards achieving regional coordination of transit plans and interregional connectivity are planning, coordination and funding of transit agencies. California High Speed Rail is identified as a step forward towards achieving coordination and connectivity. Regional coordination is seen as a path to reducing service duplication and increasing fare box recovery rates.

### **Non-Traditional Transit and Infrastructure**

This section examines alternatives like bus rapid transit, shuttles and vanpools, pedestrians and bicycles, park-and-ride lots, and transit-oriented development.

One strategy becoming increasingly popular in California is Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). Fully developed BRT systems include bus-only lanes, stations with raised platforms, fare prepayment, signal priority, real-time arrival information, and limited stops. Twenty-two California transit agencies operate BRT express service, and 13 agencies are planning BRT. BRT is often seen as a more efficient way of moving passengers across wider areas.

Shuttles and Vanpools are also becoming more widely used in California. Shuttles are flexible in costs, route planning, service provision, and operation, and they can be used for employment transportation, neighborhood access, and travel to specific recreational destinations. Shuttles can provide “last mile services,” and can be used for trips that are more specialized. They are also used as a congestion reduction mitigation strategy. Vanpools are managed differently by different public transit agencies. For example, in San Luis Obispo County, the Transportation Management Association RideOn program provides the van, insurance, maintenance, fuel, registration, and carwash for a monthly fee, while San Diego’s RideLink offers ride matching and subsidizes van leasing (\$400 per month). In San Diego, the driver negotiates the lease (including maintenance and insurance) and passengers split the cost of fuel.

Transit planning agencies are considering how bicycles and pedestrians access their transit networks. However, coordinating improvements can be difficult as cities and counties are responsible for pedestrian improvements. Although transit agencies cannot provide bicycle lanes or street bike racks, they do advocate for them. Oakland is one of the first cities in the country to develop a plan to support pedestrian travel. The report includes examples of how bicycle infrastructure has been integrated into transit stops throughout California.

Park and ride lots are operated by both transit agencies and private companies and are used to connect to buses, carpools, light rail, and commuter rail. Although transit agencies consider park and ride lots essential to connecting commuters they are not considered ideal. A Caltrans survey showed that 90% of park and ride users are commuters, with one third of users driving only 10 minutes to reach the lots. Since emissions from cold starts are high, short car trips to reach transit can produce additional pollution.

Transit Oriented Development (TOD) is moderate to high-density development (either new construction or redevelopment) within an easy walk of a major transit stop, with a mix of residences, employment, and shops. In California, thirteen agencies discuss TOD in their short-range transit plans: BART, Caltrain, LACMTA, SacRT, SamTrans, Omnitrans, Santa Monica Big Blue Bus, Fresno Area Express, LAVTA, OCTA, WestCAT, Santa Clara Valley Transit Authority (VTA), and MUNI. TOD can encounter many challenges, but is seen as an integral part to improving public transit efficiency and regional connectivity.

### **Performance Measures**

This section looks at different performance measures for public transit agencies. The most common performance measures are on-time performance and farebox recovery. On-time performance is defined as a transit vehicle operating less than five minutes behind schedule and departing less than one minute ahead of schedule, or never departing early at all. Farebox recovery is revenue generated through fares by its paying customers divided by operating expenses. Farebox recovery ratio targets vary according to type of service, the characteristics of the ridership, and funding. There are also transit agency specific performance measures like boardings per revenue hour and passengers per revenue mile and they vary according to service area and population.

### **Specialized Transit**

Specialized transit services are geared to serve the special needs of people with disabilities, elderly or low-income populations. Assembly Bill 120 (1979), the Social Services Transportation Improvement Act, called for a consolidated transportation service agency (CTSA) in each county, to foster coordination among providers of transportation to groups lacking mobility, lower insurance costs, and make better use of vehicles and funding. The services provided by CTSA's take multiple forms like fixed-route bus and light rail, demand-response, like dial a ride, or supplemental/human services transportation, like senior shuttles or shuttles for community events. The report puts forth two recommendations for improving CTSA's in California: establish a "mobility manager" based on geographic area to oversee coordination of programs and funding, including all providers; and better coordination between land use development and transit agencies so that social service agencies, medical facilities, senior housing, and employment centers can be more easily accessed by transit.

### **Outreach, Marketing & Technology**

The last section of the report gives a brief overview of the role that marketing and technology play in increasing public transit ridership. New venues for outreach and marketing, like Facebook, Twitter or user friendly websites are changing the perception of transit and provide transit agencies with the opportunity to target riders. Although, transit ridership has increased the lack of appropriate funding to improve the operations of the public transit system in California makes a dramatic increase difficult. Such increase is necessary for transit agencies to reach budgeting and ridership goals as well as for planning agencies to achieve GHG emission reduction goals.

DRAFT

## Current and Future Trends in Transit and Demographics

The data in this chapter are from the California State Controller's Transit Operators and Non-Transit Claimants Annual Reports<sup>1</sup> and the Federal Transit Administration's National Transit Database (NTD)<sup>2</sup>. The beginning of this chapter summarizes transit service revenues and expenditure trends, based on the State Controller's Fiscal Year (FY) 2008/09 and FY 2004/05 Annual Reports. Characteristics of bus, rail, and demand-response transit (accounting for over 99% of transit services) are then summarized, using NTD data, to paint a picture of California transit service over the past decade. An analysis follows of transit service performance in California's five regions over ten years, using transit operator data reported to NTD for 2000 and 2009. Data from these years illustrates recent transit supply and demand in California. California transit service is then compared to transit service in the entire United States in 2009, the most recent year for which data are available. Growth in transit service and vehicle miles traveled in California and the United States as a whole are compared.

The final section in this chapter analyzes population growth projections for two subgroups: people under the driving age, and the people 65 or older, in California to inform planning for emerging markets.

California transit operators have added service significantly between 2000 and 2009 and have increased ridership. However, growth in ridership has been smaller than growth in transit service, and both have increased less than the costs to of providing transit service. Moreover, changes in transit service supply, ridership, and costs vary widely among California's regions.

### Transit Trends

#### Statewide Transit Revenues and Expenses

##### *Transportation Development Act*

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) of 1971 created two major funding sources for public transportation and for streets, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities<sup>3</sup>. Local Transportation Fund revenues arise from a one-quarter-cent of the 8.25% California sales tax. State Transit Assistance Fund revenues arise from the state gasoline and diesel fuel sales tax. Total TDA revenues for 2009 were over \$1.4 billion, up from \$1.2 billion in 2005. TDA revenue rose 29% between 2000 and 2009<sup>4</sup>. TDA revenue was just under \$1.1 billion in 2000.

##### *Transit Revenue in California*

The Controller's report provides an outline of transit revenue sources and amounts in California. In 2009, total transit operating revenues and capital additions to equity amounted to about \$7.8 billion<sup>5</sup>, an increase of 4.1% from 2008. Table 1 outlines transit revenues in California for FY 2008/09:

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.sco.ca.gov/ard\\_locrep\\_transit.html](http://www.sco.ca.gov/ard_locrep_transit.html) Retrieved March 18, 2011.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/data.htm> Retrieved March 15, 2011.

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.sco.ca.gov/Files-ARD-Local/LocRep/0809Transit.pdf> (p. iv) Retrieved March 18, 2011.

<sup>4</sup> [http://www.sco.ca.gov/Files-ARD-Local/LocRep/transit\\_reports\\_0405transit.pdf](http://www.sco.ca.gov/Files-ARD-Local/LocRep/transit_reports_0405transit.pdf) (p. iv) Retrieved March 18, 2011.

<http://www.sco.ca.gov/Files-ARD-Local/LocRep/0809Transit.pdf> (p. iv) Retrieved March 18, 2011.

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.sco.ca.gov/Files-ARD-Local/LocRep/0809Transit.pdf> (p. v) Retrieved March 18, 2011.

**Table 1 - Transit Operating Revenues and Capital Additions to Equity**

	<b>2008-09</b>	<b>Percent of the Total Revenues</b>	<b>Increase (Decrease) From 2007-2008</b>	<b>Percentage Increase (Decrease) From Prior Year</b>
<b>Transit Operating Revenues</b>				
Passenger Fares	\$1,497,492	19.3%	41,683	2.9%
Local Transportation Fund	1,023,655	13.2	(27,798)	(2.60)
Local Sales Tax	829,546	10.7	38,274	4.80
Sales Tax	523,628	6.8	(88,832)	(14.50)
General Operating Assistance	570,127	7.3	14,022	2.50
Other Revenues	222,188	2.9	(9,897)	(4.30)
Federal Grants	676,356	8.7	166,650	32.70
Other Local Grants	109,508	1.4	4,092	3.90
STAF	148,262	1.9	(118,385)	(44.40)
Property Tax	177,583	2.3	13,363	8.10
Other State Grants	103,840	1.3	16,409	18.80
<b>Total Transit Operating Revenues</b>	<b>5,882,185</b>	<b>75.8%</b>	<b>49,581</b>	<b>0.90%</b>
<b>Capital Additions to Equity</b>				
Federal Capital	534,619	6.9	22,581	4.40
Local Capital and Non-Governmental Donations	793,943	10.2	214,994	37.10
State Capital	547,949	7.1	21,789	4.10
<b>Total Capital Additions to Equity</b>	<b>1,876,511</b>	<b>24.2</b>	<b>259,364</b>	<b>16.00</b>
<b>Total Transit Operating Revenues and Capital Additions to Equity</b>	<b>\$7,758,696</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>\$308,945</b>	<b>0.04</b>

Source: California State Controller, *Transit Operators and Non-Transit Claimants Annual Reports 2008-2009*.

Passenger fares comprised the largest portion of revenues, with a 19.3% share of the total. Passenger fares increased 2.9% from the prior year. The Local Transportation Fund made up the next largest revenue source in FY 2008/09, with a 13.2% share of the total. State Transit Assistance revenues decreased sharply, by \$118 million (over 44%) from FY 2007/08 to FY 2008/09.

#### *Operating Expenses*

Transit operating expenses in FY 2008/09 amounted to over \$7.1 billion, according to the State Controller. Salaries, wages, and benefits accounted for more than 45% of operating expenses (Table 2). The next largest expense of California transit operators was depreciation and amortization, which

accounted for about 18% of total operating expenditures. Purchased transportation (transit services contracted with other transit agencies) accounted for about 12% of operating expenses<sup>6</sup>.

Operating expenses have increased over 68%, from \$4.2 billion in FY 2000/01, to \$5.6 billion in FY 2004/05, and then to \$7.1 billion in FY 2008/09. In FY 2008/09, 207 (60.4%) of transit agencies reporting to the State Controller reported a net loss<sup>7</sup>.

**Table 2: Transit Operating Expenses**

<b>Transit Operating Expenses</b>	<b>2008-09</b>	<b>Percent of the Total Expenses</b>	<b>Increase (Decrease) from 2007-08</b>	<b>Percentage Increase (Decrease) from Prior Year</b>
Salaries, Wages, and Benefits	\$3,229,164	45.4%	\$105,553	3.4%
Depreciation and Amortization	1,272,834	17.9	120,704	10.5
Purchased Transportation	834,317	11.8	27,523	3.4
Services	675,027	9.5	114,597	20.4
Other	547,729	7.7	(44,661)	(7.5)
Materials and Supplies	548,353	7.7	(36,268)	(6.2)
<b>Total Transit Operating Expenses</b>	<b>\$7,107,424</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>\$287,448</b>	<b>4.2%</b>

Source: California State Controller. *Transit Operators and Non-Transit Claimants Annual Reports 2008-2009*.

## Statewide Transit Service

### Mode Share

In 2009, according to the National Transit Database, transit operators in California supplied 1.46 billion unlinked passenger trips (UPT) (the number of passengers who board public transportation vehicles<sup>8</sup>) in over 617 million vehicle revenue miles (VRM) (miles vehicles are scheduled to travel, or actually travel, while in revenue service<sup>9</sup>). Bus service accounted for the largest part of transit service—57% of revenue miles and 74% of passenger trips. Rail accounted for 24% of passenger trips and 20% of revenue miles. Demand-response services, (shared use transit service operating in response to calls from passengers or their agents to the transit operator, who schedules a vehicle to pick up the passengers to transport them to their destinations<sup>10</sup>) provided only 1% of trips (though demand-response accounts for about 16% of statewide transit revenue miles, demand-response vehicles serve fewer passengers per mile and per hour)<sup>11</sup>.

### Supply, Demand, and Costs

California transit operators provided about 28% more service in 2009 than in 2000, while unlinked passenger trips rose more slowly across all modes, by about 12% (1.3 billion in 2000 to 1.46 billion in

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.sco.ca.gov/Files-ARD-Local/LocRep/0809Transit.pdf> (p. xi) Retrieved March 18, 2011.

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.sco.ca.gov/Files-ARD-Local/LocRep/0809Transit.pdf> (p. xi) Retrieved March 18, 2011.

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/Glossary.htm> Retrieved April 1, 2011.

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/Glossary.htm> Retrieved April 1, 2011.

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/Glossary.htm> Retrieved April 12, 2011.

<sup>11</sup> <http://www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/data.htm>. Table: TS2.1. Retrieved March 16, 2011.

2009), as did passenger miles, by 26%. Meanwhile, transit agency operating costs grew by 69%<sup>12</sup>. Bus service remains the largest transit mode by far, with the largest gains in revenue miles and revenue hours (hours that vehicles are scheduled to travel, or actually travel, while in revenue service<sup>13</sup>), although bus service lost mode share to rail. However, operating expenses for buses rose even faster. Rail operating expenses rose 77% from 2000 to 2009, while demand response services increased 108%<sup>14</sup>.


### Regional Performance

Transit service in California can be examined by dividing the state into five regions: Four metropolitan regions, comprising the cities within the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO's) (urbanized areas within the designated MPO boundaries) that make up the Los Angeles, San Diego, San Francisco Bay Area, and Sacramento areas; and a fifth region, "Other Regions," the less populated MPO's and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPA) (See appendix for a complete breakdown of regions).

### Supply

Of the four metropolitan areas, the San Francisco Bay Area has the highest revenue share from rail, with 44% of its 198 million total revenue miles derived from rail. This is nearly double the rail miles available in the San Diego area, which provided the next highest proportion of rail revenue miles in 2009 (Figure 1). Rail provided a greater share of vehicle revenue miles than vehicle revenue hours (The hours that vehicles are scheduled to or actually travel while in revenue service<sup>15</sup>) (VRH), but bus service produced a majority of revenue hours in all regions (See Figure 4). The highest percentage of vehicle revenue hours (24%) provided by rail was in the San Francisco Bay Area. Transit operators in Los Angeles clocked the second highest number of rail VRH, but that represented only 5% of VRH across all modes. "Other Regions" had the highest proportion of demand-response VRH, at 19%.

Figure 1- 2009 California Vehicle Revenue Miles by Region and Mode (percent)



Source: National Transit Database


<sup>12</sup> <http://www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/data.htm>. Table: TS2.1. Retrieved March 16, 2011.

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/data.htm>. Table TS2.1. Retrieved March 16, 2011.

<sup>14</sup> <http://www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/data.htm>. Table TS2.1. Retrieved March 16, 2011.

<sup>15</sup> <http://www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/Glossary.htm> Retrieved April 12, 2011.


Figure 2- 2009 California Vehicle Revenue Hours by Region and Mode (percent)



Source: National Transit Database

In regions with rail transit, trains attract a disproportionate number of riders compared to the amount of service supplied. Although rail accounted for only 16% of regional VRH in San Diego, that region had among the highest rail shares for regional passenger trips—approximately 39% (see Figure 3). The same can be seen in Sacramento and the San Francisco Bay Area—despite providing a lower regional share of VRH in both cases (14% in the Sacramento area and 24% in the San Francisco Bay Area), rail in both areas took about a 39% share of ridership. Even in the Los Angeles area, where rail produced only 4.5% of regional VRH, its share of trips was 15% in 2009. Nevertheless, most transit riders still take the bus, with the highest share of bus trips in the Other Regions (where there is no competing rail service, of course), and in Los Angeles, where 85% of unlinked passenger trips were taken by bus. In all areas, demand-response services produced a negligible share of regional trips (2% in the Other Regions, 1% or less in all other regions), because demand-response services serve small, specialized segments of the population.

Figure 3- 2009 California Unlinked Passenger Trips by Region and Mode (percent)



Source: National Transit Database

Most transit service is in Los Angeles, where transit operators experienced a 20% increase in ridership over the last ten years. Sacramento saw the greatest increase in unlinked passenger trips (35%). The San Francisco Bay Area saw the lowest increase in ridership (1.5%).

### **Transit Costs and Use**

According to the National Transit Database, growth in transit operating expenses was lowest in Bay Area (55%) and highest in Sacramento (110%), where investment in a new light rail system helped to double operating expenses from 2000 to 2009<sup>16</sup>. In all regions, expenditures on rail (77%) increased at a faster rate than expenditures on the bus system (61%). Demand-response's expenses rose by 108% from 2000 through 2009.<sup>17</sup>

Even though transit services and ridership have increased throughout California, transit costs have risen even faster. California saw unlinked transit trips increase by 11% from 2000 to 2009. The Sacramento area has seen the strongest growth in rail and bus service. Bus service in San Diego increased just 2% between 2000 and 2009 and the Bay Area saw the second lowest growth in rail and bus services, at just 18%. Meanwhile, demand-response services in San Diego saw a 4% decrease in vehicle revenue hours. In general, unlinked passenger trips were taken per vehicle revenue hour in 2009 (35.6) than in 2000 (40.2) across California. Over the same period, transit operating costs increased by 54% in the Bay Area and 102% in the Other Regions, showing that transit service in California has become less cost-effective this. In short, costs have increased, while ridership per vehicle revenue hour has decreased.

