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TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

Friday, June 6, 2008

ITEM #  
RECOMMENDATION

+1. APPROVAL OF MAY 16, 2008, MEETING MINUTES

APPROVE

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Members of the public will have the opportunity to address the Transportation Committee on any issue within the jurisdiction of the Committee. Speakers are limited to three minutes each and shall reserve time by completing a “Request to Speak” form and giving it to the Clerk prior to speaking. Committee members also may provide information and announcements under this agenda item.

REPORTS (3 through 4)

+3. CAPITAL PROJECT BUDGET TRANSFER (John Haggerty)

RECOMMEND

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the transfer of funds from the Head Span Replacement Project to the City College Station Realignment Project in order to complete installation of a crossover and reconstruction of a grade crossing on C Street in the City of San Diego.

+4. REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE FARE ORDINANCE

A. SECOND PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE FARE ORDINANCE TO MODIFY EXISTING TRANSIT FARE STRUCTURE (Dan Levy)

HOLD SECOND PUBLIC HEARING

This will be the second public hearing on proposed changes to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance. The proposed changes affect services operated by both the Metropolitan Transit System and the North County Transit District, including Trolley, Breeze, SPRINTER, COASTER, Senior/Disabled/Medicare, ADA Paratransit, and Day Pass fares.

B. FIRST READING OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO COMPREHENSIVE FARE ORDINANCE AND TITLE VI FINDINGS RELATING TO AMENDMENTS (Dan Levy)

ADOPT FINDINGS AND HOLD FIRST READING

This will be the first reading of proposed amendments to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance. The proposed changes affect services operated by both the Metropolitan Transit System and the North County Transit District, including Trolley, Breeze, SPRINTER, COASTER, Senior/Disabled/Medicare, ADA Paratransit, and Day Pass fares. A Title VI analysis of the proposed fare changes will be provided. The Transportation Committee is asked to adopt findings pursuant to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act and hold the first reading of the proposed amendments to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance.
5. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled for Friday, June 13, 2008, at 9 a.m. and will be held jointly with the Board of Directors. The Policy meeting topic will be public transit funding issues. The next regularly scheduled meeting of the Transportation Committee is on Friday, June 20, 2008, at 9 a.m.

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

+next to an agenda item indicates an attachment
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

June 6, 2008

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 1

Action Requested: APPROVE

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND ACTIONS
MEETING OF MAY 16, 2008

The meeting of the Transportation Committee was called to order by Chair Jim Madaffer (City of San Diego) at 9:02 a.m. See the attached attendance sheet for Transportation Committee member attendance.

1. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

Action: Upon a motion by Deputy Mayor Jerry Rindone (South County) and a second by Councilmember Ed Gallo (North County Transit District [NCTD]), the Transportation Committee approved the minutes from the May 2, 2008, meeting.

2. PUBLIC COMMENTS/COMMUNICATIONS/MEMBER COMMENTS

Chair Madaffer announced several upcoming meetings: a Special Meeting of NCTD is a public hearing on fare changes on Friday, May 30, 2008, at NCTD, at 10 a.m.; on June 6 is the regularly scheduled Transportation Committee meeting, which will include a South County fare change public hearing; and all Committee members are asked to come to a joint SANDAG Board/Transportation Committee meeting with a discussion on transit funding on June 13. Then on June 20 is the regularly scheduled Transportation Committee meeting that will include the transit operators' budgets for approval. The next regularly scheduled Transportation Committee meeting is Friday July 4 and that meeting is cancelled.

Mayor Art Madrid (La Mesa) said he read about Karen King’s resignation from NCTD. He suggested that the possibility of a potential merger of transit agencies should be discussed at the June 13 joint SANDAG Board/Transportation Committee meeting. He thought that we should consolidate these assets. He also suggested that the Transportation Committee recommend that the SANDAG Board form an ad hoc committee with members of the Transportation Committee and MTS and NCTD Boards to pursue a long-term strategy for consolidating the transit agencies.

Chair Madaffer agreed that this is an issue that is germane to the discussion set for that June 13 joint meeting.

Chair Madaffer congratulated Karen King for her tenure with NCTD, and wished her well.

Chair Madaffer noted that there was a request to speak under Public Comments.
Kathy Evans-Calderwood, representing the San Diego Transit Coalition Research Committee, referred to a United States Department of Transportation “Public Transportation Fare Policy Summary,” dated May 1977 (copies provided), which she said addresses all the issues and does the homework for the problems and issues that the Transit Coalition have brought before you. Just because the study is old doesn’t mean it is out of date. She asked that the Transportation Committee work with them to develop a fair fare policy.

Ms. Evans-Calderwood also noted that the fareboxes do not accept the new $5 bill and thought this problem should be addressed.

Paul Jablonski, Executive Director, Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), responded that to his knowledge trolley ticket vending machines are accepting the new $5 bills.

Jack Boda, Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation, said staff didn’t anticipate that the paper money would have different looks. Every time there is a change in the look of the money, we have to change the plates, the scanners have to be upgraded, and it costs $5,000-$10,000 to make those upgrades. We are in the process of correcting that problem, but it cannot be done overnight.

**CHAIR’S REPORT (3)**

3. **STATE ROUTE 905 STATUS UPDATE (INFORMATION)**

Chair Madaffer announced that at the June 27 Board meeting, Caltrans will provide a status report on the third border crossing, State Route (SR) 11, and the Presidential Permit process.

Bill Figge, Caltrans, provided a status report on SR 905, Phases 1A and 1B, from Interstate 805 (I-805) to the Otay Mesa Port of Entry. He noted that the acquisition of several right-of-way parcels is still pending on Phase 1A, and some will go to trial. We are monitoring right-of-way costs and feel that we can bring the project in. The latest property hearing is scheduled for September. On Phase 1B, we have accelerated the project schedule a little bit as we may get funding from the federal government as part of the stimulus package. The schedule for advertising is now in September, with award in December, and construction starting in March 2009. This schedule is dependent upon receiving the additional funding. We did receive Trade Corridor Improvement Fund (TCIF) funding. The next step in the process is to get a baseline agreement for the California Transportation Commission (CTC), which is required to be submitted by July.

**REPORTS (4 through 10)**


Sookyung Kim, Financial Programming Manager, reported that RTIP amendments from member agencies are presented to the Transportation Committee on a quarterly basis. The Independent Taxpayers Oversight Committee (ITOC) has reviewed these amendments, and it had no comments. A draft list of RTIP projects was released for public comment and no public comments were received. Ms. Kim stated that there was one correction; the I-5 High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Managed Lanes report states the recommendation is to increase the Preliminary Engineering in order to complete environmental work, rather that should have said the increase was for right-of-way.
Action: Upon a motion by Deputy Mayor Rindone and a second by First Vice Chair Lori Holt Pfeiler (North County Inland), the Transportation Committee adopted Resolution No. 2008-26, approving Amendment No. 15 to the 2006 RTIP.

5. SANDAG/NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT FY 2008 CALIFORNIA TRANSIT SECURITY GRANT APPLICATION UNDER PROPOSITION 1B (RECOMMEND)

Susan Brown, Financial Manager of Programming, reported that the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006 (Proposition 1B) created a variety of discretionary and formula programs. Transportation Committee members have been important participants in securing funding sources for the San Diego region. Another discretionary program is the Proposition 1B Grade Separation program, administered by the CTC. A Proposition 1B formula program is the Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account program. NCTD has applied for funds for the SPRINTER, and MTS applied for the purchase of replacement buses. The newest Proposition 1B program is the Transit Security Grant Program. This program is managed by the State of California Office of Homeland Security (OHS) with the same formula as the State Transit Assistance (STA) funds. These monies may be used for capital projects, for increased protection, or increased capacity to move people, goods, or services in response to the aftermath of a disaster. NCTD will use its monies for high security fencing and other measures along the rail corridor. The OHS has accepted an early application submittal, subject to the receipt of approval from SANDAG.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Gallo and a second by Deputy Mayor Rindone, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors approve Resolution No. 2008-27, which authorizes the Executive Director to apply for the state transit security funds on behalf of NCTD so as to effectuate direct pass-through to the transit district.

6. PROPOSITION 1B GRADE SEPARATION FUNDING APPLICATIONS (RECOMMEND)

John Haggerty, Principal Engineer, stated that action on this item would approve four grade separation applications that will be funded through Proposition 1B. The first part of this program ($150 million of the $250 million) is available for projects ready to start construction by 2010. This portion requires a 50 percent local match and projects must be on the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Grade Separation List. Phase 2 is for $100 million and that funding is available for projects that are ready for construction by 2014. No match is required for this second phase, though a local match provision is included in the application criteria. We would like to submit these applications to the CTC based on the 2014 start date and proposed matches. We also are considering submitting a project for H Street in Chula Vista for a Phase 1 application if we can develop an accelerated schedule.

Mr. Haggerty stated that due to the limited amount of funding and the application deadline, staff used the Regional Grade Separation criteria developed by the Cities/County Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) and approved by the Transportation Committee. SANDAG criteria are for projects that achieve mobility goals for the region. He reviewed the project rating criteria. Included in the criteria is blocking delay. E and H Streets in Chula Vista both ranked high in regional priority calculations. They are included in the TransNet Ordinance, and that money will provide the matching funds. Taylor Street ranked first based on regional criteria and is the second busiest highway crossing in the state.
Accident history is a primary factor for this rating. The intersection situation at Sorrento Valley Boulevard is similar to that at E and H Streets. It ranks well due to high traffic volume and high blocking delay due to the nearby COASTER station; however, no matching funds have been identified for this project.

Mr. Haggerty noted that we have contacted member agencies through CTAC for a call for projects as all member agencies can submit projects as well as SANDAG.

Chair Madaffer noted that there was one request to speak.

Frank Rivera, Principal Engineer for the City of Chula Vista, expressed support for the funding applications for E and H Streets.

Second Vice Chair Jerome Stocks (North County Coastal) said that the City of Encinitas strongly supports this list of projects as all have regional mobility merit. However, Encinitas requests that the Encinitas Pedestrian Crossing be added to this list. It is a relatively low-cost project. We are requesting only $15 million for this project. He said he was not trying to eliminate any other project; however, this is a unique situation as it has a SANDAG work element. He suggested this project be added to the list as project No. 5.

Supervisor Ron Roberts (County of San Diego) observed that the rankings seem to be partially based on the number of vehicles per day crossing the tracks. Mr. Haggerty confirmed that was correct.

Supervisor Roberts asked if cars not crossing the tracks but having an impact on the intersection are counted. Mr. Haggerty responded that they are not as this information is not in the data the CTC is requesting.

Supervisor Roberts said that somehow we need take into consideration how delays at one grade crossing can impact other nearby intersections. The number of cars that are actually inconvenienced in reality is a lot larger than the number of those cars crossing the tracks. Just north of the tracks at Washington Street are freeway on- and off-ramps that are impacted. For example, traffic volumes are many times greater than the number of cars crossing the tracks. This is not recognized in our formula. This is a weak model in terms of setting priorities. We are looking at adding additional gates to Lindbergh Field. The Washington Street crossing is going to become a critical intersection for those gates. Any cars to northbound I-5 will be tracked through that intersection. In addition, the United States Marines are planning a whole new entrance to their base that will have a significant impact on that intersection. The criteria don’t acknowledge any of this. The model doesn’t fit the reality. He wondered why Washington Street was not included in this application. He added that the staff recommendations are valid but there are things that are missing that should be considered.

Deputy Mayor Rindone expressed support for staff’s recommendation. The City of Chula Vista is appreciative of staff’s work. The application for E and H Streets is critical to the current existing gridlock at these intersections that cross the heavily traveled Blue Line. He also appreciated SANDAG staff trying to make the 2010 deadline for H Street.

Mayor Madrid expressed support for the staff recommendation. He asked about an apparent difference in the number of trains in La Mesa. Mr. Haggerty responded that at one point the Green and Orange Lines trains overlap in La Mesa.
Mayor Madrid stated that there are seven streets in La Mesa that cross the trolley tracks, and several are impacted by grade crossings with the trolley. Drivers go through residential streets to avoid delays from trolley track crossings. He agreed with Supervisor Roberts’ comment that other streets are impacted by delays at trolley crossings and that information should be included as part of criteria for the model.

Gary Gallegos, Executive Director, reminded everyone that the Committee adopted the criteria being used by staff. We can bring back options to try and address the concerns. In terms of this program, we are competing for statewide monies. Only about four to six grade crossings across around the state will receive funding. There also is a tremendous amount of staff work to put together these applications. We have to construct these projects on the times scheduled. A lot of work being done around the airport may not be ready by these timelines. If cities want to submit other projects, we will support you. We will be lucky to get one or two projects funded. Pedestrian bridge projects will compete poorly with rail grade crossings.

Councilmember Matt Hall (North County Coastal) thanked Mr. Gallegos for his comments. He supported Second Vice Chair Stocks with regard to the importance of pedestrian crossings. There are areas where pedestrian crossings are very important. If there is an opportunity for pedestrian crossings, we would like to compete.

Councilmember Toni Atkins (City of San Diego) said that if we are going to look at pedestrian crossings, we also should consider the Centre City Development Corporation (CCDC) pedestrian bridge. We are $8 million short for that project. She understood Supervisor Roberts’ comments and agreed that we should be aware of projects in close proximity that may have an impact. It is important to have the big picture. She appreciated SANDAG working with the City on the CCDC pedestrian bridge project.

Chair Madaffer said that he agreed with Councilmember Atkins’ comments from the City of San Diego’s standpoint.

Chair Madaffer agreed there are crucial decisions that will impact the work around the Lindbergh Field Airport. He would be happy to support the City of Encinitas and City of San Diego pedestrian crossing projects.

Councilmember Monroe stated that Taylor Street rises to the top due to the number of accidents. He asked what time frame this included. Mr. Haggerty responded that the accidents occurred during the last five years. Councilmember Monroe asked how many of those accidents were with Amtrak. Mr. Haggerty replied that most of them were with Amtrak.

Councilmember Monroe suggested that grade crossings may not be the only solution for that location. We have been trying to slow down the Antrak trains in that corridor. We think that trains should go through there at 25 mph. We were able to get Amtrak to decrease speeds from 60 mph to 40 mph, but that may not be enough to reduce the accident rate.

Mr. Gallegos recognized that Taylor Street is the number one project on the CPUC list, though there are no matching funds from the state, so it is not likely that project will move forward. The strategy from staff is that this project would compete with no matching funds.
Councilmember Monroe said that MTS has put together a plan that would handle that accident situation at Taylor Street. However, it has had trouble with the CPUC on this issue. He thinks there are other possible solutions and a grade crossing is not the answer. Mr. Gallegos added that we demonstrated to the CPUC that we are trying to make changes, but that has not been successful.

Supervisor Roberts said he would support the motion. He observed the absence of the Airport Authority in making a presentation about the intersections on streets adjacent to the airport.

Chair Madaffer said that this was a good discussion on the need for these grade separation projects throughout the region. The staff recommendation limits the application to four projects. He asked the maker of the motion if he was willing to include the Encinitas and/or City of San Diego/CCDC pedestrian bridge projects. He also stated that grade separations could possibly be added to a future ballot measure.

Deputy Mayor Rindone, as the maker of the motion, said his preference was to keep the staff recommendation as is. Councilmember Monroe, who seconded the motion, agreed with Deputy Mayor Rindone.

**Action:** Upon a motion by Deputy Mayor Rindone and a second by Councilmember Monroe, the Transportation Committee recommended that the SANDAG Board of Directors approve the preparation of funding applications for E and H Streets in Chula Vista, and Taylor Street and Sorrento Valley Boulevard in the City of San Diego as regional grade separation projects.

**Motion Made:** Councilmember Hall moved to add the City of Encinitas and City of San Diego/CCDC pedestrian crossing to the staff recommendation. Councilmember Charlene Zettel (San Diego Regional Airport Authority) seconded the motion.

Deputy Mayor Rindone said he thought the new motion would be in opposition to the motion just approved, and he would not support it.

Chair Madaffer agreed that adding more projects could dilute the strength of the project list. The need is great and the amount of money is very limited. The issues Supervisor Roberts raised are good ones for further discussion.

Councilmember Zettel stated that the Airport Authority is working with the City of San Diego on traffic impacts from the Washington Street grade crossing related to Lindbergh Field expansion, and with the military on the impacts of the relocated entrance.

Supervisor Roberts felt the second motion was out of order.

Councilmember Gallo asked about the next grade separation funding opportunity. Mr. Gallegos said that every two years you adopt a new STIP, and any time there are new dollars these projects can be considered. He suggested that staff work with sponsors of the two pedestrian bridge projects. He reiterated that pedestrian crossing projects are not going to compete well when you have applications for train grade separations being submitted.
Second Vice Chair Stocks pointed out that he has the support of the Encinitas City Council to add the Encinitas pedestrian crossing project to the regional list. The Council thought it would have greater clout coming from a regional body like SANDAG rather than from the City of Encinitas. Failing that, the City is fully committed to going forward and will need SANDAG’s technical assistance.

Action Taken: The vote on the motion to include the City of Encinitas and City of San Diego/CCDC pedestrian bridge projects to the recommended list of grade separation projects to the CTC was 2-7; the motion did not pass (Aye votes: Second Vice Chair Stocks and Councilmember Hall; Nay votes: Supervisor Roberts, First Vice Chair Pfeiler, Councilmember Jack Dale (East County), Chair Madaffer, Councilmember Monroe, Deputy Mayor Rindone, and Councilmember Zettel.

Councilmember Gallo pointed out an error in the agenda report by clarifying that no trains cross Grand Avenue in Escondido.

7. MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT AND SANDAG CONCERNING PURCHASE OF NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT AUCTION RATE SECURITIES (RECOMMEND)

Renée Wasmund, Finance Director, stated that NTCD has requested our assistance. Due to the disruption in the credit market NCTD is paying an interest rate higher than the market. Many municipalities are facing this same problem. There is no net cost or risk to SANDAG from this action. We would issue $34 million of Commercial Paper, and use that cash to purchase the NCTD auction rate securities. The savings for NCTD is in the interest rate it would pay to SANDAG, which would equal the actual interest rate. It would reduce the NCTD interest rate from the 3 percent to 5.4 percent it has paid since February 2008 to a Commercial Paper rate of 1.5 percent. This would preserve the underlying NCTD insurance and swap structure it has currently in place. NCTD would pay its share of administrative, legal, and financial advisor fees. The ITOC reviewed this recommendation and had two comments. One was related to SANDAG flexibility to terminate the agreement. The response was that either party can terminate with a 90-day notice. The second concern was whether using $34 million of the SANDAG $100 million Commercial Paper program would have any negative impacts. The response was that there would be no negative impacts to SANDAG. The NCTD Board reviewed this action and approved the transaction and Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Ms. Wasmund noted that Keith Curry with Public Financial Management, and Richard Hannasch, NCTD, were in attendance to answer any questions.

Chair Madaffer asked if the $100 million was part of the $600 million set aside. Ms. Wasmund replied that this is in addition to that amount.

Chair Madaffer said the SANDAG Board has approved similar agreements with other jurisdictions. He asked if it is possible for the Commercial Paper amount to increase more than $100 million. Ms. Wasmund answered that we can do another offering and increase the amount of Commercial Paper.

Mayor Madrid observed that if we had a one agency in the region we could use either Commercial Paper or bonds. Ms. Wasmund responded affirmatively.
Councilmember Monroe asked how these bonds will be repaid. Ms. Wasmund said that the first payment begins in 2011 and NCTD has budgeted for it in its program. It is a first call on their revenues.

Councilmember Monroe said that MTS is struggling with its budget, and he thought NCTD had a bigger budget problem than MTS. Ms. Wasmund said that SANDAG is not a party to the NCTD bonds. It is not going to be our obligation to pay the NCTD bonds. We are doing this transaction because we can decrease the NCTD interest rates. The auction rate/security market has become unstable in recent months, but that has nothing to do with the NCTD credit rating.

Mr. Curry said the cost of NCTD debt is 3 percent. The variable rate bonds are trading much higher than NCTD budgeted for or anticipated. In a small way this transaction will reduce costs to SANDAG. It makes an effective use of that Commercial Paper resource. From a policy perspective, any dollar NCTD saves in interest is another dollar that can be used in San Diego County. This has nothing to do with North County; it is a national problem. He hoped that NCTD will go out and remarket its bonds when the market improves.

Deputy Mayor Rindone asked why this transaction would not jeopardize the financial support of SANDAG. Ms. Wasmund replied that when we issue the $34 million of Commercial Paper and we have to pay an interest rate, the rate we pay will equal the interest rate NCTD will pay to SANDAG to hold those bonds. There are costs to carry the Commercial Paper program. NCTD will absorb a third of that since NCTD will hold a third of the Commercial Paper. Mr. Curry added that this debt is a first lien on all NCTD resources. From that perspective, you have a strong security for payment of the obligations.

Deputy Mayor Rindone asked Mr. Gallegos if he was supportive of this action. Mr. Gallegos replied affirmatively.

Councilmember Gallo thanked in advance Ms. Wasmund and the Transportation Committee for approval of this item.

Councilmember Dale asked if this action will affect cash flow for SANDAG projects. Ms. Wasmund answered that it would not have any such affect.

Action: Upon a motion by Councilmember Gallo and a second by Chair Madaffer, the Transportation Committee recommended that the Board of Directors, acting as the San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission, adopt Resolution No. RTC 2008-02, authorizing the Executive Director to enter into an MOU with the North County Transit District concerning the purchase of auction rate securities.

8. AUGUST NORTH COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT SERVICE CHANGES (APPROVE)

Chair Madaffer noted that there was a blue sheet on this item.

Dan Levy, Senior Planner, reported that NCTD is facing a budget shortfall of $19 million. As a result, it has proposed to reduce or eliminate bus service, layoff administrative staff, and is requesting SANDAG to increase transit fares. He reviewed the proposed changes: discontinue 16 bus routes and all FAST services, reduce weekend service, and eliminate service on Route 386 east of the Wild Animal Park. The elimination of this segment of Route 386 is consistent with the Regional Short-Range Transit Plan. A Title VI analysis has
found that elimination of the Route 386 does impact minorities and persons with low income. NCTD concludes that the budget crisis warrants eliminating the eastern portion of that route. NCTD held a public hearing on these proposed changes on May 12, 2008. Based on comments received at this hearing, NCTD staff is recommending twice daily weekday lifeline service. This lifeline service would meet the intent of SANDAG Board Policy No. 018.

Karen King, NCTD Executive Director, noted that language from the draft consolidation planning document indicated that funding for public transit services would be preserved at historical levels and benchmarked at 2003 funding levels, and that if there were funding shortfalls there would be an orderly process for determining service reductions and lifeline service. NCTD has to make difficult decisions to balance its budget. The largest item is salary and wages, which accounts for 50 percent of its budget. In order to get any cost savings we have to eliminate salaries and wages. This recommendation to discontinue service to Ramona (Route 386) was difficult. We're continuing to struggle with this. If you apply regional criteria for performance, this is a very low-performing route. She urged the Transportation Committee in the future to define lifeline service.

Chair Madaffer thought it was a good idea to add that policy discussion to the joint meeting on June 13.

First Vice Chair Pfeiler asked if it is prudent for us to recommend the lifeline service if NCTD cannot afford to operate it.

Ms. King replied that the action is consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), but where do you get the money to operate the service. Do you want to provide lifeline service to Ramona and cut service to somewhere else?

Mr. Levy clarified that the recommendation is to ask NCTD to consider lifeline service.

Ms. King said that NCTD considers the Transportation Committee input very seriously.

Mr. Gallegos suggested that we determine the cost to fund this service and ask users if they are willing to pay for it.

Mr. Levy stated that the one area we have an interest in is fares. MTS was faced with a similar situation. It reduced service and doubled fares. These are some options for NCTD to consider. We are asking that they consider other options.

Second Vice Chair Stocks said that the current subsidy for Route 386, east of the Wild Animal Park, is $7.72 per passenger. We would have to raise fares significantly for passengers to pay the full cost of the fare.

Action: Upon a motion by First Vice Chair Pfeiler and a second by Councilmember Gallo, the Transportation Committee made a finding that the elimination of Route 386 and FAST service to Ramona is consistent with regional plans.
Linda Culp, Senior Planner, reported that Senate Bill (SB) 10 requires airport multimodal planning to be conducted and coordinated by SANDAG and the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (Authority). The main planning provisions of SB 10 include the development of a Regional Aviation Strategic Plan (RASP), and an Airport Multimodal Accessibility Plan (AMAP). The Authority is lead for the RASP, which will identify workable strategies to improve the performance of the regional airport system. SANDAG is the lead for the AMAP, which will develop a multimodal strategy to improve surface transportation access to airports. SB 10 also requires the Authority and SANDAG to enter into an agreement on or before June 30, 2008, for the coordination of responsibilities for the adoption of, and updates to, the RASP and AMAP. The Airport Authority gave preliminary approval to an early draft of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) at its May 1, 2008, meeting, and Authority staff intend to ask for final approval at the Authority Board meeting on June 5, 2008.

Ted Sexton, Airport Authority, reviewed the integration of the RASP, AMAP, and RTP. He also provided an overview of the RASP, and its scope and content, as well as a timeline and expense summary (estimated cost is $4.1 million).

Ms. Culp stated that the AMAP will build upon the RASP to identify multimodal transportation investments to improvement surface transportation access to airports in San Diego and other counties. She described the AMAP scope and content, integration with the RTP, and the joint planning schedule.

Mr. Sexton described the objectives of the MOU: it will set the collaborative strategic transportation planning process for the San Diego region; it identifies individual agency responsibilities in developing and coordinator the respective plan; it addresses joint agency responsibilities with emphasis on collaboration, timely information sharing, and plan review; and proposes a study coordination timeline. He reviewed the requested timeline proposed by the Authority.

Chair Madaffer expressed concerns that this whole concept is right for long-term studies. We are in the middle of an ad hoc process. He asked Mr. Sexton for assurances that this process doesn’t get bogged down in endless consultant studies. Mr. Sexton stated that the framers of the agreement understand this is a long-term comprehensive study process that is running parallel to other very important and critical infrastructure development decisions being made in the near-term. Your adoption of a RASP is not going to be foreclosed by shorter-term studies or decisions. It is written broad enough to provide for them. Status reports will be provided on a weekly basis.

Chair Madaffer asked if there is a financial limit from a consultant standpoint. Mr. Sexton replied that there are “not to exceed” limits. We are studying the regional aviation demand study portion in concert with an aviation demand study that has been authorized for Lindbergh Field. We have folded two studies into one facilities assessment. We are going to keep the timelines for our study fairly tight. We don’t want to be precipitous in going to communities without good background information.
Mr. Gallegos said that one other assurance is the legislation that requires us to finish these actions by a certain date. This will be a driver for both agencies to get things done. This action will advance the SANDAG piece so it is in alignment with the next RTP update.

Chair Madaffer expressed appreciation for all the time that the Airport Authority, SANDAG, and other stakeholders have taken to work on this problem. This is a critical effort.

Councilmember Monroe expressed some concern with paragraph 11 of the MOA.

Mayor Madrid asked how many airports around the country include transportation to regional communities. Mr. Sexton replied that there are many that claim to be regional transportation providers.

Mayor Madrid asked if we could get data from those other airports. Ms. Culp agreed that staff could provide that information.

Mayor Madrid asked if there will be a savings from combining efforts. Ms. Culp said that we have some tasks in the scope to look at other capacity and master plans. The RASP and destination Lindbergh will be using the same base data.

Councilmember Gallo asked if the Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) is involved in this effort. Ms. Culp said that it could be if conventional rail is considered as a potential connector.

Julie Wiley, General Counsel, responded to Councilmember Monroe’s question about page 11, Section F of the MOA. The Authority was adamant that this agreement include the limitations on the Authority’s ability to use its funds for various studies contemplated in this agreement and included a list of acts, laws, and restrictions that apply. In negotiations, it was felt that SANDAG also should list all of its funding limitations similar to that of the Authority. This paragraph lists all of the laws that limit SANDAG funds.

Mayor Madrid asked if someone will keep minutes of the ad hoc meetings and, if so, could they be shared with the Transportation Committee. Chair Madaffer agreed we could consider having a status report to the Transportation Committee once a month on the actions of the ad hoc committee.

Mr. Gallegos said that the City of San Diego is taking the lead for developing meeting notes. We will obtain copies for distribution to the Transportation Committee.