### *California Compared to the United States*

Transit service in California in 2009 accounted for 14% of nationwide transit trips taken-while California makes up 12% of the US population<sup>18</sup>. In addition to generating slightly more than the average national transit trips per capita, California transit operators spend more on operating costs per capita than nationwide operators. Buses provide the majority of transit service in both California and the nation, but rail accounts for a greater share of ridership, service supplied, and operating dollars in the United States as a whole, because of large, well established rail networks of in the Northeast. At the same time, California shows an outsized proportion of service and passengers (over one-third in both cases) provided by light rail.

### *Transit and Vehicle Miles Traveled*

One strategy to maintain mobility while reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is to shift drivers to public transit. Transit VMT across the United States over the last ten years has grown faster than automobile VMT. However, automobile VMT in all areas are much greater than transit revenue miles and passenger miles. In other words, despite growth in transit service and consumption, public transit's part of VMT growth over ten years has been limited.

---

<sup>16</sup> <http://www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/data.htm>. Table: TS2.1. Retrieved March 16, 2011.

<sup>17</sup> <http://www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/data.htm>. Table: TS2.1. Retrieved March 16, 2011.

<sup>18</sup> <http://www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/data.htm>. Table: TS2.1. Retrieved March 17, 2011.


## Demographic Trends in California

The California Department of Finance State Demographic Research Unit prepares population projections and demographic analyses. Three factors correlate with high public transit demand: (1) population size and growth rate; (2) age (because of those too young to drive or approaching an age when they may quit driving), and (3) location (because high-population density makes for more and better transit). Department of Finance data address the first two factors by using birth and death statistics from the California Department of Health Services. Experts, including planning experts from across California forecast population for each county, also taking migration into account. Migration for the next forty years is forecasted from trends from past decades.

### Population Growth

California's population is about 35 million. By 2020, about ten million more will make California

Figure 4 - Population Spatial Distribution 2008



Source: California Department of Finance

Figure 5 - Total projected population growth in California, 2010-2050





Figure 6 - Total projected population percentage growth in California, 2010-2050



Source: California Department of Finance

their home, and by 2050, the population could reach 50 or even 70 million, six to ten million of them, immigrants. The population spatial distribution diagram in Figure 6 shows that most Californians live in the Los Angeles, San Diego, San Francisco Bay, and Sacramento areas. While the population will continue to grow in these metropolitan areas, most population growth will occur in Southern California (2.5 million in Los Angeles and Riverside Counties, and about 1.3 million in each of three neighboring counties: Kern, San Bernardino and San Diego) (see Figure 7a). Figure 7b, on the other hand, shows most Central Valley counties expect a high population growth rate over the next forty years.

*Increasing Population of Individuals under the Driving Age, and Persons over 65*

The Department of Finance’s estimates, that California’s population growth will be driven largely by two demographic groups: individuals under the driving age (16), and people over 65.


*Projected Growth in People below the California Driving Age*

The California Department of Finance’s projects that the number of individuals below the driving age (16) is expected to grow 45.2% by 2050. The total number of individuals under 16 is projected to increase from 8.8 million in 2010 to 12.8 million individuals in the year 2050<sup>19</sup>. These individuals must seek alternatives to driving, including transit, for their mobility.


*Projected Growth in Persons over 65*

Between 2010 and 2050, the over-65 population is expected to increase by 7.2 million (162%). The over-65 population is now concentrated in Southern California (Los Angeles, Riverside, San Bernardino and

**Figure 7 Total projected population over the age of 65 in California, 2010-2050**



**Figure 8 Projected percentage growth of population over the age of 65 in California, 2010-2050**



Source: California Department of Finance

<sup>19</sup> <http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/projections/p-3/>. Table: California.xls. Retrieved on March 10, 2011.

San Diego Counties) (Figure 7). However, high growth in the over-65 population will occur throughout the state (Figure 8)<sup>20</sup>.

### *Geographic Trends*

Forecasting population distribution, demographic patterns, and future demands for public transit is difficult, due to internal and external factors such as land use regulations and the state of the global. Most Californians (95%) now live in urban areas, but the future population density of these areas cannot be known. A statewide transportation and land use model developed at UC Davis (the Production Exchange Consumption Allocation System model, or PECAS<sup>21</sup>) explores the effects of various land-use policies and other factors, such as the price of gasoline, on population distribution. If current land use trends persist statewide, most new development is expected to come from conversion of agricultural land to urban uses in the Central Valley and inland areas.

### *Future Implications of Land Use Planning on Transit Use*

Overlaying a map of current fixed-route services over urban development predicted for 2050 shows that current public transit services would prove insufficient for new urban development. Moreover, most of the areas forecasted to grow are not even connected by, or located near, fixed-route services. This disconnect between urban development and fixed-route services is most critical in the Central Valley, where current transit services are scarce.

Demand for fixed-route services is only part of the equation. The number of people under 16 and over 65, the two age groups that use public transit most, is to double between now and 2050, with most of this growth among people over 65, as the baby boom generation ages.

Trends suggest a population with a smaller share of working-age commuters and a higher share of demand-response service users. In the most populous counties, 25% of the population will be over 65. In some small counties, such as Alpine, more than 40% of the population will be over 65, and so in need of more demand-response service.

## **Conclusions**

### *Transit Trends*

The supply of transit service has risen over the past two decades with growth in both passenger trips and passenger miles. The bus remains the primary mode of transportation for transit in California, in terms of vehicle revenue hours. The San Francisco Bay Area is the most rail-accessible region in California. The other four areas in the state have a much smaller share of rail revenue miles. Demand response services have the greatest share of services in the "Other Regions" due to low-density development. Transit revenue in California has grown to over \$7.8 billion, with over \$1.5 billion collected in fares. Transit agencies served 1.5 billion passengers in 2009<sup>22</sup>. However, transit operating costs have grown even faster than new transit services. As a result, transit service in California has become less cost-effective over the last decade. The reduction in the cost effectiveness of transit

---

<sup>20</sup> <http://www.dof.ca.gov/research/demographic/reports/projections/p-3/>. Table: California.xls. Retrieved on March 10, 2011.

<sup>21</sup> Design and Implementation of PECAS: A Generalized System for Allocating Economic Production, Exchange and Consumption Quantities," Hunt, John Douglas and Abraham, J.E., in *Integrated Land-Use and Transportation Models: Behavioural Foundations*, Elsevier, 2005, pp 253-274.

<sup>22</sup> <http://www.sco.ca.gov/Files-ARD-Local/LocRep/0809Transit.pdf> (p. iv) Retrieved March 21, 2011.

research is a national trend.<sup>23</sup> Nationally, subsidies are growing faster than fares, when adjusted for inflation, and new rail systems built in the 1990s and 2000s have increased average capital costs per rider.

### *Demographic Trends*

Demographic change and population growth in California will have a direct effect on demand for public transit. If current trends hold, people under the driving age, and people over 65 will increase raise demand for cost-effective alternatives to driving, including transit. Rural areas are currently not well served by either fixed-route or demand response services. These services must be improved, to provide mobility for people who cannot drive a serious challenge for transportation planners. Inter-agency coordination and the use of options such as shuttles, demand-response service, and paratransit may help link elderly, disabled, low-income individuals, and who cannot meet their own transportation needs.

### *The Future*

Transit use has increased over the past two decades, along with the cost of providing transit services. Transit use will grow as the population of California grows by 52% by 2050. Transit-dependent groups—people too young to drive, and people over 65—will also grow. Strategic planning, interagency coordination, increased interregional connectivity, and new funding sources are essential to meet future transit demand and to reduce vehicle miles traveled.

DRAFT

---

<sup>23</sup> Brian Taylor – “Assessing the Financial and Operational Sustainability of Public Transit in the U.S.”  
<https://www.uclaextension.edu/publicpolicy/r/Arrowhead2010/Taylor,%20Brian.pdf>

## Transit Funding in California

California's \$7.7 billion<sup>24</sup> of transit funding comes from several sources. Three-quarters of transit funding comes from taxes, fees, and bonds, and the remainder from operations. Capital<sup>25</sup> funds are evenly divided between federal, state, and local government sources. Most operating<sup>26</sup> funds come from fares and state and local governments.

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) administers most federal funds for transit. Other federal agencies, such as the Department of Homeland Security, also provide funding, usually as grants for security.

State and local funding is provided through excise and fuel taxes, as well as general funds. State and local bonds, tolls, and grants from other public agencies, such as air quality management districts, also supply transit funding.

In addition to government sources, transit agencies generate revenue from fares, advertising, investments, leases, contracting services and parking.

### Federal Transit Funds

The following section outlines major sources of federal transit funding.

#### *FTA (5304)*

This fund supports planning for transportation investments. Eligible recipients are State Departments of Transportation (DOTs) and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs). Funds are first apportioned to State DOTs, which then allocate funding to MPOs. Individual projects may not receive federal funds unless they are included in the Transportation Improvement Plans required by this section.

#### *FTA Urbanized Area Funds (5307)*

These funds are allocated to urbanized areas (U.S. Census-defined, with a population 50,000 or more) by formula according to population and amount of transit service, for capital projects or maintenance, though operating expenses is an eligible expenditure for areas of less than 200,000.

---

<sup>24</sup> According to the 2009 National Transit Database

<sup>25</sup> For purchase of equipment (non-expendable tangible personal property having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost the lesser of: the capitalization level established by the government unit for financial statement purposes, or \$5,000). Capital expenses do not include operating expenses (OE) that are eligible to use capital funds. Definition from FTA National Transit Database  
<http://www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/Glossary.htm#C>

<sup>26</sup> The expenses associated with the operation of the transit agency, and classified by function or activity, and the goods and services purchased. These are consumable items with a useful life of less than one year or an acquisition cost which equals the lesser of: The capitalization level established by the government unit for financial statement purposes, or; \$5,000. Definition from FTA National Transit Database  
<http://www.ntdprogram.gov/ntdprogram/Glossary.htm#O>

### *FTA Capital Program Funds aka New Start Program (5309)*

These funds are allocated by a combination of formulas and competitive or discretionary grants, new (or extension or improvement of) fixed guideways, rolling stock purchase, facilities construction, and maintenance.

Other federal funds come from programs administered by FTA include:

- Metropolitan Planning (5303)
- Clean Fuels (5308)
- Transportation for Elderly Persons and Persons with Disabilities (5310)
- Rural and Small Urban Areas (5311)
- Job Access and Reverse Commute (5316)
- New Freedom (5317)

FTA 5310, 5311, 5316 and 5317 are for the needy. The largest of these is 5310, for Americans with Disabilities Act service.

### **State and Local Funds**

State and local funds make up two-thirds of transit funding in California. The largest state sources:

- Transportation Development Act
- Public Transportation Act
- Transportation Investment Fund, and
- Proposition 1B—PTMISEA

Local sales taxes may be imposed by special districts that operate transit service (for example, the Bay Area Rapid Transit District, Orange County Transportation Authority, and Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority ) or allocate funds to transit agencies (such as the Contra Costa, Fresno, and Sacramento County transportation authorities).

General fund revenue and bonds are other forms of state and local support. Some transit agencies (e.g., Bay Area Rapid Transit District, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Caltrain Joint Powers Authority, and the North County Transit District) issue their own bonds

### *Transportation Development Act funds (TDA)*

The California Transportation Development Act (TDA) provides two major sources of funding for public transportation: the Local Transportation Fund (LTF) and the State Transit Assistance fund (STA). These are allocated to counties based on population, taxable sales and transit performance. Counties may use LTF for local streets and roads, if they show no unmet transit needs.

To obtain TDA funds, transit agencies must recover at least 20 percent of operating expenses through fares. Most agencies recover between 20 and 30 percent, although recovery rates range from five to 40 percent. Buses are more labor intensive and have lower farebox recovery, so are most costly to operate than rail. California rail agencies recover around 40 percent. See Performance Measures chapter, for more information on farebox recovery.


### *Public Transportation Account (PTA)*

California's Public Transportation Account (PTA) is funded through the diesel sales tax and a portion of the sales tax on gasoline, including "spillover," revenues from growth in the gasoline sales tax that

exceed other sales tax revenues. PTA is the primary source of state transit funding for the State Transit Assistance (STA) fund, transit capital, and the state's intercity rail program. In recent years, the PTA expanded to fund home-to-school and regional center transportation.

**Transportation Investment Fund (TIF)**

California's Proposition 42 requires the transfer of gasoline sales tax revenue in the general fund. Since 2008, funds have been allocated by formula (box, right).



**Proposition 1B—PTMISEA**

California's Proposition 1B (The Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006) created the Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA). Of \$19.925 billion raised by the bond for transportation purposes, \$3.6 billion were allocated to PTMISEA for transit operators for ten years. PTMISEA supplies funding for transit rehabilitation, safety or modernization, facilities, bus rapid transit and, rolling stock (buses and rail cars) procurement, rehabilitation or replacement. The California Legislature appropriates PTMISEA funds annually to the State Controller for allocation per a Public Utilities Code formula: half to local operators based on fare revenue, half to regions, based on population.

Two State-Local Partnership Programs supplement PTMISEA: formula funds for voter-approved taxes and fees, and competitive grants to match developer fees. The Legislature appropriates formula funds and the California Transportation Commission (CTC) allocates them over five years to projects nominated by transit agencies. The CTC also awards competitive grants.

**Other State Funding**

Fifteen transit agencies received toll funding in 2008: thirteen of these agencies received funding from bridge tolls in the San Francisco Bay Area. The San Diego Metropolitan Transit System also received bridge toll funds. The Orange County Transportation Authority collected \$5 million from high occupancy tolls.

Small grants (under \$1 million) from local air quality management and air pollution control districts grants fund transit and shuttle services. Air quality management and pollution control districts obtain these funds from developer mitigation and local vehicle registration fees.

In 2008, six transit agencies received local property tax funding. These six transit agencies are: AC Transit (\$145 million, half from a parcel tax), Bay Area Rapid Transit (\$65 million), the Orange County Transportation Authority (\$22 million), and the San Joaquin Rapid Transit District, Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District, and City of Alameda Ferry Services (less than \$1 million each).

**Earnings from Operations**

In 2008, California's transit agencies generated \$1.8 billion from operations, or 23 percent of total funding. Fares, advertising, leasing land and equipment, and parking supplied this revenue.

### *Fares*

California transit agencies charge both a flat fare—a set fare for any trip—and distance-based fares. Some transit operators base fares on the number of “zones” traversed. Others vary fares based on the specific station of boarding and alighting. No agency examined currently applies a peak hour fare surcharge for regular fares.

Most agencies offer monthly passes, at a discount of \$7 to \$44 for agencies examined. All agencies examined offer discounts to seniors and the disabled. Some offer youth or student discounts. Some transit agencies supply bulk discount passes to large schools or employers, or to city or county employees. Some transit agencies offer free bus service (often loops through commercial corridors) downtown.

All transit agencies accept cash, but many also accept prepaid fare media smart cards that use an embedded radio frequency identification (RFID) chip to track cash balance or active passes. Passes and smart cards facilitate faster boarding, eliminate paper transfers, ease transfers between transit agencies, and assist ridership tracking. In most applications, smart card holders can register their cards and easily replace a lost card with the remaining balance. Smart cards enable transit agencies to better track boardings and alightings and to vary fares based on ridership information.

### *Advertising*

Fifty transit agencies sell advertising space, on or within vehicles, bus shelters and properties. The largest transit agencies (Los Angeles Metro, Bay Area Rapid Transit, San Francisco Muni, Orange County Transportation Authority) earn the most from advertising, though small transit agencies may benefit similarly. Petaluma Transit earns 16 percent of revenue from advertising, The County Connection (in Contra Costa County), twelve percent. Of all agencies examined, San Francisco Muni receives the highest percentage (7 percent) of its operating revenue from advertising.

### *Leases*

Transit agencies generate revenues from leasing facilities, land, and equipment. Examples include:

- Bay Area Rapid Transit receives \$5 million from telecommunications companies to run fiber optic cables alongside its right-of-way and to store equipment on its land.
- Los Angeles Metro receives \$1.5 million from renting space in its buildings.
- Golden Gate Transit receives \$600,000 from leasing its vehicles and real property.

The National Transit Database calls leases "non-transportation" revenue, like investment income, fees, and asset sales.

### *Contracted Service*

Eighteen transit agencies provide charter or contract service. For example, Los Angeles Metro receives \$240,000 for providing shuttle service to the Hollywood Bowl.

### *Parking*

Four agencies earn revenue from parking. Parking revenue ranges from SamTrans's \$64,000 to Bay Area Rapid Transit's \$1.4 million. However, most agencies provide free parking.

## State and Local Fund Sources outside California

Transit agencies across the United States receive funds from similar state and local sources including sales and property taxes, bonds, and general fund allocations. Examples of funding sources in other states:

### *Petroleum Business Taxes*

New York State levies a per-gallon fee on petroleum businesses. A portion of this fee goes to transit.<sup>27</sup>

### *Vehicle Excise Tax*

Washington State permits local governments to charge an excise tax on vehicles. Sound Transit (Seattle) levies a 0.3 percent motor vehicle excise tax that generated \$69 million in 2008.<sup>28</sup>

### *Payroll taxes*

Oregon permits local governments levy a local payroll tax for transit, bringing Portland Metro received \$214 million in 2008. Lane County Transit collected \$26 million.

### *Income taxes*

State or local governments in Indiana, New York, Ohio, and Oregon allocate general funds revenue to transit agencies. For example, the State of New York contributed \$600 million to New York MTA and a local 0.3 percent income tax of in Cincinnati generated \$40 million for the Southwest Ohio Regional Transit Authority.

## Funding Challenges

The California Transit Association (CTA), along with the federal, State, regional, and local governments, assessed California's transportation funding needs from 2011 to 2020, resulting in a report on California Unmet Transit Funding Needs. The report compared funding and capital and operating needs, and revealed a 10-year unmet operating and maintenance gap of \$22.2 billion and a capital gap of \$42.1 billion (not including three intercity rail lines owned by Caltrans and operated by Amtrak—Capitol Corridor, Surfliner, and the San Joaquin).

## Summary

Transit agencies receive funds from local, state, federal sources as well as revenue generated from operations. Most federal funding comes from the urbanized area formula grants and capital programs. The greatest source of state and local funds is sales tax, followed by general fund revenue. Transit agencies earn revenue from fares and advertising.

Sources of information about funding transit lack uniform reporting standards. The National Transit Database shows how transit agencies spend, but not fund sources. The California State Controller Report does report sources, especially the Local Transportation Fund and the State Transit Assistance Fund.

---

<sup>27</sup> *Financing Options to Meet Highway and Transit Needs*, NCHRP Web-Only Document 102 (Washington, DC, 2006) ([http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/nchrp/nchrp\\_w102.pdt](http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/nchrp/nchrp_w102.pdt))

<sup>28</sup> Sound Transit, *Quarterly Financial Report*, December 31, 2008 6 National Transit Database, 2008 7 National Transit Database, 2008, *Tax Funds*

## California & Federal Law on Strategic Transit Planning

California's overarching global warming initiatives requires reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emission to 1990 level by 2020 through implementing local, regional, and statewide mandates and polices. This chapter discusses overview of statutes, regulations, and polices that affecting public transportation. (See summary in the appendix).

### Greenhouse Gas Reduction

#### *Assembly Bill 32 and Senate Bill 375*

Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32) (2006) requires that the state reduce GHG emission to 1990 levels by 2020. The law does not specify strategies, instead creating general guidelines, outlining goals, and mandating the California Air Resources Board to create and implement strategies. The Air Resources Board has adopted an AB 32 Scoping Plan and is drafting and promulgating implementation regulations. The AB 32 Adopted Scoping Plan suggests a few specific roles for public transit. For example, the plan recommends adopting strategies to increase public transit use among state employees.

The transportation sector contributes over 40 percent of the GHG emissions in the State of California; automobiles and light trucks alone contribute almost 30 percent. The state plans to address these emissions through three strategies. The first is through new vehicle technology. The state has established guidelines for vehicle GHG emissions (AB 1493, Pavley) which will spur adoption of new, more GHG efficient vehicles. Second, California's Low Carbon Fuel Standard seeks to reduce the GHG intensity of transportation fuels 10% by 2020.

State lawmakers were concerned that GHG reductions from improvements to vehicle technology and reductions in fuel GHG intensity would be eroded by increases in vehicle miles traveled. SB 375 (Steinberg, 2008) seeks additional transportation GHG reductions from regional Metropolitan Planning Organizations, which are charged with preparing regional transportation and housing plans.

SB 375 calls for the integration of transportation planning, land use, and housing to lower GHG emissions from cars and light trucks by reducing vehicle miles traveled. SB 375 requires the Air Resources Board to develop regional reduction targets. Regional governments must develop a "Sustainable Communities Strategy" for that integrates the Regional Transportation Plan and Regional Housing Needs Allocation to achieve future GHG reduction targets.

The language of SB 375 explicitly recognizes the role of transit in achieving such reductions:

Each transportation planning agency...shall prepare and adopt a regional transportation plan directed at achieving a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system, including, but not limited to, mass transportation, highway, railroad, maritime, bicycle, pedestrian, goods movement, and aviation facilities and services. (65080 (a))

SB 375 requires the collection of public transit supply data and "measures of equity and accessibility," including the "percentage of the population served by frequent and reliable public transit." SB 375 also calls for balanced household growth targets in regional transportation plans, and for planning to maximize use of public transportation and existing infrastructure. Compact, mixed-use development, when combined with other strategies, can bring low levels of VMT. Many regions will incorporate transit-oriented development as a central element of their Sustainable Communities Strategy.

### *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)*

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) came into law in 1969. In response, the California State Assembly created the Assembly Select Committee on Environmental Quality to study supplementing NEPA through state law. In 1970, this committee issued The Environmental Bill of Rights, which called for a California counterpart to NEPA. Later that same year, the legislature passed, and Governor Reagan signed, the California Environmental Quality Act.<sup>29</sup>

Senate Bill 97 (2007) required the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to develop amendments to CEQA Guidelines for the mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions and their effects. OPR was to prepare, develop, and transmit amendments to the Natural Resources Agency by July 1, 2009.<sup>30</sup>

As directed by SB 97, the Natural Resources Agency amended CEQA Guidelines for greenhouse gas emissions on December 30, 2009. On February 16, 2010, the Office of Administrative Law approved the amendments and filed them with the Secretary of State for inclusion in the California Code of Regulations. The amendments became effective on March 18, 2010.<sup>31</sup>

The new guidelines seek to integrate the GHG reduction goals of AB 32 and SB 375 into the CEQA review process. Additionally, SB 375 includes CEQA streamlining for regions with Sustainable Communities Strategies. CEQA streamlining applies to certain projects, including "Transit Priority Projects" (at least 50% residential use, a density of at least 20 units per acre, and within a half mile of a regional transit corridor) or residential/mixed use (at least 75 percent of the total square footage for residential use).

### **Air-Quality Mandates for Transit Operators**

Air quality mandates call for monitoring transit vehicle fleets and funding new equipment. Adopted in February 2000, Title 13 (California Code of Regulations, sections 1956.1, 2020, 2023, 2023.1 & 2023), requires urban bus operators to choose either diesel or alternative fuel, to reduce exhaust emissions. The Air Resources Board monitors nitrogen oxides and particulate matter emissions from transit fleets, funds zero-emission bus demonstration projects. Transit agencies choosing diesel must purchase new, cleaner buses, or retrofit older bus engines with filters. ARB sets emission standards for clean diesel buses. Agencies choosing alternative must purchase at least 85% alternative-fuel buses, running on compressed natural gas, propane, ethanol, biodiesel, or methanol. The ARB has opposed on a requirement that transit operators purchase zero emissions buses.<sup>32</sup>

### **Bond Initiatives**

#### *Proposition 1A-- High-Speed Rail*

In 2002, California voters approved the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century, which generated \$10 billion for intercity high-speed rail. The High-Speed Rail Authority, established in 1996, oversees the implementation of high-speed rail funds, including \$3 billion from federal programs. The federal government also redirected \$624 million to California's High-Speed Rail Authority from other states not planning a high-speed rail system.

---

<sup>29</sup> California Natural Resources Agency website, "Frequently Asked Questions About CEQA," <http://ceres.ca.gov/ceqa/more/faq.html#guidelines3>

<sup>30</sup> California Natural Resources Agency website, "Proposed Guidelines Amendments & Related Materials," [http://ceres.ca.gov/ceqa/guidelines/proposed\\_guidelines\\_amendments\\_and\\_related\\_materials.html](http://ceres.ca.gov/ceqa/guidelines/proposed_guidelines_amendments_and_related_materials.html)

<sup>31</sup> California Natural Resources Agency website, "CEQA Guidelines: 2009 SB 97 Rulemaking," <http://ceres.ca.gov/ceqa/guidelines/>

<sup>32</sup> California Air Resources Board, "Postponement of the Purchase Requirement for Zero-Emission Buses under the Transit Fleet Rule," <http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/bus/zeb/mailouts/msc1004.pdf>

California's High-Speed Rail Authority envisions a new transportation system linking Los Angeles to San Francisco through the State's Central Valley. The planned rail system will provide Californians an alternative to automotive and air travel and aims to make the State's transportation system globally competitive.

*Proposition 1B (The Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006)*

Proposition 1B authorizes programs to improve transportation infrastructure in California, including transit improvements. Three specific programs authorized by Proposition 1B include: (1) the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account, which funds transit improvements to the State Highway System and its major access routes; (2) the Local Street and Road, Congestion Relief, and Traffic Safety Account, which funds improvements to transit facilities that reduce traffic, improve safety, and increase ridership, and (3) the Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account, which provides funding for projects such as transit rehabilitation, safety or modernization improvements of transit facilities, capital service enhancements or expansions, new capital projects, bus rapid transit improvements, or rolling stock procurement, rehabilitation or replacement.

*Proposition 1C (The Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006)*

California's Proposition 1C funds affordable housing and infrastructure projects in the State's Strategic Growth Plan. Proposition 1C authorizes funds for infill housing and projects that improve transit access. Prop 1C also funds high-density, transit-oriented development projects, as well as transit information systems. The California Department of Housing and Community Development oversees these funds.

*Proposition 116 (The Clean Air and Transportation Improvement Act of 1990)*

California's Proposition 116 authorized \$2 billion to expand intercity, commuter, and urban rail service. It also funded Amtrak, subway and light rail projects, a proposed monorail in Irvine, the San Francisco Bay Area ferry service, bicycle commuter projects, rural public transit, and the Bay Area Rapid Transit extension to San Francisco International Airport.

*Assembly Bill 105*

Assembly Bill 105 (2011) reauthorizes the fuel tax swap of 2010, which allowed the state to use gas tax revenues for general obligation bond debt service, and provided restorative funding for local transit. AB 105 maintains annual transit funding at \$350 million, the amount proposed by the fuel tax swap, by shifting sales tax on diesel fuel to transit operations. The fuel tax swap was overturned by Proposition 26, which stated that any new taxes or fees put into place after January 1, 2010 required a two-thirds vote of approval, and by Proposition 22, which prohibited the use of gas tax revenues for general obligation bond debt service.<sup>33</sup>

**The California Transportation Plan (CTP)**

*Senate Bill 391*

Senate Bill 391 (2009) requires the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) to update the California Transportation Plan (CTP) by December 31, 2015, and every five years thereafter. SB 391 also requires Caltrans to describe a statewide, integrated, multimodal transportation system to achieve the GHG emission targets of AB 32, using the "Sustainable Communities Strategy" in SB 375.

---

<sup>33</sup> Legislative Counsel of California website, "AB 105 Assembly Bill –Bill Analysis," [http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/11-12/bill/asm/ab\\_0101-0150/ab\\_105\\_cfa\\_20110317\\_113735\\_sen\\_floor.html](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/11-12/bill/asm/ab_0101-0150/ab_105_cfa_20110317_113735_sen_floor.html)

The CTP is a twenty-year plan for a multimodal, sustainable transportation system, based on demographic, economic, and technological forecasts. The goal of CTP is to develop a “safe, sustainable, world-class transportation system that provides for the mobility and accessibility of people, goods, services, and information through an integrated, multimodal network that is developed through collaboration and achieves a prosperous economy, a quality environment, and social equity” with emphasis on transit and non-motorized modes. Caltrans, regional transportation planning agencies, and public transit operators are partners in the planning.

### **Federal Disability Law**

Laws and regulations requiring access for the disabled affect public transit profoundly. First, transit operators must provide equal access for all, not just for those who can mount stairs or see. Second, transit operators are legally obligated to provide services such as demand-response for those who cannot use fixed-route transit.

#### *Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA)*

The American with Disabilities Act prohibits transit agencies from discriminating against the disabled. Newly purchased or leased vehicles must be accessible. Unless it would result in an undue burden, transit agencies must provide paratransit service to those unable to use regular transit.

#### *Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC)*

The Job Access and Reverse Commute program aims to provide accessibility for low-income, urban individuals to suburban jobs, daycare and schools through reverse commute service.

#### *Public Transportation for Elderly in Low or No Regular Service*

The Elderly and Disabled Specialized Transit program (Federal Transit Administration Section 5310) funds public transit in areas with no regular service, and for to the elderly and disabled with few transportation options. This program helps transit agencies buy accessible vans, buses, communication equipment, and computer hardware and software.

### **Challenges and Opportunities**

California’s statewide GHG initiatives, AB 32 and SB 375, require the integration of transportation and land use planning to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. These initiatives may raise the cost of single-occupant vehicle trips and increase demand for public transit.

To meet AB 32 and SB 375 emissions targets, vehicle miles traveled must be reduced, which requires alternatives to driving. However, according to findings in SB 391, "Current public transportation services and facilities are inadequate to meet current and expected future increases in demand." In response, AB 32 and SB 375 encourage Caltrans and local transit agencies to develop public transportation services.

Air quality regulations require current public transit fleets to meet rigorous air quality standards. In some cases, this requires the purchase of expensive new vehicles, which force transit agencies to shift funds to fleet renewal from other purposes. However, transit agencies regularly budget for fleet turnover, regardless of air quality requirements. Overall, emissions from California public transit agencies have declined.

### **Conclusion**

Through statewide legislation, California aims to reduce vehicle miles traveled through integrated and coordinated transportation and land-use planning. This goal cannot be achieved without funding public transit to meet growing demand.

As Californians age, public transit must accommodate urban and suburban elderly with limited mobility. This changing demographic could form the base for efficient demand-response service.

Public transit plays an important role that is not well described, developed, and funded under AB 32 and SB 375. The Statewide Transit Strategic Plan articulates the role public transit plays in light of population growth, changing demographics, economic trends, and legislative mandates.

DRAFT

## Regional Coordination & Interregional Connectivity

Local transit agencies coordinate their services to serve regional needs and strive for long-distance transit, or interregional connectivity. This chapter discusses current regional coordination efforts, interregional connectivity and how these systems interact and includes a brief look into future proposed interregional transit.

### Regional Coordination

Transit agencies work together to create a regional system that builds complete trips, often primarily serving long-distance commuters. Short Range Transportation Plans (SRTP) describe a region, member agencies, and steps toward regional coordination and connectivity.

### Route Coordination

Cooperation among regional transit agencies eliminates duplication and promotes connectivity by building upon the strengths of adjacent agencies to create a complete travel network. The following section examines two examples of regional route coordination: one in Northern California and one in Southern California.

### Northern California Urban Transit Strategies

#### *San Francisco Municipal Transit Authority*

The San Francisco Municipal Transit Authority (Muni) serves the City of San Francisco, with motorbuses, trolleybuses, light rail, streetcars, and cable cars. According to its 2006-2025 Short Range Transit Plan, 80 routes serve the 47 square-mile network.<sup>34</sup> This plan revealed that 522,227<sup>35</sup> people per day commute into San Francisco, while 93,971 commute from the city to outlying areas.<sup>36</sup>

Muni operates almost exclusively within San Francisco. Outside of the city, neighboring transit agencies, including San Mateo County Transit District (Samtrans), San Francisco Ferry, and Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART), provide service. Within the City of San Francisco, there are four regional transit hubs that connect at least three transit operators each: (1) the Ferry Terminal, (2) the Embarcadero, Montgomery, and Civic Center BART/Muni subway stations, (3) the Transbay Terminal (currently being reconstructed to be the Transbay Transit Center), and (4) the Caltrain Station at 4<sup>th</sup> & King Streets just south of downtown.<sup>37</sup>

### Southern California Urban Transit Strategies

#### *Omnitrans*

The cities of Chino, Colton, Fontana, Loma Linda, Montclair, Ontario, Redlands, Rialto, San Bernardino, Upland, along with the San Bernardino County, established Omnitrans as the regional transit authority for southwestern San Bernardino County. Since its founding, the cities of Chino Hills, Grand Terrace, Highland, Rancho Cucamonga, and Yucaipa have joined the agency. Omnitrans serves 456 square-miles

---

<sup>34</sup> "Short Range Transit Plan: San Francisco Municipal Railway FY2006-2005," Pg 25, Chapter 4 Current Service and Service Evaluation.

<sup>35</sup> San Francisco Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), ACS 2006 San Francisco Bay Area Data Highlights Report, Nov. 2007.

<sup>36</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, 2009 American Community Survey: S081 Commuting Characteristics by Sex. Economic Characteristics. Retrieved Oct. 14, 2010.

<sup>37</sup> MTC Transit Connectivity Plan: Final Summary Report, May 2006, Pg, 2-4, Chapter 2 Regional Transit Hubs.

with 29 bus routes. In its SRTP, Omnitrans has come to cooperative agreements to connect retail destinations, health care centers, and transit hubs with adjacent transit agencies including Riverside Transit Authority, Foothill Transit, Orange County Transportation Authority, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Pomona Valley Transportation Authority, and Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority.<sup>38</sup>

### **Rural Transit**

Santa Cruz County, serviced by Santa Cruz METRO, serves 450 square miles of Santa Cruz County with 39 routes.<sup>39</sup> Half the population lives on just 5% of the land in Santa Cruz, Watsonville, Capitola, and Scotts Valley. The remaining half of the population is sparsely distributed throughout small rural communities. Santa Cruz METRO connects with Monterey-Salinas Transit in Watsonville. This agency coordinates routes and transfers with Santa Cruz METRO to complement services and minimize duplication. Santa Cruz METRO also coordinates with Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) through Diridon Station in Downtown San Jose, which serves as the connection point between the two agencies.

Rural Mariposa and Sierra Counties rely solely on demand-response transit, dial-a-ride service not only for the elderly and disabled, but for the general public, too.

### **Fare Coordination**

Many transit agencies coordinate transit passes and transfers.

In the San Francisco Bay Area, Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) started the TransLink fare payment program in 2002 as a universal pass for Bay Area transit agencies including AC Transit, BART, Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District, Muni, and SamTrans. That pass, now called the Clipper Card, will link 27 transit agencies in nine Bay Area counties.