Councilmember Gallo suggested that this information be e-mailed to Committee members.

Councilmember Dale asked if we already have aviation demand forecasts for what we will need in the future and the capacity of existing airports. He wondered if we will be spending money for studies we already have done.

Mr. Sexton stated that no air cargo study that has been done measured the air goods in the region from San Diego to domestic and international markets. This study will provide you with that data.
Councilmember Dale asked if that study will be for all of the different airports in San Diego County. Mr. Sexton replied that it will be a regional study.

Chair Madaffer said he loved the concept but cannot stand the timeline. He doesn’t want this to be a “make work” project for consultants. It takes tough policy decisions. The public is tired of studying Lindbergh Field.

Supervisor Roberts expressed concern with developing short-range plans prior to making decisions on long-range plans. Mr. Sexton stated that we need to make near-time development decisions now that provide for demand experience today and for the next 5 years to 10 years without precluding the range of regional airports. It is a planning vehicle.

Chair Madaffer asked staff to come back with a timeline that meshes both near-term and long-term planning efforts.

Supervisor Roberts stated that his critique of the Airport Authority is that it continually conducts short-range planning. He thought they would be doing longer-range planning. He was surprised that all of the regional information will come in after you make those short-range decisions. The cart is before the horse here.

Bob Leiter, Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning, said that when we bring this to the Board next week we will lay out the process that is connected with the Master Plan and the timelines for the long-range plans. There is a clear connection between the work going on now and in the future. We will fold the Master Plan and the RASP into the RTP by 2011. What’s being done now with Lindbergh Field is focused on that particular airport, its future function and capacity, and not at other airports in this region or that could serve this region in the future.

Supervisor Roberts said that it seems like decisions are being made for Lindbergh Field that do not take into consideration a regional component. Mr. Leiter said that state law requires us to conduct a study for the region. The effort could be compressed and shortened.

Chair Madaffer asked if we can comply with SB 10 and fold that work into the efforts of the ad hoc committee. Ms. Wiley said it is possible under SB 10 to use a shorter timeline.

Mr. Gallegos suggested that staff sit down with the Authority and ask what it would take to compress the RASP to match the work of the ad hoc group. It is a good idea to know our regional capacity.

Councilmember Dale stated that if we have the ability to move cargo with a company such as Jim’s Air, but we don’t know that yet, how is that studied? Mr. Sexton answered that scenarios will be presented for consideration which will be facility driven.

Mayor Madrid suggested that staff consider themselves as policy makers and view issues as decision makers from a policy standpoint. Timelines have to be shortened and the scope broadened.

Chair Madaffer noted that this MOA will go to the Board on May 23 for discussion only.

Action: This item was presented for information only.
10. **SPRINTER PROJECT STATUS REPORT AND SANDAG INDEPENDENT ASSESSMENT (INFORMATION)**

Jim Linthicum, Director of Engineering and Construction, provided a status report on the SPRINTER project indicating current progress. He noted that the Regional Water Quality Board conducted an inspection since this agenda report was published and found the project in compliance.

Mr. Linthicum stated that the estimate at completion is $479.3 million, which is $14.8 million less than the project budget of $484.1 million. A contractor claim was submitted and there is still a backlog of 178 change orders. There is a group of staff dedicated to resolving these issues. The delay in opening the line could result in an additional delay claim from the contractor.

Councilmember Monroe asked about the timing of the average ridership. Mr. Linthicum said the number was calculated from opening day.

Councilmember Monroe asked if the average is by week. Ms. King responded that it is an open system, and SANDAG, in conjunction with others, counts the ridership in a 10-day period throughout the span of service. This then is amalgamated into a single day's ridership.

Mayor Dave Druker (Del Mar) said that we could provide more data from the ons and offs in an enhanced report. Ms. King stated that during the first month of operations there were daily counts but that daily count system has been suspended.

**Action:** This item was presented for information only.

11. **UPCOMING MEETINGS**

The next meeting of the Transportation Committee is scheduled with a special meeting on May 30. That will be followed with a regularly scheduled meeting June 6, a joint meeting with the SANDAG Board on June 13, and a regularly scheduled meeting on June 20.

12. **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Madaffer adjourned the meeting at 11:22 a.m.
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Introduction

SANDAG implements projects for the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) that require construction contracting. These projects are included in the SANDAG Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and Program Budget. SANDAG policy requires Board approval for budget changes in amounts over $500,000, cumulative. This item recommends requesting the Board approve a transfer of $300,000 into the City College Station Realignment Project resulting in a cumulative budget change of $550,000.

Recommendation

The Transportation Committee is asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the transfer of $300,000 from the Head Span Replacement Project to the City College Station Realignment Project in order to complete installation of a crossover and reconstruction of a grade crossing on C Street in the City of San Diego.

Discussion

City College/C Street Crossover

The Transportation Committee previously approved the transfer of $250,000 from the MTS Capital Program into the City College Station Realignment Project to install a crossover on C Street between 9th Avenue and 10th Avenue in the City of San Diego.

Since that time, San Diego Trolley, Inc. has determined that the 10th Avenue Trolley grade crossing is failing. The crossover should not be installed without replacing the severely deteriorated rail in the adjacent crossing. The estimated additional cost to repair the grade crossing is $275,000. However, because of the unknown condition of the track prior to opening up the crossing, staff recommends an additional $25,000 of contingency if the work limits need to be extended or more remedial work is required.

The total amount transferred would be $300,000 from available State Transportation Assistance funds in the Head Span Replacement Project.

Head Span Replacement Project

This project replaces head spans that are at or near the end of their useful life. Head spans are the wires spanning the Trolley tracks that support the contact wire. The Head Span Replacement Project budget is $700,000 and is currently in design. The reduction of funding would reduce the number of head spans replaced under this project, requiring additional replacement in future year capital
programs. In order to mitigate for shifting funds to C Street, staff would replace the oldest and least reliable head spans first. In addition, staff would utilize the new SANDAG job order construction contracting capability. The job order contract would allow for more head span replacements by reducing design and bidding costs.

Table 1 summarizes the budget changes recommended for approval. At its June 12, 2008, meeting, the MTS Board is scheduled to discuss a recommendation that the SANDAG Board approve this transfer (Attachment 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project (CIP #)</th>
<th>FY 2008 Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Budget Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City College Realignment Project (1049400)</td>
<td>$16,497,049</td>
<td>$16,797,049</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Span Replacement Project (1115600)</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>-$300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JACK BODA
Director of Mobility Management and Project Implementation

Attachment: 1. MTS Executive Committee Item D1, June 5, 2008

Key Staff Contact: John Haggerty, (619) 699-6937, jhag@sandag.org

Funds are budgeted in Work Element #1142100, #1128000
Agenda

Item No. D1

JOINT MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
for the
Metropolitan Transit System,
San Diego Transit Corporation, and
San Diego Trolley, Inc.

June 5, 2008

SUBJECT:

MTS: 9TH AVENUE AND C STREET GRADE CROSSING REPLACEMENT – FUND TRANSFER

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Executive Committee forward a recommendation to the Board of Directors to request from the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) Board of Directors a transfer of funds from the Orange Line Head Span Replacement Project (CIP 1115600) to the City College Station Realignment Project (CIP 1049400) as shown in the Fund Transfer Summary (Attachment A).

Budget Impact

No change to the overall CIP amount. $300,000 would be added to the City College Station Realignment Project from the Orange Line Head Span Replacement Project in SANDAG’s CIP budget.

DISCUSSION:

On June 14, 2007, the MTS Board requested that the SANDAG Transportation Committee transfer funds to the City College Realignment Project so a change order could be issued to the contractor for relocation and replacement of old worn track crossover between 8th and 9th Avenues and C Street. The fund transfer was approved and preliminary field work began early this year. During this investigation, it was discovered that rails in the 9th Avenue and C Street grade crossing, which is adjacent to track crossover scheduled to be replaced, were extremely worn creating wide gauge, which is beyond the Federal Railway Administration’s (FRA’s) limit for Class 3. Train-speed restrictions were implemented immediately to reduce the operation to FRA
Class 1. These worn rails need to be replaced urgently so that continuing rail wear does not further widen the gauge. The most expeditious way to accomplish this work is by adding an additional scope of work in the current change order for replacing and relocating track crossover under the City College Realignment Project. Both of these work areas are adjacent to each other and overlap to some extent, which would make it much more efficient and faster for one contractor to do all work. SANDAG staff estimates that the 9th and C Street grade-crossing track could be replaced for an additional $300,000 if all work is done under one change order.

SDTI has completed a cost analysis and recommends that the work be done under a change order to the SANDAG City College Realignment Project for the following reasons:

1. In early 2008, grade crossings at L Street in Chula Vista and West Park Avenue were rehabilitated under another SANDAG project with very similar scopes of work for $550,000.00. This compares favorably with current work at C Street considering that the other two crossings did not involve catenary work (whereas this one does).

2. If work is done under a separate standalone project, it would require design, competitive bidding, and a formal contract award process adding four to five months in addition to construction time.

3. Design and administrative costs add approximately $25,000 to the total project cost, which could be eliminated with a SANDAG contract change order for the City College Realignment Project.

4. Separate mobilization and insurance would add an estimated $18,000 to the total cost of the project, which could be eliminated with a SANDAG contract change order.

5. Additional construction management costs would be approximately $25,000, which could be significantly reduced if all work is done under one contract change order.

6. The City College Realignment Project was competitively bid, and a contract change order would include the same unit prices for the track, civil, and catenary work as in the original bid.

The FY 09 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) includes the Orange Line Head Span Replacement Project with a total budget of $700,000. The scope of this project is to replace and improve worn head spans in the catenary system of the Orange Line. The design for this project is just getting started, and actual construction is about six months away. Due to the urgency of the 9th and C Street grade crossing rail replacement work, San Diego Trolley, Inc. (SDTI) staff recommends transferring $300,000 from the Orange Line Head Span Replacement Project to the City College Realignment Project. This would allow rail-crossing replacement work to proceed right away and would not impact
design progress for the Head Span Replacement Project. The future construction of Head Span Project would be phased based on available funds and future availability of more capital funds. SDTI staff feels that some delay in the Head Span replacement work could be tolerated to accomplish grade-crossing rail replacement work at 9th and C Street.

Since both of these projects are in SANDAG’s CIP budget, staff is recommending that the MTS Board forward a request to the SANDAG Board to approve the fund transfer.

Paul C. Jablonski
Chief Executive Officer

Key Staff Contact: Russ Desai, 619.595.4908, rdesai@sdtsdmts.com

Attachment: A. Fund Transfer Summary
### FUND TRANSFER SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT (CIP NO.)</th>
<th>FY 08 Budget</th>
<th>Proposed Budget</th>
<th>Budget Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. City College Realignment Project (CIP 1049400)</td>
<td>$16,497,049</td>
<td>$16,797,049</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Head Span Replacement Project (CIP 1115600)</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>-$300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECOND PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE FARE ORDINANCE TO MODIFY EXISTING TRANSIT FARE STRUCTURE  File Number 3002300

Introduction

The fare changes being proposed at this time have been requested by Metropolitan Transit System and North County Transit District in order to meet the financial needs of the transit agencies, and to make the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance (Fare Ordinance) more consistent with the provisions of the TransNet Extension Ordinance.

Two fare hearings are required, one in North County and one in South County. The hearing for the North County area was held on May 30, 2008. The details on the proposed fare changes were outlined with the May 30, 2008, Transportation Committee item, and are provided as Attachment 1 to this report for reference purposes.

Following the second public hearing, the first reading of proposed amendments to the Fare Ordinance is scheduled as part of item 4B to this Transportation Committee agenda. The results of the Title VI Report also are included in Agenda Item 4B.

A number of public comments received to date by letter, e-mail, and phone are included with Attachment 1. Staff will prepare a summary of these comments and the comments received at the May 30, 2008, Transportation Committee meeting public hearing, in the staff presentation at the June 6, 2008, Transportation Committee meeting.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachment: 1. May 30, 2008, Transportation Committee Agenda Item #2

Key Staff Contact: Dan Levy, (619) 699-6942, dle@sandag.org
PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO REGIONAL COMPREHENSIVE FARE ORDINANCE TO MODIFY EXISTING TRANSIT FARE STRUCTURE

Introduction

The fare changes being proposed at this time are needed in order to meet the financial needs of the transit agencies, to bring and make the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance (Ordinance) consistent with the provisions of the TransNet Extension Ordinance.

The proposed fare changes (Attachment 1) are potential amendments to the Ordinance. An additional public hearing will be held by the Transportation Committee on June 6, 2008. The first reading of the amended Ordinance is also scheduled for the SANDAG Transportation Committee on June 6, 2008. Federal regulations require SANDAG to prepare a Title VI analysis to assess the impacts of the proposed fare changes on minorities and low income persons. The Title VI Report will be provided at the June 6, 2008 public hearing, along with a complete projection of the revenue impacts from the proposed changes.

This report also provides an update on the Comprehensive Regional Fare Structure and Revenue Sharing Study. A letter from the Joint Committee on Regional Transit (see Attachment 2) asked that any recommendations from the study not be included as part of these proposed fare changes, and instead be discussed as part of the draft report (due in early summer) that will be reviewed with the transit operators. Per this request, no fare study recommendations are included as part of the proposed fare changes outlined in this report.

Discussion

Background

SANDAG is responsible for establishing all public transit fares within San Diego County. SANDAG Board Policy Nos. 025 (Public Participation) and 029 (Regional Comprehensive Fare Policy), as well as federal regulations, require SANDAG to hold hearings to receive public comment whenever fare changes are being considered.

Proposed Fare Changes

Both the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and North County Transit District (NCTD) have requested a number of fare changes to address FY 2009 budget shortfalls. These proposed fare changes are listed in Attachment 1.
Summary of Proposed NCTD Fare Changes

COASTER

- Increase adult cash fares by $0.50 per zone to $4.50-$6.00 (depending the number of zones traveled) on July 1, 2008, and an additional $0.50 per zone on January 1, 2009, to $5.00-$6.50. Senior/Medicare/Disabled (S/M/D) fares would increase to equal 50 percent of the adult cash fare.

- Increase adult monthly pass by $14.00-$15.00 to $129.00-$168.00 (depending on the number of zones traveled) on July 1, 2008, and an additional $14.00-$15.00 on January 1, 2009, to $144.00-$182.00.

- Increase S/M/D monthly pass by $3.50 to $42.00 on July 1, 2008, and an additional $3.50 on January 1, 2009, to $45.50.

- Increase youth monthly pass by $7.00 to $84.00 on July 1, 2008, and an additional $7.00 on January 1, 2009, to $91.00.

BREEZE and SPRINTER

- Increase NCTD day pass by $0.50 to $4.50 on July 1, 2008.

- Increase NCTD S/M/D day pass by $0.25 to $2.25.

- Increase NCTD adult monthly pass by $5.00 to $59.00 on July 1, 2008.

- Increase NCTD College Monthly Pass by $5.00 to $49.00 on July 1, 2008.

LIFT (Americans with Disabilities Act service)

- Eliminate fares for passengers riding Lift who also ride BREEZE or SPRINTER on July 1, 2008.

In addition, SANDAG also is proposing as an alternative that the BREEZE/SPRINTER day pass be phased out in December 2008, and be replaced with the Regional Day Pass at $5.00. Elimination of the BREEZE/SPRINTER Day Pass will only be feasible if the current revenue sharing agreements are also modified in the Ordinance. Discussions with the MTS and NCTD are currently underway to see if these changes can be made as part of these proposed fare changes.

Summary of Proposed MTS Fare Changes

The Sorrento Valley Coaster Connection (SVCC) operated by MTS currently does not collect any fares. Proposed fares are as follows:

- Implement an adult cash fare of $1.00 and an S/D/M fare of $0.50 on September 1, 2008.

- Implement an adult monthly passes as a supplement to 2 and 3 Zone Coaster passes of $40.00 per month, an S/D/M pass of $10.00 per month, and Youth passes of $20.00 on September 1, 2008.
Proposed changes to San Diego Trolley fares involve eliminating the existing zone structure (fare is determined by number of stations traveled) and replacing it with a flat fare structure (single fare regardless of number of stations traveled). Two possible options are proposed:

- **Option 1** – a flat fare of $2.25 with no transfers between trolley lines.
- **Option 2** – a flat fare of $2.50, with free transfers between trolley lines.

Both options produce the same amount of revenue and would retain the existing downtown fare zone with a fare of $1.25, but each has advantages and disadvantages relative to the issue of transfers between bus and trolley routes:

- The first option creates consistency between the bus and trolley system in terms of eliminating transfers between routes (bus transfers were eliminated as of January 1, 2008), and having the same $2.25 cash fare. The $2.25 cash fare also minimizes the cost for passengers using the buses or trolleys for shorter distanced travel. Passengers traveling on multiple trolley and bus routes have the $5.00 Regional Day Pass available that allows for unlimited use.

- The second option charges a higher fare of $2.50 but allows for travel anywhere on the trolley system, including free trolley to trolley transfers (but does not allow transfers to/from the bus system). This option responds to concerns over the “forced transfer” between the Blue and Green Lines at Old Town due to the fact that the new low-floor trolley vehicles used on the Green Line cannot operate south of Old Town until such time as the stations are modified to accept the low-floor vehicles. However, since most passengers make roundtrips, the price of a roundtrip under this option (2 x $2.50 = $5.00) is the same as the Regional Day Pass that passengers would already use under first option.

MTS is currently evaluating the merits of the two options. Their recommendation, along with public input received to date, will be used to develop a SANDAG staff recommendation that will be outlined at the May 30, 2008 Transportation Committee meeting.

It also is proposed that new S/M/D and Youth monthly passes be introduced for the Premium Express Service to be consistent with the TransNet Extension Ordinance and regional practice. The new Premium Express youth pass would sell for $45.00 and the new S/M/D monthly pass would sell for $22.50 beginning on September 1, 2008.

**Summary of Proposed Fare Changes Affecting Both NCTD and MTS**

- For the ADA Paratransit services operated by NCTD (Lift) and MTS (Access), the proposed change would amend the Ordinance to better reflect the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidance and regulations. Two options are to be considered by the Transportation Committee. The first option uses the specific wording from the FTA guidance that up to double the fixed-route fare can be charged, while the second option proposes uses the same wording but adds that the fare be capped at $5.00 or twice the maximum regular fare for corridor service. The purpose of the cap is to ensure that ADA systems users are not faced with an excessive fare increase as a result of changing the language of the Ordinance.

- For $/D/M fares, it is also proposed to make changes to ensure consistency with FTA guidance and regulations. The FTA requires that $/D/M cash fares priced at 50 percent of the regular adult price be offered for each generally available fare. Given the fact that the Regional Day Pass, priced at $5.00, is now more widely available on buses and trolleys given the elimination
of bus transfers in January 2008, the S/D/M Regional Day Pass needs to be implemented. The proposed change would introduce a new S/D/M Regional Day Pass at $2.50 and an S/D/M Regional Premium Day Pass at $5.50. The cost of providing the S/D/M day pass is offset by other proposed changes to S/D/M senior fares outlined earlier. (Note: NCTD already offers an S/D/M pass for its NCTD Day Pass.) While the FTA only requires reduced S/D/M fares during off peak periods, the proposed change would make available the Regional S/D/M Day Pass at all times.

- Regarding the current Regional Monthly Pass, two changes are proposed: (1) transition the current calendar monthly pass to a 30-day rolling pass; and (2) introduce a 14-day rolling pass. A rolling pass allows the user to purchase the pass on any day of the month and is valid from the first day of use for either 14 or 30 days. The proposed changes are in response to issues raised during the last fare change hearing process in 2007 when many people commented on the difficulty of paying for a monthly bus pass at the beginning of the month when rent and other expenses are due. At that time, the Transportation Committee asked that staff evaluate how passes could be made easier to purchase by low income riders. The combination of a rolling pass along with the ability to purchase either a 14-day or 30-day rolling pass will provide a much higher level of convenience and flexibility for transit riders. Both rolling passes are proposed to be introduced in January 2009, in conjunction with the full implementation of the Compass Card. The 14-day pass would be priced at 60 percent of a 30-day pass to ensure that there is no revenue loss for MTS and NCTD.

- For the Regional Premium Day Pass, the proposed change would extend the use of the Pass to the Coaster and increase the fare $3.00 to $14.00 effective July 1, 2009; the S/M/D Premium Day Pass would also be increased by $1.50 to $7.00 effective July 1, 2009.

- Extending the validity of the Regional/Premium Day Pass to include the COASTER is highly desirable, but could not be implemented until July 1, 2009, when the Compass Card is fully deployed.

Title VI Analysis and Public Comments

SANDAG is finalizing a Title VI analysis on the proposed fare changes, and the report will be included with the agenda item on the proposed fare changes at the June 6, 2008, Transportation Committee meeting.

A number of public comments received to date by letter, email, and phone are included as Attachment 3. Staff will prepare a summary of the comments and responses with the June 6, 2008, Transportation Committee agenda item.

Fare Study Update and Public Outreach

As noted above, the draft final report for the Comprehensive Regional Fare Structure and Revenue Sharing Study will be available later this summer. The aim of the study is develop a new simplified and consolidated fare structure for MTS and NCTD that takes advantage of Compass Card and fairly shares revenue between the systems. The goal of SANDAG and the consultants is to meet or exceed the revenue needs of the operators with the least impact on ridership.

As part of the study process, SANDAG and the fare consultant held a series of five public open houses to discuss fare issues with members of the public. Organizations representing minorities and people of limited means were invited to participate and notices were placed on all transit vehicles,
and advertised in local newspapers. More than 125 people turned out and discussed what they like and dislike about the existing fares and provided input on some of the proposed structural changes. The draft report will factor the comments received into the consultant’s recommendations on changes to the fare structure and revenue sharing.

The draft report, along with a detailed listing of the comments made at the open houses, will be brought to the MTS and NCTD Boards and Transportation Committee for review later this summer. Based on that review, staff will then develop recommendations on a new ordinance for consideration by the Transportation Committee and Board of Directors that would supersede the existing Ordinance and go into effect in January 2009.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. Proposed Fare Changes
               2. Letter from JCRT to Chairman Madaffer dated 5/12/08
               3. Public Comments on Proposed Fare Changes as of 5/22/08

Key Staff Contact: Dan Levy, (619) 699-6942, dle@sandag.org
## Proposed Fare Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Element</th>
<th>01-Jul-08</th>
<th>01-Sep-08</th>
<th>01-Jan-09</th>
<th>01-Jul-09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NCTD COASTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Zone Regular Cash Fare</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Zone Regular Cash Fare</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Zone Regular Cash Fare</td>
<td>$5.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Zone Regular Cash Fare</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Zone Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$129.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$144.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Zone Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$154.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Zone Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$156.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$170.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Zone Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$168.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$182.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/M/D Cash</td>
<td>50% of Regular Cash</td>
<td>50% of Regular Cash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/M/D Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$45.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Pass</td>
<td>$84.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$91.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NCTD BREEZE/SPRINTER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$59.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$49.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Day Pass Option A</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Day Pass Option B</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NCTD LIFT/MTS Access</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD LIFT &amp; MTS Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>All fares: double fixed route regular fare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>All fares: double fixed route regular fare to cap of $5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD LIFT</td>
<td>Reduced Fare I.D. Holders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ride BREEZE &amp; SPRINTER free</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MTS Sorrento Valley Coaster Connection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Cash Fare</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/M/D Cash Fare</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/D/M Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Pass</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MTS Trolley Regular Cash Fare</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>$2.25 no transfers</td>
<td>$1.25 Downtown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B</td>
<td>$2.50 trolley only transfers</td>
<td>$1.25 Downtown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Premium Day Pass</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/M/D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Premium Monthly Pass</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Pass</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/M/D</td>
<td>$22.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior/Medicare/Disabled (S/M/D)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Corridor Day Pass</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trolley</td>
<td>50% of cash fare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Express</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Bus</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Trolley</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Bus</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Bus</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MTS/NCTD 14 Day Local/Corridor Rolling Pass</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS/NCTD 30 Day Rolling Pass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Notes
- **All fares**: double fixed route regular fare
- **All fares**: double fixed route regular fare to cap of $5.00
- **Ride BREEZE & SPRINTER free**
May 12, 2008

Chairman Jim Madafier
SANDAG Transportation Committee
401 B Street
San Diego, CA 92101

Subject: Transit Fares

Dear Chairman Madafier:

On May 1, 2008 the Joint Committee on Regional Transit (JCRT) met to discuss matters of mutual concern. Among these matters was the issue of transit fares, implementation of proposed fare increases and the fare study that has been in process at SANDAG since 2006. As you are aware, both transit agencies are facing very difficult budget decisions this year and we are jointly concerned about the process and schedule that has been set for the Transportation Committee consideration of modifications to the fare ordinance.

Due to the urgency to approve and implement balanced transit agency budgets for FY 2009, the JCRT respectfully requests that the issue of currently proposed fare increases be bifurcated from the longer range, more strategic considerations that are expected to come out of the fare study.

The JCRT requests that information regarding the fare study be presented to each transit Board with adequate time to thoughtfully consider the study and provide input to the consultants before a draft report is finalized. It was the opinion of the JCRT members that this would not be possible prior to July 1, 2008 as neither NCTD nor MTS have received any information regarding some aspects of the fare study and in light of the transit Board's current focus to approve and implement a balanced budget that will require both fare increases and service cuts.

We appreciate that SANDAG is focusing immediately on the fare increases needed to achieve balanced transit budgets for FY2009, but request that SANDAG staff work with MTS and NCTD to identify those aspects of the fare study that need more time for consideration by the transit boards. We would be happy to meet with you at your convenience to discuss our request.