Similarly, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) started the EZ Pass program in 2002 to link 13 Los Angeles transit agencies with unlimited access to bus and rail.

Omnitrans, in San Bernardino County, coordinates full basic fare transfers among Foothill Transit, Mountain Area Regional Authority, and Riverside Transit Authority, and limited fare transfer with Metro, Southern California Regional Rail Authority (Metrolink), and Orange County Transportation Authority.<sup>40</sup>

Sacramento's Regional Transit has coordinated monthly passes and transfers with nine other local transit operators: Yolo, Yuba, Sutter, Placer and El Dorado counties. Similar to Omnitrans, there are stipulations on accepted fares of adjacent transit operators based on the transferring route.

Local businesses often cooperate with local transit operators coordinating shuttles that connect transit with employment sites, shopping or community. This collaboration can provide the important beginning and ending legs of trips that make transit a viable option for riders.

---

<sup>38</sup> Omnitrans Comprehensive Operational Assessment & Short Range Transit Plan, July 11, 2007, Pg. 56 Chapter 3 Regional Transit Services.

<sup>39</sup> 2007-2008 Santa Cruz METRO Short Range Transit Plan, Pg. 1-9, Chapter 1, Services Provided.

<sup>40</sup> Omnitrans Comprehensive Operational Assessment & Short Range Transit Plan, July 11, 2007, Pg. 56 Chapter 3 "Regional Transit Services."

## Regional Rail

Regions in California have also coordinated to provide regional and commuter rail services.

### *BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT (BART)*

BART was planned in 1946 as a high-speed electric rail system, winning narrow approval in a three-county election in 1962. Construction began in 1964, and daily operations began in 1972. Today, BART links five San Francisco Bay Area counties and interfaces with many transit agencies.

In 2010, an average of 334,984 passengers rode the 104-mile, 43-station heavy-rail system daily, down from a high of 357,775 in 2008.<sup>41</sup> BART shares four stations with MUNI Metro, San Francisco's light rail transit system. BART also shares a station with Caltrain in Millbrae. BART connects to the Oakland Coliseum, Oakland International Airport, and San Francisco International Airport. A planned extension to Livermore will coordinate with Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority and the Altamont Commuter Express, San Joaquin Valley's passenger rail service.<sup>42</sup>

BART charges zone-based fares, with automated collection via entry and exit gates, with a variety of multi-use and discount tickets. Children under four ride free.<sup>43</sup> MTC's Clipper Card allows a single fare for all transit trips, through electronic "smart card" technology.<sup>44</sup>

BART has been a leader in technology for rider convenience. In October 2005, BART became the first major transit agency to offer downloadable maps and schedules for media players, such as the Apple iPod. BART also offers wifi (wireless internet)<sup>45</sup>, as well as cell phone signal coverage in the Transbay Tube, under San Francisco Bay.<sup>46</sup>

### *Metrolink*

In 1991, a Joint Powers Agreement among Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Orange County Transportation Authority, and Riverside, San Bernardino and Ventura Counties created the Southern California Regional Rail Authority known as Metrolink. The agency acquired 175 miles of track from Southern Pacific and use of Union Station in Downtown Los Angeles from Union Pacific. Metrolink opened in 1992, with three lines to Ventura, Santa Clarita, and San Bernardino. In 1993, the system expanded to Riverside and in 1994, to Orange County.<sup>47</sup> In 1995, the nation's first suburb-to-suburb commuter rail line connected Orange County to the Inland Empire (San Bernardino and Riverside Counties).<sup>48</sup> Riverside was linked to Downtown Los Angeles, via Fullerton, in 2002.<sup>49</sup> Today, Metrolink has seven routes, 55 stations, and 388 miles of track.<sup>50</sup>

In 2010, 5.6 million people rode Metrolink<sup>51</sup>, which connects to Metro's Red, Purple, and Gold light rail lines, Amtrak's Surfliner train, and Greyhound buses at Union Station. Metrolink connects employment

<sup>41</sup> "BART Fiscal Year Weekday Average Exits," <http://www.bart.gov/about/reports/index.aspx>

<sup>42</sup> "BART to Livermore Extension: Final Program Environmental Impact Report Responses to Comments," Section 1: Introduction, Subsection 1.1 Background Program Description, Pg 1-9, June 2010.

<sup>43</sup> BART website, "Tickets > Overview" section, March 2011, <http://www.bart.gov/tickets/index.aspx>

<sup>44</sup> BART website, "Facts" section, March 2011, <http://www.bart.gov/about/history/facts.aspx>

<sup>45</sup> Press Release, "WiFi Rail Inc. to provide wifi access on BART system," Feb. 2, 2009.

<sup>46</sup> Press Release, "BART expands wireless access to Transbay Tube," Dec. 21, 2009.

<sup>47</sup> <http://www.metrolinktrains.com/about/?id=5>

<sup>48</sup> <http://www.metrolinktrains.com/about/?id=5>

<sup>49</sup> Metrolink website, <http://www.metrolinktrains.com/about/?id=5>

<sup>50</sup> Metrolink Quarterly Report, March 17, 2011

<sup>51</sup> Metrolink Quarterly Report, March 17, 2011

centers to outlying residential communities, to Bob Hope Airport in Burbank, California State University Los Angeles, and Angel Stadium in Anaheim.

Metrolink charges zone-based fares, with single trip, monthly, and multi-use tickets sold at vending machines or booths. Conductors perform random fare checks. Through the Rail2Rail program, Metrolink and Amtrak share tickets. Metrolink honors EZ Transit passes from 19 Los Angeles transit agencies.<sup>52</sup>

### *Additional Regional Rail Lines*

The Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board operates Caltrain along the peninsula from San Francisco to San Jose and Gilroy.

North (San Diego) County Transit District operates the Coaster and Sprinter rail lines. Coaster operates along the same right-of-way as the Amtrak Surfliner, from Oceanside to San Diego. Sprinter connects Oceanside inland to Escondido.

## **Interregional Connectivity**

In populated areas, rail and bus provide interregional transit for long distance commuters and travelers. The following section examines interregional connections provided by publicly operated or funded transit services.

### **Interregional Rail**

Much interregional connectivity is through rail. Heavy rail such as Amtrak and Altamont Commuter Express move millions of commuters. These agencies share rail use with freight but not without conflict.

### **Amtrak Intercity Rail**

Regional connectivity through intercity passenger rail is a major goal of the California Department of Transportation. This mission is outlined in the Governor's Strategic Growth Plan, the Global Warming Solutions Act (Assembly Bill 32), and California Transportation Plan 2025.<sup>53</sup> Caltrans funds three intercity rail lines, operated by Amtrak and run on Union Pacific and Burlington Northern Santa Fe track: Capitol Corridor, Pacific Surfliner, and the San Joaquin. These systems moved nearly 5.2 million passengers in 2010<sup>54</sup>. California is second only to the Northeast Corridor in Amtrak ridership.

#### *Capitol Corridor*

Capitol Corridor's 170 miles connect the Sacramento region to the East and South San Francisco Bay with 32 daily trips. It interfaces with BART in Richmond and Caltrain at Diridon Station in San Jose. The system uses zone-based fares and multi-ride passes. Caltrans began this service in 1991, transferring its administration to the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority (CCJPA) and its day-to-day operations to BART in 1998. Amtrak offers free wi-fi<sup>55</sup>, quiet cars, and an onboard café, drawing an increase in increasing ridership<sup>56</sup>. January 2011 ridership reached 130,860, an

---

<sup>52</sup> EZ Transit pass program <http://www.metrolinktrains.com/fares/?id=6>

<sup>53</sup> California State Rail Plan 2007-08 to 2017-18, California Department of Transportation, Part 1 Chapter 1: California's Vision for Passenger Intercity Rail." March 2008.

<sup>54</sup> Amtrak Press Release, "Amtrak Sets new Ridership Record," Oct 2010, ATK-10-134.

<sup>55</sup> Sacramento Bee, "Capitol Corridor Trains Offer Free Wi-fi," Feb. 19, 2011, Section 1-A, <http://www.sacbee.com/2011/02/19/3415088/capitol-corridor-trains-to-add.html>

<sup>56</sup> NPR, "For Amtrak Riders, It's All Aboard Despite the Cost" October. 27, 2010, <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=130861792>

11% increase over the previous year. From February 2009 to January 2010, 1.62 million passengers rode the system.<sup>57</sup> The trip from Sacramento to San Jose takes 3 hours.

### *Pacific Surfliner*

Pacific Surfliner's 380 miles connect San Luis Obispo and San Diego via Los Angeles. The line is a segment of Coast Starlight, running daily from Seattle to San Diego via Portland, Sacramento and Oakland.<sup>58</sup> Pacific Surfliner is Amtrak's busiest line on the West Coast, carrying 2.6 million passengers per year.<sup>59</sup> Pacific Surfliner's history is complex. Until 1992, Burlington Northern Santa Fe's predecessor, the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe, owned its track. The right-of-way was sold in 1992 to Metro, Orange County Transportation Authority, North (San Diego) County Transit District, and San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board, with BNSF retaining the right in perpetuity to freight service.<sup>60</sup> Today, Amtrak, Metrolink, Coaster and BNSF operate along the route. The trip from San Luis Obispo to Los Angeles takes 5.5 hours, and Los Angeles to San Diego takes 2.5 hours. A new daily weekday express began operation between San Diego and Los Angeles in February 2011, which saves 18 minutes by eliminating some stops in Orange County.<sup>61</sup>

### *The San Joaquin*

Running from Bakersfield to Oakland and Sacramento, the San Joaquin is Amtrak's third busiest intercity line in California. It moves 977,834 riders a year.<sup>62</sup> Eight trains a day (March 2011) link Bakersfield and Oakland, connecting to BART in Richmond. Four trains a day link Bakersfield and Sacramento, with connections to the Capitol Corridor and Sacramento Regional Transit light rail at Sacramento Valley Station. Amtrak cannot run from Bakersfield to Los Angeles via the Tehachapi, a freight line too busy for passenger service.<sup>63</sup> From Bakersfield to Oakland takes 6 hours and from Bakersfield to Sacramento takes 5 hours.

### *Amtrak Expansion*

Amtrak projects more interregional rail in the California State Rail Plan, 2007-08 to 2017-18:

- San Francisco to San Luis Obispo
- Sacramento to Reno
- Sacramento to Redding

New service depends on demand, right-of-way, funding, equipment, and construction.

---

<sup>57</sup> CCJPA News, "More Northern California Drivers Ditched Cars in January to Ride Capitol Corridor Instead," Feb. 11, 2011, <http://www.amtrakcapitols.com/news/whats-new/more-northern-california-drivers-ditched-cars-in-january-to-ride-capitol-corridor-instead/>

<sup>58</sup> This route has been studied for an additional intercity passenger rail line connecting San Luis Obispo to San Francisco. Reference California State Rail Plan 2007-08 to 2017-18, California Department of Transportation, Part 1 Chapter 1: California's Vision for Passenger Intercity Rail." March 2008.

<sup>59</sup> Amtrak Press Release, "Amtrak Sets new Ridership Record," Oct 2010, ATK-10-134.

<sup>60</sup> LOSSAN Corridor Strategic Plan, Section 3.0 Pg. 10, Overview of the LOSSAN Corridor, Oct. 2003.

<sup>61</sup> MTS website, <http://www.sdmts.com/Marketing/NewAmtrakExpress.asp>

<sup>62</sup> Amtrak Press Release, "Amtrak Sets new Ridership Record," Oct 2010, ATK-10-134.

<sup>63</sup> Solomon, Brian (1999). *Southern Pacific Railroad*. Osceola: MBI Publishing Company. p. 20. ISBN 0760306141.

### *Altamont Commuter Express*

In 1997, seven cities and San Joaquin, Alameda and Santa Clara Counties formed a joint powers authority to connect San Joaquin County commuters to Alameda and Santa Clara Counties via the Altamont Pass.<sup>64</sup> The resulting efforts created the Altamont Commuter Express (ACE). Operations began in 1998, with two morning trains running from Stockton to San Jose and two limited-stop afternoon trains running from San Jose to Stockton. In 2001, a third morning and evening train was added in each direction.

ACE connects with San Joaquin Regional Transit District, Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority. ACE operates on Union Pacific track and conflicts between freight and passenger service are common, bringing slow speeds and delays.<sup>65</sup>

### **Interregional Bus Service**

The following section examines public interregional bus service. Private interregional bus service has also become significant in the United States and some parts of California.

#### *San Joaquin RTD*

Along with local service, San Joaquin Regional Transit District operates, as of March 2011, bus service to Sacramento (2 routes), the San Francisco Bay Area (12 routes), and BART stations (2 routes), with subscription based fares, from \$132.00 to \$144.00 a month. A one-way fare is \$7.00.

#### *Commuter Bus Routes*

Where complete rail networks are not built-out or geography stands in the way, commuter buses make for interregional connectivity, relying on freeway for quick, long-distance service. Where facilities exist, some routes save travel time by using high occupancy vehicle lanes. El Dorado Transit operates from the foothills of Placer County to Downtown Sacramento on 11 morning and afternoon trips. Fares are \$5.00 one-way, \$180.00 monthly, or a monthly combination (with Sacramento Regional Transit) pass for \$210.00.<sup>66</sup> Yuba Sutter Transit offers nine morning and afternoon trips from Yuba City to Downtown Sacramento via Marysville, with three midday trips. Fares are \$4.00 one-way, \$128.00 monthly, or a monthly combination (with Sacramento Regional Transit) pass for \$178.00.<sup>67</sup> Santa Cruz METRO operates the Highway 17 Express-Amtrak bus route from Santa Cruz and Scotts Valley to the Downtown San Jose Diridon Station, along mountainous Highway 17. Fares are \$5.00 one-way and \$113.00 monthly. Daily and monthly passes allow unlimited travel on San Jose Valley Transportation Authority.<sup>68</sup>

#### *Yosemite Area Regional Transportation Authority (YARTS)*

To serve tourists and employees of Yosemite National Park, Merced County Association of Governments, as well as Mariposa and Mono Counties, created the Yosemite Area Regional Transportation System. YARTS' success spurred the Council of Fresno County Governments in conjunction with YARTS and Madera County Transportation Commission to conduct a feasibility study

---

<sup>64</sup> <http://www.acerail.com/AboutUs/HistoryofACE.aspx>

<sup>65</sup> Altamont Newsletter, Feb. 2011, Pg. 4, [http://www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov/Altamont\\_Corridor.aspx](http://www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov/Altamont_Corridor.aspx)

<sup>66</sup> El Dorado Transit, <http://www.eldoradotransit.com/farescomm.html>

<sup>67</sup> Yuba-Sutter Transit website,

<http://www.yubasuttertransit.com/download/brochures/Sacramento%20Brochure%2010-1-10.pdf>

<sup>68</sup> Santa Cruz METRO transit website, <http://www.scmttd.com/en/fares/fares>

for creating a similar regional system. The study examines a system that would connect Fresno to Yosemite and Sequoia National Park/Kings Canyon with stations at transit stops, including Amtrak.<sup>69</sup>

### **Successes and Barriers to Regional Coordination and Interregional Connectivity**

The San Francisco Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the regional transportation planning and financing agency that oversees the planning, finance, and operations of 20 public transit operators in the nine Bay Area counties. The goals of its 2006 “MTC Transit Connectivity Plan” are to “identify and implement ways to improve the quality of the linkages between transit systems for the transit customer.”<sup>70</sup> This objective is supported by Regional Measure 2’s call for coordination of transit systems, routes, fares, schedules and facilities. MTC Transit Connectivity Plan pointed to a lack of coordinated regional transit hubs, which MTC has since set out to improve.

MTC has sought better connectivity with the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys. It issued the “San Francisco Bay Area Regional Rail Plan” (in coordination with BART, Caltrain, and the California High Speed Rail Authority), in September 2007, pointing to the need for interconnected rail between San Francisco and the Valleys.

It appears that no other organization in the State provides a coordinated focus on inter-operator coordination comparable to that of the MTC. Sacramento Area Council of Governments, the fourth largest metropolitan planning organization in the state, bases some operations on the MTC model but lacks comparable planning, coordination and funding. Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), with a regional council of 83 members, is the nation’s largest metropolitan planning organization. It contains 190 cities and 19 million residents in six counties. Each county has its own transportation agency, the largest being Metro. San Diego Association of Governments covers San Diego County alone.

The California Transit Association’s “Assessment of California’s Statewide Unfunded Transit Needs FY2011-FY2020” identifies a 10-year operating gap of \$22.2 billion and a capital gap of \$42.1 billion, putting a premium on cooperation among transit agencies.

Transit agencies such as MTC and Metro have taken steps to coordinate fares but much more remains to be done. Many local transit agencies have fare transfer agreements but such agreements are seldom regional. This makes coordinating longer drops more difficult for riders. Take, for example, riders traveling from suburban Folsom to Sacramento International Airport. Folsom Stage Line bus service coordinates fare transfers with Sacramento Regional Transit, which has a fare transfer agreement with Yolobus (which serves Sacramento International Airport). Yet, no fare agreement exists between Folsom Stage Line and Yolobus. In another example, BART manages Capitol Corridor Amtrak operations, yet Capitol Corridor riders must purchase a separate ticket to transfer to a BART train.