Sincerely,

Harry Mathis
MTS Chair

Ed Gallo
NCTD Chair

cc: SANDAG Transportation Committee Members
MTS Board Members
NCTD Board Members
Gary Gallegos, SANDAG Executive Director
Paul Jablonski, General MTS Chief Executive Officer
Karen King, NCTD Executive Director
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Email/Voicemail</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>05/14/2008</td>
<td>10:14AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Lita McConroy</td>
<td>Customer is dissatisfied with the raising of fares and the reduction of routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>05/15/2008</td>
<td>7:58 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Matthew Stecker</td>
<td>Customer believes that if fares are raised for coaster connection in Sorrento valley, people will be driven away from using this type of public transit. Despite the fact that gas prices are up, this rise in cost will not be low enough to offset the convenience of riding in a car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>05/15/2008</td>
<td>8:36 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Christine Faschini</td>
<td>Customer comments that having the hearings during working hours, limits the sheer amount of people who can attend the meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>05/15/2008</td>
<td>8:38 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Christine Faschini</td>
<td>Customer comments that she has been riding the coaster for 10 years, and her monthly pass has only been checked six times. She believes that there should be more systems to hold customers accountable for buying a ticket.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>05/15/2008</td>
<td>8:41 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Christine Faschini</td>
<td>Customer would like to know if the rumor that a coaster conductor does not give tickets because that would mean that they would have to go to court to contest on their free days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>05/15/2008</td>
<td>8:45 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Christine Faschini</td>
<td>Customer believes that many of the budgetary problems that the coaster is dealing with is because that patrons are not held accountable to buy a ticket. She believes that the system here should be similar to Washington DC where there are ticket counters and turnstiles before patrons can board the train.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>05/15/2008</td>
<td>8:49 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Joseph Tuchscherer</td>
<td>Customer comments that it would be financially difficult to have an increase in both coaster monthly pass as well as the svcc monthly pass. He comments that if these were both to increase, he would have no choice but to stop riding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>05/15/2008</td>
<td>9:55 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Sheri Day</td>
<td>Customer comments that a raise of $14 twice in seven months is too much of a raise for the working poor. She comments that the rolling 30 consecutive day pass for the Compass card is confusing. Lastly, she agrees that senior/disabled prices should be raised, because she feels they should do their fair share also.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>05/15/2008</td>
<td>11:28 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Shane Lutz</td>
<td>Customers comments that he began to ride the train to save money on gas and car maintenance, but with the proposal of increased fares, riding his car to work would be cheaper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>05/15/2008</td>
<td>1:32 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Heather Lutz</td>
<td>Customer comments that riding the coaster and taking the free shuttle was a way to save money on gas and avoid traffic congestion. But with the rising fares it would be more convenient to ride her car, thus adding to the traffic congestion of the area. She questions how is everyone suppose to 'go green' if it's too expensive?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>05/15/2008</td>
<td>1:42 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Kimberly McIntyre</td>
<td>Customer comments that the $40 fare hikes are unfair because it is only a 1 mile ride up the hill to the Sorrento valley station. She feels that the budget overages should be mitigated by reducing the number of almost empty mid day trains and forcing youth and seniors to pay the same rates as all the other patrons. Lastly, she comments that these types of fare hikes are why average citizens cannot 'go green.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>05/15/2008</td>
<td>6:47 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Diana</td>
<td>Customer would like to speak to a SANDAG representative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>05/16/2008</td>
<td>8:24 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Susan Kincade</td>
<td>Customer comments that the rider alert in unclear if there is a savings in purchasing the compass pass. She would like to know if it is cheaper to buy the pass for a monthly, or buy single tickets every day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>05/16/2008</td>
<td>8:36 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>John Cisna</td>
<td>Customer comments that the fare increase by $68 dollars, which is a 59% increase for patrons using one zone is unfair. He also believes that it is unfair that seniors and students pay 75% less than everyone else. Customer also feels there should be a regular shuttle services to the Coaster station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>05/16/2008</td>
<td>10:36 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>William Blakeslee</td>
<td>Customer comments that he is a senior citizen who has relied on using the coaster train at Old town to get to work in north county. In the past, he has been able to ride in his car 3 miles to the station and pay $38 dollars for a monthly pass. But now, with rising fuel costs and an increase in fares he doesn't know how he will be able to afford it? Also, he comments that the rider alert is very unclear as to the exact increase in fares. He asks how do you calculate 25% of the new 4 zone coaster pass? He asks for clarification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Email/Voicemail</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>05/16/2008</td>
<td>11:33 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Lamees Mansur</td>
<td>Customer comments that increases in prices is distressful for seniors. She also comments the rider alert is unclear with exactly how much the fares will increase. She comments what is 25% of the new 4 zone pass? She comments that it should be more clear in the alert, by saying what is the current price and how much will it increase? She wonders how normal citizens will be able to afford this fares increases. She believes that the fares should be decreasing, not increasing. She would like a SANDAG employee to call her back about the exact fare increases for ADA complimentary passes and senior fares.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>05/16/2008</td>
<td>12:42 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Christopher Carmichael</td>
<td>Customer comments that he believes the fare hikes are fair, although he believes that there is too much anticipation for the compass cards and no results yet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>05/16/2008</td>
<td>9:54 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Bill Overman</td>
<td>Customer is concerned that the raised fares will affect paratransit riders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>05/16/2008</td>
<td>1:42 PM</td>
<td>Voicemail</td>
<td>Jeff London</td>
<td>Customer comments that senior/medical/ disabled fare being doubled is unfair, because they live on fixed incomes and general relief programs such as food stamps. He comments that instead of increasing fares, SANDAG should petition to get more funding for transit, or more food stamps for disabled/Medicare/senior citizens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>05/17/2008</td>
<td>1:37 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Peter Lau</td>
<td>Customer would like to know if the new fare change will affect the currently monthly bus and trolley passes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>05/17/2008</td>
<td>7:45 AM</td>
<td>Voicemail</td>
<td>Wendy Thomas</td>
<td>Customer would like to know how the senior pass fares will be changed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>05/17/2008</td>
<td>7:39 PM</td>
<td>Voicemail</td>
<td>Charles Keisar</td>
<td>Customer would like to verify the amendment to the fare proposal. He would like to be called back as soon as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>05/18/2008</td>
<td>8:54 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Ron LaClair</td>
<td>Customer is concerned that will the rising fuel costs, and also increase in transit fares, ridership will decrease. He notices that in the past couple weeks, ridership has increased, and if these raises still are processed, this may deter many patrons. He believes both the first and second fee hikes are unreasonable for the working middleclass, and a decrease in a coaster monthly pass to $28 dollars would be more reasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>05/19/2008</td>
<td>11:38 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>William Huggins</td>
<td>Customer comments that the increase in both coaster monthly pass and the svcc shuttle, will be a total of 48% increase--which she feels is unacceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>05/19/2008</td>
<td>12:18 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Diann Pierson</td>
<td>Customer comments that the $1 fare will delay the shuttle both ways. She also feels that patrons who ride the shuttle to other stops should have to pay an extra fare for different zones, similar to the coaster shuttle system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>05/19/2008</td>
<td>1:23 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Tim Scott</td>
<td>Customer comments that the svcc shuttle is a very vital service because it is close to his office, and he hopes that these fares will not be raised. He also agrees that the compass card would really be helpful to many patrons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>05/20/2008</td>
<td>9:46 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Christina</td>
<td>Customer comments that if the fares increase, people will start driving to work again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>05/20/2008</td>
<td>9:50 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Gulam Jamal</td>
<td>Customer comments that she is a new patron to the Coaster and the Coaster shuttle, and thoroughly enjoys it. She understands why the first fare raise must be made, but not the second.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>05/20/2008</td>
<td>10:03 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Marc Kozai</td>
<td>Customer believes that raising the fares would deter people from using public transportation. He comments that instead of raising all fares, some bus routes, that he sees empty many times should be cut. He also comments that the coaster shuttle is vital to those that live in north county, and those fares should not be raised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>05/20/2008</td>
<td>11:02 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Kimberly Huynh</td>
<td>Customer comments that the point of mass transit is that it should be cheaper than driving. She feels if these fares are raised, they will almost be equal. She agrees with the raise in svcc shuttle fees, but not in the raise in coaster fares.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>05/20/2008</td>
<td>12:56 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Gary Brown</td>
<td>Customer comments that if these fares are raised, he will no long use the coaster. He comments that one year ago, he paid $43 for the 10-tripper, which was eliminated. Now with these fare increases, he will have to pay $75 for the same 5 trips. He believes that instead of fare increases, the coaster should check for tickets more often.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Email/Voicemail</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>05/20/2008</td>
<td>3:10 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Warren Dale</td>
<td>Customer comments that he would like to see the svcc shuttle continue, and not to have a monthly coaster pass be 30 consecutive days, because he feels this is more of a hassle. Customer comments that if these fare hikes continue, the coaster shuttle should have extended hours. His co-workers do not take the coaster shuttle as of right now, because it does not run in off hours, when many times his co-workers have to ride the coaster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>05/20/2008</td>
<td>3:59 PM</td>
<td>Voicemail</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Customer is calling on behalf of ADA paratransit changes. He would like a call back about the changes that will occur for passes and monthly rider fees. The customer is calling on behalf of his wife who is a paratransit user.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>05/20/2008</td>
<td>9:14 AM</td>
<td>Voicemail</td>
<td>Peggy Russell</td>
<td>Customer is inquiring as to how much the fee would be for a senior that would be able to ride all transit services. She would like to know the name of the pass for a senior and the costs of all fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>05/20/2008</td>
<td>9:33 AM</td>
<td>Voicemail</td>
<td>Sheila Christine</td>
<td>Customer comments that the 30 day consecutive Coaster pass will be troublesome for people who work for company subsidized monthly transit passes. She would like a call back for some clarification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>05/20/2008</td>
<td>2:47 PM</td>
<td>Voicemail</td>
<td>Mr. Hooker</td>
<td>Customer comments that doing away from a calendar month for the monthly passes would be hard for senior citizens and disabled citizens who are on fixed incomes. He comments that an increase in cash fares seems fair, but not for monthly passes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>05/20/2008</td>
<td>10:57 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Jesse Hammond</td>
<td>Customer believes that an increase in fares will only deter people from using public transit. She wonders why the Coaster does not sell ad space on the train, just like New York and Boston do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>05/21/2008</td>
<td>8:05 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Heather Lutz</td>
<td>Customer comments that the percentage of Coaster patrons has risen 9% since last year, and now fares are being increased. She believes that people are getting greedy, and that the fare raises are unfair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>05/21/2008</td>
<td>8:52 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Dave Beadle</td>
<td>Customer comments that the fare raises will prevent companies such as his own (Qualcomm) from paying into a commuter benefits program where company subsidy with pre-tax and post tax payroll deductions are made. He strongly urges that these fees are not raised before the deadline to make adjustments on June 10, 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>05/21/2008</td>
<td>9:36 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Robert Gannon</td>
<td>Customer comments there should be some increase in fairs—but at a reasonable rate. He does not agree with the 50% increase in fares for Coaster and SVCC shuttle, and believes that ridership will falter if these fares are implemented. He believes in affordable mass transit, and hopes that these fare hikes are re-considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>05/21/2008</td>
<td>9:27 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Michael Nelson</td>
<td>Customer comments that the increase in over 50% for Coaster fares would be highly detrimental to ridership. He comments on an article that he read in North County Times that indicated that SANDAG spends 4 million dollars per year on marketing. He believes that this budget should be reduced, and that money be put into transit. Also, he feels that the service to Petco park should be cut because not enough people use it. Lastly, he comments that if these fares go into implementation his company (one of the largest in San Diego) will begin sponsoring a van pool as an alternative to the Coaster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>05/21/2008</td>
<td>10:14 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Lance Hetherington</td>
<td>Customer comments that he hopes that the svcc shuttle and coaster fares are not raised. He also comments that he would use the coaster more often if it was a little cheaper, and had extended hours to downtown SD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>05/21/2008</td>
<td>10:16 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Melinda Scott</td>
<td>Customer comments that monthly passes should cover the entire month whether that be 29 or 31. She does not agree with the raise in fares, since they just increased a few months ago. Lastly, she feels that seniors should get a discount on a day pass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>05/21/2008</td>
<td>10:48 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Chris Fulmer</td>
<td>Customer believes fare increases are too large, premium day pass is a great idea, round trip tickets for the coaster should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>05/21/2008</td>
<td>11:15 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Mark Morel</td>
<td>Customer comments that he has been a daily patron of the Coaster and Coaster connection for seven year, but if these fare increases are implemented, he will abandon this transit method.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>05/21/2008</td>
<td>11:43 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>Customer believes that prices should not be raised, because this will add to congestion on the freeways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>05/21/2008</td>
<td>12:43 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Shirley Phillips</td>
<td>Customer comments that North County times report an increase by 9% in Coaster ridership, but if the fares are increased, ridership will decrease. He believes that only one fare increase would be reasonable, instead of two.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Email/Voicemail</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>05/21/2008</td>
<td>1:35 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Violet Rosales</td>
<td>Customer comments that the increase in fees would be an additional hardship for patrons, especially since the 978 bus is always full and standing room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>05/21/2008</td>
<td>8:58 AM</td>
<td>Voicemail</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Customer would like to know if he can still purchase a monthly pass at Vons? He believes that this will be more confusing, if passes are 30 consecutive days instead of a calendar month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>05/21/2008</td>
<td>2:29 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Roxanne Olson</td>
<td>Customer is passionately against the raising of prices and vows to not use the Coaster if fares are raised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>05/21/2008</td>
<td>3:01 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Diana Brown</td>
<td>Customer would like SANDAG to consider not raising the fares for the Coaster shuttle, and also would like the pay per trip option to be reinstated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
San Diego Association of Governments

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

June 6, 2008

Action Requested: ADOPT FINDING AND HOLD FIRST READING

FIRST READING OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO COMPREHENSIVE FARE ORDINANCE AND TITLE VI FINDINGS RELATING TO AMENDMENTS

File Number 3002300

Introduction

SANDAG has been responsible for setting all public transit fares in the San Diego region since 2003. The regional fare structure is outlined in the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance (Fare Ordinance). The Fare Ordinance needs to be updated to reflect a number of proposed changes, including fare increases to address FY 2009 budget shortfalls requested by the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and North County Transit District (NCTD), and changes to make the Fare Ordinance more consistent with the TransNet Extension Ordinance and federal regulations.

Public hearings were scheduled in accordance with SANDAG Board Policy No. 025, “Public Participation and Involvement Policy,” and Board Policy No. 029, “Regional Fare Policy and Comprehensive Fare Ordinance.” In addition to the public hearing scheduled for today (Agenda Item 4A), another hearing was held in North County on May 30, 2008, in order to provide the public with opportunities to comment on the proposed changes. In addition, a telephone voice mail number, an e-mail address, and Web site were available for members of the public who wished to comment, but were unable to attend the two meetings.

This report outlines the proposed changes to the Fare Ordinance with optional language in several provisions that require input from the Transportation Committee. Action today would hold the first of two readings on these proposed amendments (the second reading is scheduled for the June 13, 2008, Board of Directors meeting).

Discussion

Highlights of Proposed Fare Ordinance Changes

The proposed amendments to the Fare Ordinance reflect the recommendations of SANDAG staff after consultation with NCTD and MTS. The proposed amendments are shown in Attachment 1, and summarized below. In several cases, an optional amendment to the staff recommendation is discussed for the Transportation Committee’s consideration. Potential effects of each option are provided based on discussions between SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD staffs.
Summary of Proposed NCTD Fare Changes

COASTER

- Increase adult cash fares by $0.50 per zone to $4.50-$6.00 (depending the number of zones traveled) on July 1, 2008, and an additional $0.50 per zone on January 1, 2009, to $5.00-$6.50. Senior/Medicare/Disabled (S/M/D) fares would increase to equal 50 percent of the adult cash fare.

- Increase adult monthly pass by $14.00-$15.00 to $129.00-$168.00 (depending on the number of zones traveled) on July 1, 2008, and an additional $14.00-$15.00 on January 1, 2009, to $144.00-$182.00.

- Increase S/M/D monthly pass by $3.50 to $42.00 on July 1, 2008, and an additional $3.50 on January 1, 2009, to $45.50.

- Increase youth monthly pass by $7.00 to $84.00 on July 1, 2008, and an additional $7.00 on January 1, 2009, to $91.00.

BREEZE and SPRINTER

- Increase NCTD day pass by $0.50 to $4.50 on July 1, 2008.

- Increase NCTD S/M/D day pass by $0.25 to $2.25 on July 1, 2008.

- Phase out the NCTD Day Pass and replace it with the $5.00 Regional Day Pass on January 1, 2009. An optional Fare Ordinance amendment would not phase out the NCTD Day Pass at this time.

The advantages of having one day pass throughout the region is that the existence of two day passes with different prices and validity has been a source of confusion and frustration for both passengers and drivers. Elimination of the BREEZE/SPRINTER Day Pass will require the current revenue sharing agreements to be modified in the Fare Ordinance. Discussions with MTS and NCTD are currently underway and revenue sharing recommendations will be made by the fare consultant in the summer of 2008. Elimination of the NCTD Day Pass would also result in an estimated $150,000 in increased revenue to NCTD

- Increase NCTD adult monthly pass by $5.00 to $59.00 on July 1, 2008

- Increase NCTD College Monthly Pass by $5.00 to $49.00 on July 1, 2008

LIFT (Americans with Disabilities Act service)

- Eliminate fares for passengers riding LIFT who also ride BREEZE or SPRINTER on July 1, 2008

Summary of Proposed MTS Fare Changes

Sorrento Valley Coaster Connection

- Implement an adult cash fare of $1.00 and an S/D/M fare of $0.50 on September 1, 2008 (no fares are currently collected).
• Implement an adult monthly passes as a supplement to 2 and 3 Zone Coaster passes of $40.00 per month, an S/D/M pass of $10.00 per month, and Youth passes of $20.00 on September 1, 2008.

Trolley

• Implement a flat cash fare of $2.25 with no transfers between trolley lines. An optional amendment to the Fare Ordinance would implement a flat cash fare of $2.50, with free transfers between trolley lines. Both would retain the existing downtown fare zone with a fare of $1.25.

The $2.25 fare would create consistency between the bus and trolley system in terms of eliminating transfers between routes (bus transfers were eliminated as of January 1, 2008), and having the same $2.25 cash fare. The $2.25 cash fare also minimizes the cost for passengers using the trolleys for shorter distanced travel. Passengers traveling on multiple trolley and bus routes and those making round trips have the $5.00 Regional Day Pass available that allows for unlimited use. This fare has fewer Title VI impacts than the $2.50 option, applies the same basic rules to bus and light rail systems across the entire County and generates the same amount of revenue as the $2.50 option.

The $2.50 fare option would allow for travel anywhere on the trolley system, including free trolley to trolley transfers (but does not allow transfers to/from the bus system). MTS staff feel that this option responds to concerns over the transfers required between the Blue and Green Lines at Old Town, Blue and Orange at 12th and Imperial and Green and Orange at Grossmont. However, based on the fare changes that were implemented in January 2008, passengers making a similar transfer between the Trolley and bus systems must pay twice unless they purchase a Day Pass. Since most passengers make roundtrips, the price of a roundtrip with a transfer under this option (2 x $2.50 = $5.00) is the same as the Regional Day Pass that passengers would already use under first option. The $2.50 results in one way Trolley trips that require one or more transfers being less expensive than one way trips on the bus network that require transfers.

Premium Express

• Implement new S/M/D and Youth monthly passes at $45.00 and $22.50, respectively, beginning on September 1, 2008, consistent with the TransNet Extension Ordinance and regional practice.

Proposed Fare Changes Affecting Both NCTD and MTS

ADA Paratransit - NCTD Lift and MTS Access

• Amend the Fare Ordinance to improve consistency with Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidance and regulations that allow fares to be up to double the fixed-route fare including transfers can be charged, with a maximum one-way trip cost of $5.00. An optional amendment to the Fare Ordinance would not have a $5.00 maximum for a one way trip.

The $5.00 maximum, while not required by FTA guidance, would eliminate the potential for considerably higher fares than at present ($4.50 maximum currently) since the FTA guidance technically would allow transit operators to charge as much as $12.00 (NCTD) or $13.50 (MTS) for an ADA Paratransit trip that requires two transfers. Not having a $5.00 one-way maximum
fare could potentially create a federal Title VI impact to low income and minority riders, and would require additional Title VI analysis. SANDAG will present a Title VI analysis of these two options at the Transportation Committee Meeting on June 6, 2008.

Senior/Disabled/Medicare (S/D/M)

- Amend the Fare Ordinance for S/D/M cash fares on MTS to improve consistency with Federal Transit Administration guidance. With the changes the S/D/M fare will be 50% of the single trip price on each service. S/D/M cash fares will increase on services with fares of more than $2.00 (Trolley, Premium, Express and Urban), and decrease on services with fares of less than $2.00 (downtown Trolley, shuttle).

Regional Passes

- Make two changes to the Regional Monthly Pass: (1) transition the current calendar monthly pass to a 30-day rolling pass, and (2) introduce a 14-day rolling pass. A “rolling pass” allows the user to purchase the pass on any day of the month and is valid from the first day of use for either 14 or 30 days. The proposed changes are in response to issues raised during the last fare change hearing process in 2007 when many people commented on the difficulty of paying for a monthly bus pass at the beginning of the month when rent and other expenses are due. At that time, the Transportation Committee asked that staff evaluate how passes could be made easier to purchase by low income riders. The combination of the rolling pass concept and the ability to purchase either a 14-day or 30-day pass will provide a much higher level of convenience and flexibility for transit riders. Both rolling passes are proposed to be introduced in January 2009, in conjunction with the full implementation of the Compass Card. The 14-day pass would be priced at 60 percent of a 30-day pass to ensure that there is no revenue loss for MTS and NCTD. The consultant preparing the Regional Fare and Revenue Sharing Study will be available at the Transportation Committee to answer questions on the concept and impact of ‘Rolling Passes’.

- Create a new Day Pass valid for travel on the COASTER and Premium Express with a fare of up to $14.00. The pass would become effective July 1, 2009; when the Compass Card is fully deployed and recommendations on revised revenue sharing can be implemented. An optional amendment would not make these changes at this time.

  Approving the recommended change would make the fare structure for the Coaster consistent with the rest of regional transit system by creating a Day Pass that allows passengers to transfer to and from SPRINTER, trolley, and bus services. It would also avoid the need to hold a separate set of public hearings were the change to be delayed until 2009. A fare of $14.00 would be required to ensure that a day pass would not be less expensive than a return trip on the COASTER (maximum $13.00), but still less expensive than the current cost of a Premium Day Pass ($10) and a Regional Day Pass combined ($10.00 + $5.00 = $15.00)

Revenue & Ridership Impacts

SANDAG is currently conducting a Transit Fare and Revenue Sharing Study and has a consultant under contract. One of the tasks assigned to the consultant is to develop a computer model to forecast revenue and ridership impacts of different fare scenarios. The consultant was asked to run the model based on the fare change proposals under consideration. The model is based on a calendar year as the last two fare adjustments have been implemented on July 1. The results, shown in Attachment 3, indicate an increase in forecasted revenues of 3 percent regionally for the second
half of calendar year 2008 and 8 percent for calendar year 2009. Ridership impacts from the proposed fare changes are expected to be minimal (1-3% decrease) over this same period; however, the model does not reflect the recent increase in ridership due to increased fuel prices, so actual ridership impacts could be less.

Title VI Analysis

Title VI of the federal Civil Rights Act and related federal regulations provide for an analysis to be done to determine if there is a disproportionate impact on people of limited means or minority racial groups prior to the implementation of any fare changes.

A Title VI assessment has been completed (Attachment 2) on the proposed fare changes and options outlined in this report. The analysis found that there are no disproportionate impacts on low income or minority (LIM) passengers from the proposed fare changes or options. The proposed $2.50 Trolley fare impacted LIM passengers slightly more than the $2.25 fare since a higher percentage of LIM riders use the Trolley for short distance trips than longer distanced trips; however, it does not have a disproportionate impact on LIM riders.

Summary of Proposed Actions

Based on the proposed fare changes and Title VI analysis outlined above, the Transportation Committee is asked to hold the first reading of the proposed amendments to the Fare Ordinance (Attachment 1). As outlined in the discussion above, there are optional language choices for the amendments that the Transportation Committee may want to make regarding the proposed changes to provisions in the Fare Ordinance concerning the NCTD and Regional Day Passes, the trolley cash fare, the ADA Paratransit fare, and the Coaster/Premium Day Pass. Should the Transportation Committee decide to pursue one or more of these optional amendments, only the language selected on June 6, 2008, will be included in the Fare Ordinance for the second and final reading at the June 13, 2008 joint meeting with the Transportation Committee and Board of Directors.

Next Steps

In order to enact the proposed changes to the Fare Ordinance, the SANDAG must hold two readings of the Fare Ordinance amendments. The second reading is scheduled to occur on June 13, 2008.

Unless otherwise specifically identified within the Fare Ordinance, all proposed amendments will go into effect 15 days after final approval by the SANDAG Board of Directors, which is planned for June 13, 2008.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance with Proposed Amendments
   2. Title VI Fare Proposal Evaluation for the San Diego Region, September 2007
   3. Projected Revenue and Ridership

Key Staff Contact: Dan Levy, (619) 699-6942, dle@sandag.org
SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
COMPREHENSIVE FARE ORDINANCE

An Ordinance Establishing a Regional
Fare Pricing Schedule

The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) ordains as follows:

SECTION 1: FINDINGS

This Ordinance is adopted to implement a Comprehensive Fare Ordinance setting forth a fare structure for all public transit service providers in San Diego County.

SECTION 2: REGIONAL TRANSIT SERVICE DEFINITIONS

2.1 ADA: Americans with Disabilities Act, as defined in Title 49, Part 37, of the United States Code.

2.2 ADA Complementary Paratransit Service: Specialized curb-to-curb transportation services provided to persons who qualify as eligible for such services under the guidelines of the ADA. Except for commuter bus, commuter rail, or intercity rail systems, each public entity operating a fixed-route system shall provide complementary paratransit or other special service to individuals with disabilities (who cannot access or use fixed-route transit due to a qualifying disability) that is comparable to the level of service provided to individuals without disabilities who use the fixed-route system.

2.3 ADA Complementary Paratransit Zone: A zone is the geographical area defined by fixed boundaries within which particular fares are established. The boundaries for the zones are determined by each of the contracting agencies for the local operator of the paratransit service. The zones are as follows:
   - Zone 1: Central San Diego
   - Zone 2: Mid-County: Poway, Rancho Bernardo, Rancho Peñasquitos, Carmel Mountain Ranch, and Sabre Springs
   - Zone 3: East County: La Mesa, El Cajon, Santee, Lakeside, Lemon Grove, Spring Valley, and parts of Alpine
   - Zone 4: South Bay: Chula Vista, Coronado, National City, Imperial Beach, Palm City, Nestor, Otay Mesa, and San Ysidro
   - Zone 5: North County Transit District (NCTD) Service Area

2.4 BREEZE: NCTD bus service.
2.5 **Bus:** Rubber-tired transit vehicles operated by Chula Vista Transit (CVT), Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), National City Transit (NCT), and NCTD.

2.6 **Bus Rapid Transit:** A form of rapid transit operated wholly or partly on exclusive bus lanes, guideways, or managed lanes.

2.7 **Child:** Any person five years of age or under.

2.8 **COASTER:** Commuter rail service operated by NCTD in the I-5 corridor.

2.9 **College Student:** Any person enrolled as a student with a current enrollment in a participating accredited San Diego area post-secondary school. Valid picture ID includes proof of enrollment in an area-wide post secondary school. MTS and NCTD may at their option further define the eligibility of students to purchase College discounted passes through sales agreements negotiated with each participating post secondary school.

2.10 **Premium Express:** Bus service with stops only at major transit centers, residential centers and activity centers; generally traveling 50 percent or more of the one-way trip miles on freeways; averaging at least 20 miles per hour, with an average passenger trip length of over 10 miles; and using commuter coaches.

2.11 **Commuter Rail Service:** Commuter rail transit vehicles (COASTER) operated by NCTD.

2.12 **Compass Card:** The Compass Card is an electronic fare medium based on contactless smart card technology. The Compass Card can hold either transit products or cash for use on regional transit services. Transit products include but are not limited to monthly passes (all types), student semester passes, multi-Day Pass, and special event period passes.

   The Compass Card utilizes wireless technology to interface with Compass validator devices on regional buses, rail platforms and regional ticket vending machines. Patrons using or validating their Compass Card will need to touch or tap their card on one of the above mentioned validator devices.

2.13 **DART-Direct Access to Regional Transit:** A curb to curb demand responsive bus service to local destinations and to transfer points with regional transit service.

2.14 **Dedicated Transportation Service:** In relation to social service agencies or other organizations, a dedicated transportation service is defined as paratransit vehicle usage that is set apart for and guaranteed to an agency for the transportation of its eligible clients. The vehicle, for a particular time frame, is for the definite use of these persons and a ride is unavailable to other eligible persons within the community.

2.15 **Disabled:** Any person with a permanent or temporary mental or physical disability as defined by the ADA. Acceptable proof of disabled fare eligibility shall be a Senior/Disabled/Medicare Compass Card, an MTS identification card, Medicare Card, NCTD disabled identification card, State of California Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) disabled identification card, or DMV placard identification card. This definition applies to persons who seek to purchase and/or use a Senior/Disabled/Medicare monthly
pass or Senior/Disabled/Medicare cash-fare for fixed-route transit or general public demand-responsive services.

2.16 **Express Service:** Bus service with limited stops including, but not limited to, major transit centers, residential centers and activity centers; has more than six stops outside Centre City or at collector end of route; generally traveling less than (50 percent of the one-way trip miles on freeways; and averaging at least 12 miles per hour, with an average passenger trip length of approximately 10 miles or under; and uses standard coaches or transit buses as designated by MTS or NCTD.

2.17 **FAST:** Curb to curb service operated on demand by NCTD in specific areas of North County using and accepting the same fares, passes and interagency transfers as regular BREEZE routes.

2.18 **Flex-Route:** Flex-route service is a point-deviation service in which vehicles stop at designated bus stops (points) at scheduled times, but during the time between two scheduled stops, drivers pick up and drop off passengers with advanced reservations over a dispersed area.

2.19 **LIFT:** LIFT provides curb-to-curb service for people with disabilities who are unable to use regular lift-equipped buses and vans in North County.

2.20 **Light Rail:** Electric light rail transit vehicles (trolley) operated by MTS or Diesel light rail transit vehicles (SPRINTER) to be operated by NCTD.

2.21 **Local Service:** Bus service on local roads serving neighborhood destinations and feeding transit centers in the immediate area as designated by MTS or NCTD.

2.22 **MTS:** Metropolitan Transit System operates services in all areas of San Diego County outside the jurisdiction of NCTD.

2.23 **MTS Shuttle Service:** Local bus service on roads serving neighborhood destinations and feeding transit centers in the immediate area as designated by either MTS or NCTD.

2.24 **NCTD:** North County Transit District operating services in Northern San Diego County. North County services include the BREEZE, LIFT, FAST, COASTER, the SPRINTER and their contract operators.

2.25 **Pass by Mail:** A service offered by SANDAG and NCTD that permits individual passengers to order passes to be delivered by postal mail.

2.26 **Personal Care Attendant:** In relation to the ADA complementary paratransit service, a personal care attendant is a person who is designated by the ADA eligible passenger to aid in their mobility. The person may be a friend, family member, or paid employee. A personal care attendant is not charged a fare on the ADA complementary paratransit service vehicle on which she/he accompanies the ADA eligible passenger. The need for and use of a personal care attendant must be indicated at the time of eligibility certification.
2.27 **Premium Express Service:** Any transit service operated by MTS or NCTD that charges a higher fare than is required for Regular Service. Premium services include NCTD COASTER and MTS Premium service.

2.28 **Regular Service:** Fixed route bus service including MTS Local, MTS Urban, MTS Express, MTS Circulators and Shuttles, and NCTD BREEZE as well as Trolley and SPRINTER Rail services.

2.29 **Rural Bus Service:** Bus service operated by MTS providing limited daily or weekly service linking rural Northeastern or Southeastern San Diego County to a multimodal transit center or major shopping center generally provided on a two-lane highway or roadway with one-way vehicle trip lengths ranging from 15 to 80 miles.

2.30 **Senior:** Any person 60 years of age or older. Acceptable proof of senior fare eligibility shall be a Medicare Card, a valid driver's license, a State of California Senior identification card, or an MTS identification card in the MTS area, or an NCTD identification card in the NCTD area. This definition applies to persons who seek to purchase and/or use a Senior/Disabled/Medicare monthly pass or Senior/Disabled/Medicare cash-fare on fixed-route transit or general public demand-responsive services.

2.31 **SPRINTER:** Diesel Multiple Unit service to be operated by NCTD in a light rail mode in the Oceanside-Escondido corridor.

2.32 **Station:** A light rail, bus rapid transit or commuter rail passenger stop. For the purposes of this ordinance, all the stops within Centre City San Diego are considered one station.

2.33 **Sworn Peace Officers:** MTS and NCTD operators will allow all local (San Diego County), state, and federal sworn peace officers, in uniform or in civilian clothes, to ride on scheduled bus and train routes without charge. This privilege does not apply to special events for off-duty officers.

2.34 **Transfers:** The action by passengers in which they leave one bus, train, or other transit vehicle and board a subsequent bus, train, or other transit vehicle to complete their trips.

2.35 **Trolley:** Light rail transit service operated by MTS.

2.36 **TVM:** Ticket Vending Machine commonly found at Trolley, SPRINTER, Commuter Rail and Bus Rapid Transit Stations, and used for the sale of single and multi-trip fare products.

2.37 **Upgrade:** An additional fare required to enhance the value of an original fare (upon transfer) or a pass to travel on a higher fare service.

2.38 **Urban Service:** Moderate speed bus service primarily on arterial streets with frequent stops as designated by MTS or NCTD.

2.39 **Youth:** Any person 6-18 years of age (inclusive). Acceptable proof of youth fare eligibility in the region shall be an MTS Youth identification card, a valid driver's license, or current school photo identification card (through high school only).
SECTION 3: REGIONAL PASSES AND TICKETS

3.1 Regional Bus and Trolley Monthly Passes

The price of a Regional Monthly Pass shall be based on service type. Local Urban Bus, Express Bus, and San Diego Trolley passes shall be $64.00 ($68 effective January 1, 2009). Premium Express passes shall be $90.00. A Regional Monthly pass shall entitle the person to whom the pass is issued to unlimited rides, during the month for which the pass is designated, on any equal or lower priced, regularly scheduled services provided by MTS and NCTD. See Section 5.7 for use on MTS Rural Designated Rural services. See Section 5.12-14 for use on the COASTER. See Section 5.6-7 for use on DART.

3.2 Regional Senior/Disabled/Medicare Bus and Trolley Monthly Passes

The price of a regional Senior/Disabled/Medicare monthly pass is $16.00 ($17.00 effective January 1, 2009) and shall entitle the Senior, or Disabled, or Medicare passenger to unlimited trips, during the month for which the pass is designated, on any regularly scheduled services provided by those operators identified in this Ordinance except the COASTER, and or MTS Rural Designated Rural Bus. See Section 5.7 for use on MTS Rural Designated Rural services. See Section 5.12-14 for use on the COASTER. See Section 5.6-7 for use on DART. An additional cash upgrade is required to ride DART and the COASTER.

The price of a Premium Express monthly pass for Senior/Disabled/Medicare shall be $22.50 effective January 1, 2009.

3.3 Regional Youth Bus and Trolley Monthly Passes

The price of a youth monthly pass is $32.00 ($34.00 effective January 1, 2009) and shall entitle the youth passenger to unlimited trips, during the month for which the pass is designated, on any regularly scheduled services provided by those operators identified in this Ordinance except the COASTER or MTS Rural Designated Rural services. See Section 5.7 for use on MTS Rural Designated Rural services. See Section 5.12-14 for use on the COASTER. See Section 5.6-7 for use on DART.

The price of a Premium Express monthly pass for Youth shall be $45 effective January 1, 2009.

3.4 Regional COASTER Monthly Pass

Effective July 1, 2008
Regular: 1 Zone: $115129.00, 2 Zone: $126140.00, 3 Zone: $142156.00, 4 Zone: $154168.00
Youth: All zones: $2284.00
Senior/ Disabled/Medicare: All zones: $38542.00

NCTD shall publish in its Rider’s Guide a listing of which COASTER stations are located in each Zone.
Effective January 1, 2009:

Regular: 1 Zone: $144.00, 2 Zone: $154.00, 3 Zone: $170.00, 4 Zone: $182.00
Youth: All zones: $91.00
Senior/Disabled/Medicare: All zones: $45.50

3.5 Half Price Bus and Trolley Passes

Half price Regional Passes may be purchased from The Transit Store from the 15th to the 24th of each month. These passes are valid from the 15th of the month to the end of the month.

Effective January 1, 2009, the Half Price Pass shall be replaced with a 14-day pass priced at $41.00.

3.6 30-Day Rolling Pass

Effective January 1, 2009, each Regional Pass listed in Section 3 shall be replaced with a 30-Day Rolling Pass. A 30-Day Rolling Pass shall be valid for unlimited rides for 30 days beginning on the first day the pass is validated.

SECTION 4: REGIONAL DAY PASSES

4.1 Regional Day Pass

Regional Day Passes shall be available at all TVMs and onboard all bus services operated by MTS and NCTD. The Regional Day Pass shall be valid for unlimited travel on any MTS or NCTD regular service for the person to whom it issued until the end of the service day on which it was issued. The price for Regional Day Passes shall be $5.00 for a one day pass. Multiple day passes shall be available for use on consecutive days. A two day pass is $9.00, a three day pass is $12 and a four day pass is $15.

The Regional Day Pass is not eligible for travel on NCTD or MTS Premium services; however, it entitles the bearer to purchase a “Transfer from Transit” ticket for the COASTER at COASTER TVMs.

4.2 Regional Premium Day Pass

Regional Premium Day Passes shall be available at all TVMs and onboard all bus services operated by MTS and NCTD. The Regional Premium Day Pass shall be valid for unlimited travel on any MTS or NCTD regular or Premium service except as noted below for the person to whom it issued until the end of the service day on which it was issued.

The Regional Premium Day Pass is not eligible for free travel on the COASTER or MTS Rural service. The Regional Premium Day Pass entitles the bearer to purchase a “Transfer from Transit” ticket for the COASTER at COASTER TVMs. Passengers holding a Regional Premium Day Pass must pay the appropriate (Adult or Senior/Disabled/Medicare) cash upgrade.
Regional Premium Day passes will be sold for $11.00 except that passengers who pay a MTS Rural Designated Rural fare will be issued a pass on demand at no cost. Passengers on ADA Complementary Paratransit services who wish to transfer to Regular or Premium Services will be issued a Premium Regional Day pass at no charge. All rules for use and upgrades for the purchased Regional Premium Day Pass apply to all free Regional Premium Day Passes.

4.2 NCTD BREEZE DAY PASS

NCTD BREEZE Day Passes are valid for unlimited travel on BREEZE, SPRINTER, and FAST services by the person to whom it was issued until the end of the service day on which it was issued. The price for a NCTD BREEZE Day Pass shall be $4.00 for adults and $2.00 for Seniors, Disabled, and Medicare passengers. Not valid on MTS services.

SECTION 5: REGIONAL CASH FARES

5.1 MTS Shuttle Fares

MTS shuttle cash fare: $1.00

5.2 MTS Local Services

MTS local service cash fare: $2.00. The fare shall be increased to effective 1/1/2007 and $2.25 effective January 1, 1/1/2009.

5.3 MTS Urban Services

MTS urban services cash fare: $2.25

5.4 MTS Express

MTS Express: $2.50

5.5 MTS Premium Express:

Premium Express: $5.00 (Effective 1/1/2008)

5.56 MTS Senior/Disabled/Medicare Cash Fares

Senior/Disabled: $1.00 The Senior/Disabled/Medicare single trip fare shall be one-half of the adult cash fare for each type of fixed-route service.
MTS DART

The price of a one-way trip on MTS DART shall be as follows:

MTS DART (Scripps Ranch, Rancho Bernardo) Regular/Adult $3.00
MTS DART Senior/Disabled $1.50
*All other prepaid fare media upgrade $0.50. (*Includes all monthly passes, Day Pass passes, and all other MTS prepaid fare media.)

MTS Designated Rural Cash Fares

The Board of Directors of MTS or NCTD may at their discretion designate any bus route operating primarily in a rural area to be a Designated Rural Route for purposes of establishing a rural fare. Designated Rural cash fares are based on a zone system. Zone boundaries run north-south from the San Diego – Riverside County line, due south to Ramona (Ramona Station), Alpine (Tavern Road and Alpine Boulevard), and Tecate border crossing (Tecate Road and Thing Road). The table provided below exhibits the one-way cash fare for travel within 1 and 2 zones applicable to regular passengers and Senior/Disabled/Medicare passengers. Tokens shall be accepted at face value and change will not be provided where token value exceeds fare.

Senior and Disabled cash fares shall be 50 percent of the regular cash fare.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular Passenger Fare</th>
<th>Senior/Disabled/Medicare Fare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within 1 Zone</strong></td>
<td><strong>Within 2 Zones</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Fare Only</td>
<td>Total Fare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTER or Regional Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 5 years and under</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Fare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

San Diego County Premium Juror Day Passes shall be accepted for a single zone rural trip.

Rural passengers may request a MTS Day Pass or Premium Day Pass upon payment of their cash fare. The MTS Day Pass or Premium Day Pass will be issued at no additional cost and is not valid for use on MTS Rural Designated Rural services.

ADA Paratransit Services Cash Fares (MTS Access or NCTD LIFT)

The cash fare for ADA Paratransit per ride for ADA Certified passengers for one complete trip, origin to destination regardless of any need to transfer between ADA operators or zones, shall be double the local fixed-route fare of the typical fixed-route service linking the origin and destination based on a determination by MTS or NCTD. Such determination must be made by calculating the regular fixed-route fare including transfers for a trip of similar length, at a similar time of day, on the operator's fixed-route system.

MTS ADA tickets are valid only for use on MTS ADA services. NCTD ADA tickets are valid only for use on NCTD ADA services.
There is no charge to transfer from any ADA Paratransit service to any Local, Community, Corridor, or Regional bus or rail service. A transfer slip will be issued by the driver of the ADA Paratransit service.

Passengers transferring from any Local, Community, Corridor, or Regional bus or rail service must pay a supplement if the fare paid on the Local, Community, or Regional service is less than the fare on the ADA Paratransit service they are boarding. The supplement required will be the applicable ADA Paratransit fare less the amount of any fare paid on the Community, Local, Corridor, or Regional route.

Passengers transferring from fixed route to ADA Paratransit service will only receive a transfer credit if the fare paid on the fixed-route service is a fare for which a paper receipt or Day Pass is issued. This includes single and return trip rail tickets, or bus and rail day passes. If a single trip cash fare is deposited into a fixed-route farebox, the ADA passenger will be required pay the full fare when boarding a subsequent ADA vehicle as receipts are not issued for single trip cash fares deposited into the farebox.

One personal care attendant may ride free with each ADA passenger riding an ADA Paratransit or transit vehicle if the requirement for an attendant is identified on the ADA certification.

5.10 NCTD Reduced Fare Identification Card on BREEZE and SPRINTER

Passengers holding a valid NCTD issued Paratransit Reduced Fare Identification Card may ride BREEZE, FAST, or SPRINTER services without payment of any fare. A personal care attendant may also ride free accompanying the passenger with a Reduced Fare Identification Card if the requirement for a personal care attendant is identified on the Paratransit Reduced Fare Identification Card.

Zone 1 (MTS Access): $4.50
Zone 2 (MTS Access): $3.50
Zone 3 (MTS Access): $3.50
Zone 4 (MTS Access): $3.50
Zone 5 (NCTD LIFT): $4.00
10 Ticket Book for Zone 1: $45.00
Coupon Book for Zones 2 – 4: $40.00
10 Ticket Book for Zone 5: $40.00

5.1011 Trolley One-Way Cash Fares

Senior/Disabled: $1.00
Centre City: $1.25
1 station: $1.50
2 stations: $1.75
3 stations: $2.00
4-10 stations: $2.25
11-19 stations: $2.50
Effective September 1, 2008, the fare for a single, one-way trip between any two stations on a single Trolley line shall be $2.25 for an adult. Each trip with a single ride ticket must be completed within 2 hours of the time a ticket is purchased or validated.

A one-way is defined as a one-way trip in a direction away from the station of issue. The one-way ticket is valid for two hours and must be valid during the entire trolley trip. Round-trip tickets may be sold at two times the price of a single-ride ticket. A round-trip ticket shall entitle the person to whom the ticket is issued one round trip, which may be used at any time throughout the operating day.

**5.1012 Round-Trip Trolley Cash Fares Downtown Zone**

- Round-trip 2 @ $1.00: $2.00 (Senior/Disabled/Medicare fare)
- Round-trip 2 @ $1.25: $2.50 (Centre City Only fare)
- Round-trip 2 @ $1.50: $3.00
- Round-trip 2 @ $1.75: $3.50
- Round-trip 2 @ $2.00: $4.00
- Round-trip 2 @ $2.25: $4.50
- Round-trip 2 @ $2.50: $5.00
- Round-trip 2 @ $3.00: $6.00

The adult price of a trip on the Trolley originating and terminating at any two stations between American Plaza and to 12th and Imperial shall be $1.25.

A round-trip ticket shall entitle the person to whom the ticket is issued one round-trip, which may be used at any time throughout the operating day.

**5.1113 NCTD BREEZE, FAST, SPRINTER, and NCTD COASTER Connection Services:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash</th>
<th>Day Pass</th>
<th>Senior/and Disabled/Medicare unlimited use for one day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$2.0025*</td>
<td>$4.0050*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* BREEZE/SPRINTER Day Pass will be discontinued on December 31, 2008.

**5.1214 COASTER Regular Cash Fares and Tickets**

Effective July 1, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Zones</th>
<th>Single Trip Transfer From Transit</th>
<th>Regular Single Trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Zone</td>
<td>$2.0050</td>
<td>$4.0050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Zones</td>
<td>$2.503.00</td>
<td>$4.505.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Zones</td>
<td>$3.0050</td>
<td>$5.0050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Zones</td>
<td>$3.504.00</td>
<td>$5.56.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Senior/ & Disabled/Medicare COASTER Fares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Zones</th>
<th>Single Trip Transfer From Transit</th>
<th>Regular Single Trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Zone</td>
<td>$1.0025</td>
<td>$2.0025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Zones</td>
<td>$1.2550</td>
<td>$2.2550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Zones</td>
<td>$1.5075</td>
<td>$2.5075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Zones</td>
<td>$1.752.00</td>
<td>$2.753.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effective January 1, 2009**

NCTD shall publish in its Rider’s Guide the name of each COASTER Station and the zone in which it is located.

An **cash upgrade** (“Transfer from **PassTransit**”) ticket is required for all regional day and monthly passes. ADA Paratransit riders may transfer to the COASTER free of charge.

**Persons holding valid COASTER monthly passes may ride any Amtrak Pacific Surfliner within the origin and destination zones of their passes. The Rail 2 Rail program is subject to annual renewal with the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak).**

### Rail 2 Rail

**The Rail 2 Rail program is subject to annual renewal with the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak).** Persons holding valid Amtrak tickets may ride any COASTER train between Oceanside and San Diego within the origin/destination stations listed on the ticket. The program includes riders on Amtrak Thruway buses between Oceanside and San Diego on a space available basis. **The Rail 2 Rail program is subject to annual renewal with the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak).**
5.14 Children

Children age five (5) and under ride free on all fixed route and general public dial a ride services operated by MTS and NCTD. The number of free children permitted per paying adult, senior, or youth fare shall be determined by NCTD or MTS.

5.17 Multi-Trip Tickets

NCTD or MTS may, at their option, bundle and sell packs of at least ten multiple single-trip tickets for any service they operate. The ticket bundles may be sold at a discount of up to 10 percent of the face value.

5.18 Sorrento Valley Coaster Connection

The single trip Sorrento Valley Coaster Connection (SVCC) fare shall be $1.00 for Adults and $0.50 for Senior/Disabled/Medicare.

The price for a monthly pass for the SVCC shall be $40.00 for Adults, $20.00 for Youth, and $10.00 for Senior/Disabled/Medicare.

All Regional Day Passes or Monthly Passes will be accepted onboard the SVCC. COASTER passes and BREEZE/SPRINTER passes will not be valid for payment of the SVCC fare.

SECTION 6: REGIONAL MONTHLY PASS UPGRADES AND TRANSFERS

6.1 Regional Pass Upgrades

Passengers holding a valid Regional Adult Monthly pass may take an unlimited number of trips for the period of validity of the pass on any MTS or NCTD service except Premium Services. Passengers with a Regional Pass may purchase a COASTER Cash-fare by selecting the “Transfer with Pass from Transit” option. Monthly Regional pass holders may not use the pass on MTS Premium Express. Regional Monthly Pass holders will receive a discount of $1.00 per zone on MTS Rural Designated Rural Services.

6.2 Senior/Disabled/Medicare and Youth Pass Upgrades

There shall be no cash upgrades required on Senior/Disabled/Medicare or youth monthly passes for travel on any regularly scheduled services provided by those operators identified in this ordinance except:

- An upgrade of $2.00 per zone for Seniors/Disabled for passengers transferring to MTS Rural Bus Services.
- An upgrade of $4.00 per zone for Youth passengers transferring to MTS Rural Bus Services.
- An upgrade based on zones for passengers transferring to the COASTER.
6.3 **Bus, SPRINTER, Trolley Transfers**

Passengers wishing to transfer between MTS Regular or between MTS and NCTD Regular services must pay a cash fare upon boarding each service, or be in possession of a valid Regional Day Pass or valid Regional Premium Day Pass. Passengers transferring between NCTD Regular Services may use a NCTD BREEZE Day Pass.

6.4 **MTS and NCTD Transfers**

Passengers who wish to transfer between the BREEZE and MTS must pay the appropriate cash fare for each boarding unless they are in possession of a day pass or monthly pass valid for the vehicle they are boarding. Passengers holding a Regional Day Pass or Premium Day Pass must select the “Transfer with Pass from Transit” button on COASTER ticket vending machines and pay the required fare.

Passengers with a valid COASTER ticket may board any MTS Bus or Trolley within the validity period of their ticket. *Effective July 1, 2009, a COASTER ticket will not be accepted as payment toward any fare on MTS services.*

6.5 **BREEZE Social Service Day Pass**

The BREEZE Social Service Day Pass is not accepted for travel on MTS.

6.6 **TRANSFERS to and from ADA Service**

Passengers wishing to transfer between MTS ADA Complementary Paratransit services and regular or premium transit services must be in possession of a Regional Premium Day Pass. A Regional Premium Day Pass will be issued on demand at no cost to any eligible ADA certified passenger onboard a Paratransit vehicle. *NCTD ADA Paratransit passengers may transfer at no cost to BREEZE or SPRINTER using a transfer issued onboard the ADA Paratransit Service.*

Eligible passengers with a validated COASTER ticket may transfer to an ADA Complementary Paratransit service vehicle without the payment of an upgrade charge.

Eligible ADA passengers may transfer to ADA Complementary Paratransit service with a Trolley ticket. Upon boarding the ADA vehicle they will be required to pay an upgrade so that the total fare for the trip on Trolley and ADA Paratransit is equivalent to the applicable ADA fare.

Eligible ADA passengers may transfer to ADA Complementary Paratransit service with a SPRINTER ticket. Upon boarding the ADA vehicle they will be required to pay an upgrade so that the total fare for the trip on SPRINTER and ADA Paratransit is equivalent to the applicable ADA fare.

*BREEZE Drivers may issue transfers to ADA eligible passengers who wish to transfer from the BREEZE to NCTD ADA Complementary Paratransit. Passengers presenting a transfer when boarding an NCTD ADA Complementary Paratransit bus must pay an upgrade so that the total fare for the trip on bus and ADA Paratransit is equivalent to the applicable NCTD ADA fare.*
SECTION 7: TRANSFERS WITH OTHER TRANSIT OPERATORS WITHIN OR OUTSIDE SAN DIEGO COUNTY

7.1 METROLINK Trip Tickets and Monthly Passes

METROLINK Trip Tickets and Monthly Passes are valid as full boarding fare on all NCTD bus routes and the SPRINTER on all routes directly serving the Oceanside Transit Center. METROLINK tickets and passes are not valid for transferring between NCTD routes or between NCTD and MTS. METROLINK tickets are not valid for transfers to the COASTER. The rules governing the acceptance of these are as follows:

a. **Monthly Pass:** This pass MUST have the correct current month and year, and list Oceanside as a valid city printed on it to be valid.

b. **Ten-Ride Ticket:** This ticket has a validation printing area for each of ten (10) rides on METROLINK. In order to be valid to board an NCTD bus at Oceanside, the current date must appear in one of the boxes numbered 1 - 10.

c. **Round-Trip Ticket:** This ticket must be imprinted with the current date and is valid until the time shown on that date on buses operating to and from the Oceanside Transit Center.

d. **One-Way Ticket:** This ticket must be imprinted with the current date and is valid until the time shown on that date, to board a bus departing the Oceanside Transit Center only.

7.2 NCTD and Orange County Transit Transportation Authority (OCTA) Transfers

The following transfer agreement is in effect with OCTA between its Route 1 and Route 191 and BREEZE Route 395:

a. **BREEZE Route 395 to OCTA Route 1 or Route 191:** The passenger will pay the appropriate NCTD single cash fare (or Day Pass fare) and be issued an interagency transfer onboard the 395. This transfer or Day Pass will be accepted by OCTA drivers as full fare for one boarding. In addition, NCTD BREEZE Passes and Regional Passes will be accepted by OCTA as full fare for one boarding on its system.

b. **OCTA Route 1 or Route 191 to BREEZE Route 395:** An OCTA passenger may transfer from an OCTA bus to NCTD Route 395 by displaying a valid OCTA Day Pass, or a valid OCTA Monthly Pass. No further fare upgrade will be required. The OCTA Day Pass or Monthly Pass is good for one boarding only on NCTD service. Therefore, the OCTA Day Pass or OCTA Monthly Pass is valid only on Route 395 in San Clemente, as this is the only route that connects with OCTA. Passengers continuing on other routes in Oceanside will need to pay a single cash fare or purchase an NCTD Day Pass.
SECTION 9: PARTICIPATION IN THE REGIONAL FARE SYSTEM

The policy for participation in the regional fare system by transit providers shall be as follows:

- Private operators participating in the regional fare system must operate a fixed route and fixed, published schedule.
- Operators must serve an area or need not currently served by an existing operator.
- Any publicly subsidized operator should be incorporated into the regional fare system to the extent feasible and practical.
- Any transit provider handling regional transit fare media shall have a secure handling procedure for all media. Fare media shall be handled as cash-value media, with appropriate security provided for acceptance, inspection, storage, distribution, and disposal.

SECTION 10: OTHER REGIONAL FARE MEDIA AND PROGRAMS

10.1 Regional Universal Tokens

Universal tokens shall be available for $2.25 each, and in multiples of 20 ($45.00) or 40 ($90.00), and shall entitle the person holding the universal token to up to a $2.25 cash-fare value trip on any MTS or NCTD regular bus, or Trolley service (not including COASTER, SPRINTNER or ADA Paratransit services). Some Bus and Trolley services may require an cash upgrade in conjunction with the universal token.

10.2 Classroom Day Pass - Bus and Trolley

Classroom Day Pass, valid for one day during nonpeak hours on NCTD and MTS, may be issued to school and youth groups (up to 18 years of age) on an advance sales basis only. Each group shall consist of a minimum of 15 people. One chaperone per every five students may ride at the Classroom Day Pass price. The price of Classroom Day Pass shall be $1.50 per person.

10.3 Classroom Day Pass - COASTER

The COASTER Classroom Day Pass provides special round trip fare on selected trains only of $3.00 per person. Additional fare of $1.50 is required for transfer to MTS Bus or Trolley. Travel during nonpeak hours Monday through Friday. Maximum of 135 student and adults per group on a scheduled train. Not all trains are available at the group rate. Classroom Day Passes that provide use of the COASTER, BREEZE, and FAST services are $4.50 per person.

10.4 MTS Hotel Scratch One-Day Pass

The Hotel Scratch One-Day Pass is a one-day MTS Day Pass priced at a standard one-day price but with scratch off instead of punched month, day, and year boxes. The Day Pass has a unique serial number code, and the customer may not return or exchange a Day Pass. Only hotels with a pass sales agreement can sell this type of Day Pass.
10.5 **NCTD Social Service Agency Day Pass**

The NCTD Social Service Agency Day Pass is a one-day NCTD Day Pass, sold in packs of ten priced at $40.00, which is validated by Social Service agencies by punching or scratching off the proper day, month, and year. It is sold only to qualified social service agencies who agree to dispense the Day Pass according to NCTD requirements. The Social Service Agency Day Pass has a unique serial number code, and the customer may not return or exchange a Social Service Agency Day Pass. For transfers to MTS, review section 6.4.d.

10.6 **San Diego County Juror Day Passes**

Any Court in San Diego County following successful partnership negotiations with SANDAG/MTS/NCTD may purchase special fare media to be distributed to jurors who turn in their Jury Summons at a Court house in San Diego County. The following special juror fare media are available for purchase:

Juror Regional Day Pass valid for all Regular MTS and NCTD services. The price per day for this pass shall be 85 percent of the Regional Day Pass.

Juror Regional Premium Day Pass valid for travel on NCTD and MTS Regular and Premium Services except 2 Zone Rural Bus services. The price of this pass shall be 85 percent of a Premium Day Pass. Use of this pass for a 2 Zone rural trip will require payment of a $5.00 upgrade for adults, and $4.00 for seniors in each direction.

**SECTION 11:**

11.1 **MTS Pass, Token, and Ticket Sales Commission:**

The commission is the amount of money that is retained from the retail purchase price by an authorized pass sales outlet including Transit Store on the sale of each monthly pass, token, Prepaid Ticket, or Day Pass. The following chart shows the Pass Sales Commissions for the region:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FARE MEDIA</th>
<th>PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT ($)</th>
<th>AMOUNT (%)</th>
<th>EFFECTIVE DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$64.00</td>
<td>$0.64</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1/1/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly or 30-Day Pass</td>
<td>$68.00</td>
<td>$0.68</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1/1/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Senior/Disabled Premium</td>
<td>$22.50</td>
<td>$0.34</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1/1/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Youth Premium</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$0.67</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1/1/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly or 30-Day Pass</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1/1/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Pass Senior/Disabled</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$0.24</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1/1/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Pass Youth</td>
<td>$32.00</td>
<td>$0.48</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1/1/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly or 30-Day Pass Senior/Disabled</td>
<td>$17.00</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1/1/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Day Pass</td>
<td>$41.00</td>
<td>$0.62</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1/1/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly or 30-Day Pass Youth</td>
<td>$34.00</td>
<td>$0.51</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1/1/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.25 Token 20-Pack</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$0.45</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.25 Token 40-Pack</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11.2 Regional Group Advance Day Pass Sales

Group event day passes, valid for one to seven days, may be issued to groups (minimum quantity = 100) only on a 21-day or longer advance sales basis. The price of group event advance sales passes shall be as follows:

- One-Day Pass: $4.50
- Two-Day Pass: $8.00
- Three-Day Pass: $11.00
- Four-Day Pass: $14.00
- Five-Day Pass: $16.00
- Six-Day Pass: $18.00
- Seven-Day Pass: $20.00

The group event day pass shall entitle the person to whom the pass is issued unlimited rides during the corresponding number of consecutive days for which the pass is valid on any regularly scheduled services provided by NCTD or MTS. Use on designated Rural Bus services will require payment of $4.00 per zone upgrade.