---

<sup>69</sup> Draft Report Yosemite, Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Park Transit Market Assessment & Feasibility Study, February 2011,  
[http://www.fresnocog.org/siteadmin/AgendaFiles/279/ITEM%20I%20AND%20VI%20G\\_Fresno%20NPS%20Draft%20Final%20Report%20\(1.31.2011\)%20FINAL%20version.pdf](http://www.fresnocog.org/siteadmin/AgendaFiles/279/ITEM%20I%20AND%20VI%20G_Fresno%20NPS%20Draft%20Final%20Report%20(1.31.2011)%20FINAL%20version.pdf)

<sup>70</sup> MTC Transit Connectivity Plan  
[http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/connectivity/Final\\_Connectivity\\_Study/finalsummary.pdf](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/connectivity/Final_Connectivity_Study/finalsummary.pdf)

## **The Future of Interregional Planning**

### *California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA)*

Inspired by high-speed rail worldwide, California's electrically powered high-speed trains will help meet growing demands on state transportation infrastructure. Initially planned to run from San Francisco to Los Angeles/Anaheim via the Central Valley (a 2 hour, 40 minute trip at up to 220 miles per hour) and later to Sacramento and San Diego. High-speed rail will link with local transit agencies, providing potential for a more environmentally responsible alternative to traveling by air or automobile.<sup>71</sup>

### *ACE Altamont Pass planning*

ACE (San Joaquin Valley to the East and South San Francisco Bay Area) is working with CHSRA on its long-range plan, studying the possibility of using high-speed rail to connect Stockton and Modesto to Livermore, Pleasanton, and Santa Clara County.<sup>72</sup>

## **Summary**

California transit agencies are achieving regional coordination by reducing service duplication and by coordinating fares.

Without strong incentives for transit agencies to coordinate, progress toward interregional connectivity is slow. As a result, Amtrak is the only public transit option connecting Northern and Southern California. Travel times on public transportation are much longer than on private, often due to a lack of rail infrastructure investment and conflict with freight rail. Such is the case on the Altamont Commuter Express between San Joaquin County and the San Francisco Bay Area.

California looks to growing interregional connectivity with investments in traditional and electric high-speed rail. Amtrak continues to grow capacity on its traditional rail system, as funding and demand allow. Dedicated passenger high-speed rail will connect the San Francisco Bay Area with Los Angeles, and later, Sacramento and San Diego, eliminating conflict with freight rail.

---

<sup>71</sup> California High Speed Rail Authority, Vision Statement.

<sup>72</sup> Altamont Newsletter, Feb. 2011, [http://www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov/Altamont\\_Corridor.aspx](http://www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov/Altamont_Corridor.aspx)

## Non-traditional Transit and Infrastructure

When the average commuter thinks of transit, fixed-route bus and rail come to mind, but that is an incomplete picture – a transit system involves many more interconnected services. This chapter gives an overview of the supporting services and infrastructure of public transit by examining in detail the following: bus rapid transit, shuttles and vanpools, pedestrian and bicycles, park-and-ride lots, and transit-oriented development – based on the review of 38 California transit agencies that report to the National Transit Database (See table in Appendix.).

### Bus Rapid Transit

Bus rapid transit (BRT) is a term applied to a variety of public transportation systems using buses to provide faster, more efficient service than ordinary bus service. BRT often has many characteristics of rail without some of rail's high initial capital costs. Fully developed BRT systems include bus-only lanes to eliminate conflicts with other traffic, stations with raised and level platforms to ease boarding, fare prepayment, signal priority, real-time arrival information and limited stops. The Federal Transit Administration maintains a BRT website and publishes guides to planning and implementing BRT and adapting it to local needs.<sup>73</sup> The California Department of Transportation published the handbook, "Bus Rapid Transit: A Handbook for Partners," on existing and planned BRT systems (see Caltrans Map of BRT in California) and describes the role and policy of the Department with respect to BRT. The handbook discusses the Caltrans Director's Policy on BRT (DP-27), highlighting and clarifying Caltrans's role as a partner with transit operators – as well as transit planning and development agencies – in support of this innovative transit mode. While the infrastructure, vehicle, and service features of BRT vary, the handbook notes that the objectives of a fully developed BRT line are a high quality, "rail-like" transit service that:

- Reduces transit travel time
- Increases trip reliability
- Improves transit connections and provides direct service
- Decreases station stop dwell and waiting times
- Enhances system identity
- Increases comfort
- Enhances safety and security<sup>74</sup>

Some of BRT attractions are lower infrastructure costs, greater flexibility, and shorter development time when compared to rail, with faster, higher quality service than traditional bus service, attracting more riders to their system. BRT can combine the best features of rail with the flexibility and cost advantages of roadway transit systems. BRT can even be a precursor to rail – a quickly built, flexible alternative as a seed of a rail system.

Twenty-two California transit agencies operate BRT express service, and 13 agencies are planning BRT. The latter range from proposing plans and guidelines, to completing environmental impact reports and public input, to detailed consideration of future BRT systems. Each BRT proposal is unique, and not every transit agency will adopt every element of a complete BRT system. Some transit agencies nickname express buses "BRT lite," and several are considering incremental BRT, adopting relatively inexpensive components, with more to come later.

---

<sup>73</sup> <http://www.nbrti.org>

<sup>74</sup> <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/Docs-Pdfs/BRT/BRT-Handbook-030706.pdf>

### *Examples of Existing BRT in California*

The California Department of Transportation bus rapid transit project experience extends back to 1973, when the Interstate 10 El Monte Busway opened for service in Los Angeles County, with three bus stations and several park-and-ride lots. In 1976, the lanes were opened to carpools, although, the 13-mile route is no longer bus-only, it does speed up bus service along its route. Foothill Transit runs an express bus route called Silver Streak, using the El Monte Busway carrying commuters between the San Gabriel Valley and downtown Los Angeles. The U.S. Department of Transportation's conducted an executive report, "Effects of Changing HOV Lane Occupancy Requirements: El Monte Busway Case Study," that discussed how the busway changed when the HOV occupancy requirement was lowered from three to two, the report found that greater congestion on the busway and raised other issues that are relevant to BRT, such as enforcement and management of lanes.<sup>75</sup>

Another BRT system is the Orange Line in Los Angeles, a fourteen-mile route in the San Fernando Valley that uses a former railroad right-of-way for its two dedicated bus lanes. Because it is separated from traffic and has some signal priority at cross streets, the line's speed and reliability comparable favorably to rail. Indeed, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority considers the Orange Line part of its "Go Metro" transit system of high-speed lines with frequent all-day services. The Orange Line is considered distinct from its "Rapid" bus lines, which run in mixed traffic. The fact that the Orange Line travels the back fences of suburban houses in an old rail right-of-way makes it somewhat unique.

The Orange Line features low-floor buses, pre-boarding payment, and 60-foot articulated buses that reach up to 55 miles per hour on some stretches. It connects at one end with the Metro Rail system, and is an important feeder line for those traveling from the San Fernando Valley to downtown Los Angeles on transit. The Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority also operates the Metro Rapid bus system, which features some basic BRT features, such as traffic signal priority, low-floor buses, and "NextBus" real-time traveler information. According to Metro, ridership has risen 40 percent and travel time has decreased 29 percent.<sup>76</sup> The system started in 2000 with the Wilshire and Ventura Boulevard corridors and has expanded to cover 450 miles. Long Beach Transit operates Zap, a limited-stop peak-hour express service, with signal prioritization, but without dedicated lanes. Santa Monica Big Blue Bus and Culver City Bus also operate limited stop bus services on major corridors that are branded as "Rapid."

### *Planned BRT Systems*

The Southern California Association of Governments counts future BRT projects in its Regional Transit Plan. Many add bus-only or bus-priority lanes to existing roads; when complete, the system will crisscross most of the greater Los Angeles region. The San Diego Association of Governments are planning a South Bay BRT line that will include arterial "transit-only" lanes, transit signal priority, special bus-only shoulder lanes on the freeway, and enhanced customer amenities. Construction on freeway express lanes and BRT stations has begun, and the 21-mile route is slated to open in 2013.

The Bay Area's Metropolitan Transportation Commission is planning two BRT lines, along Van Ness Avenue and Geary Boulevard in San Francisco, two of the most heavily traveled corridors with already high transit ridership. A citizens' advisory committee calls for dedicated bus lanes, ticket vending

---

<sup>75</sup> <http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/jpodocs/reports/te/13679.html>

<sup>76</sup> <http://www.metro.net/projects/rapid/>

machines and a proof-of-payment system, real-time bus arrival information, curb extensions, islands, and medians to minimize pedestrian crossing distances.<sup>77</sup>

Model of Geary BRT Corridor



Model of Van Ness BRT Corridor<sup>78</sup>



Alameda/Contra Costa (AC) Transit is planning a 15-mile BRT line from Berkeley to San Leandro along a heavily traveled bus route, with dedicated bus lanes, a proof-of-payment fare system, and raised platforms with at-grade boarding. However, BRT is has been controversial in Berkeley, as the city council voted not to dedicate bus-only lanes on Telegraph Avenue. Local riders object to the loss of bus stops, since BRT require stops that are farther apart than those of the express bus now serving the corridor, making BRT less attractive for riders with limited mobility. The project's Final Environmental Impact Report is expected to be released in the summer of 2011. Many other transit agencies are planning BRT, by using buses to increase mobility by limiting traffic conflict. Transit agencies include: SamTrans (San Mateo), Santa Cruz METRO, Orange County Transportation Authority, Sacramento Regional Transit, Omnitrans (San Bernardino County), and the City of Santa Monica.

### *BRT Challenges*

The L.A. Orange Line, has had its problems, especially with safety. Soon after the line opened, several cars running red lights collided with transit vehicles. In response, Metro reduced bus speeds through intersections from 25 mph to 10 mph, lowering average speeds and increasing travel time. Other safety modifications include:

- 36-inch bus crossing signs at intersections
- Traffic signal timing to give buses more time to clear intersections
- Changing round green light signals to an "up" arrow signal, to emphasize the prohibition on "turning right on red"
- Lowering the flashing "bus coming" sign to be adjacent to "no right turn on red"
- 24-inch "Look Both Ways" pedestrian warning signs
- "Keep Clear" pavement markings at intersections
- Strobe lights on buses to increase visibility; and
- Photo enforcement cameras to deter red-light runners.<sup>79</sup>

<sup>77</sup> [http://www.sfmta.com/cms/raccess/MuniAccessGuide8NewProjects.htm#\\_Geary\\_Corridor\\_Bus](http://www.sfmta.com/cms/raccess/MuniAccessGuide8NewProjects.htm#_Geary_Corridor_Bus)

<sup>78</sup> [http://www.sfmta.com/cms/raccess/MuniAccessGuide8NewProjects.htm#\\_Geary\\_Corridor\\_Bus](http://www.sfmta.com/cms/raccess/MuniAccessGuide8NewProjects.htm#_Geary_Corridor_Bus)

<sup>79</sup> [http://www.gobrt.org/Orange\\_Line\\_Preliminary\\_Evaluation\\_by\\_BTI.pdf](http://www.gobrt.org/Orange_Line_Preliminary_Evaluation_by_BTI.pdf)

The Orange Line shows that care must be taken when designing at-grade busways that intersect with busy arterial streets. Planners should anticipate that car drivers will enter the busway unintentionally. Safety measures can increase travel time, therefore agencies should consider grade separation at busy intersections. Specifications must ensure long-term pavement integrity.<sup>80</sup>

**BRT Funding**

Funding varies for specific BRT projects. Capital-intensive BRT projects fall under the category of “New Starts” in SAFETEA-LU. This law authorized funding for Fiscal Years (FY) 2005 through 2009 (with extensions continuing it through today) and is a primary source of federal funds for BRT projects. The Act also has a provision for “Small Starts,” where the total project cost

<b>Table 3: Committee Funding for No-Build Alternative (Rapid Bus and Build Alternatives)</b>	
Funding Source	Amount (\$2005 in millions)
Regional Measure 2 (Bridge Tolls)	\$65.00
Alameda County Measure B (Sales Tax)	\$20.23
CMA TIP	\$9.39
Federal Grant	\$2.73
Federal STIP	\$2.70
SAFETEA-LU	\$2.00
Total:	\$102.05
Source: AC Transit, 2006	

is under \$250 million and the federal share would be below \$75 million. To be eligible for such funding, the BRT must be a fixed guide way project defined in SAFETEA-LU as: “a substantial portion of the project operates in a separate right-of-way dedicated for public transit use during peak hour operations.”<sup>81</sup> It is noteworthy that the definition of what is meant by “substantial” remains to be determined by the FTA. A project without any exclusive bus lane operations might be eligible for New Starts and Small Starts funding if project expenditures represent a substantial investment in a defined corridor as demonstrated by various features.<sup>82</sup>

Local transit agencies have highlighted various funding strategies to support the development and implementation of BRT. One example is from East Bay Bus Rapid Transit Project. In the table (top right), it depicts committed funding from a variety of programs, including toll increases on bridges in the San Francisco Bay Area.<sup>83</sup>

BRT offers an opportunity to create a fast and relatively inexpensive system upgrade to attract riders who might not otherwise take transit. Because BRT is a flexible, relatively easily implemented system, transit agencies and transit operators have been willing to think creatively about how to use it within their service areas, choosing aspects that are most locally appropriate and experimenting with different elements to best fit their community’s transit needs. Planners are analyzing implemented BRT lines to develop best practices and assist developing future BRTs throughout the State.<sup>84</sup> Funding varies for each project and local agencies have become creative when it comes to initial BRT studies, acquisition of right of way, and plan implementation. A key advantage of BRT is that the infrastructure and service can be implemented in phases over time, with full BRT service as the long-range goal. Therein lies the challenge: developing a BRT system at low cost that provides sufficient quality of service to achieve BRT objectives. While full BRT may not be feasible in every case, a certain minimum number of features must be present in order to achieve the higher quality of service envisioned with BRT. In practice, each BRT

<sup>80</sup> [http://www.gobrt.org/Orange\\_Line\\_Preliminary\\_Evaluation\\_by\\_BTI.pdf](http://www.gobrt.org/Orange_Line_Preliminary_Evaluation_by_BTI.pdf)  
<sup>81</sup> [http://www.fta.dot.gov/planning/newstarts/planning\\_environment\\_2608.html](http://www.fta.dot.gov/planning/newstarts/planning_environment_2608.html)  
<sup>82</sup> <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/Docs-Pdfs/BRT/BRT-Handbook-030706.pdf>  
<sup>83</sup> [http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/uploadedFiles/Planning\\_and\\_Development/Level\\_3\\_-\\_Commissions/9-24-08\\_Item%2010\\_BRT%20attach%204\\_Transit%20funding.pdf](http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/uploadedFiles/Planning_and_Development/Level_3_-_Commissions/9-24-08_Item%2010_BRT%20attach%204_Transit%20funding.pdf)  
<sup>84</sup> [http://www.fta.dot.gov/assistance/research/research\\_7978.html](http://www.fta.dot.gov/assistance/research/research_7978.html)

project will vary from others and be designed around the physical characteristics offered by the specific corridor available funding sources.

### **Shuttles and Vanpools**

Shuttles and vanpools can extend the reach of transit, in part by filling in service gaps and complement larger transportation networks with services to smaller areas. Shuttles are flexible in costs, route planning, service provision, and operation, and they can be used for employment transportation, neighborhood access, and travel to specific recreational destinations. The range of possibilities for shuttle use also brings opportunities for cooperation among agencies, businesses, and employers for transportation provision. Vanpool services can range from ride-matching, to incentives for sharing a ride to work, to operation of regional van or car services.

#### *Shuttles*

Shuttles offer flexibility for smaller groups without having to implement a large transportation network or system. Shuttle services may provide direct trips to selected locations, such as airports, colleges, and employment centers. The Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District, for example, operates two lines of airport shuttles called SuperRide and Santa Barbara Airbus. Shuttles may also serve smaller communities with a loyal or captive ridership base. Santa Barbara MTD operates UCSB and City College shuttles that serve students in and around college campuses. Shuttles may serve highly specialized events – for example, Westlink’s 49ers Express Shuttle that takes fans to football games – or locations, such as Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s (VTA) eight shuttle routes to and from Great America Amusement Park. They are usually implemented to serve specific needs of certain groups, centers, or communities.

For instance, VTA’s Downtown Area Shuttle Service began as a small downtown circulator for San Jose and now serves many communities with large numbers of residents who commute into the downtown regions. The VTA’s 2007 Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA), a system-wide review of all VTA bus services, investigated market opportunities to expand the program into other areas. Eleven community bus routes were implemented in January 2008 as recommended by the COA. VTA’s Community Bus (shuttle) service is planned to meet the needs of individual communities and neighborhoods, improve general circulation within a local area, and provide access to arterial bus routes, light rail or transit centers. Community Bus service is typically deployed in lower-density residential developments or central business districts, with the intent of providing connections amongst housing, schools, shopping malls, employment centers, and recreational areas. It is provided in areas not physically conducive to operating standard bus service or exhibiting higher ridership demand.<sup>85</sup>

Shuttles can also provide “last-mile” service to carry passengers to their destinations from transit hubs and stations. Their specialized nature allows them to extend service at a lower cost and with greater flexibility than larger transportation systems. The Altamont Commuter Express (ACE) relies on its ACE Express Shuttle to bring 1,300 passengers every weekday from the ACE train stations to their destinations. Caltrain provides shuttle service to employment sites in San Mateo and Santa Clara, operating 31 weekday commute shuttles and one weekend shuttle serving 5,000 riders per weekday.

Many shuttles run only during peak commute hours. The Santa Clara VTA shuttle carries passengers from light rail stations to employment from 6 am and 9 am and back again from 3 pm and 6 pm., in coordination with other local transit agencies. VTA’s DASH connects all-day to rail (ACE, Caltrain, and

---

<sup>85</sup> Fleet Management Plan, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (Page B-15), Feb 2010.