Group event day passes for special events may be purchased in bulk in advance at discounted rates as follows or as otherwise agreed to by the SANDAG Board:

- 100-999 passes: Regular advanced day pass price
- 1,000-1,999 passes: 5 percent discount per pass
- 2,000-2,999 passes: 10 percent discount per pass
- 3,000+ passes: 15 percent discount per pass
- 4,000+ passes: 20 percent discount per pass

11.3 MTS College Semester/Monthly Pass

MTS shall sell a College Semester Pass and a College Monthly Pass. The College Semester Pass shall be payable in advance, and sold only during the term’s registration period. The College Semester Pass and College Monthly shall have the same validity as a Regional Monthly Pass. MTS at its sole discretion may add bonus days to the validity of any College Pass.

The price of a College Semester Pass shall be priced per day for a college semester of not less than 63 days. The price shall be based on a 35 percent discount on the Regional Monthly Pass, divided by 31 and multiplied by the number of days in the semester school year. MTS shall divide the total amount per school year into two, three, or four equal installments to correspond to the college calendars. The period of validity of a Semester Pass may not be less than two calendar months.
A College Monthly pass shall be priced at a 20 percent discount of a Regional Monthly Pass.

The semester and monthly college student pass is to be sold only at schools, colleges, and universities that have signed a sales agreement with MTS defining eligibility and other criteria deemed necessary by MTS.

11.4 MTS ACCESS and NCTD LIFT Service Ticket Books:

All ADA prepaid fare media will only be **valid only** on the system for which it was developed. Each system shall have the flexibility to price the tickets at a level that is consistent with the ADA fare that is charged in the operating area.

11.5 Northbound San Ysidro Trolley Ticket

The Northbound Trolley Ticket, dispensed from the San Ysidro kiosk, is good for a one-way, northbound trip on the San Diego Trolley for a maximum fare ride of $2.50 (up to 19 stations from San Ysidro on any San Diego Trolley route). The ticket is punched by the San Ysidro vendor at the point of sale for the hour, minute, month, date, and year of travel and expires 120 minutes after the time punched.

11.6 Ecopass Group Sales Pass Program

This program is for businesses or groups with 25 or more employees or members who purchase Bus and Trolley monthly passes and who are willing to purchase 25 passes or more for a minimum of three months. The price would be set based on participation in the program for a year for the specified number of monthly passes. Only one trial program is permitted per employer or group. The trial program agreement must be for a specific fiscal year. Advance payment for the total number of Trial Program passes is required. The discount is available for an employer or group purchasing 300 or more passes for an annual (12 months) program. The program can be pro-rated to accommodate the time left in the fiscal year. The program agreement and payment must be for a specific fiscal year. Advance payment for the total number of annual monthly passes is required.

The price of the employer or group sales pass program shall be tiered according to the number of annual regular adult passes purchased. The discount offered shall be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Quantity</th>
<th>Average Users</th>
<th>Month Discount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 300 to 600 passes/year</td>
<td>25 - 50</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 601 to 1,200 passes/year</td>
<td>51 - 100</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 1,201 to 3,000 passes/year</td>
<td>101 - 250</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 3,001 or more passes/year</td>
<td>251 or more</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The standard $64 ($68) prediscounted Monthly Pass is valid on all regular Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) buses, the San Diego Trolley, and NCTD BREEZE, SPRINTER, and FAST services.
Cash upgrades apply when using this pass on MTS Premium Express Bus, MTS Rural Designated Rural Service, and the COASTER.

11.76 Temporary, Promotional, and Experimental Fares

The two transit agencies shall have the ability to set temporary, promotional and experimental fares. Temporary, promotional, and experimental fares are defined as fares implemented for no more than twelve months for seasonal events or for marketing purposes. These fares because of their short term/temporary nature would not need to be included in the Comprehensive Fare Ordinance or require a public hearing.

SECTION 12: NCTD ONLY FARE MEDIA & PROGRAMS

12.1 BREEZE Monthly Pass (NCTD): $54.00

This monthly pass valid on BREEZE, SPRINTER, and FAST services for unlimited trips during the one calendar month it is issued. It is not valid for travel on MTS.

12.2 BREEZE College Pass

This monthly pass is valid on BREEZE, SPRINTER, and FAST services for unlimited trips by college students during the one calendar month it is issued. NCTD may sell discounted BREEZE monthly passes to any post secondary educational institution (college) in its service area with whom NCTD signs an agreement establishing terms and conditions. The price for monthly passes sold to post secondary educational institutions shall be $10.00 per month less than the regular BREEZE Monthly pass. It is not valid for travel on MTS.

12.3 BREEZE/SPRINTER/BREEZE Day Pass

NCTD fareboxes and SPRINTER ticket vending machines issue a Day Pass when the passenger deposits $4.00 (or $2.00 for Senior/Disabled/Medicare upon proper key entry by the operator). The Day Pass is valid for unlimited travel on all NCTD BREEZE bus routes, the SPRINTER, and NCTD FAST services until 11:59 p.m. (or last bus of the day) on the date of issue. It is not valid for travel on MTS.

The NCTD SPRINTER/BREEZE Day Pass is valid as a transfer for one connecting bus trip on OCTA services.

The NCTD Breeze/SprinterSPRINTER/BREEZE Day Pass shall not be sold after December 31, 2008.

12.4 Social Service Agency Day Pass

NCTD one-day pass valid for unlimited travel on all NCTD BREEZE bus routes, SPRINTER, and NCTD FAST Service until 11:59 p.m. or last bus of the day on the date of issue. For transfers to MTS please see section 6.4.d.

12.5 LIFT 10 Ride Ticket Books
NCTD sells 10 Ride Ticket Books to eligible ADA certified agencies and eligible ADA certified passengers for $40.00.

SECTION 13: REGIONAL TICKET AND PASS ADMINISTRATION

This section shall cover the administration of printing, sales, boarding counts, revenue collection, and revenue allocation for regular, senior/disabled, Day Pass, all tickets, and tokens. All figures for the Adult pass include the College Semester/Monthly Pass. This section does not apply to general public or Senior/Disabled/Medicare dial-a-ride operators.

13.1 SANDAG Responsibilities

SANDAG shall ensure that each operator submits Monthly Pass boarding counts by category (adult - all zones combined, senior/disabled, and youth), all ticket counts (by ticket type), and tokens and transfer upgrades to SANDAG on a monthly basis. In addition, SANDAG shall ensure that those operators operating Express and Commuter Express routes submit pass-boarding counts by route. SANDAG shall also ensure that appropriate operators submit transfer upgrade activity counts.

13.2 SANDAG shall distribute the proportion of revenues from all regional fare media, including but not limited to, tokens. Adult Monthly Passes, Senior/Disabled/Medicare and Youth Monthly Passes, College Semester/Monthly Passes, and ticket sales are to be allocated to each operator on a countywide basis in accordance with Exhibit 1.

13.3 SANDAG shall determine the proportion of revenues from Senior/Disabled/Medicare and Youth Monthly Pass sales to be allocated to each operator on a countywide basis in accordance with Exhibit 1.

13.4 SANDAG shall determine the proportion of revenues from all ticket sales to be allocated to each operator on a countywide basis in accordance with the formula shown in Exhibit 1.

13.5 SANDAG shall submit the Monthly Pass summary counts and allocation percentages by category (Adult, Senior/Disabled, Youth, and College Semester/Monthly) and all pass levels and all ticket counts (by type) for each operator. SANDAG shall disburse the Monthly Pass, Day Pass, upgrades, and ticket sales revenue collected to the various operators in accordance with the calculated percentages. SANDAG shall complete said percentages and counts for the previous month by the 25th day of the month following.

13.6 SANDAG shall prepare a yearly summary of Monthly Passes, tokens, and ticket riders (by operator).

13.7 SANDAG shall fund and administer the design and printing of regional passes, tokens, and tickets. The design of which shall be subject to approval by the operators.

13.8 SANDAG shall fund the regional prepaid fare program encompassing the distribution and sales reconciliation of Monthly Passes (for Adults by price, Senior/Disabled, and Youth), Day Pass Passes, tokens, all tickets, pass-by-mail program media. A Pass Sales Manager employed by SANDAG will be the coordinator of this fare program.
13.9  SANDAG shall determine the Day Pass pass sales revenue to be allocated to MTS, NCTD, and any participating private operator based on the number of boardings by operator. Allocation to a private operator shall be determined and updated each calendar year based on Day Pass usage surveys.

13.10 SANDAG shall prepare a monthly summary of TransNet Local Transportation Sales Tax subsidies for Senior/Disabled/Medicare and Youth Passes, or any other local jurisdiction subsidy by the end of the month.

13.11 SANDAG shall prepare a monthly summary of regional Monthly Pass (for Adult by price, Senior/Disabled, and Youth), Day Pass Pass, and all ticket revenue distribution, including subsidies, and shall submit a copy of these data, SANDAG summary counts, and allocation percentages to each operator.

13.12 SANDAG shall keep a separate fund for all pass and ticket sales revenue received.

13.13 SANDAG shall issue a check monthly to each operator for its portion of Adult Monthly Passes, Senior/Disabled/Medicare Passes, Youth Passes, Day Pass Passes, all tickets, TransNet Local Transportation Tax subsidies (MTS area operators only). The pass and ticket revenue check shall reflect the net amount to be received by each operator after adjustment is made to allocate transfer fares paid on first vehicles as described in Exhibit 1. Checks for a particular month's revenue shall be issued by SANDAG for all funds received, and any applicable interest earned, during the previous month. These checks shall be issued within ten working days from the beginning of the month of the SANDAG report. A reconciling report shall be sent to each operator showing which month the money is from and any adjustments needed (e.g., bad checks, theft, or error).

13.14 SANDAG shall bill local jurisdictions monthly for any subsidy payments that may result from a reduced price monthly pass program established by that jurisdiction and apportion such revenue to the appropriate operators.

SECTION 14: OPERATOR RESPONSIBILITIES

14.1 Each operator shall determine pass riders by category: Adult (all zones combined), Senior/Disabled/Medicare and Youth, ticket riders by type, and tokens. Operators shall determine other prepaid fare media (Day Pass, Classroom Day Pass) as feasible, based on current farebox technology in use. Those operators operating Express, Commuter Express routes shall count pass boardings by route for Express, and Commuter Express services. Buses shall be equipped to permit operators to maintain a daily count of each category, type of rider, and upgrades. A daily record shall be maintained and kept on file for a one-year period. Such records shall be made available to SANDAG at its request. For the purpose of ticket revenue allocation, the tickets shall be counted as follows:

- A ticket received for fare payment is counted as a ticket for revenue allocation.
- A Day Pass pass, ticket usage, and upgrades on the San Diego Trolley shall be determined on a sampling basis as prescribed by SANDAG.
14.2 Each operator shall prepare a monthly summary of pass riders (by category and route, where applicable), all tickets, token riders (by type), and upgrades using the formula in Exhibit 1, and submit the summary of the previous month to SANDAG by the 23rd day of the month following.

14.3 Each operator shall permit SANDAG to be the arbiter in case of questions regarding pass counts, and SANDAG shall justify its decision to the operator(s) in question.

SECTION 15: IDENTIFICATION CARDS

15.1 MTS Transit identification cards for senior, disabled, and youth riders shall be available at The Transit Store at a price of $6.00. A $4.00 fee will be charged for a lost or stolen replacement card.

15.2 NCTD reduced fare ID cards are available free from NCTD Customer Service. A $5.00 replacement fee is charged for replacement cards after the first free card.

SECTION 16: COMPASS CARD

16.1 SANDAG, the administrator of the Compass Card Program, may require a nonrefundable fee to acquire a Compass Card. The fee shall not exceed $5.00.

Compass Card users may elect to register their card. If registered, users will be entitled to one fee free replacement if the card is lost or stolen. Additionally, registered users of the Compass Card are entitled to balance protection. Registered users will be reimbursed their cash or transit product at the time the card is reported lost or stolen. Reimbursement will be provided on a new Compass Card or through the refund process outlined in Paragraph 17.6. An unregistered user shall have no right to reimbursement or refund of a Compass Card balance even if the card is lost or stolen.

Compass Card users may opt not to participate in the registration program, but shall be required to pay the above-mentioned fee and will not receive the benefits of registration. Whether or not a user pays a fee or participates in the registration program, the Compass Card shall be the property of SANDAG and may be revoked and/or confiscated by SANDAG, MTS, or NCTD personnel.

16.2 Compass Card users who have a transit product stored on their card must validate their card on each transit service that they ride, each and every time they use the service. Compass Card users must validate their cards via on-board validators on buses or station platform validators for rapid transit services such as COASTER, Trolley, SPRINTER, and BRT services.

Patrons who fail to validate their Compass Card in the manner describe above will be deemed to not be in possession of valid fare and subject to applicable fines and penalties.

16.3 Use of a Compass Card with a “stored value” is defined as use of any Compass Card for a debit transaction for transit service when transit cash has been placed on the card.
Compass Card users must present their card to the appropriate deduction device when entering fixed fare transit services (e.g. fixed route bus, SPRINTER) and present their card to the appropriate validator device when entering and exiting zone-based transit services (COASTER, Trolley).

Patrons who fail to present their Compass Card while entering transit services in the manner describe above, will be deemed to not be in possession of valid fare and subject to applicable fines and penalties.

Patrons who fail to present their Compass Card while exiting zone-based transit services in the manner describe above, will be charged the highest rate for that service mode.

16.4 Users of the Compass Card must produce the Compass Card for inspection by authorized MTS, SANDAG, NCTD, security or law enforcement staff on demand.

16.5 The San Diego Compass Card is intended as a fare payment device on MTS services and NCTD services and any non-authorized use of the card is strictly forbidden. Persons found to be using the Compass Card in a fraudulent manner may have their Compass Card confiscated, their account suspended, and any remaining cash value in the account may be eligible for a refund following the procedure in Section 17.6.

16.6 Refunds of transit products on Compass Cards will not be provided.

Refunds of cash value remaining on voluntarily surrendered cards and confiscated cards will be considered on an individual basis for holders of registered Compass Cards only. Registered Compass Card holders seeking a refund must complete an application form available from the Transit Store or NCTD Customer Service, and follow the submission instructions on the application. SANDAG reserves the right to refuse any request for refund, or to make a partial refund. SANDAG also reserves the right to deduct a processing fee of not more than 10 percent on any refund.

Refunds will be issued as a credit on the same card as the original purchase if made by credit card. Original payments made by cash, check or debit card will be refunded by check.
SECTION 17: EFFECTIVE DATE OF AMENDMENTS

17.1 Unless otherwise specifically identified within this Ordinance, all amendments to this Ordinance shall go into effect 15 days after final approval by the SANDAG Board of Directors on the dates specified below.

Amendments pertaining to the SPRINTER shall go into effect upon start up of revenue service of the SPRINTER.

All other amendments made as of October 19, 2007, shall go into effect on January 1, 2008, unless identified as coming into effect on January 1, 2009.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the San Diego Association of Governments, this ____ day of ______ June, 2007-2008 by the following vote:

AYES:

NAYS:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

I, Clerk of the Board of SANDAG, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of an Ordinance adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors on June 13October 19, 2007, 2008, at the time and by the vote stated above, which said Ordinance is on file in the office of SANDAG.

DATED: October 19, 2007________________________, 2008

_________________________________________
Clerk of the Board
Exhibit 1

REVENUE SHARING AGREEMENTS
ADULT PASS
REVENUE ALLOCATION FORMULA

PROCEDURE DESCRIPTION

This formula shall be applied to all regional monthly passes sold at $64 effective January 1, 2008) ($68 effective January 1, 2009). The $90 passes are not part of the formula except that 5 percent of the total revenue from the $90 passes is retained for the region and combined with the $64 ($68) revenue. (The five-percent rate represents the transfer rate on the Premium Express routes that accept the $90 passes. MTS keeps all the remaining $90 pass revenue.) The base pass revenue is then allocated to each operator that accepts the $64 ($68) passes based on the revenue the operator’s percentage of regional pass boardings for all adult passes.

PASS REVENUE ALLOCATION PROCEDURES

Step 1

1a. The total number of $64 ($68) adult passes sold * $64 ($68) + 5 percent of $90 Adult pass revenue = monthly pass base revenue.

1b. The total number of $64 ($68) pass riders on all routes operated by operator “x” / the total number of $64 ($68) pass riders on all routes operated by all operators = proportion of $64 ($68) pass base revenue allocated to operator “x.”

1c. 1a * 1b = $64 ($68) base pass revenue allocated to operator “x.”

Step 2

2a. The total $90 pass revenue (minus the 5 percent included in the $64 ($68) pass base) is allocated to those MTS services that accept $90 passes.

Note:
Any interest accrued by SANDAG as a result of the holding of pass revenues before allocation to the transit operators shall be paid to the operators.
REGULAR AND PREMIUM REGIONAL DAY PASS
REVENUE ALLOCATION FORMULA

PROCEDURE DESCRIPTION FOR REGIONAL DAY PASS

This procedure shall in effect until such time as the SPRINTER/BREEZE Day Pass is no longer being sold, at which time a new revenue sharing formula shall be adopted.

The total number of Regional Day Passes issued by MTS and NCTD shall be collected and verified.

Each boarding on a MTS bus or NCTD bus with a Regional Day Pass shall be recorded and the total number of boardings shall be reported to SANDAG.

A monthly survey of Trolley riders and a quarterly survey of SPRINTER riders shall be conducted using the statistical procedures developed by SANDAG. From this survey the monthly or quarterly number of Regional Day Pass passengers shall be determined.

The NCTD percentage share of Day Pass revenue shall be calculated by dividing the number of NCTD Regional Day Pass boardings by the total (MTS + NCTD) number of boardings each reporting period. The MTS percentage share of Day Pass revenue shall be calculated by dividing the number of MTS Regional Day Pass boardings by the total (MTS + NCTD) number of boardings each reporting period.

The total revenue from the distribution of all Regional Day Passes shall be determined by adding the revenue received from 1, 2, 3, and 4 day Regional Day Passes and 1 - 7 day Regional Group Advance Day Passes. The revenue allocation for MTS shall be the total revenue times the percentage of Regional Day Pass Boardings on MTS. The revenue allocation for NCTD shall be the total revenue times the percentage of Regional Day Pass Boardings on NCTD.

PROCEDURE DESCRIPTION FOR REGIONAL PREMIUM DAY PASS

This procedure shall in effect until such time as a Regional Premium Day Pass valid for travel on the COASTER is introduced and at which time a new revenue sharing formula shall be adopted.

The total number of Premium Day Passes issued by MTS and NCTD shall be collected and verified.

Each boarding on a MTS bus or NCTD bus with a Premium Day Pass shall be recorded and the total number of boardings shall be reported to SANDAG.

A monthly survey of Trolley riders and a Quarterly survey of Sprinter riders shall be conducted using the statistical procedures developed by SANDAG. From this survey the monthly or quarterly number of Premium Day Pass passengers shall be determined.

The NCTD percentage share of Day Pass revenue shall be calculated by dividing the number of NCTD Premium Day Pass boardings by the total (MTS + NCTD) number of boardings each reporting period. The MTS percentage share of Day Pass revenue shall be calculated by dividing the number of MTS Premium Day Pass boardings by the total (MTS + NCTD) number of boardings each reporting period.

The total revenue from the distribution of all Premium Day Passes shall be determined by adding the revenue received from 1 day Premium Day Passes. The revenue allocation for MTS shall be the total revenue times the percentage of Premium Day Pass Boardings on MTS. The revenue allocation for NCTD shall be the total revenue times the percentage of Premium Day Pass Boardings on NCTD.
1. The total number of pass riders (by category) on all routes operated by operator “x,” divided by the total number of pass riders (by category) on all routes operated by all operators equals the proportion of pass revenue (by category) allocated to operator “x.”

2. Revenue distribution for Senior/Disabled/Medicare and Youth passes will be capped at a level of $5.5 million TransNet funding annually (effective through June 30, 2008).

Note:
Any interest accrued by SANDAG as a result of the holding of pass revenues before allocation to the transit operators shall be paid to the operators.
TICKET REVENUE ALLOCATION FORMULA

All revenue from ticket sales is allocated in the method described below, regardless of the relationship between ticket sales and use.

1. Each operator’s monthly percent share of revenue from sales of and Special Events Scratch-off Tickets (conventions, etc.) is determined by the percentage of Day Trippers reported as collected by each operator.

2. All of the revenue (100 percent) Tourism Industry Hotel Ticket is allocated to San Diego Trolley Inc.

3. All of the revenue (100 percent) for the $2.50 Northbound Trolley Ticket (sold only at San Ysidro/Tijuana Trolley Station) is allocated to San Diego Trolley, Inc. (SDTI).

4. Each operator’s percentage share of San Diego County Juror Ticket revenue is calculated annually based on the previous year’s rates of redemption, as reported by operators. Revenues are allocated and dispersed quarterly. SANDAG Pass Sales Manager retains one percent of the quarterly sales revenue for administrative costs.

Note:
Any interest accrued by SANDAG as a result of the holding of ticket sales revenues before allocation to the transit operators shall be paid to the operators.
1. PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

1.1 SANDAG is responsible for the design and minting of regional transit tokens. Token collection (from operators), counting, and distribution to sales outlets is the responsibility of SANDAG.

1.2 Tokens are sold only at The Transit Store, at a price of $2.25 each.

1.3 One type of tokens is currently in circulation and accepted as valid fare media. This is:

1.4 Tokens are accepted as valid fare payment on MTS and North County Transit District (NCTD).

1.5 Tokens shall be treated as a cash fare. A token inserted into a ticket vending machine shall be replaced with a printed ticket of a $2.25 value (or higher, if upgraded). Tokens are not accepted as valid fare media in the COASTER or SPRINTER ticket vending machines.

2. TOKEN REVENUE ALLOCATION

2.1 The monthly token boardings for all participating operators will be calculated by the actual tokens received.

2.2 All tokens received will be reported to SANDAG monthly.

2.3 All token sales revenue will be remitted to SANDAG.

2.4 Operators shall sort tokens from other currency and deliver in a sealed envelope to SANDAG on a monthly basis for reimbursement. The envelope should be marked on the outside with the operator name and the number of tokens enclosed. SANDAG will reimburse the operator for each token submitted based on the calculated value of each token at the time of sale using a first in-first out methodology. SANDAG will reimburse operators following submittal of tokens in the monthly distribution report.

Note:

Any interest accrued by SANDAG as a result of the holding of token sales revenues before allocation to the transit operators shall be paid to the operators.
TransNet PASS SUBSIDY ALLOCATION PROCEDURE

OBJECTIVE

To allocate TransNet pass subsidies in a manner that ensures that each operator receives pass revenue (sales and subsidies) in an amount equal to pass sales revenue received prior to TransNet. For MTS area operators, the TransNet subsidy allocation will be capped at $5.5 million annually (through 2008).

STEPS

1. Determine individual operator percent of countywide boardings (from operator counts).

2. Allocate pass sales revenue based on Step 1.

3. Total MTS area operator percent share to determine MTS area share of countywide boardings (NCTD share = remaining).

4. Determine pass sales attributable to MTS/NCTD boardings.
   - MTS % x number of countywide passes sold.
   - NCTD % x number of countywide passes sold.

5. Effective January 1, 2008, Multiply MTS passes sold x $16.00 (Senior/Disabled/Medicare)\(^1\) or $32.00 (Youth)\(^2\) subsidy/pass = MTS area TransNet subsidy pool.

   Effective January 1, 2009, Multiply MTS passes sold x $17.00 (Senior/Disabled/Medicare) or $35.00 (Youth) subsidy/pass = MTS area TransNet subsidy pool.

   NCTD completes its own TransNet calculation (NCTD TransNet subsidy pool = NCTD passes x $ determined by NCTD).

6. Recalculate individual operator percent share of boardings for MTS area only.

7. Apply operator shares to MTS TransNet subsidy pool = individual operator TransNet subsidy.

8. Steps 2 + 6 = total operator pass revenue.

---

\(^1\) Base price for youth Senior/Disabled/Medicare is 25 percent of Regional Monthly Pass. Therefore on January 1, 2008, TransNet subsidy/pass is $64 - $16.00 pass revenue = $48.00 subsidy/pass. On January 1, 2009, TransNet subsidy/pass is $68 - $17 pass revenue = $51 subsidy/pass.

\(^2\) Base price for youth Senior/Disabled/Medicare is 50 percent of Regional Monthly Pass. Therefore on January 1, 2008, TransNet subsidy/pass is $64 - $32.00 pass revenue = $32.00 subsidy/pass. On January 1, 2009, TransNet subsidy/pass is $68 - $34 pass revenue = $34 subsidy/pass.
COASTER REVENUE SHARING AGREEMENT

Five percent of net COASTER Revenue, including single tickets, round-trip tickets, ten-trip tickets, and monthly passes shall be allocated by North County Transit District to MTS.

NCTD shall advise SANDAG of the total COASTER net revenue and pay 5 percent to SANDAG. Direct payments to participating agencies (i.e., Trolley for special event coordination) shall be deducted from the 5 percent net revenue submitted to SANDAG. Based on the data provided by NCTD, SANDAG shall forward the 5 percent share to MTS once each year in the year end distribution (June).

MTS shall have the responsibility for allocating the revenue to the transit operators within the MTS organization. SANDAG will direct the funds based on the MTS allocation. SANDAG will conduct a survey at least every three years of COASTER transfers patterns. MTS may elect to use the survey of transfer patterns to determine how the COASTER revenue is allocated among operators.

Note:

Any interest accrued by SANDAG as a result of the holding of COASTER revenues before allocation to the transit operators shall be paid to the operators.
The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus; plans, engineers, and builds public transit; makes strategic plans; obtains and allocates resources; and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region’s quality of life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHAIR</th>
<th>FIRST VICE CHAIR</th>
<th>SECOND VICE CHAIR</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Mary Teresa Sessom</td>
<td>Hon. Lori Holt Pfeifer</td>
<td>Hon. Jerome Stocks</td>
<td>Gary L. Gallegos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF CARLSBAD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Matt Hall, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Bud Lewis, Mayor</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Ann Schin, Mayor Pro-Tem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF CHULA VISTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Cheryl Coo, Mayor</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Jerry Sande, Deputy Mayor</td>
<td>(A) Hon. John McCann, Councilmember</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF CORONADO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Phil Monroe, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Carrie Downey, Mayor Pro-Tem</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Al Ovada, Councilmember</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF DEL MAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Crystal Crawford, Deputy Mayor</td>
<td>(A) Hon. David Chukar, Mayor</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Richard Kem, Councilmember</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF EL CAJON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Mark Leavitt, Mayor</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Jillian Hanson Cox, Councilmember</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF ENCINITAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jerome Stodd, Mayor</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Teresa Barth, Councilmember</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF ESCONDIDO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Lori Holt Pfeifer, Mayor</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Ed Gallo, Councilmember</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Sam Abed, Mayor Pro-Tem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF IMPERIAL BEACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hon. Jim Janney, Mayor</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Patricia McCoy, Mayor Pro-Tem</td>
<td>(A) Hon. Mayda Winter, Councilmember</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF LA MESA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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INTRODUCTION

This Federal Civil Rights Title VI analysis has been prepared to evaluate amendments to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance scheduled for implementation in July 2008 and January 2009. The amended ordinance would be approved by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) and implemented by the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North County Transit District (NCTD). The analysis assesses how the proposal will affect different transit rider populations and determines if any of the proposed fare changes will result in disproportionately negative impacts and adverse effects on minority and low-income (LIM) populations within the San Diego region.

Background and Responsibility

With the approval of Senate Bill (SB) 1703 in 2003, the planning and programming functions of the MTS and NCTD were consolidated under SANDAG. Contained within these functions is the responsibility for developing a Regional Fare Policy, including setting fares for transit services in the region through a Comprehensive Fare Ordinance. The MTS and NCTD Board of Directors have requested a fare increase to partially mitigate a revenue shortfall caused by reduced tax revenue, increased fuel costs, and reduced subsidies from the State.

Title VI Requirements

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d) states that: “No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” The scope of Title VI was expanded by the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987 (P.L. 100-209) to include all of a recipient’s and contractor’s programs or activities whether federally assisted or not.

The February 11, 1994, Executive Order 12898, “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations” added low-income to minority and required that disproportionately adverse impacts be identified and addressed. Environmental justice applies to all programs, policies, and activities being evaluated and is consistent with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Executive Order 12898 also requires public involvement and mandates that transportation agencies ensure there is no exclusion from participation, no denial of benefits, and no discrimination in the services that they provide to LIM populations.

The August 11, 2000, Executive Order 13166, “Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency” introduced the requirement to provide “meaningful access to Limited English Proficient (LEP) persons” (Chapter IV, Part 4). Executive Order 13166 requires Federal agencies to examine the services they provide, identify any need for services to those with Limited English Proficiency (LEP), and develop and implement a system to provide those services so that LEP persons can have meaningful access to them. To fulfill this requirement, FTA recipients must take responsible steps to ensure meaningful access to the benefits, services, information, and other important portions of their programs and activities for individuals who are LEP.

This Title VI assessment was prepared by SANDAG.
Limited English Proficiency

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is a term used to describe individuals who are not proficient in the English language. Executive Order 13166 “Improving Access to Services for Persons With Limited English Proficiency (August 2000),” is directed at implementing the protections afforded by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related regulations. Accordingly, it prohibits recipients of Federal financial assistance from discriminating based on national origin by failing to provide meaningful access to service for individuals who are LEP. These protections require that LEP persons be provided with an equal opportunity to benefit from or have access to services that are normally provided in English.

SANDAG defines LEP persons as those individuals who do not speak English as their primary language and who have limited ability to read, write, speak, or understand English. These non-English speaking persons in San Diego County have been identified based on data obtained from the Census 2000, which included response categories such as “Language Spoken at Home and the Ability to Speak English.” Those who responded to the Census by stating that they speak English “not well” or “not at all” are considered to be LEP individuals.

To ensure meaningful access to LEP persons, SANDAG certifies compliance with the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) “Policy Guidance Concerning Recipients’ Responsibilities to Limited English Proficient (LEP) Persons.” The policy guidance includes a “Safe Harbor” provision where the USDOT considers the written translation of vital documents in languages other than English (for eligible LEP language groups consisting of 5 percent or more of the population) to be strong evidence of compliance with the recipient’s written-translation obligations under Title VI.

In the San Diego Region, SANDAG will strive to ensure that LEP services will be provided for languages that meet or exceed this 5 percent threshold. Written translations will be provided for each eligible LEP language group that constitutes 5 percent or more of the population likely to be served by public transit. This 5 percent trigger will serve as the benchmark for continued translations of languages over time. Written language services consist of the written-translation of the following vital documents: (1) All fare-related signs in bus, trolley, and train stations; and, (2) Notices of public hearings regarding recipients’ proposed transportation plans, projects, or changes, reductions, denial, or termination of services or benefits.

Table 1 highlights the Census data for “Language Spoken at Home and the Ability to Speak English” in the MTS and NCTD service areas, as well as for the region as a whole. Based on the Census 2000 data, Spanish is the only language in the San Diego Region that meets or exceeds the 5 percent LEP trigger in the combined categories of English spoken “not well” or “not at all.” Within the MTS service area, the total population who speak English “not well” or “not at all” is 5 percent, within the NCTD service area the total population who speak English “not well” or “not at all” is 7 percent and in the entire San Diego Region, the total population who speak English “not well” or “not at all” is 6 percent.
Table 1
Language Spoken at Home and the Ability to Speak English†
(Population age 5 and older)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prominent Household Language</th>
<th>Ability to Speak English</th>
<th>MTS</th>
<th>NCTD</th>
<th>Regional Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Speak English Only</td>
<td>1,234,316</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>518,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td>410,137</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>161,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speak English “well”</td>
<td>314,871</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>108,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speak English “not well” or “not at all”</td>
<td>95,266</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>52,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Island</td>
<td></td>
<td>163,249</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speak English “well”</td>
<td>134,730</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speak English “not well” or “not at all”</td>
<td>28,519</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>81,899</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>23,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speak English “well”</td>
<td>72,574</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speak English “not well” or “not at all”</td>
<td>9,235</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1,624</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Based on Census 2000 data
Methodology for Fare Analysis

In order to comply with Executive Order 12898 mandating the inclusion of “minority and low-income populations (LIM)” in the analysis of environmental justice, SANDAG first defined the LIM populations in the San Diego region by transit district service area; and for the region as a whole. LIM populations were defined by Census Tract and a LIM Census Tract was identified as any Census Tract where the total percentage of the LIM population was greater than the LIM percentage for the service area as a whole. Based upon the Census data, SANDAG determined the LIM averages to be 51 percent in the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) service area, 40 percent in the North County Transit District (NCTD) service area, and 49 percent regionwide (shown in Table 2). A complete table of LIM populations by Census Tract in the San Diego region can be found in Appendix A of this document.

Table 2
Total LIM Population by Census Tract in the San Diego Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Total LIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>2,017,725</td>
<td>1,045,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>796,108</td>
<td>332,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Total</td>
<td>2,813,833</td>
<td>1,378,136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To conduct this Title VI assessment for proposed changes to the current fare structure, information generated from the SANDAG 2002 Onboard Ridership Survey was analyzed to understand the region’s transit ridership in relation to fare usage patterns and LIM populations. Using the information from ridership surveys allows for a more thorough evaluation while simultaneously indicating whether LIM riders are more likely to use the mode of service, payment type, or payment media that would be subject to the proposed fare adjustments.

By using the data derived from the ridership surveys, staff was able to create a regional ridership profile that better defines the proportion of LIM and Non-LIM populations who use public transit in the region. In the MTS service area, 77 percent of riders are considered to be LIM, while 65 percent of NCTD riders are LIM. The regionwide average is 73 percent. In order to provide a reasonable comparison, SANDAG utilized the ridership survey LIM average to assess Title VI impacts, instead of using the LIM averages by Census Tract included in Table 2. Table 3 provides the overview of LIM populations based on ridership as described above.
Table 3
Total LIM Population by Ridership Surveys in the San Diego Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Total Surveys†</th>
<th>Total LIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>21,073</td>
<td>16,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>10,556</td>
<td>6,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Total</td>
<td>31,629</td>
<td>23,168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Based on Valid Surveys

In order to provide the Title VI evaluation, a complete analysis of transit modes and fare payment type/media was conducted using the data derived from the onboard survey. Specific route types (i.e. local, urban, express, etc.) as well as specific pass types (i.e. adult monthly, premium express, etc.) were categorized based on method of payment (cash or pass) and ridership status (LIM vs. Non-LIM). In general, Title VI impacts would be likely when fare increases occur on routes (or groups of routes) that support a larger than average percentage of LIM riders. It should be noted that for the purposes of this report, staff has assumed that the passenger demographics and travel behavior have not changed since the 2002 survey was conducted. A copy of the SANDAG 2002 Onboard Transit Survey is included in Appendix B of this document.

Data Collection

To collect the information for the Onboard Passenger Survey, surveyors rode onboard buses, Trolleys, and the COASTER, offering survey forms to passengers as they boarded the vehicle. Surveys were self-administered; however, the surveyors were available for questions. When passengers completed the questionnaires, they were collected and tracked by route, date, trip time, and direction. The data then was coded, entered, and analyzed. MTS routes and NCTD routes had a slightly different survey form (see Appendix B). While slightly different, the survey questions were worded so that the forms could be combined in the analysis. An average of 314 completed questionnaires per route were collected and efforts were made to survey in both directions and during all time-periods (A.M. Peak, Midday, P.M. Peak, and Other).

LIM riders were those individuals who stated on the survey that they considered themselves anything other than white (non-Hispanic) and/or they indicated that their household income was below $20,000. The $20,000 threshold was determined through an application of average household size combined with the federal poverty guidelines. Ridership surveys from the NCTD area were used to determine the average household size (4.00 persons per household), while data from the MTS service area was unavailable. However, Census data for both service areas exhibited similarities which made the application of NCTD household size to the region logical. Since the federal poverty threshold in 2002 was set at $18,392 for a family of four (when the survey was performed), any respondent who stated that their household income was “Under $10,000” or between “$10,000 and $19,999” were considered “low-income” for the purposes of this evaluation.

From the survey responses given, the data then was analyzed by transit mode (bus and Trolley) and payment type (cash, pass, transfers) to determine the absolute number and percentage of LIM riders that could be impacted from any of the proposed fare alternatives. A complete table containing this LIM evaluation by route and payment types can be found in Appendix C of this document.
While every attempt was made to evaluate each component of the proposed fare changes, a few minor categories were not available or needed to be adjusted based on the limitations of the available data. Specifically, a thorough evaluation of Senior, Disabled and Medicare (SDM) riders (monthly pass holders and cash riders) was not available since the data enabled only the identification of seniors within this category. Additionally, several of the proposed fare changes (including changes to day passes, and SVCC\textsuperscript{†} COASTER Connection fares) were not available since the survey form did not enable identification of these ridership subsets or the service/fare product was not available at the time the survey was conducted. Additionally, youth monthly pass changes (available to youth ages six through 18) were not evaluated since the survey did not include individuals under 13 years old.

**Description of the Existing Fare Structure and Fare Alternatives**

The following fare alternatives have been proposed by MTS and NCTD and evaluated by SANDAG to determine if the fare adjustment alternatives will have disproportionately adverse effects on LIM populations in the San Diego region. This proposed alternative includes recommendation changes to July 2008 and January 2009 cash fares, regional pass fares, and other discounted pass fares. Table 4 provides an overview of the existing fare structure (cash and pass), while Tables 5 and 6 detail the possible alternatives for both 2008 and 2009.

**Cash Fares**

Possible cash fare changes include increases to MTS Express SDM fares (2008), MTS Urban SDM fares (2008), MTS Premium Express SDM fares (2008), COASTER Regular and SDM fares (2008 and 2009), SVCC COASTER Connection fares (2008), MTS Access fares (2008) and NCTD LIFT fares (2008). A flat fare is proposed on the Trolley with two possible alternatives: a $2.25 fare with each line considered a separate service with no transfers between lines (except at Old Town) and a $2.50 fare allowing transfers between Trolley lines. The alternatives also include two price reductions; a $0.25 cent reduction to both the MTS shuttle and MTS downtown fares (2009).

**Pass Fares**

The current regional pass fares are $64.00 for a regular regional pass, $90.00 for a premium regular express pass, $16.00 for a regional SDM pass, $32.00 for a Regional Youth pass, $54.00 for an NCTD BREEZE/SPRINTER Regular Monthly pass, $115.00 to $154.00 for a COASTER Regular Monthly pass, $11.00 for a Premium Express day pass, $5.00 for a Regular-Regional Day pass, and $2.00 for an NCTD SDM Day pass. There are currently no Regular-Regional SDM Day passes or 14-day passes of any kind other than the half-month Regional pass which can be purchased on the 15th day of each month.

Monthly pass alternatives explored in this report include increases to NCTD BREEZE Monthly passes (2008); MTS Premium Express SDM and Youth Monthly passes (2008); COASTER Regular, SDM, and Youth Monthly passes (2008 and 2009); MTS Rural Regular, SDM and Youth Monthly passes (2008); SVCC Regular, SDM and Youth Monthly COASTER pass supplement (2008); Regular, SDM and Youth Regional Monthly passes (2009); and the institution of a 14-consecutive Regular-Regional Monthly pass (2009). Day pass alternatives under discussion include increases to NCTD BREEZE Regular Day passes (2008 and 2009); applicability of the Regular-Regional Day pass to SVCC COASTER Connection services (2008); Premium Express Day passes (2009); Regional SDM Day passes (2009); and the applicability of Premium Express Day passes for COASTER services (2009). No Monthly or Day pass price decreases are explored for 2008 or 2009.

\textsuperscript{†} Sorrento Valley COASTER Connection
Other Discounted Pass Fares and Fare-Related Programs

Other discounted pass fares and fare-related programs include changes to the BREEZE College Monthly Pass and the temporal cycle of the Regular, SDM, and Youth Monthly passes. The BREEZE College Monthly pass would increase by $5.00 in 2008 and, with the full implementation of the regional Smart Card, the calendar month system currently used for the Regional Monthly passes would be converted to a rolling 30-day pass. In addition, the current fare proposals also have implications for the ADA services offered by both of the transit agencies. Consideration is being given to a proposal that the fare ordinance be amended to fix the fare for Complementary ADA services at double the price of fixed-route service as permitted by federal regulation. In addition, consideration is being given to permitting passengers holding a valid NCTD Paratransit Reduced Fare Identification Card to ride the NCTD fixed-route services without payment of any fare. A personal care attendant also would be able to ride any of the fixed-route or demand responsive services without payment of any fare. None of the above mentioned discount pass fares or changes to other fare-related programs are evaluated in this report given the lack of available survey data for the affected populations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Single Ride Fare†</th>
<th>Day Pass</th>
<th>14-Day Pass‡</th>
<th>30-Day Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regular/Youth</td>
<td>Senior/Disabled</td>
<td>Adult/Youth</td>
<td>Senior/Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>MTS Bus (Local/Urban)</td>
<td>$2.00-2.25</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BREEZE</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>Trolley‡</td>
<td>$1.50-$3.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPRINTER</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Express</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>MTS Premium Express</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COASTER§</td>
<td>$4.00-5.50</td>
<td>$2.00-2.75</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>MTS (2 zones)</td>
<td>$5.00-10.00</td>
<td>$2.50-5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>MTS Shuttle</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Downtown</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD FAST</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SVCC COASTER Connector</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>MTS Access</td>
<td>$3.50-$4.50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD LIFT</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicates change from previous year

† No transfers between vehicles or services; separate fare (or pass) required for each boarding
‡ Regional half-month pass currently good for the last half-month only
§ COASTER – 4 zones

NCTD-only; Regional/MTS passes also accepted on BREEZE, SPRINTER, and NCTD Rural service; no NCTD-only S/D or Youth passes; no NCTD-only 14-Day Pass

College passes: College Monthly Pass (MTS) = $51.20; BREEZE College Pass = $39.00 to $44.00; College Semester Pass = $1.34/day
## Table 5
### July 2008 Fare Structure Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Single Ride Fare†</th>
<th>Day Pass</th>
<th>14-Day Pass</th>
<th>30-Day Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adult/ Youth</td>
<td>Senior/ Disabled</td>
<td>Adult/ Youth</td>
<td>Senior/ Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>MTS Bus (Local/Urban)</td>
<td>$2.00-2.25</td>
<td>$1.00-1.10</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BREEZE</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>Trolley† (Alt 1)+‡</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trolley‡ (Alt 2)+‡</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPRINTER</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Express</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>MTS Premium Express</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COASTER§</td>
<td>$4.50-6.00</td>
<td>$2.25-3.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>MTS (2 zones)</td>
<td>$5.00-10.00</td>
<td>$2.50-5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>MTS Shuttle</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Downtown</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>MTS Access</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD LIFT</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates change from existing fare structure
† No transfers between vehicles or services; separate fare (or pass) required for each boarding; 5 percent bonus when loading $10.00 or more on Compass Card
‡ Trolley – (1) No “zones,” each line considered separate service; however, free transfer between Trolley lines at Old Town only; (2) Transfers allowed between Trolley lines
§ COASTER – 4 zones (same as current structure)
* NCTD-only; Regional/MTS passes also accepted on BREEZE and SPRINTER; no NCTD-only S/D or Youth passes, no NCTD-only 14-Day Pass
** Actual 2008 implementation pending discussion with operators

**College passes:** College Monthly Pass (MTS) = $51.20, BREEZE College Pass = $49.00, College Semester Pass = $1.34/day
## Table 6

**January 2009 Fare Structure Alternative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Single Ride Fare†</th>
<th>Day Pass</th>
<th>14-Day Pass</th>
<th>30-Day Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adult/Youth</td>
<td>Senior/Disabled</td>
<td>Adult/Youth</td>
<td>Senior/Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>MTS Bus (Local/Urban)</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BREEZE</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>Trolley (Alt 1)</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trolley (Alt 2)</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPRINTER</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Express</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>MTS Premium Express</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$14.00**</td>
<td>$7.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COASTER§</td>
<td>$5.00-6.50</td>
<td>$2.50-3.25</td>
<td>$14.00**</td>
<td>$7.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>MTS (2 zones)</td>
<td>$5.00-10.00</td>
<td>$2.50-5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>MTS Shuttle</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Downtown</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SVCC COASTER Connector**</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>MTS Access</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD LIFT</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Indicates change from July 2008 fare structure
‡ No transfers between vehicles or services; separate fare (or pass) required for each boarding; 5 percent bonus when loading $10.00 or more on Compass Card
§ Trolley – (1) No “zones;” each line considered separate service; however, free transfer between Trolley lines at Old Town only; (2) Transfers allowed between Trolley lines
§§ COASTER – 4 zones (same as current structure)
* NCTD-only; Regional/MTS passes also accepted on BREEZE, SPRINTER, and NCTD Rural service; no NCTD-only S/D or Youth passes, no NCTD-only 14-Day Pass
** Actual 2009 implementation pending discussion with operators

**College passes:** College Monthly Pass (MTS) = $51.20, BREEZE College Pass = $49.00; College Semester Pass = $1.34/day
Since the proposed Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) fare alternatives are specific to identified time periods (July 2008 and January 2009) the impact assessment was prepared to compare between the changes proposed in each of these intervals and the preceding time period. The data from which the conclusions were derived is included in Tables 6 and 7 for proposed July 2008 fare changes and Tables 8 and 9 for proposed January 2009 fare changes. Service area minority and low-income (LIM) thresholds were used to evaluate cash fare increases. However, since many of the affected passes are regional in nature, regional LIM thresholds also were applied to calculate any impacts from the proposed pass increases.

**MTS and NCTD Fare Alternative - 2008**

**Cash Fare Assessment**

The 2008 proposed cash fare changes include a 25 percent increase to MTS express Senior, Disabled and Medicare (SDM) fares, between 9 percent and 13 percent increases (depending on zone) in North County Transit District (NCTD) COASTER fares, between 13 percent and 29 percent in both agencies ADA paratransit fares, as well as the initiation of a fare on the SVCC\(^\dagger\) COASTER Connection service offered by the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS). MTS Trolley services were evaluated under two flat fare proposals. The first of which involves a $2.25 fare, which carries a potential of increasing fares by between 13 percent and 50 percent for some riders, while reducing the fare for others by between 10 percent and 25 percent, with the remainder experiencing no fare change. This is due to the existing zone-based fare structure on the Trolley. Under the other flat fare alternative, some fares would increase by between 11 percent and 67 percent, others reduced by between 9 percent and 17 percent, with others remaining unchanged.

The only majority LIM service, under the host of services with proposed changes listed in the above paragraph, is the Trolley service. The analysis was based on the rider surveys which were separated between those riders who would pay more under the flat fare vs. riders whose fares would not change combined with those riders who would pay less. The $2.25 flat fare alternative with no transfers does not cause a disproportionate impact since those who would have to pay more under this scenario are less LIM than those whose fares would not change or those whose fares would be less (83.4% LIM vs. 86.0% Non-LIM). Therefore, there are no disproportionate impacts from this alternative. The $2.50 flat fare (allowing transfers) was found to have a greater impact on LIM riders since those who would have to pay more are slightly more likely to be LIM than those whose fares would not change or whose fares would be less (85.2% LIM vs. 84.5% LIM). The $2.50 fare, however does not create a disproportionate impact on LIM riders.

It also was determined that there are greater Title VI impacts from the $2.50 fare scenario since more LIM riders use the Trolley for short distance trips, however they are not disproportionate. Those traveling between one and three stops include 39 percent cash riders (40% LIM) who would experience up to a 67 percent increase in fares under the $2.50 flat fare (compared to 50% price increase under the $2.25 fare). Therefore, the short distance riders would be affected by the $2.50 flat fare, with those currently traveling between one and three stops (the most cash and most LIM riders) experiencing the largest Trolley fare increase by dollar amount and percentage.

\(^\dagger\) Sorrento Valley COASTER Connection
**Title VI Impacts:** No disproportionate impacts caused by either Trolley fare option.

**Pass Fare Assessment**

Several pass categories would experience price increases under the proposed alternative in July 2008. Of the passes which could be evaluated, the monthly passes increases range between 9 percent and 41 percent. The only majority LIM service affected by the proposed changes in the BREEZE/SPRINTER regular monthly pass which would experience an increase of 9 percent. However, this increase is tempered by increases of the same percentage and higher (up to 41% for MTS premium express pass increases). Therefore, there are no disproportionate negative and adverse effects on LIM populations from this proposal. In addition, NCTD day passes include increases under the fare proposal but could not be evaluated since day passes were not in existence when the fare survey was conducted.

**Title VI Impacts:** NONE

**MTS and NCTD Fare Alternative - 2009**

**Cash Fare Assessment**

Proposed cash fare changes in January 2009, compared to the proposed July 2008 prices, include a 13 percent increase on MTS Local bus fares, between 8 percent and 11 percent increases on NCTD COASTER fares, a 75 percent increase on MTS regular shuttle fares but a 25 percent price reduction on shuttle SDM fares, between a 25 percent reduction (SDM) and a 40 percent increase (regular fare) on MTS downtown services. This increase does not generate a Title VI impact since it does not cause disproportionately adverse effects on LIM populations within the San Diego region since the MTS Local bus is not considered a majority LIM service.

**Title VI Impacts:** NONE

**Pass Fare Assessment**

Similar to the monthly pass assessment for 2008, several pass categories would experience price increases under the proposed alternative in 2009. Of the passes which could be evaluated, the Senior/Disabled pass and the Regular-Regional Monthly pass would both increase by 6 percent equally. While adult Monthly pass holders represent a higher than average LIM percentage, the Senior pass category is not disproportionately LIM. In addition, the COASTER Monthly pass increases are larger (in both dollars and percentages) than the increases experienced by regular-regional pass riders. The COASTER service also is a decidedly more Non-LIM service. The Premium Express Day pass price increases also are proposed to be the largest percentage fare increase in the pass category and also a service that is a majority Non-LIM. Therefore, the proportional pass increases would not cause disproportionately negative impacts and adverse effects on minority and LIM populations. In addition, NCTD day passes include increases under the fare proposal but could not be evaluated since day passes were not in existence when the fare survey was conducted.
Title VI Impacts: NONE

Summary and Conclusions

Based on the Title VI evaluation conducted for the proposed July 2008 and January 2009 MTS and NCTD service area fare changes, SANDAG staff has concluded there are no disparate Title VI impacts from the proposed changes. The proposed $2.50 Trolley fare impacted low income and minority passengers slightly more than the $2.25 fare since a higher percentage of low income and minority riders use the trolley for short distance trips than longer distance trips; however, it does not have a disproportionate impact on LIM riders.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>July 2008</th>
<th>% Price Change from Existing</th>
<th>Service Area LIM %</th>
<th>LIM %</th>
<th>% Difference (Service Area LIM vs. Actual LIM %)</th>
<th>LIM or Non-LIM Route</th>
<th>Disproportionate LIM Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>Trolley (Alt 1)†</td>
<td>$1.50-$2.00</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>13% to 50%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trolley (Alt1)‡</td>
<td>$2.25-$3.00</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>-25% to 0%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>LIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Trolley (Alt 2)‡</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.50-$2.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>+11% to +67%</strong></td>
<td><strong>77%</strong></td>
<td><strong>85%</strong></td>
<td><strong>8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>LIM</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trolley (Alt 2)‡</td>
<td>$2.50-$3.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>-17% to 0%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>LIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Express (SDM)</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>Non-LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>MTS COASTER (Regular and SDM)</td>
<td>$2.00-$2.75</td>
<td>$2.25-$3.00</td>
<td>+9% to +13%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>Non-LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>SVCC COASTER Connector (Regular and SDM)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.50-$1.00</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>Non-LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>MTS Access</td>
<td>$3.50-$4.50</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>0% to +29%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD LIFT</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† No existing fare product for service, fare products are new
‡ Actual 2008 implementation pending discussion with operators
N/A = Data not available
**Table 8**

**Existing Pass Fare Structure vs. 2008 Pass Fare Structure Alternative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>July 2008</th>
<th>% Price Change from Existing</th>
<th>Service Area LIM %</th>
<th>LIM %</th>
<th>% Difference (Service Area LIM vs. Actual LIM %)</th>
<th>LIM or Non-LIM Route?</th>
<th>Disproportionate LIM Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day Pass (NCTD)</td>
<td>Day Tripper (Regular &amp; SDM)</td>
<td>$2.00 or $4.00</td>
<td>$2.25 or $4.50</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Day Pass (SDM)</td>
<td>Day Tripper (SDM)</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>Non-LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Day Pass as it applies to SVCC COASTER Connection</td>
<td>Regular COASTER Service to Business Parks</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular NCTD BREEZE/SPRINTER Pass</td>
<td>Good on NCTD Only</td>
<td>$54.00</td>
<td>$59.00</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD COASTER Pass</td>
<td>Good on COASTER Only</td>
<td>$115-$154</td>
<td>$129-$168</td>
<td>+9% to +13%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-37%</td>
<td>Non-LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Premium Express Pass (SDM)</td>
<td>Senior Disabled Medicare Pass</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$22.50</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-52%</td>
<td>Non-LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Premium Express Pass (Youth)</td>
<td>Ages 6 to 18</td>
<td>$32.00</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Rural Pass</td>
<td>MTS Rural Services</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>$130-$168 Regular $22.50 SDM $45 Youth</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† No existing fare product for service, fare products are new

N/A = Data not available
### Table 9
2008 Cash Fare Structure Alternative vs. 2009 Cash Fare Structure Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>July 2008</th>
<th>July 2009</th>
<th>% Price Change from Existing</th>
<th>Service Area LIM %</th>
<th>LIM %</th>
<th>% Difference (Service Area LIM vs. Actual LIM %)</th>
<th>LIM or Non-LIM Route</th>
<th>Disproportionate LIM Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>MTS Bus (Local)</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>+1%†</td>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>MTS COASTER (Regular and SDM)</td>
<td>$2.25-$3.00</td>
<td>$2.50-$3.25</td>
<td>+8% to +11%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>Non-LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>MTS Shuttle (Regular)</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>Non-LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Shuttle (SDM)</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>-50%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>Non-LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Downtown (Regular and SDM)</td>
<td>$1.25 and $1.00</td>
<td>$1.75 and $0.60</td>
<td>-25% to +40%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Not considered a significant difference to warrant a determination of disproportionate impacts

### Table 10
2008 Pass Fare Structure Alternative vs. 2009 Pass Fare Structure Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>July 2008</th>
<th>July 2009</th>
<th>% Price Change from Existing</th>
<th>Service Area LIM %</th>
<th>LIM %</th>
<th>% Difference (Service Area LIM vs. Actual LIM %)</th>
<th>LIM or Non-LIM Route</th>
<th>Disproportionate LIM Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day Pass (NCTD)</td>
<td>Day Tripper (Regular and SDM)</td>
<td>$2.25 or $4.50</td>
<td>$2.50 or $5.00</td>
<td>+11%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Express Day Pass (MTS)</td>
<td>Premium Day Tripper</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>$14.00†</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>Non-LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Regional 14-Day Pass</td>
<td>14-Day Consecutive Day Pass</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>$40.80</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD COASTER Pass</td>
<td>Good on COASTER Only</td>
<td>$129-$168</td>
<td>$144-$182</td>
<td>+9% to +13%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-37%</td>
<td>Non-LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Regional Monthly Pass</td>
<td>Local, Urban, Trolley</td>
<td>$64.00</td>
<td>$68.00</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior, Disabled, Medicare Regional Monthly Pass</td>
<td>Ages 60-plus</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$17.00</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>Non-LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Pass</td>
<td>Ages 6 to 18</td>
<td>$32.00</td>
<td>$34.00</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† No existing fare product for service, fare products are new
‡ Actual 2009 implementation pending discussion with operators
### Projected Revenue and Ridership by Transit Agency
(6 months - July to December 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>MTS</th>
<th></th>
<th>NCTD</th>
<th></th>
<th>REGION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Ridership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>$30,957,002</td>
<td>37,799,614</td>
<td>$5,701,863</td>
<td>5,088,173</td>
<td>$36,658,865</td>
<td>42,887,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>$31,834,401</td>
<td>37,659,448</td>
<td>$6,000,739</td>
<td>5,015,818</td>
<td>$37,835,140</td>
<td>42,675,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>$877,399</td>
<td>-140,166</td>
<td>$298,877</td>
<td>-72,355</td>
<td>$1,176,276</td>
<td>-212,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Projected Revenue & Ridership by Transit Agency
(12 months - January - December 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>MTS</th>
<th></th>
<th>NCTD</th>
<th></th>
<th>REGION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Ridership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>$61,914,004</td>
<td>75,599,229</td>
<td>$11,403,725</td>
<td>10,176,346</td>
<td>$73,317,729</td>
<td>85,775,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>$66,274,771</td>
<td>74,904,068</td>
<td>$12,560,472</td>
<td>9,907,905</td>
<td>$78,835,243</td>
<td>84,811,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>$4,360,767</td>
<td>-695,161</td>
<td>$1,156,747</td>
<td>-268,440</td>
<td>$5,517,514</td>
<td>-963,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 06, 2008
SANDAG
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
AGENDA ITEM #2 (Public Comment...)