VTA light rail), carrying 700 passengers daily to employment and schools in downtown San Jose. Large transit networks either operate their own shuttles or contract out.

Congestion reduction is an important contribution of shuttles, aiding traffic mitigation measures via cooperation between transit agencies and cities. The Santa Barbara MTD entered into an agreement with the City of Santa Barbara to operate shuttles in busy corridors. The Downtown-Waterfront Shuttle and the Seaside Shuttle offer subsidized fares at \$0.25 per ride. “Wharf Woody” offers free rides to the beach. The following are other examples of agencies that support shuttle services: transit agencies that want to extend



service coverage, planning organizations that want to decrease congestion, environmental quality agencies that want to decrease carbon emissions, and employers who want to provide a transportation option for employees. For instance, Caltrain operates shuttles in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties funded by a combination of Caltrain Joint Powers Board local funds, employers, and regional grant funds from the Transportation Fund for Clean Air administered by Santa Clara VTA. The City of San Jose pays \$1.2 million a year toward operating the Free Airport Flyer, to the airport, light rail, and ACE and Caltrain.

Google Shuttle Photo by Randi Beach, The New York Times

The flexibility of shuttles for a variety of trip purposes makes them relatively easy to implement and operate. Employers benefit from reliable transportation for their employees, cities may see reductions in the number of vehicles on the road, and riders can more easily get to their destinations. A great example of employment generated shuttle services is that provided by Google, shuttling more than 1,200 employees daily to and from its headquarters on 32 free shuttles with comfortable leather seats and wireless internet. Bicycles are allowed on exterior racks, dogs on forward seats, or on their owners’ laps on full shuttles. Google shuttles log 132 trips daily to 40 locations in a dozen cities in six San Francisco Bay Area counties, some 4,400 miles. Morning service starts at 5:05 a.m., with the last pickup at 10:40 a.m. Evening service runs from 3:40 p.m. to 10:05 p.m., with pickups as often as every 15 minutes.<sup>86</sup>

### *Vanpools*

Vanpools are another convenient and efficient alternative commute mode, providing benefits to riders such as reduced commute expenses, convenient transportation without having to drive, and the use of carpool lanes for speedier commutes. Vanpools are encouraged as a way to save energy, cut down on emissions, and lessen congestion, and they are embraced by air quality agencies as well as regional traffic management agencies.

Long-distance commuters share vanpool driving with others going a similar distance on the same schedule. Some Vanpools register with the local metropolitan planning organization to get ride-matching and funding, and carry 7 to 15 passengers. Individual riders usually form vanpools, although

<sup>86</sup> <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/03/10/technology/10google.html> accessed on March 18, 2011

sometimes employers do. In San Luis Obispo County, the Transportation Management Association RideOn program provides the van, insurance, maintenance, fuel, registration, and carwash for a monthly fee shared by the passengers. The driver picks up the other passengers on the way to his or her job and thus is allowed to ride free.

In other areas, agency roles are limited to providing ride-matching services and help vanpools form. In the San Francisco Bay Area, 511.org lists vanpools with available seats, with tips on how to start (leasing a van, costs, incentives such as free tolls and low-cost parking), vanpool consultants, and ride matching to recruit new riders and keep vans full. San Diego's RideLink offers ride matching and subsidizes van leasing by \$400 per month using Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement funds. In San Diego, the driver negotiates the lease (including maintenance and insurance) and passengers split the cost of fuel.

Vanpools and shuttles could also support specialized populations such as disabled, seniors, lower income, or occupation specific travelers. For example, CalVans Joint Powers Association is a statewide commuter and farmworker vanpool agency being piloted in 2010 and officially forming in 2011 between the councils of governments in Kings, Madera, Fresno, Tulare, Monterey, San Benito, Santa Cruz, Sacramento, Yolo, Yuba, and Sutter Counties. The CalVans JPA was made to create, fund, operate and otherwise manage public transportation projects and programs aimed at providing qualified agricultural workers with safe affordable vehicles they could use to drive themselves and others to work. CalVans operates as a Public Transit Agency and is a restructuring of a very successful vanpool program currently operated by Kings Area Rural Transit Agency, (KART). In 2001, KART initiated its vanpool program with several vanpools transporting workers to prison facilities in Corcoran and Avenal. The vanpool expanded in 2002 with the funding for the Agricultural Industries Transportation Services (AITS) project. The number of farm workers vanpools varies between 80 and 140 vans throughout the agricultural season.

Shuttles and vanpools are flexible, low-cost alternatives to regular fixed-route services. They are used in California for a wide variety of purposes: commuter services delivering employees to specific work sites; free downtown or shopping-area circulators paid for by local merchants; feeder routes for rail services; campus-area loops serving students and local colleges; and transportation to special events or special locations. Each example includes services operated by transit agencies as well as other companies or organizations on contract to agencies, employers or merchants. With available funding and demand, shuttles and vanpools provide the opportunity for California residents to utilize flexible route services, while providing sustainable alternatives to driving alone.

## **Bicycles and Pedestrians**

The Short Range Transit Plans reviewed for this report identify how transit agencies recognize the need to provide access to vehicles, transit stations, and transit stops. Several agencies state a goal of "encouraging alternatives to driving" in their Short Range Transit Plans; alternatives can include not only transit, but also non-motorized modes such as walking and bicycling. Moreover, pedestrians and cyclists have been far less formally organized into economic and political interest groups than automobile and transit interests. As a result, the needs of pedestrians and cyclists have often been neglected in planning and designing the built environment, including the development of new transit systems and services.<sup>87</sup>

### *Pedestrians*

Transit passengers are always pedestrians before and after leaving the transit system. Wide streets with heavy or high-speed traffic, lacking signals and crosswalks, and bus stops that do not include seating or

---

<sup>87</sup> [http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped\\_bike/docs/case9.pdf](http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/ped_bike/docs/case9.pdf)

weather protection can negatively affect the pedestrian experience for transit users and discourage people from choosing to take public transit. Short-range transit plans aim to improve the pedestrian link to transit, but transit agencies must cooperate with cities and counties responsible for local streets.

Transit agencies treat access of disabled and senior pedestrians to transit – especially in suburban and rural areas in their “coordinated plans” under the Americans with Disabilities Act – with synchronized crossing signals (especially at multi-lane intersections) and improved crossings, sidewalks, and bus stops. Some rural areas lack sidewalks, and some bus stops disembark passengers onto shoulders, which can be especially perilous for transit users with impaired mobility.

The San Francisco Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Commission recommends developing city-based pedestrian plans (such as Oakland’s, with 148,000 daily pedestrian trips to and from AC Transit), since cities and counties are responsible for pedestrian improvements. Oakland’s pedestrian plan provided much-needed data about how pedestrians access transit, and it helped Oakland develop policies and design guidelines to better accommodate pedestrians. Another kind of effort is a planning document like AC Transit’s “Designing with Transit,” a “handbook for elected officials, local staff, and other community builders” that includes guidelines for pedestrian design around bus stops.<sup>88</sup>

AC Transit’s Designing with Transit outlined several walking policies and best practices to highlight how to improve pedestrian access and the quality of non-motorized modes of transportation. Oakland is one of the first cities in the country to develop a plan to support pedestrian travel. Oakland’s plan sets goals to increase walking, to provide guidance on key pedestrian issues and to support the Mayor’s goal of having walking trips replace auto trips. The plan identifies existing policies that support pedestrians in Oakland, and provides specific guidelines on how to implement these goals.<sup>89</sup> The goals include:

- Goal 1: Pedestrian Safety – Create a street environment that strives to ensure pedestrian safety;
- Goal 2: Pedestrian Access – Develop an environment throughout the city, prioritizing routes to school and transit, that enables pedestrians to travel safely and freely;
- Goal 3: Streetscaping and Land Use – Provide pedestrian amenities and promote land uses that enhance public spaces and neighborhood commercial districts.

### *Bicycles*

Transit and bicycles are sometimes competing modes, especially where climate and topography better suit cycling. Bicycles also complement buses and trains, providing the critical “last mile” connection. Buses assist cyclists in hilly areas, or in inclement weather, and both bus and rail extend the reach of bicycle trips. Accommodating bikes can increase the numbers of potential riders on a transit system by increasing the passenger “catchment area”: A traveler can cover a greater distance on bike than foot in a given period.

Many California transit agencies allow bikes to be taken onboard buses and trains, using bike racks on buses and bike cars on trains. Where space on trains is given over to cyclists, they typically share it with people traveling with strollers and wheelchairs. Agencies often restrict bring bikes on trains during peak hours in order to accommodate the maximum number of standing room riders. In some cases, rail agencies have the flexibility to add capacity by putting more trains into service; for example, Caltrain has added special bike cars to some of its trains in an effort to increase bike capacity. Additionally, Los

---

<sup>88</sup> <http://www.actransit.org/planning-focus/reports/323-2/> (Accessed on March 21, 2011)

<sup>89</sup> <http://www.actransit.org/planning-focus/reports/323-2/> (Accessed on March 18, 2011)


Angeles County Metro lifted its peak-hour bike restrictions in 2011 and has removed seats on some train cars to accommodate bikes and other bulky items.<sup>90</sup>

Buses are generally limited to two or three bikes on folding racks mounted to the vehicle's front. These capacity limits can discourage riders, especially if service is infrequent and an already full rack can mean a long wait for the next bus. The city of Davis' bus agency, Unitrans, contemplated this issue early on when it considered adding bike racks to its buses. The agency realized that, with the very high bicycle use throughout the city, any bike racks it provided were likely to be usually filled, and potential users would not be able to count on finding an open rack space. For that reason, Unitrans, in bicycle-friendly Davis, has not provided bike racks on its buses, as they are likely to be always filled, and therefore likely to disappoint most who would attempt to use the them.

Transit agencies cannot provide bicycle lanes or on-street bike racks, but they do advocate for them. Despite the jurisdictional constraint, AC Transit is developing a bicycle parking plan for its bus stops. Rail and bus agencies provide bike parking on their property, as in the "Bike Station," at rail stops in Long Beach, Berkeley, San Francisco, Palo Alto, and Covina. Bike stations can be run by private and nonprofit groups, and can provide secure bike parking, sales and service, showers and lockers, and bike rentals. Bike sharing is also one way around the problem of capacity on transit. Cyclist can park a bike at one end of a transit trip and pick up another at the other end. Bike-share systems have succeeded in extending transit's reach in Paris and Barcelona, and one has recently begun in Washington, D.C. The Long Beach bike station began offering bike sharing to city employees in 2008.

Another issue faced by transit agencies is bicycles and buses sharing road space. Providing separate on-street bike lanes is not always politically feasible. As well, bikes and buses will often leapfrog one another – i.e. a cyclist will pass a stopped bus, only to be passed again by the bus as it re-enters the travel lane – creating additional risk of a collision and anxiety for the bicyclists and bus driver. The Chicago Bicycle Program created a training video to train bus drivers and cyclists on safe ways to share the road. The video has received positive attention in part because it speaks to both groups; neither drivers nor bicyclists get the message that they are the ones who must change their behavior unilaterally.

Public information about bike access is also important; while most transit agencies accommodate bikes, it is not always clear from their websites and using a bus bike rack requires instruction (some agencies forbid drivers from assisting). Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's "Pocket Riders Guide" shows how to use bike racks, with notes on proper helmet use and safety. San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit does not allow bicycles on escalators, so riders must locate and use elevators that are not always clearly marked, or



<sup>90</sup> <http://thesource.metro.net/2011/04/28/metro-board-lifts-peak-hour-bike-restriction-on-metro-rail-board-takes-action-on-other-key-issues/>

else carry bikes up and down long, crowded staircases.

Providing a high-quality experience for transit riders who access stations on foot or bicycle has the potential of increasing ridership. Cities can provide safer access to transit locations by improving streetscapes with functioning sidewalks and bike paths. In addition, transit agencies can work with local jurisdictions to maintain areas around transit locations to ensure pedestrians and cyclists are well accommodated.

## Park and Ride

Transit agencies and private companies operate park-and-ride lots to connect commuters to buses, carpools, light rail, and commuter rail, thus facilitating public transportation use and carpooling. According to the California BusPool project, about 27 percent of Caltrans park-and-ride lot users connected to a bus. The majority of the remaining users joined a carpool or vanpool (See Figure 6-4).<sup>91</sup>



Park-and-ride lots play an important role in bringing in riders. For example, Golden Empire Transit in Bakersfield is building park-and-ride lots to expand access to express bus service. Foothill Transit and Fresno Area Express (FAX) use park-and-ride lots to increase ridership and decrease downtown congestion. AC Transit uses park-and-ride as a collector for suburban bus service, coordinating schedules of buses with park-and-ride that include amenities such as bike lockers, shelters, and increased lighting.

Most agencies offer free parking to encourage transit use and carpooling, while others charge parking fees to help fund park-and-ride services and regulate demand at busy lots. Most funding for park-and-ride comes from federal and local sources. Large transit agencies often have partial control over park-and-ride facilities, entering into agreements with other entities. Sacramento Regional Transit (RT) operates a portion of its Blue Line light rail system within the Interstate 80 right-of-way, with stations and parking at Watt/I-80, Watt/I-80 West, and Roseville Road stations, with the consent of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). In 2009, Caltrans agreed to allow RT to begin charging Park-Pay-and-Ride users \$1 per day or \$15 for a monthly pass.<sup>92</sup>

The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) operates 31 park-and-ride lots, 23 owned by VTA and eight shared with cities and shopping centers. VTA's website offers an interactive map that highlights the various park-and-ride lots.<sup>93</sup> The Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District (GGBHTD), serving commuters between San

### Lot Usage and Travel Characteristics

- Nearly three-quarters (73%) of respondents drove 10 miles or less from their home to a P&R lot. Within this group the average driving distance was 8 miles.
- The vast majority of respondents (83%) indicated that their travel time from home to a P&R lot was less than 20 minutes. Just over one-third (34%) said it took them less than 10 minutes.
- The distribution was fairly even between those who used a carpool (26%), rode a bus (27%) or used a vanpool (36%).
- The average distance from the P&R lot to the final destination was 37 miles. Nearly a third (30%) said the distance traveled was more than 46 miles.
- The average travel time from a P&R lot to the final destination was 48 minutes. Nearly one-third (31%) of respondents indicated that it takes them over one hour.
- 35% of respondents have been using a lot for more than 3 years. Another one-third (31%) can be considered "newbies" who have been using a lot for less than a year.
- Most respondents learned about their P&R lot either from co-workers/family/friends (31%), seeing the lot while driving (29%), or their employer (15%).
- Exactly one-third (33%) said they have used another P&R lot within their region.

<sup>91</sup> [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/systemops/buspool/CALTRANS\\_buspool\\_final\\_report\\_COMPLETE.pdf](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/systemops/buspool/CALTRANS_buspool_final_report_COMPLETE.pdf)

<sup>92</sup> <http://www.sacrt.com/PP&R.stm>

<sup>93</sup> [http://www.vta.org/services/park\\_ride.html](http://www.vta.org/services/park_ride.html)

Francisco and Sonoma and Marin Counties, owns two park-and-ride lots and uses twelve park-and-ride lots in other jurisdictions.

### Challenges and Opportunities

Park-and-ride potential varies by region. A Caltrans survey found that 90 percent of park-and-ride users are commuting to and from work, but the utilization of park-and-ride lots vary. Many Caltrans lots fill to capacity and lead to cars spilling into surrounding areas, while other lots sit only half-full. In some regions, long distances, travel time, and convenience favor the automobile, transit is inadequate, and no high-occupancy lanes exist to encourage carpooling. In these instances, a park-and-ride lot may wind up underused. Tri Delta (Eastern Contra Costa Transit) discovered a major problem with a newly constructed park-and-ride facility a few miles away from a BART station.<sup>94</sup> The distance between the two facilities was too short – and the transit connection too infrequent – to entice drivers to use the park-and-ride instead of driving directly to the BART station. Other factors affecting the utilization of park-and-ride facilities include the quality of a given park-and-ride facility and its ease of use, as can the perceived security of the lot.

Ultimately, transit agencies consider park-and-ride essential, but not ideal. A California Bus Pool survey (See Table Above)<sup>95</sup> found that one-third park-and-ride users drive only 10 minutes to reach them, and most drive no more than 20. Because emissions from cold starts are high, short car trips to reach transit are particularly inefficient.<sup>96</sup> Lots with impervious surfaces can also cause polluted water runoff issues and raise air temperature, due to the heat trapping effects of asphalt. Additionally, surface parking lots may preclude using available land to build transit-oriented development. Conversely, a transit agency can use parking lots as a form of land banking – putting land to good use until a future development necessitates its conversion to a more productive purpose. Ultimately, park-and-rides can provide important connections between commuters and public transportation and carpooling, closing service gaps between transit stations and homes.

### Transit-Oriented Development

Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) is moderate to high-density development (either new construction or redevelopment) within an easy walk of a major transit stop, with a mix of residences, employment, and shops. In California, thirteen agencies discuss TOD in their short-range transit plans: BART, Caltrain, LACMTA, SacRT, SamTrans, Omnitrans, Santa Monica Big Blue Bus, Fresno Area Express, LAVTA, OCTA, WestCAT, Santa Clara Valley Transit Authority (VTA), and SF MUNI.