Good morning Chair Madaffer, Vice-Chair Dale, board members, staff, and other fellow citizens. Chuck Lungrenhausen of 5308 Monroe Ave.#124 which is in the SDSU neighborhood of San Diego. 92115 Phone 619-546-5618.

Back in time to Oct. of 2007 a fare increase was the subject before this group. Here we are again less than a year on the same subject because of the large increase in fuel prices throughout the country.

Our Governor and State legislature took $1.26 Billion from the state Public Transportation Account at that time. Now you have to ask the public to shell out more money for a fare increase well good luck.

Thanks for listening and the opportunity to speak.
THE PROBLEM

Buses have been leaving trolley stops 5 MINUTES BEFORE the trolley arrives for the past 11 years.

THE SOLUTION

Delay the #14 EAST bound BUS departure from FASHION VALLEY by 10 minutes, the length of time needed for a passenger to get from the TROLLEY to the BUS at the TROLLEY STOP, starting IMMEDIATELY.

THE RESULTS

Not only will TROLLEY passengers be able to TRANSFER from the GREEN LINE trolley to the #14 BUS at RIO VISTA, MISSION SAN DIEGO, and SDSU, but BUS riders from other buses that use FASHION VALLEY will now have time to catch the #14 EAST bound BUS.

ANOTHER PROBLEM

The #14 EAST bound BUS was forced to WAIT at KAISER Hospital for the #13 BUS to ARRIVE from GRANTVILLE Trolley Station because the #14 BUS STOP at GRANTVILLE was ELIMINATED. The LOSS OF RIDERSHIP on STANDING-ROOM ONLY buses with GRADE school, MIDDLE school, SDSU, workers, and residents was upwards of 50 to 100 per day.

THE SOLUTION

Return the #14 BUS STOP to GRANTVILLE, IMMEDIATELY. Replace two of the #13 BUS trips to KAISER with the buses from the restored #14 BUS STOP, RETURN the #13 BUS TERMINAL at KAISER to GRANTVILLE, and make the #13 BUS STOP at KAISER exactly that, a BUS STOP on the #13 BUS ROUTE.

CONCLUSIONS

Buses leaving trolley stops 5 MINUTES BEFORE the TROLLEY ARRIVES for the past 11 years is ENOUGH.

Further reducing service is NOT THE SOLUTION.

I respectfully request SANDAG to DELETE the CHANGES scheduled for BUS #14 by MTS for JUNE 15 and for SEPTEMBER. I further request that SANDAG start a buildup of BUS #14 by DELAYING the DEPARTURE from FASHION VALLEY by my suggested 10 MINUTES to allow TIMELY TRANSFERS from the GREEN LINE trolley to the #14 EAST bound BUS. This should be done IMMEDIATELY.

BUS #14 is the ONLY bus route that allows non-drivers to get to destinations available by CAR on ROUTE 8. It is IMPERATIVE that it be kept on a 30 MINUTE SCHEDULE.

I truly believe you MAYORS, COUNCIL members, SUPERVISORS, and others of similar importance will AGREE that IMPROVING a SERVICE is MORE IMPORTANT than ELIMINATING a SERVICE.

Thank you in advance for a POSITIVE RESPONSE to my request, and GOD BLESS YOU.
The results of Control of Public Transportation by PEOPLE WHO DO NOT USE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION has resulted in practically total annihilation of EAST-WEST bus service that SHOULD provide an alternative to driving on Route 8 between the FASHION VALLEY area and the LA MESA-EL CAJON area.

I refer to BUS ROUTE 14. Over a period of several years, dating back to the extension of the BLUE LINE trolley to MISSION SAN DIEGO, buses have been INCONVENIENTLY scheduled to leave trolley stops from 3 to 5 minutes BEFORE the EAST BOUND trolleys arrive. This occurred because TIMING of the #14 BUS was ARBITRARILY set at 1 minute and 31 minutes past the hour. This TIMING allows NO CONNECTIONS from other buses at FASHION VALLEY or from the EAST bound GREEN LINE trolley. As the #14 BUS comes from OLD TOWN to FASHION VALLEY and then connects to no other buses until KAISER, this time of departure from FASHION VALLEY could easily be moved by 10 minutes to allow as much as a 7 minute connection time between the EAST bound GREEN LINE Trolley and the EAST bound #14 BUS.

Delaying the departure of the EAST bound #14 BUS for TEN minutes at FASHION VALLEY would IMMEDIATELY increase ridership by allowing riders from other buses to catch the #14 BUS at FASHION VALLEY and by allowing riders from the EAST bound GREEN LINE trolley to catch the #14 bus at RIO VISTA, at the SAN DIEGO MISSION trolley station, and at the SDSU trolley station.

Let's review the MAJOR LOSS of bus ridership on the EAST bound #14 BUS at KAISER HOSPITAL. By ELIMINATING the #14 BUS STOP at GRANTVILLE Trolley Station when the #13 BUS route was split into #13 and #14, passengers wanting to continue EAST had to take the #13 BUS from GRANTVILLE to KAISER HOSPITAL. By FORCING the #14 BUS to wait for the #13 BUS for those passengers at KAISER, the students at the PUBLIC SCHOOLS and SDSU plus the workers who had been using the #14 BUS WERE LOST. This was a major loss of ridership because these buses HAD BEEN STANDING ROOM ONLY going EAST on ZION Avenue, past KAISER, both TO and FROM schools. The ONLY WAY to correct this situation and REGAIN this ridership would be to return the #14 BUS STOP at GRANTVILLE.

It is URGENT that this #14 EAST-WEST bus service be maintained on a half-hour basis. A 10 minute DEPARTURE DELAY EAST bound from FASHION VALLEY would immediately increase RIDERSHIP as explained above. Returning the #14 BUS STOP at GRANTVILLE would ELIMINATE the constraints at KAISER and would allow SCHOOL CHILDREN, SDSU students, and WORKERS to start this service again.

P.S.: I respectfully request you, the SANDAG Transportation Committee, to intervene in this MTS decision and IMMEDIATELY take action to INCREASE ridership on the #14 EAST bound BUS by DELAYING the #14 BUS departure from FASHION VALLEY by 10 MINUTES. This 10 minute delay will open a never tapped source of potential bus riders. A bus must arrive AFTER the trolley to allow this to happen. This delay will do that. How about starting the day after the June 3 election?
Proposed Amendments to Comprehensive Fare Ordinance
First Reading
Transportation Committee – June 6, 2008

Introduction

- The ordinance includes all changes recommended by SANDAG staff as reviewed in Agenda Item 4A
- All **recommended** changes are:
  - consistent with TransNet, Federal Transit Administration and Title VI
  - consistent with goals and objectives of the pending fare study results
  - able to generate the revenue required by the transit operators
Title VI

- Federal Civil Rights legislation that seeks to reduce disparate impacts on minorities and persons with low income as a result of fare changes
- Disparate impacts are permitted if the alternatives cause greater impacts on protected populations and the changes are in the public interest
- An updated Title VI analysis is provided today with as a blue sheet

Five Provisions With Amendment Options

1. Replacing NCTD Day Pass with Regional Day Pass
2. Day Pass for COASTER
3. Changes to Trolley fares
4. ADA paratransit fare changes
5. 30 and 14 day rolling passes
1. Proposed NCTD Regional Day Pass

- **Recommendation:**
  - Increases day pass to $4.50 (S/D/M $2.25) on July 1, 2008
  - Replaces NCTD $4.50 pass with $5.00 Regional Day Pass on January 1, 2009 IF new revenue sharing agreement is reached

- **Option:**
  - Increases day pass to $4.50 (S/D/M $2.25) on July 1, 2008
  - Replaces NCTD $4.50 pass with $5.00 Regional Day Pass on January 1, 2009

**Discussion**

- **Recommendation:**
  - Reduces confusion about eligibility and transfers
  - Generates $150,000 additional revenue for NCTD
  - Avoids need to amend ordinance in FY 2009

- **Option:**
  - Maintains NCTD day pass
  - Retains inconsistency with regional fare policy objective of simplification and unification of fare structure
Today’s Action

- Motion to accept staff recommendation to increase NCTD day pass to $4.50 (S/D/M $2.25) on July 1, 2008 and then replace it with a $5.00 Regional Day Pass on January 1, 2009 if new revenue sharing agreement is reached
  
  OR

- Motion to raise NCTD day pass to $4.50 (S/D/M $2.25) on July 1, 2008

2. Proposed COASTER Day Pass

- Recommendation:
  - Creates a new Premium Day Pass valid on entire system including COASTER and Premium Express Buses
  - Premium Day Pass to be priced $1.00 higher than maximum COASTER round trip ($14.00)
  - Premium Day Pass to be implemented July 1, 2009 IF new revenue sharing agreement is reached

- Option:
  - Continues current system without a system-wide day pass
### Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation:</th>
<th>Option:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creates same transfer rules for entire regional transit system</td>
<td>Maintains inconsistent transfer policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increases revenue for both MTS and NCTD</td>
<td>Current transfer policy makes riders pay higher fare in one direction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Today’s Action

- **Motion to accept staff recommendation and introduce system-wide Premium Day Pass at $14.00 effective July 1, 2009 if a new revenue sharing agreement is reached**
  - **OR**
  - **Motion to maintain the existing $11.00 Premium Express Day Pass**
3. Changes to Trolley Fares

- **Recommendation:**
  - $2.25 flat fare with no transfers effective September 1, 2008
  - Continues downtown zone fare of $1.25
  - S/D/M fare of $1.10 and $0.60 downtown
  - Day Pass $5.00 (no change)

- **Option:**
  - $2.50 flat fare with free trolley to trolley transfers
  - Continues downtown zone fare of $1.25
  - S/D/M fare of $1.25 and $0.60 downtown
  - Day Pass $5.00 (no change)

---

Current Trolley Ridership

- 76% use passes
- 16% buy single or return ticket
- Up to 20% transfer between trolley lines
- Approximately 6% travel one way

- About 1% pay cash, transfer between trolley lines and ride one way
- **Conclusion:** $2.50 fare with free transfers benefits less than 1% of riders
Round Trip Examples

- $2.25 fare minimizes fare increase and generates same revenue for MTS as $2.50 option

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$2.25 Recommended</th>
<th>$2.50 Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round trip fares</td>
<td>Round trip fares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Single Trolley</td>
<td>- Single Trolley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2+ Trolley lines</td>
<td>- 2+ Trolley lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- e.g. Blue/Green</td>
<td>- e.g. Blue/Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Trolley + bus</td>
<td>- Trolley + bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

- Recommendation:
  - Implements transfer policy consistent with Title VI protected riders
  - Causes less impact on Title VI protected riders than $2.50 option
  - Generates same revenue as $2.50 option
  - Fewer riders (40%) will pay a higher single trip fare than for $2.50 option
  - Day Pass means round trips average $2.50 per direction for transferring passengers
  - Title VI impacts offset by simplification of trolley fares which is in public interest

- Option:
  - About 1% of riders benefit from this fare
  - Causes greater impact on Title VI protected riders than $2.25 option
  - More riders (70%) will pay a higher single trip fare than for $2.25 option
  - Transferring round trip passengers would pay same rate per trip as Day Pass
  - Title VI impacts offset by simplification of trolley fares which is in public interest
Today’s Action

- Motion to accept staff recommendation to set flat Trolley fare of $2.25 (S/D/M $1.10) with no free transfers between Trolley lines and downtown zone fare of $1.25, effective Sept. 1, 2008

  OR

- Motion to set flat Trolley fare of $2.50 (S/D/M $1.25) with free transfers between Trolley lines and downtown zone fare of $1.25, effective Sept 1, 2008

4. ADA Paratransit Fare Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation:</th>
<th>Option:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Adopts federal language to set ADA fares at twice the equivalent of fares for the same trip on fixed route service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adds a maximum one way fare of $4.50 for MTS Access &amp; NCTD LIFT and $4.00 for MTS Suburban Access on July 1, 2008, and $5.00 for all systems January 1, 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopts federal language to set ADA fares at twice the equivalent fares for the same trip on fixed route service without implementing a maximum one way fare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

- Recommendation:
  - Some ADA fares on trips that parallel low fare routes will decrease; others could increase.
  - MTS has indicated Suburban Access will increase from $3.50 to $4.00.
  - MTS and NCTD have not informed if they are considering pending increases.
  - No disparate Title VI impacts.

- Option:
  - Without a maximum fare for one way trip, if a transit operator imposes a one way fare in excess of $5.00, there are Title VI impacts, and an alternatives analysis would be required.
  - If a maximum is not adopted and the operators do not charge more than $5.00, there is no Title VI impact.

Today’s Action

- Motion to accept staff recommendation to adopt federal language and set maximum one way fares of $4.50 for MTS Access & NCTD LIFT, and $4.00 MTS Suburban Access on July 1, 2008, and $5.00 on January 1, 2009.

OR

- Motion to adopt federal language without a maximum one way fare.
### 5. 30 and 14 Day Rolling Passes

#### Recommendation:
- Converts existing calendar month Regional Pass to a 30 day rolling pass effective January 1, 2009
- Introduces 14 day rolling pass priced at 60% of 30 day pass effective January 1, 2009

#### Option:
- Do not introduce 30 day rolling pass
- Do not introduce 14 day rolling pass

### 30 Day Rolling Pass Discussion

#### Recommendation:
- Responds to Transportation Committee desire to make monthly passes easier for persons of limited means
- Revenue neutral, ridership expected to increase
- Pass is activated for 30 days upon first time use on bus or rail system
- Fare Study consultant found concept to be very popular during public outreach
- Rolling passes have been adopted by many transit agencies

#### Option:
- Perpetuates difficulty of purchasing monthly passes easier for persons of limited means
- Revenue neutral, ridership expected to increase
- Pass is activated for 30 days upon first time use on bus or rail system
- Fare Study consultant found concept to be very popular during public outreach
- Rolling passes have been adopted by many transit agencies
14 Day Rolling Pass Discussion

- Recommendation:
  - Responds to Transportation Committee desire to make purchasing of monthly passes easier for persons of limited means
  - Priced at 60% of 30 day pass or $41
  - Fare Study model forecast shows slight revenue increase
  - Gives customers another option to reduce their cash outlay at one time
  - Replaces existing 2nd half of the month pass

- Option:
  - Priced at 60% ($41.00) of the 30 day pass effective January 1, 2009

Today’s Action

- Motion to accept staff recommendation to replace the existing calendar month Regional Pass with a 30 day rolling pass and introduce a 14 day rolling pass priced at 60% ($41.00) of the 30 day pass effective January 1, 2009

OR

- Motion to keep existing calendar month Regional Pass and 2nd half of the month pass
Action on Options
Comprehensive Fare Ordinance

Today’s Action
1. North County Day Pass

- Motion to accept staff recommendation to increase NCTD day pass to $4.50 (S/D/M $2.25) on July 1, 2008 and then replace it with a $5.00 Regional Day Pass on January 1, 2009 if new revenue sharing agreement is reached
- OR
- Motion to raise NCTD day pass to $4.50 (S/D/M $2.25) on July 1, 2008
Today’s Action
2. Premium/COASTER Day Pass

- Motion to accept staff recommendation to introduce system-wide Premium Day Pass at $14.00 effective July 1, 2009 if a new revenue sharing agreement is reached
  OR
- Motion to maintain the existing $11.00 Premium Express Day Pass

Today’s Action
3. Trolley Fares

- Motion to accept staff recommendation to set flat Trolley fare of $2.25 (S/D/M $1.10) with no free transfers between Trolley lines and downtown zone fare of $1.25, effective Sept. 1, 2008
  OR
- Motion to set flat Trolley fare of $2.50 (S/D/M $1.25) with free transfers between Trolley lines and downtown zone fare of $1.25, effective Sept 1, 2008
Today’s Action
4. ADA Paratransit Fares

- Motion to accept to staff recommendation to adopt federal language and set maximum one way fares of $4.50 for MTS Access & NCTD LIFT $4.00 and MTS Suburban Access on July 1, 2008, and $5.00 (all systems) on January 1, 2009

OR

- Motion to adopt federal language without a maximum one way fare

Today’s Action
5. Rolling Passes

- Motion to accept staff recommendation to replace the existing calendar month Regional Pass with a 30 day rolling pass and introduce a 14 day rolling pass priced at 60% ($41.00) of the 30 day pass effective January 1, 2009

OR

- Motion to keep existing calendar month Regional Pass and 2\textsuperscript{nd} half of the month pass
Title VI

- The Title VI analysis finds:
  - The proposed Trolley fare change creates a disparate impact on low income groups or minorities, but finds that the change is in the public interest.
  - All other proposed fare changes do not create disparate impacts.

Next Steps

- Second reading of Ordinance amendments will be held by Board of Directors at a joint meeting with the Transportation Committee on June 13, 2008.
- Adoption of CEQA findings and Ordinance amendments scheduled for joint meeting.
Amendments to Comprehensive Fare Ordinance
First Reading
Transportation Committee – June 6, 2008
May 21, 2008

To whom it may concern:

On Monday May 19, 2008, I Michelle Beathe was waiting the bus stop on time around 5:55 a.m. with the other passengers on Bradley and Graves for the first #833 bus going towards Santee trolley. The first #833 bus is supposed to pick us at 6:03 a.m. While we were still waiting for the first bus the time was 6:12 a.m. I Michelle had to make a long distance Phone call using my cell phone to the company South Land in Miramar Mesa. I asked the “dispatcher what is taking the #833 bus to long?? “the dispatcher “said the #833 is stuck in traffic and is over at park way plaza. Which is a lie!! I” asked the him if we can send out a shuttle bus to pick us up so we won’t be late! To for school and work!! The dispatcher said” sorry we can’t do that!! I had a strong voice because I was very angry and up set! The dispatcher “said I’m trying to commucaite with you?? I said” on your not !!! I asked the dispatcher what is first and last name ?? he said “that my name is Harry also cant’ gave you my last name because it’s personal and confidential.

This phone call was made around 6:13 a.m. My friend was very mad too because the #833 bus running she had to work at 7:30 a.m. I had to be at school at 7:00 a.m. to study for my final Exams. My friend Jennifer made a phone call around 6:20 a.m. She kept getting the answer machine. YES! South Land is Ignoring problems !!!!!! The fact that’s we were going to be late!!! They don’t seem to care about their passers’ that is the honest truth! because we wouldn’t have this on going problems with South Land Pour bus Service!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
after the we both made the calls to South Land. We were still waiting for the bus and Still hasn’t showed up the time was 6:30 a.m. The #833 bus arrived at the stop at 6:47 a.m. I “asked the driver” what took so long “she said” she wake up late and she got the wrong bus schedule. To me that’ sounds like an excuse because she didn’t look me the face when she said” that to me. I can make up excuses too Explaining to my teacher why I’m four late and how come you weren’t on class on time? You’ll will end up failing your classes!!! Also I’m looking at the traveling time to leaving my house and going to school by bus. Mean while the #833 bus was late on route. The passenger’s asked the driver why is she late? The driver “said that she got the wrong #833 schedule. After while she was not paying attention to the route because she was messing around the key pad. When she Should stay focus on route because we are One Hour Late! We arrived at the Santee trolley 7:00 a.m. I at Grossmont College at 7:51 a.m. just barley made it to my 8 clock class. My friend was some what late to work at 8:20a.m.

Due to this matter with the #833 #3132 bus beginning an hr. late!

I Michelle and Jennifer as a witness indent occur with the #833 being late our time to travel work and school.

There is a difference between walking up and getting the wrong bus schedule.

Michelle Barth

Date

J. Rose

Date
February 11, 2008

To Whom It May Concern:

I’m a regular passenger that takes the #833 Bus. On the week days in the morning over on Sam’s hill catching the first bus to Santee. Also there are some regular passenger’s that take the same bus. On February 1, 2008, we were waiting out at the bus stop on time 6:Am as time went by around 6:12 am. I called the Southland bus company. I asked the “the dispatcher were is the #833 bus? The “distich said” the #833 bus is on I-25 free way. I was very surprised and so were the other passenger’s. I asked the distich if can send a shuttle bus to pick us up and take us the Santee trolley???????? The dispatcher “ said sorry we can’t do that”. I also asked the dispatcher were is the South land company is located??? “ he “ said in Miramar Mesa. We were very surprises. Because the #833 bus was running very late. Two of the regular passenger’s has to use their bus fair to and from work. To call a Cab to take them to work also the passengers had to use my cell phone and it wasted my air time on my Cell Phone and also Because I had to call South Land Company in Miramar
Mesa (858) 752-1150 to call and make that Complaint about this problem the first bus #388 heading to Santee Trolley which and take that has which wasted my air time on cell phone which for an Emergency Only !!! The phone calls that I had to make is long dissentience. I feel that I should get Reimbursed for the air time. I’ll send you my cell Bill so payment will be pay off. I hope I’ll be able to afford my payments. And the extra money that the passenger’s use for the cab fair $12.00 Each person adds up to $24.00 to that dentition the cab meter is running. This a is serious matter too. These passenger’s can’t afford to be late to Work it’s costing them their pay check. The #833 Bus pick us pick at Sam’s Hill at 6:26am and Arrive at the Santee Trolley at 6:38am. One hrs. late. The driver really seem to about the costumers concerned if we were late for work! That’s fair to us. #833 bus # 3133

Please look in to this matter as soon as possible. Thank you.

Sincerely, #833 passenger Michelle Beathe If there are any questions Please contact me at (619)
On February 11, 2008 this indent occurred with the #833 with the bus being one ½ hr. late picking the we the passengers by Sam’s Hill around 6:26am and arriving at the Santee Trolley at 6:30am. There is on Excused for the first bus being late to Santee trolley.

I Michelle Beattie 3-19-08 I’m a Witness

Date

I Joseph Brown MARCH 13-08 I’m a Witness

Date

I 13.19.08 I’m a Witness

Date

I ___________________________ I’m a Witness

Date

I ___________________________ I’m a Witness

Date 3-11-08

I ___________________________ I’m a Witness

Date

I ___________________________ I’m a Witness

Date
Does there have to be a WtW assignment? No. ACL 03-15 has a Q&A on this point:

Q. Are there a minimum number of participation hours required of a CalWORKs participant in order to receive transportation services?

A. No. Manual of Policies and Procedures (MPP) Section 42-750.11 states that necessary supportive services, including transportation, shall be available to every participant in order to participate in the program activity to which he or she is assigned or to accept or retain employment. (Our emphasis added)
WtW Work Supportive Services Issue

- Statewide, 50% of the WtW participants do not get transportation. DSS: Source WtW 25 report
- Statewide, counties provide mileage reimbursement from 44.5¢ to less than 20¢ a mile depending on the county one lives.

Transportation & Ancillary Laws & Regulations

- W&I C §1323.2 - Transportation & ancillary services shall be available to everybody who needs it to participate.
- W&I C 1323.2(a)(e)(2) Transportation costs, which shall be governed by regional market rates as determined in accordance with regulations established by the department.
- W&I C 1323.2(a)(e)(3) Ancillary expenses, which shall include the cost of books, tools, clothing specifically required for the job, fees, and other necessary costs.

Welfare and Institutions Code sections 1323.2, W&I C section 1323.2(a)(e)(2) and W&I C section 1323.2(a)(e)(3)

How are Payments Made?

- W&I C §11323.4(a) 11323.4. (a) Payments for supportive services, as described in Section 11323.2, shall be advanced to the participant, wherever necessary, and when desired by the participant, so that the participant need not use his or her funds to pay for these services.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For: San Diego, February, 2008</th>
<th>2-parent</th>
<th>FG</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source: DSS WtW 25 Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollees</td>
<td>2195</td>
<td>6895</td>
<td>9090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemptions</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>2484</td>
<td>2791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WtW Sanctions</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>1629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminated due to Time Limits</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>1629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entered Employment</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminated due to Employment</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reappraisal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Search</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsubsidized Employment</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>3658</td>
<td>4550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Employment</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidized private sector employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidized public sector employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OJT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Based OJT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Study</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Skills Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education Training</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>1407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education directly related to work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory Progress in secondary school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other activities</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>1155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care for Comm. Service participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Services</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Services</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Abuse Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Granted a DV waiver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unduplicated participants</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>5681</td>
<td>7021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIPS</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncompliance</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good cause for not participating in WtW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>3374</td>
<td>4207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancillary Services</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>917</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CENSUS 2000 PROFILE

**City Heights Community Planning Area**

**City of San Diego**

### Population by Race and Hispanic Origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Total Population) (SF1 - P6)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Non-Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>78,843</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>41,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>24,819</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>14,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>10,943</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>13,299</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian &amp; Other Pac. Is.</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race</td>
<td>23,408</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>5,446</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2,486</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population by Age and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Total Population) (SF1 - P12)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>78,843</td>
<td>39,571</td>
<td>39,272</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>8,965</td>
<td>4,576</td>
<td>4,389</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>9,217</td>
<td>4,813</td>
<td>4,404</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>7,272</td>
<td>3,729</td>
<td>3,543</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 17</td>
<td>3,071</td>
<td>1,986</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 and 19</td>
<td>2,575</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24</td>
<td>7,238</td>
<td>3,537</td>
<td>3,701</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29</td>
<td>7,075</td>
<td>3,718</td>
<td>3,357</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34</td>
<td>6,068</td>
<td>3,116</td>
<td>2,952</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 39</td>
<td>4,801</td>
<td>2,409</td>
<td>2,392</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td>3,691</td>
<td>1,918</td>
<td>1,773</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 54</td>
<td>2,826</td>
<td>1,354</td>
<td>1,472</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 59</td>
<td>1,893</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and 61</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 to 64</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 69</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 74</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 79</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 to 84</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 and older</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>29,385</td>
<td>15,084</td>
<td>14,301</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and older</td>
<td>3,778</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td>2,149</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population by Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Population age 15 and older) (P18)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total age 15 and older</td>
<td>53,329</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>20,987</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married, excluding separated</td>
<td>23,070</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>2,659</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>4,663</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population by Household/Group Quarters Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Total population) (SF1 - P27)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>78,843</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household population</td>
<td>78,582</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group quarters population</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalized population</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noninstitutionalized pop.</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

See last page for important notes on the use of this information.

Source: SANDAG, constructed from U.S. Census Bureau's 2000 Census Summary Files 1 and 2.
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Ratio of Income to Poverty Level

(Population for whom poverty status is determined) (P08)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78,582</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under .50</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50 to .74</td>
<td>8,402</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.75 to .99</td>
<td>9,686</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 to 1.24</td>
<td>7,796</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25 to 1.49</td>
<td>7,787</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50 to 1.99</td>
<td>9,713</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 and over</td>
<td>23,616</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Poverty Status of Families by Family Type and Presence of Related Children

(Poverty Status of Families) (P07)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78,582</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Poverty</td>
<td>48,853</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Poverty</td>
<td>29,729</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic and Economic Characteristics

NOTES

* Percent of total

The 2000 Census was conducted in April, 2000. Some questions were asked of all households (Summary File 1); others were asked of only a sample of households (Summary File 3). Some data presented here may not match 2000 Census information published by the U.S. Census Bureau for the following reasons: sample census data have been controlled to match 100 percent count (Summary File 1) data; and some minor adjustments were made (such as correcting the location of housing units that were erroneously allocated by the Census Bureau to roads and open space) to more accurately reflect the region's true population and housing distribution.