Transit-oriented development creates opportunities for integrated and cooperative development arrangements that better connect land use and transportation. When successfully implemented, TOD projects can allow regions to grow while minimizing the amount of vehicle miles traveled that are added. At the same time, it increases the housing options for those who cannot drive or do not want to own one or more cars. Transit operators can greatly benefit from the development of housing and employment close to their service networks. A survey cosponsored by the Silicon Valley Manufacturing Group and Santa Clara Valley Transit Authority (VTA) revealed that people who live near rail stations use bus and rail transit five times more often than the average person in the county.<sup>97</sup>

<sup>94</sup> [http://trideltatransit.com/park\\_ride.aspx](http://trideltatransit.com/park_ride.aspx)

<sup>95</sup> [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/systemops/buspool/CALTRANS\\_buspool\\_final\\_report\\_COMPLETE.pdf](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/systemops/buspool/CALTRANS_buspool_final_report_COMPLETE.pdf)

<sup>96</sup> <http://www.bikeleague.org/resources/why/environment.php>

<sup>97</sup> <http://www.vta.org/projects/tod.html>

Housing, employment, and transportation investors are shifting attention to small, walkable urban neighborhoods. The Center for Transit Oriented Development estimates that a quarter of new households in the United States will seek housing within a half-mile of a fixed-guided way transit station, double what is now available.<sup>98</sup> TOD also provides an opportunity to address accessibility issues of low-income individuals by providing opportunities to include affordable housing and services, which can simplify trip making for transit-dependent individuals.

TOD locations affect whether land use areas are devoted to residential versus commercial use. Caltrans' California Transit-Oriented Development Database compared land use at 12 urban and nine suburban stations. At urban rail stations, 31% of the TOD land use area is residential, while commercial footage averages about 50% percent. For TODs in suburban settings, this relationship is reversed: average land use among nine areas studied is 65% residential and 22% commercial.<sup>99</sup>

Most TOD projects in California are near rail stations because their permanence can ensure long-term transit access for residents and employers. Transit-oriented development in cities often attracts high-value projects. A mix of residential, commercial, and recreational space and walkable destinations raises the image and value of a redeveloped area. The Fourth Street MUNI light rail station in San Francisco is central to the Mission Bay Redevelopment Area, with 6,000 residential units along the historic waterfront, with retail, parks, and a research center. Fruitvale Village (next to BART) in Oakland is often used as a template for successful TOD. Built next to the Fruitvale BART station, it includes retail, office, and market rate and affordable housing. In San Diego, the Rio Vista light rail station is surrounded by new retail and housing within a quarter mile.



Fruitvale Village TOD development, Oakland, CA

BART Station Area Planning Policy promotes community partnerships for planning, access, and function, and advocates for transit at all government levels. BART planned the Fruitvale Transit Village with the city, to revitalize a low-income, inner-city area with a mix of housing and retail. BART's Development Policy Review Panel expressed a need to examine new development practices to maximize the use of land rather than follow prevailing development practices.

TOD requires local government commitment and must be allowable under existing community planning policies. San Mateo County's Transit-Oriented Development Opportunity Study helped SamTrans assess TOD opportunities within a half-mile of rail stations. The study concluded that reducing on-site parking encouraged projects that would not have been economically feasible with typical parking requirements. Cities can proactively support TOD through zoning changes, station planning, and cooperation with developers.

While many TODs focus on rail, buses also can support TOD it provides high quality transit service. Uptown District in San Diego is an example of a pedestrian-oriented retail and residential center served by several bus connections. In Los Angeles, 16 percent of TOD residents commute almost exclusively by buses. Suburban TODs are also more likely to be served by buses because those regions often lack the density that usually justifies an investment in rail transit.

<sup>98</sup> <http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/public/tod>

<sup>99</sup> <http://transitorienteddevelopment.dot.ca.gov/station/NewCompareGraph.jsp>

Transit-oriented development requires close cooperation among transit agencies, the government and developers. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's Smart Growth Partnership joins public and private leaders to promote TOD near rail and bus stations. The Livermore Amador Valley Transportation Authority's short-range transit plan advocates municipal "priority development areas" near rail and bus lines, to facilitate TOD. Santa Clara Valley Transit Authority (VTA) has joined with local government to promote TOD and prove TOD expertise. Several cities have amended their zoning codes and regulations to include provisions for transit supportive land uses at existing and planned rail stations. VTA provides expertise and resources on how to achieve transit friendly development. The expected results of these planning efforts are better communities that offer people a variety of transportation choices – beyond the oversupply of auto-dependent household.<sup>100</sup>

VTA's joint development projects are models for the type of development that promotes transit and pedestrian use. Located on VTA-owned land, they allow residents and employees easy access to transit. Several projects that have increased transit ridership, generated revenue, and improved neighborhoods include: Tamien Child Care Center, Almaden Lake Village Housing, and Ohlone-Chynoweth Mixed-Use Project. These projects are described in further detail in their respective TOD Program fact sheets, available from VTA's Planning Department.<sup>101</sup>

High-density infill development or redevelopment around transit stations creates opportunities for efficient use of space. Since the passage of Assembly Bill 32 and Senate Bill 375, cities are now obligated to utilize TOD to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by bringing people to transit. Planning for TOD must come early in the planning process, to ensure that land use and transportation planning are well integrated. The need to accommodate multiple transit systems may motivate cities to develop specific station area plans. For example, the development of a TOD at the Waterfront District in the City of Hercules incorporates a ferry station, a Capitol Corridor Amtrak station, and local and express bus service.

## Conclusion

This chapter details some of the transit infrastructure that is increasing nontraditional fixed route transit trips, such as park-and-ride and transit-oriented development. Bus Rapid Transit is becoming a popular transit mode throughout California in the state's larger urban areas. BRT in its fully realized form can provide light rail-like service at a far lower cost, while more modest improvements to traditional bus routes can boost ridership. Transit agencies are making BRT safer through signage, signals, and grade separation. Shuttles and vanpools are bridging service gaps left by fixed-route service – whether they are sponsored by transit agencies, employers, health service agencies, non-profits, or private companies. By having an array of providers, specific transit needs are met without the total cost burdening the local transit agency.

All transit users start as a pedestrian or cyclist, yet the latter are categorically underrepresented transportation planning. Transit agencies and local jurisdictions are beginning to provide better access to stations and stops, with safer paths, bike lanes, shelters with lighting and benches, and bus racks and trailers, to increase transit ridership. Park-and-ride and transit-oriented development, supported by transit agencies, cities and counties, developers, and Caltrans, shorten the distances to transit from home, shopping, and employment, and reduce congestion, grow transit ridership, and lower greenhouse gas emissions. These different transit modes and support systems have one thing in common: in order

---

<sup>100</sup> <http://www.vta.org/projects/tod.html>

<sup>101</sup> <http://www.vta.org/projects/tod.html>

to improve the overall transit system, all stakeholders involved must coordinate their planning and implementation early and often.

DRAFT

## Performance Measures

Performance measures are targets by which transit agencies judge the effectiveness of operations, financial management, and customer satisfaction. Internal evaluations and external surveys allow agencies to establish guidelines for setting performance goals.

### Common Performance Measures

#### *On-time Performance*

On-time performance is frequently defined as arriving less than five minutes behind schedule and departing less than one minute ahead of schedule, or never departing early at all. Most transit agencies aim for 90 to 95 percent on-time performance.

#### *Farebox Recovery*

Farebox recovery is the ratio of fare revenue generated through fares by its paying customers to operating expenses. In general, California transit agencies must maintain a farebox recovery of 20 percent to receive Transportation Development Act funds (from 0.25 percent of the State sales tax). Farebox recovery targets vary among transit agencies: Fresno Area Express, 28 percent; Foothill Transit, 26.33 percent; Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District, 40 percent. Other transit agencies set a lower target due to their service area's population or physical characteristics. Napa County Transportation and Planning Authority had difficulty achieving a 20 percent recovery ratio because it services a wide area with varying transportation needs, and so lowered its recovery target to 17 percent (San Francisco Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Commission's standard for mixed suburban and intercity rural service).

Farebox recovery ratio targets vary according to type of service, the characteristics of the ridership, and funding. Amador Valley Transit sets a 90 percent recovery rate on certain lines. Some transit agencies only operate certain services if they can achieve steady farebox recovery with minimal investment. Transit agencies also understand that passengers are willing to pay a higher price for services such as fast commuter routes, so they charge a higher fare. Santa Clarita Transit has set a higher farebox recovery ratio for commuter service (30 to 35 percent) than for other fixed-route service (20 percent).

Transit agencies count average boardings per day, week, or month to compare short-term ridership to long-term trends and goals. Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority uses passenger boardings to identify underperforming services. The primary standard for buses is boardings per revenue hour, the secondary standard, daily boardings per station. Bus routes falling short of standards and that still have not met that minimum after restructuring and operation refinement may be discontinued. For rail services, that may mean that underperforming stations may be closed. Passenger boardings measure service efficiency, and vary among transit agencies due to the different populations and areas served.

#### *Transit Agency Specific Performance Measures*

Transit agency performance standards (e.g., boardings per revenue hour and passengers per revenue mile) vary according to service area and population (see Table 4: Common Performance Measures). Transit agencies with a dense population of the transit-dependent naturally attract more passengers than transit agencies with a thinly populated service area with few routes. Thus, transit agencies develop their own standards that are unique to their own operation. For example, analyzing revenue miles between road or service calls (i.e., bus breakdowns) range from 4,000 (San Luis Obispo Transit) to 9,000 (Santa Rosa CityBus). Service and safety standards also vary among transit agencies; revenue miles between preventable accidents range from 70,000 (San Luis Obispo Transit) to 400,000 (Golden Gate

Bridge, Highway and Transportation District). BART’s Quarterly Performance Report measure the achievement of specific goals based on benchmark standards in the areas of customer experience, transit travel demand, physical infrastructure, and financial health. Customer surveys also influence standards: BART evaluates services every two years through a passenger survey conducted by an independent research firm.

*Review Procedures*

Despite varying approaches to route evaluation and indicators, most transit agencies follow similar steps in reviewing service, acquiring information for indicators, measuring against standards, and taking corrective action. Exceptions can be made to underperforming routes if the route fills a specific need, which may be evaluated by the number of route-dependent riders served, the value of the route to the community, and level of subsidy from outside sources.

**Conclusion**

Performance measures enable evaluation of the operating efficiency of transit agencies. Transit agencies use many performance measures, such as farebox recovery, are commonly used, but other, qualitative performance measures, such as mode choice, are unique, shaped by a transit agency’s service area and population. Some standards, such as farebox recovery ratios, are relatively easily carried over from agency to agency. Other standards are more difficult to translate due to distinctive service areas, both in quantifiable terms—for example, population size and density—and in qualitative terms, such as mode choice. It is difficult to set uniform standards for all transit agencies, but adopting common performance measures allow transit agencies to evaluate their transit operations.

**Table 4 : Common Performance Measures**

## Specialized Transit

Transportation for people with disabilities, elderly, and low-income travelers varies throughout California. Providers include transit agencies, social services from cities and counties, senior centers, faith-based organizations, independent living centers, health care centers, and for-profit paratransit companies. The types and purposes of trips taken by people with disabilities, elderly, and low-income travelers vary and are not easily categorized. Because of this, transportation for these groups is most easily served with a flexible plan. Fixed-route public transit in some areas may not be a viable option to serve the special needs of low mobility population segments. For example, in rural areas where there are limited or no fixed-route services, demand response is a lifeline for elderly and people with disabilities who would otherwise be without transportation. As a result, State and Federal legislation has been created to provide and support specialized transit services for the most at-need segment of the population.

### *Consolidated Transportation Services Agencies*

Assembly Bill 120 (1979), the Social Services Transportation Improvement Act, called for a consolidated transportation service agency (CTSA) in each county, to foster coordination among providers of transportation to groups lacking mobility, lower insurance costs, and make better use of vehicles and funding.<sup>102 103</sup> No funds are committed to carry out AB 120; transit agencies coordinate transportation resources and the role of the many CTSA varies.

Regional transportation planning agencies and metropolitan planning agencies have set up CTSA in 55 counties, See Table 5: Consolidated transportation Service Agencies.

---

<sup>102</sup> [http://www.asila.org/other\\_mobility\\_resources/ctsa.html](http://www.asila.org/other_mobility_resources/ctsa.html) (Accessed on March 1, 2011)

<sup>103</sup> <http://www.calact.org/doc.aspx?17> (Accessed on March 2, 2011)

California Department of Transportation  
 Baselines: Current and Future Transit and Demographic Trends

<b>Table 5: Consolidated Transportation Service Agencies</b>			<i>Private Agency</i>	<i>County Agency</i>
Access Services, Inc	Madera County Transportation Commission	Full Access & Coordinated Transportation, Inc.		San Benito County Local Transportation Authority
Amador Regional Transit System (ARTS)	Mendocino Transit Authority	Fresno County EOC		Shasta Senior Nutrition Program, Inc.
Butte County	Merced County Transit	Fresno County Rural Transit Agency		Siskiyou County Transportation Commission
Coastside Opportunity Center, Inc.	Modoc Transportation Agency/ Sage Stage	Glenn County Transportation Commission		Sunline Transit Agency
Colusa County Transit Authority	Monterey-Salinas Transit	Gold Country Telecare, Inc.		Tehama County Transportation Commission
Community Bridges Lift Line	Napa County Transportation Planning Agency	Humboldt Community Access and Resource Center, Inc. (CTSA)		Transportation Agency for Monterey County
County of Nevada	North of the River Recreation and Park District	Imperial County Department of Public Works		Trinity County Transportation Commission
CTSA Placer (PRIDE Industries)	Orange County Transportation Authority	Indian Elders Council, Inc.		Tuolumne County Board of Supervisors
Del Norte Assoc. for Developmental Services	Paratransit, Inc.	Inyo County Board of Supervisors		Stanislaus Counsel of Governments
Easy Lift Transportation Inc., CTSA	Plumas County Transportation Commission	Inyo Mono Transit		United Cerebral Palsy of San Luis Obispo

Paratransit, Inc., serving the Sacramento area, was the first designated CTSA in California. Paratransit, Inc. works with social service agencies, such as United Cerebral Palsy, Asian Community Center (ACC), and Los Rios Community College District to increase transportation options for seniors, individuals with disabilities, and persons with low incomes.<sup>104</sup> Paratransit, Inc. offers the Vehicle Maintenance Partnership Program to local non-profit organizations. The ACC uses two vehicles, provided by Paratransit, Inc., and over 50 volunteer drivers to provide thousands of trips each year at a fraction of the cost of dial-a-ride services. Paratransit, Inc. also offers the Travel Training program. It is designed to teach individuals with disabilities, elderly, and low-income individuals how to use fixed route public transit rather than door-to-door services.<sup>105</sup> Currently, the following services are provided by transit agencies with the assistances of the CTSA:

- Fixed-Route: Bus and light rail, commute and reverse commute buses, and connector buses.
- Demand-Response: Dial-a-ride services for the elderly and disabled (and sometimes to the general public); Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) complementary paratransit service; daily service to senior centers; shared-ride transportation for seniors and the disabled (and sometimes for the general public) to medical appointments; ADA rural service (fixed-route service with deviations).
- Supplemental/Human Services Transportation: Senior Shuttle (with advance reservation to seniors for weekly grocery shopping, as well as monthly lunch outings); trips for cancer patients attending medical appointments; service to community centers, cultural events, classes, medical appointments, and adult day health centers; county veteran service offices for veterans to access medical appointments at Veterans Administration hospitals and clinics.<sup>106</sup>

### *Coordinated Services Plans*

Federal planning requirements established by the passage of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) requires the recipients of certain funding sources administered by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to certify that such funded projects are part of a coordinated plan. The requirements were established in an effort to coordinate services. Executive Order 13330 Human Services Transportation Coordination was signed to advance the coordination nationally. The human services transportation coordination provisions of SAFETEA-LU aim to improve transportation services for people with disabilities, older adults, and individuals with lower incomes by ensuring that communities coordinate transportation resources provided through multiple federal programs. Therefore, recipients of these grants must develop a Human Service Transportation Coordination Plans. These coordinated service plans must identify current transportation providers and services, discuss the transportation needs of the relevant target populations, identify strategies to address those needs, and establish implementation priorities among projects and activities.

### *Coordinated Services Plan Challenges*

Coordinating Human Service Transportation Coordination Services Plans is made challenging by a number of barriers, including a lack of a centralized service inventory: many agencies do not know with whom to coordinate. The specific Coordinated Services Plans reviewed for the purpose of this report (MPOs for Los Angeles, Orange County, San Diego, Sacramento, and the San Francisco Bay Area) all identified coordination of transportation services as key to improving efficiency and closing service gaps.

<sup>104</sup> <http://www.paratransit.org/php/ctsa.php> (Accessed on Feb. 28, 2011)

<sup>105</sup> <http://www.paratransit.org/php/ctsa.php> (Accessed on Feb. 28, 2011)

<sup>106</sup> *Mobility Action Plan (MAP) Phase 1 Implementation Study Final Report: Executive Summaries Public Transit-Human Services coordinated Transportation Plans, Volume 1 Large and Small Urban Counties*  
<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/DocsPdfs/CoordinatedPIng/smallnlargeurbanexecsummary043010.pdf>

Funding requirements that make coordination difficult were identified as a barrier to achieving this goal. Some requirements do not allow mixing of social service clients with other consumers. Agencies frequently operate on tight budgets and insufficient numbers of staff vehicles. Funding limitations can prevent coordination efforts, such as development of plans and programs, which would require extra time and resources. Other barriers identified in coordinated plans include: variations in consumer/client needs trip lengths; language barriers; liability insurance; service quality and timing; same-day trip requirements; training; and jurisdictional constraints, especially in large metro areas where people must cross city and county lines to reach their destinations. In addition, some entities say they are not interested in coordinating with other agencies.

At times, the human service and transit agency goals were found to conflict. From the Coordinated Services Plan of the Southern California Association of Governments:

For public transit, transportation services are its core business, around which significant infrastructure has been built. For human services agencies, transportation is a support service and often viewed as a distraction from the agencies' primary purpose.

From the San Francisco Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Coordinated Services Plan:

Coordination may require a larger effort than can be anticipated: "Perhaps the most important 'lesson learned' ... is that successful implementation of coordination strategies will require the joint cooperation and effort of multiple entities that may or may not have coordinated well in the past.

The Los Angeles Coordinated Services Plan ranked medical trips, same-day transportation, multiple-errand trips, and weekend and evening trips as its top five needs. Medical and same-day trips were the most important needs reported by participating agencies and more than half reported serving same-day trip needs. Non-emergency and inter-community medical trips were the most consistently difficult-to-serve trip type noted across all groups. This is in part due to MediCal reimbursement policy. This is particularly a problem in Los Angeles, where medical trips can be to distant regional facilities.

### **Federal Transit Agency Funding for Specialized Transit**

The major federal funding sources for specialized transit include the Elderly Individuals and Individuals with Disabilities (Section 5310), Section 5311, Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) (Section 5316) and New Freedom Programs (Section 5317). Successful applicants for these grants within California enter into a project agreement with Caltrans that stipulates the terms and conditions under which the equipment must be procured and operated.

#### *Section 5310*

Funds transportation for the elderly and disabled where public transit is unavailable, insufficient, or inappropriate, allowing for procurement of accessible vans and buses, communication equipment, and computer hardware and software.<sup>107</sup>

#### *Section 5311*

Funds public transportation and intercity bus projects in rural areas (with a population of under 50,000) for access to employment, education, health care, shopping and recreation. Projects primarily serve the elderly and disabled but also the general public.<sup>108</sup>

---

<sup>107</sup> <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/Docs-Pdfs/5311/5311-Handbook.pdf>

### *Section 5316 (JARC)*

Funds transportation from cities and rural areas to suburban employment.

### *Section 5317*

Funds transportation for the disabled seeking integration into the workforce, beyond requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act.<sup>109</sup>

### *Federal Funding Challenges*

These funding types are formula-based grants and subject to changes in the federal annual budget. It is therefore difficult to determine how much funding will be available year to year.<sup>110</sup> In addition, funding regulations that prevent combining transportation funds with human service agency funds can erect barriers to coordination. Most for these funds come with restrictions on their use and many can only be used for specific purposes. For example, JARC/New Freedom funds cannot be used to subsidize fares on existing fixed route or paratransit service. In California, MediCal funds cannot be used to purchase transit passes. Federal regulations allow the practice, which leaves agencies unable to provide transit vouchers to clients that they would otherwise serve. Elderly people who are unable to ride fixed-route buses and do not qualify as disabled under the Americans with Disabilities Act may have difficulty finding transportation for non-medical trips. The elderly often have difficulty in securing reliable transportation and navigating transit systems. The Sacramento Coordinated Services Plan, however, provides an example of successful coordination. It has programs that can fund transportation for the “transportation-disadvantaged,” including health, labor and training, development, and equity grants (See Appendix-SACOG Funding Sources).

The inability to combine funds also makes it difficult for providers to share resources and costs for equipment and operations. As such, many potential coordination efficiencies are lost. For example, vans used for job access may be underutilized at off-peak times. However, under funding rules, it may not be possible for them to be used by other kinds of trips or by other trip providers. Sharing resources could provide a large efficiency gain for transit operators. City-operated systems and public transit operators receive continuing, relatively stable funding from dedicated federal, state, and local transit sources. Human services agencies generally rely on private donations, general fund allocations, and special grants. Even considering the large cutbacks suffered by many transit agencies in recent years, public transit has a more reliable year-to-year budget than many human services agencies.

### **Summary**

Public transit has an important role to play in providing transportation for people with disabilities, the elderly, and low-income members of the community. However, these groups cannot always be efficiently and cost-effectively served by public transit. Two key recommendations arose from a review of some of the Coordinated Services Plans in California: establish a “mobility manager” based on geographic area to oversee coordination of programs and funding; and provide better coordination between land use development and transit agencies so that social service agencies, medical facilities, senior housing, and employment centers can be more easily accessed by transit.<sup>111</sup>

---

<sup>108</sup> <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/Docs-Pdfs/5311/5311-Handbook.pdf>

<sup>109</sup> <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/5310.html>

<sup>110</sup> <http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/C9070.1F.pdf>

<sup>111</sup> <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/DocsPdfs/CoordinatedPIng/smallnlargeurbanexecsummary043010.pdf>

DRAFT

## Outreach, Marketing & Technology

Transit agencies are keen to maintain customers and attract new ones through outreach, marketing, and technology by distributing information, getting feedback from users, and improving the perception that transit is a comfortable and affordable way to travel.<sup>112</sup>


### Outreach

Before conducting outreach, transit agencies develop strategic documents such as short- and long-range transportation plans to help focus marketing efforts. After developing strategies, transit agencies conduct outreach

to their targeted customers such as seniors, people with disabilities, students, workers, and non-English speakers for feedback to improve their services. Many agencies have developed outreach strategies that include employee training, customer interaction, transit pass price reduction, and advertising campaigns.

The development of outreach strategies is important to an agency, as it helps focus its efforts to reach a specific targeted group. In their short-range transportation plan, the Sacramento Regional Transit agency developed a “marketing program” that lays

out strategies for market research, service promotion, incentives, outreach, and customer relations.<sup>113</sup> Through outreach, agencies can educate potential transit users about routes, fares, and stations, among other features of the system. Transit agency marketing strategies typically focus on target groups; one particular group is senior citizens, who as a group may be driving less than working age commuters. For instance, the Fresno Area Express gives free rides to seniors on Sundays through its Silver Sundays program<sup>114</sup> to promote and teach them about their transit system, thus breaking down one barrier for potential riders – lack of experience. Another transit agency that focuses on educating their clients about their transit system is Sacramento Paratransit's Mobility Training program. This program is funded



Contrast in marketing transit: the auto industries “creeps and weirdoes” advertisement versus LA Metro’s advertisement.



<sup>112</sup> Arpi, E., “Transit Agencies Need to Invest in Marketing: A Lesson from Los Angeles,” Dec. 8 2009, <http://thecityfix.com/transit-agencies-need-to-invest-in-marketing-a-lesson-from-los-angeles/>, retrieved March 17, 2011.

<sup>113</sup> Sacramento Regional Transit, “Short Range Transit Plan 2000 – 2008,” Sept. 1999, <http://www.sacrt.com/shortrangeplan/srtpdfs/1999SRTP.pdf>,” retrieved March 17, 2011.


<sup>114</sup> City of Fresno, “FAX Begins New Silver Sundays Program,” July 2004, <http://www.fresno.gov/News/PressReleases/2004/FAXBeginsNewSilverSundaysProgram.htm>,” retrieved March 17, 2011.

by a federal block grant and reaches out to people with disabilities for low- or no-cost independent travel.<sup>115</sup> The program's goal is to provide its clients with a better understanding of the transit system through mobility trainers. These trainers assist participants in getting to bus stops, light rail stations, and to destinations by helping clients with wayfinding.

In trying to understand the transit system, native language differences are often found to be a barrier to some transit users. To resolve this conflict, some transit agencies recruit bilingual employees and publish route information and maps in multiple languages. Long Beach Transit publishes service information in English and Spanish, while providing Spanish and Khmer translation at public meetings and on the phone.<sup>116</sup> Los Angeles County Metro launched a Spanish language blog, *El Pasajero*, to keep the county's millions of Spanish-speakers better informed.<sup>117</sup>

Transit agencies have also begun to reach out with youth in the community, to help them form positive impressions about public transit at an early age. The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority's Youth Outreach Program makes presentations to kindergarteners through eighth-graders.<sup>118</sup> The goal of the program is to make transit appealing to youths, so that they will be more willing to use transit when they become adults. According to Jack Neff of Ad Age Digital, transit youth outreach has played a part in the 7.7 percent decline in driving by adults 21-30 since 1995.<sup>119</sup>

Transit agencies serving commuters in densely populated cities have focused on developing relationships with large employers, in part by introducing them to new routes that serve worksites. The Santa Barbara Metropolitan Transit District took a Valley Express Commuter Bus to worksites to give employees a tour and promote their express bus route. Along with outreach efforts, transit agencies also offer transit passes to employers. The Eco Pass partnership between Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority and Silicon Valley employers promotes transit by working with employers to subsidize unlimited-ride passes for employees.<sup>120</sup> In Sacramento, Caltrans employees can purchase discounted Sacramento Regional Transit monthly passes. Both transit programs are



<sup>115</sup> Paratransit Inc., "Mobility Training Program," [http://paratransit.org/php/mobility\\_training.php](http://paratransit.org/php/mobility_training.php), retrieved March 17, 2011.

<sup>116</sup> Long Beach Transit, "<http://www.lbtransit.com/stats%5Cindex.html>, retrieved April 20, 2011.

<sup>117</sup> <http://elpasajero.metro.net/>

<sup>118</sup> Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, "Youth Outreach Program," <http://www.vta.org/services/yop.html>, retrieved March 17, 2011.

<sup>119</sup> Neff, J., "Is Digital Revolution Driving Decline in U.S. Car Culture?" May 31, 2010, <http://adage.com/article/digital/digital-revolution-driving-decline-u-s-car-culture/144155/>, retrieved March 17, 2011.


<sup>120</sup> 2010 VTA Eco Pass, Santa Clara Valley Transit Authority, <http://www.flickr.com/photos/bike/4271805817/>, retrieved March 17, 2011.

tax-advantaged, as fees for the pass can be deducted out of a person's gross income.

Another way transit agencies reach out to the public is through targeted campaigns. When air quality is a concern for a region, transit agencies have worked with other organizations, such as their region's air quality district, to offer commuters free rides during "Spare the Air Days." The State Transit Assistance program provides funding for these free rides and is a strategy used to try to stay within the federal air quality mandates.<sup>121</sup> A secondary benefit is that transit agencies use this day to promote their transit services.

## Technology

Outreach is an important element of educating the public about transit service and reaching a variety of users. The Internet and complementing technology has expanded the tools at the disposal of transit agencies, giving agencies more economical and potentially wider-reaching ways to connect with users through websites, social media platforms and other web-based media. Websites present a great opportunity to communicate with regular and potential riders about service updates, fare and pass information, where to



The 2010 VTA Eco Pass

purchase fares, and how to reach a destination via transit. Many transit agencies also sell fare media online. L.A. County Metro employs its website, TapToGo.net, to let riders add value to their transit TAP Cards and register them so that loaded funds can be retrieved in case the TAP Card is lost or stolen. As more and more people of all age groups use the Internet as a source of information, transit agencies must invest in making websites visually attractive, easy to use, and able to satisfy the informational needs of many different kinds of visitors, i.e. web novices versus experts, and those accessing by computer versus web-enabled cell phone.

## Websites

A well-designed website informs visitors about every aspect of a transit agency, including but not limited to: fares, transfers, routes, bike racks, wheelchair accommodations, and schedules. The San Francisco Bay Area Clipper's smart card website lets visitors to search for sales locations by city and zip code participating locations. The San Francisco Bay Area's TransLink website, Transit.511.org, allows users to search by location (an intersection or address), with maps of sales locations.

For trip planning, more and more transit agencies are moving toward interactive sites that provide details about the next arriving bus and estimated time of arrival. San Francisco's Bay Area Rapid Transit website allows users to enter time and location in its "QuickPlanner." Seventeen websites have an

<sup>121</sup> Bay Area Rapid Transit, "Spare the Air free transit program completed," July 19, 2006, <http://www.bart.gov/news/articles/2006/newsf20060601.aspx>, retrieved March 18, 2011.

integrated trip planner or link to an external trip planner (Google Transit, or a regional transportation site, such as 511 for the Bay Area and San Diego), while nine lists destinations served and routes.

Websites also offer agencies the opportunity to help commuters better calculate the cost savings of using transit, as drivers typically underestimate the cost of driving – thinking only of gasoline prices and not of depreciation, wear-and-tear, as well as sunk costs.

### *Complementing Technology*

Transit agencies have begun to use social media to market their services by using Facebook and Twitter. The Bay Area Rapid Transit District has around 12,500 followers on Twitter to-date and can reach each individual follower instantly by posting information on the agency's Twitter account.<sup>122</sup> These social media sites provide quick, up-to-date information about service changes and delays without a lot of overhead cost.

NextBus provides real-time service information for transit agencies and their customers across in dozens of cities across the country. Their technology combines GPS data with their predictive software to give accurate arrival time stops for transit vehicles. Transit agencies are providing users with this information in a variety of ways: via real-time displays at stations, the NextBus website, text message and phone call. It eliminates user uncertainty regarding when the next transit vehicle will arrive at a designated stop and provides transit agencies with efficient on-time performance information.<sup>123</sup> California currently has 16 transit agencies that contract with NextBus, including AC Transit, Metro, Muni, Davis Unitrans, Camarillo Area Transit, and Simi Valley Transit.

### **Feedback**

Most transit agencies conduct surveys to understand travel patterns and customer needs. Survey conductors often directly interview clients on transit vehicles, but agencies are now attempting to capture information on non-riders too. During the creation of the Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) Short Range Transit Plan, the agency conducted both on-board and telephone surveys of residents. This effort allowed RABA to include both current and potential riders and develop a comprehensive service plan.

Transit agencies work with many stakeholders to improve their transit network. The San Mateo County District (SamTrans) reaches out to citizens through advisory committees, the County Association of Governments Board of Directors, the City Manager's Association, and town hall meetings. The Monterey-Salinas County Transit uses census data, state and regional planning documents, county reports, surveys of public service agencies and riders, and public meetings. The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) collaborated with communities, schools, and businesses to develop "Project Safe Place," a program that marks and symbolizes VTA transit vehicles as safe locations for children to seek help when in danger.<sup>124</sup>

### **Challenges**

Over the last half-century, State and Federal funding priorities have heavily favored investments in the private automobile at the expense of public transit investments. Unsurprisingly, many California's find

---

<sup>122</sup> Twitter, "SF BART on Twitter," <http://twitter.com/#!/SFBART>, retrieved April 20, 2011.

<sup>123</sup> Nextbus.com, "How We Make Riders' Lives Easier," <http://news.nextbus.com/how-nextbus-works-2/how-we-make-riders-lives-easier/>, retrieved March 17, 2011.

<sup>124</sup> Santa Clara Valley Transit Authority, "Public Transit Services," [http://www.vta.org/brochures\\_publications/pdf/ch\\_3.pdf](http://www.vta.org/brochures_publications/pdf/ch_3.pdf), retrieved April 20, 2011.

themselves in neighborhoods poorly served by and logistically unfavorable to public transit. This makes transit an uncompetitive or unappealing option to driving for many Californians. Better outreach and marketing can play a key role in convincing the typical commuter of the savings and other benefits of using public transit.

Rising fuel costs have helped boost transit in recent times, but the sustainability of those gains is not yet known. In the near term, the recession, and its attendant State and Federal fiscal problems, have led to cutbacks in funding for public transit and therefore forced agencies to cut service and/or raise fares – creating challenges for attracting and keeping riders.

In 2009 alone, California cut \$536 million from the State Transit Assistance program (for transit operations). Small transit agencies were hit the hardest, as they are the most reliant on state subsidies. In its Short-Range Transit Plan, the El Dorado Transit Authority notes their citizens perceive El Dorado's commuter buses to be "full – at least in the eyes of the riders – and some park-and-ride lots are at capacity."<sup>125</sup>

Slim resources cripple transit operations and add to the challenge of improving the perception of transit. The American Public Transportation Association predicts that, if gas reaches \$5 per gallon, the nation can expect an additional 1.5 billion in passenger trips.<sup>126</sup> However, transit agencies are not protected against rising gas prices either and may have to raise their fares to pay their fuel bills.<sup>127</sup> In California, this may also be detrimental to the perception of transit, if a whole cohort of new transit riders is met with cuts to bus lines, decreased frequency, and crowded buses.

## Conclusion

Through outreach, marketing and technology, transit's image is improving. Transit is becoming more user-friendly as agencies are able to reach targeted riders. Technology brings online trip planning, coordinated fares, social media outreach and real-time arrivals/departure information—lessening inconvenience and uncertainty. Interaction and feedback helps with maintaining and attracting riders, despite reduced funding. Although ridership numbers have increased, the lack of funding to improve the operation of the transit system could make it difficult to sustain increased ridership across California.

---

<sup>125</sup>El Dorado Transit Authority, "Market Assessment and Marketing Plan of 2006," January 26, 2006, <http://www.eldoradotransit.com/assets/pdf/Reports/EDT%202006%20Marketing%20Plan.pdf>," retrieved March 22, 2011.

<sup>126</sup>American Public Transportation Association, "Potential Impact of Gasoline Price Increases on the U.S. Public Transportation Ridership, 2011-2012" [http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/APTA\\_Effect\\_of\\_Gas\\_Price\\_Increase\\_2011.pdf](http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/APTA_Effect_of_Gas_Price_Increase_2011.pdf), retrieved April 20, 2011.

<sup>127</sup>AltTransport, "Rising Fuel Prices Have Spurred Transit Ridership, But Could Hurt Transportation Budgets," <http://alttransport.com/2011/03/rising-fuel-have-spurred-transit-ridership-but-could-hurt-public-transportation-budgets/>, retrieved April 20, 2011.