Source: SANDAG, constructed from U.S. Census Bureau's 2000 Census Summary Files 1 and 3.
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§ 2301. Findings: statement of purpose

(a) Findings
The Congress finds that—

(1) the Nation has a vested interest in building a quality and productive workforce that will enable the United States to compete effectively in the global marketplace;

(2) two in every three new entrants to the workforce during the 1990's will be women, and women must appropriate basic and occupational skills to fill jobs requiring more high skill levels than the jobs of today; and

(3) there are approximately 15,600,000 displaced homemakers in the United States, the majority of whom are women not in the labor force, who live in poverty and who require educational, vocational, training and other services to obtain financial independence and economic security; and

(4) Federal, State, and local programs addressing the training and employment needs of displaced homemakers have been fragmented and insufficient to serve displaced homemakers effectively.

(b) Purpose
It is the purpose of this chapter to provide assistance to States to provide coordination and referral services, support service assistance, and program and technical assistance to displaced homemakers and displaced homemaker service providers. Such assistance will enable public and private entities to better meet the needs of displaced homemakers and will expand the employment and self-sufficiency options of displaced homemakers.


HISTORICAL AND STATUTORY NOTES

Short Title
1990 Acts. Section 1 of Pub.L. 101-554 provided that "This Act [enacting this chapter] may be cited as the "Displaced Homemakers Self-Sufficiency Assistance Act.""

§ 2302. Definitions

As used in this chapter:

(1) The term "adult population" includes individuals aged 22 through 64.

(2) The term "community-based organization" has the same meaning given that term in section 1503 of this title.

(3) The term "displaced homemaker" means an individual who has been providing unpaid services to family members in the home and who—

(A) has been dependent either—

(i) on public assistance and whose youngest child is within 2 years of losing eligibility under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act [42 U.S.C. § 601 et seq.]; or

(ii) on the income of another family member but is no longer supported by that income, and

(B) is unemployed or underemployed and is experiencing difficulty in obtaining or upgrading employment.

(4) The term "eligible service provider" means—

(A) a community-based organization;

(B) a local educational agency (as such term is defined in section 1503 of this title);

(C) a postsecondary school (as such term is defined in such section);

(D) an institution of higher education (as such term is defined in such section);

(E) an area vocational education school (as such term is defined in such section); or

(F) other entities designated by the Governor that have the demonstrated ability to meet the needs of displaced homemakers.

(5) The term "eligible statewide public agency or statewide nonprofit organization" means agencies and organizations with demonstrated experience administering programs that serve displaced homemakers.

(6) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Labor.

(7) The term "State" includes any of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

References

§ 2303. Grants

(a) Grants by States

Except as provided in this section, for any fiscal year, a State shall make grants to the State agencies for the State fiscal year.

(b) State grants to localities

Except as provided in this section, for any fiscal year, a State shall make grants to localities for the State fiscal year.

(c) Authorized appropriations

The Secretary, in the exercise of his discretion, may appropriate funds to carry out the purposes of this chapter and for the administration of the funds available for grants and other provisions under the authority of this chapter.

§ 2304. In general

(a) In general

Each eligible State shall provide a nonprofit organization that is providing a competitive grant under this chapter and submit an application for the purpose of the Secretary to carry out the purposes of this chapter.

Complete Annotation Materials, see Title 29, U.S.C.A. 920
(8) The term “supportive services assistance” means assistance which is necessary to enable an individual eligible for services under this chapter to participate in programs funded under this chapter. Such services may include transportation, health care, special services and materials for the handicapped, child care, adult dependent care, meals, temporary shelter, financial counseling and other reasonable expenses required for participation in the program and may be provided in-kind or through cash assistance.


HISTORICAL AND STATUTORY NOTES

References in Text

§ 2303. Program authorization

(a) Grants by the Secretary
Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c) of this section, for any fiscal year for which the appropriation for this chapter is less than $25,000,000, the Secretary shall make the funds available as grants to eligible State agencies and statewide nonprofit organizations on a competitive award basis.

(b) State grant program
Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, for any fiscal year for which the appropriation for this chapter equals or exceeds $25,000,000, and for any fiscal year thereafter the Secretary shall make the available funds to grant States from allocations under section 2306 of this title.

(c) Reservation
The Secretary shall reserve such amounts as are necessary, not to exceed 5 percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to this chapter, for training and technical assistance under section 2313(b) of this title, and for administration and evaluation of the programs funded under this chapter.


§ 2304. Competitive grants

(a) In general
Each eligible statewide public agency or statewide nonprofit organization desiring to receive a competitive grant under section 2303(a) of this title shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require. Each such application shall contain assurances that the State Job Training Coordinating Council and the Governor have had an opportunity to review and comment on the application. Each applicant shall include the comments received by the applicant pursuant to such review.

(b) Priority
In awarding grants under section 2303(a) of this title, the Secretary shall give priority to applications from statewide public agencies and statewide nonprofit organizations which—

(1) demonstrate that employment and training related services will be provided to displaced homemakers who are economically disadvantaged;

(2) provide access to a comprehensive referral system so that participants will be directed to appropriate services based on their assessed needs;

(3) demonstrate that employment and training related funds and services to be provided will be coordinated with other Federal and non-Federal programs providing education, training, or other human services;

(4) demonstrate the ability to provide appropriate transition for participants into other related programs such as adult basic education, remedial education, vocational education, and the Job Training Partnership Act [29 U.S.C.A. § 1501 et seq.]; and

(5) demonstrate experience in providing services to displaced homemakers.

(c) Awards
The Secretary shall not award more than 1 competitive grant per State. The competition for such grants shall be conducted annually, except that when a grantee has performed satisfactorily under the terms of an existing grant agreement and the immediately preceding grant agreement, the Secretary may waive the requirement for such competition upon receipt from the grantee of a satisfactory program plan for the succeeding grant period.


HISTORICAL AND STATUTORY NOTES

References in Text

§ 2305. Use of competitive grant funds

(a) In general
Funds awarded under section 2303(a) of this title may be used for any purpose described in section 2309 of this title and for statewide model and demonstra-

Complete Annotation Materials, see Title 29, U.S.C.A. 921
The amendment to the Act of 1957, in effect on the date hereof, is set out at note 245.

1. Nothing in this section shall be construed to deprive the Attorney General or the Deputy Attorney General of the United States of any authority granted to him by law to investigate or prosecute any offense, as defined in this section, the investigation of which is within the jurisdiction of the United States.


FEDERAL CRIMINAL CODE—SELECTED PROVISIONS


Chapter 13—CIVIL RIGHTS

§ 245. Federally protected activities

(a) Any person who shall violate any provision of this section shall be guilty of a crime punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, for each violation.

(b) No provision of this section shall be construed to deprive the United States of any authority granted by law to investigate or prosecute any offense, as defined in this section, the investigation of which is within the jurisdiction of the United States.


§ 1502

For the purposes of this chapter, the following definitions apply:

(1) The term "academic credit" means credit for education, training, or work experience applicable toward a secondary school diploma, a postsecondary degree, or an accredited certificate of completion, consistent with applicable State law and regulation and the requirements of an accredited educational agency or institution in a State.

(2) The term "administrative entity" means the entity designated to administer a job training plan under section 1513(b)(1)(B) of this title.

(3) The term "area of substantial unemployment" means any area of sufficient size and scope to sustain programs under parts A and C of subchapter II of this chapter and which has an average rate of unemployment of at least 6.5 percent for the most recent twelve months as determined by the Secretary. Determinations of areas of substantial unemployment shall be made once each fiscal year.

(4) The term "chief elected official" includes—
(A) in the case of a State, the Governor; and
(B) in the District of Columbia, the mayor; and
(C) in the case of a service delivery area designated under section 1511(a)(4)(A)(iii) of this title, the governing body.

(5) The term "community-based organizations" means private nonprofit organizations which are representative of communities or significant segments of communities and which provide job training services (for example, Opportunities Industrialization Centers, the National Urban League, SER-Jobs for Progress, United Way of America, Mainstream, the National Puerto Rican Forum, National Council of La Raza, 70,001, Jobs for Youth, the Association of Farmworker Opportunity Programs, the Center for Employment Training, literacy organizations, agencies or organizations serving older individuals, organizations that provide service opportunities, youth corps programs, organizations operating career intern programs, neighborhood groups and organizations, community action agencies, community development corporations, vocational rehabilitation organizations, rehabilitation facilities (as defined in section 7010 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 [29 U.S.C. 706(10)]), agencies serving youth, agencies serving individuals with disabilities, including disabled veterans, agencies serving displaced homemakers, union-related organizations, and employer-related nonprofit organizations, and organizations serving nonreservation Indians, as well as tribal governments and Native Alaskan groups.

(6) Except as otherwise provided therein, the term "council" means the private industry council established under section 1512 of this title.

(7) The term "economic development agencies" includes local planning and zoning commissions or boards, community development agencies, and other local agencies and institutions responsible for regulating, promoting, or assisting in local economic development.

(8) The term "economically disadvantaged" means an individual who (A) receives, or is a member of a family which receives, cash welfare payments under a Federal, State, or local welfare program; (B) has, or is a member of a family which has, received a total family income for the six-month period prior to application for the program involved (exclusive of unemployment compensation, child support payments, and welfare payments) which, in relation to family size, was not in excess of the higher of (i) the official poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, and revised annually in accordance with section 9902(2) of Title 42, or (ii) 70 percent of the lower living standard income level; (C) is receiving (or has been determined within the 6-month period prior to the application for the program involved to be eligible to receive) food stamp pursuant to the Food Stamp Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. § 2011 et seq.); (D) qualifies as a homeless individual under subsections (a) and (c) of section 103 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C.A. § 11302(a) and (c)); (E) is a foster child on behalf of whom State or local government payments are made; or (F) in cases permitted by regulations of the Secretary, is an individual with a disability whose own income meets the requirements of clause (A) or (B), but who is a member of a family whose income does not meet such requirements.

(9) The term "Governor" means the chief executive of any State.

(10)(A) The term "individual with a disability" means any individual who has a physical or mental disability which for such individual constitutes or results in a substantial handicap to employment.

(B) The term "individuals with disabilities" means more than one individual with a disability.

(11) The term "Hawaiian native" means any individual of whose ancestors were natives, prior to 1778, of the area which now comprises the State of Hawaii.
The term "institution of higher education" means any institution of higher education as that term is defined in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 [20 U.S.C.A. § 1141(a)].

The term "labor market area" means an economically integrated geographic area within which individuals can reside and find employment within a reasonable distance or can readily change employment without changing their place of residence. Such areas shall be identified in accordance with criteria used by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor in defining such areas or similar criteria established by a Governor.

The term "local educational agency" means such an agency as defined in section 521(22) of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Education Act [20 U.S.C.A. § 2471(22)].

The term "low-income level" means $7,000 with respect to income in 1969, and for any later year means that amount which bears the same relationship to $7,000 as the Consumer Price Index for that year bears to the Consumer Price Index for 1969, rounded to the nearest $1,000.

The term "lower living standard income level" means that income level (adjusted for regional, metropolitan, urban, and rural differences and family size) determined annually by the Secretary based on the most recent "lower living family budget" issued by the Secretary.

The term "offender" means any adult or juvenile who is or has been subject to any stage of the criminal justice process for whom services under this chapter may be beneficial or who requires assistance in overcoming artificial barriers to employment resulting from a record of arrest or conviction.

The term "postsecondary institution" means an institution of higher education as that term is defined in section 481(a)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 [20 U.S.C.A. § 1088(a)(1)].

The term "private sector" means, for purposes of the State job training councils and private industry councils, persons who are owners, chief executives or chief operating officers of private for-profit employers and major nongovernmental employers, such as health and educational institutions or other executives of such employers who have substantial management or policy responsibility.

The term "public assistance" means Federal, State, or local government cash payments for which eligibility is determined by a needs or income test.

The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Labor.

The term "State" means any of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and Palau.

The term "State educational agency" means such an agency as defined in section 8801 of Title 20.

The term "supportive services" means services which are necessary to enable an individual eligible for training under this chapter, but who cannot afford to pay for such services, to participate in a training program funded under this chapter. Such supportive services may include transportation, health care, financial assistance (except as a post-termination service), drug and alcohol abuse counseling and referral, individual and family counseling, special services and materials for individuals with disabilities, job coaches, child care and dependent care, meals, temporary shelter, financial counseling, and other reasonable expenses required for participation in the training program and may be provided in-kind or through cash assistance.

The term "unemployed individuals" means individuals who are without jobs and who want and are available for work. The determination of whether individuals are without jobs shall be made in accordance with the criteria used by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor in defining individuals as unemployed.

The term "unit of general local government" means any general purpose political subdivision of a State which has the power to levy taxes and spend funds, as well as general corporate and police powers.

The term "veteran" means an individual who served in the active military, naval, or air service, and who was discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable.

The term "disabled veteran" means (i) a veteran who is entitled to compensation under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, or (ii) an individual who was discharged or released from active duty because of service-connected disability.

The term "recently separated veteran" means any veteran who applies for participation under any subchapter of this chapter within 48 months of the discharge or release from active military, naval, or air service.

The term "Vietnam era veteran" means a veteran any part of whose active military service occurred between August 5, 1964, and May 7, 1975.
The term "displaced homemaker" means an individual who has been providing unpaid services to family members in the home and who—

(A) has been dependent either—

(i) on public assistance and whose youngest child is within 2 years of losing eligibility under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act; or

(ii) on the income of another family member but is no longer supported by that income; and

(B) is unemployed or underemployed and is experiencing difficulty in obtaining or upgrading employment.

The term "nontraditional employment" as applied to women refers to occupations or fields of work where women comprise less than 25 percent of the individuals employed in such occupation or field of work.

The term "basic skills deficient" means, with respect to an individual, that the individual has English reading or computing skills at or below the 8th grade level on a generally accepted standardized test or a comparable score on a criterion-referenced test.

The term "case management" means the provision of a client-centered approach in the delivery of services, designed to—

(A) prepare and coordinate comprehensive employment plans, such as service strategies, for participants to ensure access to the necessary training and supportive services, using, where feasible, computer-based technologies; and

(B) provide job and career counseling during program participation and after job placement.

The term "citizenship skills" means skills and qualities, such as teamwork, problem-solving ability, self-esteem, initiative, leadership, commitment to life-long learning, and an ethic of civic responsibility, that are characteristic of productive workers and good citizens.

The term "family" means two or more persons related by blood, marriage, or decree of court, who are living in a single residence, and are included in one or more of the following categories:

(A) A husband, wife, and dependent children.

(B) A parent or guardian and dependent children.

(C) A husband and wife.

The term "hard-to-serve individual" means an individual who is included in one or more of the categories described in section 1603(b) of this title or subsection (b) or (d) of section 1643 of this title.

The term "JOBS" means the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training Program authorized under part F of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 681 et seq.).

The term "participant" means an individual who has been determined to be eligible to participate in and who is receiving services (except post-termination services authorized under sections 1604(c)(4) and 1644(d)(5) of this title and followup services authorized under section 1632(d) of this title) under a program authorized by this chapter. Participation shall be deemed to commence on the first day, following determination of eligibility, on which the participant began receiving subsidized employment, training, or other services provided under this chapter.

The term "school dropout" means an individual who is no longer attending any school who has not received a secondary school diploma or a certificate from a program of equivalency for such a diploma.

The term "termination" means the separation of a participant who is no longer receiving services (except post-termination services authorized under sections 1604(c)(4) and 1644(d)(5) of this title and followup services authorized under section 1632(d) of this title) under a program authorized by this chapter.

The term "youth corps program" means a program, such as a conservation corps or youth service program, that offers productive work with visible community benefits in a natural resource or human service setting and that gives participants a mix of work experience, basic and life skills, education, training, and supportive services.

References in Text

This chapter, referred to in provisions preceding par. (1) and in pars. (17), (24), (27)(C), (37) and (39), was in the original "this Act", meaning Pub.L. 97-300, Oct. 13, 1982, 96 Stat. 1322, as amended, known as the Job Training Partnership Act, which is classified principally to this chapter (sec. 1501 et seq.). For complete classification of this Act to the Code, see Short Title note set out under section 1501 of this title and Tables.
Interference with civil rights—

Private persons, see West's Federal Practice Manual § 14141 et seq.

Public officials, see West's Federal Practice Manual § 14041 et seq.

Preliminary procedures, see West's Federal Practice Manual § 16161 et seq.

Protected rights, sources and remedies, see West's Federal Practice Manual § 12081 et seq.

Voting rights laws, see West's Federal Practice Manual § 12281 et seq.

American Digest System

Conspiracy against exercise of civil rights; offenses, see Conspiracy §§ 29.5(1, 2).

Conspiracy to interfere with civil rights; civil liability, see Conspiracy §§ 7.5(1 to 3).

Federal remedies for civil rights violations; civil actions in general, see Civil Rights §§ 191 et seq.

Encyclopedias

Conspiracy affecting civil rights; civil liability, see C.J.S. Conspiracy § 102.

Conspiracy to interfere with exercise of civil rights; criminal responsibility, see C.J.S. Conspiracy §§ 57.1(1, 2).

Federal remedies for violation of civil rights; civil actions in general, see C.J.S. Civil Rights § 225 et seq.
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60 Am Jur 2d, Penal and Correctional Institutions § 189.

61A Am Jur 2d, Pleading § 86.


20 Am Jur Trials, p. 351.

38 Am Jur Trials, p. 493.

Forms

4-year State plan (and related needs assessment carried out for the plan) developed in accordance with section 342 of the Adult Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1206a);

(C) the variety of settings, including workplace settings, in which literacy training and learning opportunities will be provided; and

(D) the linkages that will be established, where feasible, to avoid duplication and enhance the delivery of services, with programs under-

(i) subchapters II and III of this chapter;

(ii) the Adult Education Act [20 U.S.C. § 1201 et seq.];


(iv) the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act [42 U.S.C. § 11301 et seq.];


(vi) the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 [29 U.S.C. 701 et seq.];

(vii) the National Literacy Act of 1991 (Public Law 102–73);

(viii) the Emergency Immigrant Education Act of 1984 (20 U.S.C. 3121 et seq.); and

(ix) the National and Community Service Act of 1990 [42 U.S.C.A. § 12501 et seq.];

(3) the goals to be achieved and services to be provided by the nontraditional employment for women programs specified in subsection (a)(2)(C) of this section that will receive the assistance; and

(4) the proportion of funds received under this section that will be used to achieve the goals, and provide the services, described in paragraphs (1)(2), and (3).

(d) Service requirements

(1) Permitted services

Services funded under this section to carry out the projects described in subsection (a)(2) of this section may include education and training, vocational education services, and related services, provided to participants under subchapter II of this chapter. In addition, services funded under this section may include services for offenders, veterans, and other individuals who the Governor determines require special assistance.

(2) Limitations on expenditures

(A) Coordination of services

Not more than 20 percent of the funds allocated under this section may be expended for the Federal share of projects described in subsection (a)(2)(D) of this section at the State and local levels.

(B) School–to–work services; literacy and lifelong learning services

Not less than 80 percent of the funds allocated under this section shall be expended for the Federal share of projects conducted in accordance with subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of subsection (a)(2) of this section.

(C) Economically disadvantaged individuals

Not less than 75 percent of the funds allocated for projects under subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of subsection (a)(2) of this section shall be expended for projects for economically disadvantaged individuals who experience barriers to employment. Priority for funds not expended for the economically disadvantaged shall be given to title III participants and persons with barriers to employment.

(e) Distribution of funds in absence of agreement

If no agreement is reached in accordance with subsection (b) of this section on the use of funds under this section, the funds shall be available to the Governor to achieve the goals and provide the services described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (c) of this section.

(f) Reports and records

(1) Reports by Governors

The Governor shall prepare reports on the projects funded under this section, including such information as the Secretary may require to determine the extent to which the projects supported under this section result in achieving the goals specified in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (c) of this section. The Governor shall submit the reports to the Secretary at such intervals as shall be determined by the Secretary.

(2) Records and reports of recipients


HISTORICAL AND STATUTORY NOTES

References in Text

This chapter, referred to in subsec. (b)(2)(A), was in the original "this Act", meaning Pub.L. 97–300, Oct. 13, 1982, 96 Stat. 1322, as amended, known as the Job Training Partnership Act, which is classified principally to this chapter (sec. 1501 et seq.). For tables listing provisions codified in the Code, see Short Title note under this title and Tables.


The Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, which is classified principally to chapter III of this title, is referred to in this table, see Short Title note under this title and Table.


Capital Improvement Program
Budget Transfer
Recommendations

• Transfer $300,000 into City College Realignment Project from Head Span Replacement Project
• Funds for priority track repair at crossing
• Scheduled for June 12, 2008 MTS Board approval

Project Transfer Summary & Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EXISTING FY08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City College Realignment Project</td>
<td>$16,497,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Span Replacement Project</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comments on Proposed Changes to the Comprehensive Fare Ordinance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Email/Voicemail</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>05/21/2008</td>
<td>4:47 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Lorraine Sullivan</td>
<td>Customer explains that she is both handicap and a care giver to her father, and a rise in Coaster fares and an additional fee for the svcc shuttle would be a big financial strain to her limited budget. She hopes these fares are reconsidered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>05/21/2008</td>
<td>5:21 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Art Page</td>
<td>Customer states that she has been a Coaster patron of 12 years, but if these two fare increases occur, she will stop riding the Coaster completely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>05/21/2008</td>
<td>5:36 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>K Schaeffer</td>
<td>Customer comments that public transit usually is popular because of time, convenience and money saving, but all three of these are already compromised with the raising of fares. She comments that many people in Carlsbad stopped using the Coaster after the Carlsbad Coaster connection was ended, many more stopped after ending the 10 pack ticket program, and now with this increase ridership will continue to decrease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>05/22/2008</td>
<td>12:44 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Marvice Young</td>
<td>Customer comments that SANDAG should exhaust all of it's possibilities before raising fares. He explains that lately there have been many fare increases as well as route cuts, which seems unfair. He would like to know what surveys have been conducted to account for these issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>05/22/2008</td>
<td>8:29 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Kelly Vaughn</td>
<td>Customer comments that she works at Scripps Hospital but not for Scripps hospital, so her travel fees to use the shuttle and Coaster are not reimbursed. With these fare hikes, she comments that she will no longer use transit, because not only is it not cheap, but it is also very time consuming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>05/22/2008</td>
<td>8:48 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Neil Grodskey</td>
<td>Customer disagrees with fare increases, and believes that ridership had been increasing steadily before these fare increases were implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>05/22/2008</td>
<td>8:58 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Steve Fitch</td>
<td>Customer comments that his commute is only 12 miles, but he rides the Coaster because he believe in public transit. Although, if these fare hikes are implemented, he will no longer try to support the public transit system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>05/22/2008</td>
<td>3:01 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Brent Newman</td>
<td>Customer wonders why fees are being raised now, when gas prices are sky rocketing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>05/22/2008</td>
<td>4:19 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Deanna Hall</td>
<td>Customer comments that she does not agree with the fare increases. Also, she would like the weekly passes to be reinstated as another option to buying only the daily or monthly pass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>05/22/2008</td>
<td>6:38 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Jennifer Reiswig</td>
<td>Customer explains her reservations on the implementation of the new monthly passes with the new compass card. She comments that in the past, a patron was able to recharge a monthly pass at any grocery store. The new compass card can only be recharged online, the Transit store and NCTD, Vista and Escondido transit centers. She comments that this will create more hardship to those people who cannot access these venues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>05/22/2008</td>
<td>9:08 AM</td>
<td>Voicemail</td>
<td>Rosa Gonzales</td>
<td>Customer would like to know how can one recharge a smart card?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>05/22/2008</td>
<td>12:22 PM</td>
<td>Voicemail</td>
<td>Rebecca Dickturn</td>
<td>Customer calls about senior/medicare/monthly passes and relates how much of a financial hardship this rise in fares will be for those who are under a fixed income.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>05/22/2008</td>
<td>4:15 PM</td>
<td>Voicemail</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Customer is upset that many routes are being cut, and fares are being increased. She believes if fares are increased, routes should be increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>05/23/2008</td>
<td>8:33 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Joseph DeCamp</td>
<td>Customer strongly opposes the fare increases and believes that it will no longer be financially better to use transit instead of using a personal car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>05/23/2008</td>
<td>8:49 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Anna Dalton</td>
<td>Customer has been a transit rider for years and is disappointed in the rate increases because she believes that more people have been trying to use transit to be more 'green', but after they are implemented people will be discouraged again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>05/23/2008</td>
<td>8:54 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Eric Leslie</td>
<td>Customer relates that many people have been starting to use the Coaster more because of rising fuel costs, but price hikes will discourage customers. He believes that people should check tickets more and government should subsidize more costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Email/Voicemail</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>05/23/2008</td>
<td>9:20 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Donald Hoffhine</td>
<td>Customer would like to know if there will be a method to obtain receipts for Coaster Connection cash fares for tax benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>05/23/2008</td>
<td>12:31 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Mary Goetz</td>
<td>Customer believes that rates for seniors and disabled should be raised to offset prices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>05/23/2008</td>
<td>2:28 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Jim Hissong</td>
<td>Customer is upset over the increases and believes that they will discourage ridership. He believes that transit is not a timesaver and the only benefit was the money saved from using the car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>05/23/2008</td>
<td>11:56 AM</td>
<td>Voicemail</td>
<td>Carol Thomas</td>
<td>Customer is very upset that bus services are being cut especially since gas prices are going increased. She believes that if fares are increased, bus routes should also be increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>05/23/2008</td>
<td>12:48 PM</td>
<td>Voicemail</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Customer is a senior/medicare rider and is upset that fares are being increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>05/24/2008</td>
<td>11:06 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Jonathan Samaniego</td>
<td>Customer states that because of high gas prices, this is the first time he will use transit and with the price hikes he believes future riders will be discouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>05/24/2008</td>
<td>1:45 PM</td>
<td>Voicemail</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Customer wonders why senior rates are being raised?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>05/25/2008</td>
<td>11:02 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Jared Weikart</td>
<td>Customer disagrees with fare increases because he believes that they are unjustified and will not offset the price of oil for cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>05/25/2008</td>
<td>1:13 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Customer works in Sorrento Valley and would like SANDAG to consider creating more bus stops along the 972 route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>05/25/2008</td>
<td>2:57 PM</td>
<td>Voicemail</td>
<td>Gregory Dutch</td>
<td>Customer thinks that fare increases should be stopped, because the public is bearing a huge financial hardship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>05/25/2008</td>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td>Voicemail</td>
<td>Gregory Dutch</td>
<td>Customer believes that federal government needs to look at how transportation is managed in San Diego. He believes our transit system is obscured, and unhelpful to residents. He believes SANDAG is taking advantage of seniors and disabled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>05/26/2008</td>
<td>6:45 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Susan Oliver</td>
<td>Customer has been a Sprinter rider for years and is upset with the fare increases. She believes that riders should have their tickets checked more often to make people more accountable and increase revenue back to SANDAG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>05/26/2008</td>
<td>11:09 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>David Booker</td>
<td>Customer understands that rising fuel costs will cause some fares to increase, but she believes that svcc should be a free service shuttle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>05/27/2008</td>
<td>8:40 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>John Miller</td>
<td>Customer would like to ask SANDAG to consider not raising fees because of the economic hardship it would cost to those who live in Sorrento Valley and work in San Diego.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>05/27/2008</td>
<td>9:19 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Nicholas Brunski</td>
<td>Customer believes that seniors and college students should pay the same as everyone else—and this would offset the rising fuel costs. He believes increasing fares will discourage future ridership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>05/27/2008</td>
<td>9:26 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Cathy Moore</td>
<td>Customer disagrees with the fare increases and especially with the proposed fee for SVCC. She believes this will add to the traffic pollution of the area and cause financial hardships for those who have to continue to use transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>05/27/2008</td>
<td>9:36 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Linda Christian</td>
<td>Customer believes that senior and disabled fares should not be increased and svcc proposed fare should be included in the Coaster fare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>05/27/2008</td>
<td>11:28 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Jack Fennessy</td>
<td>Customer states that if any fares are raised he will stop using the Coaster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>05/27/2008</td>
<td>11:45 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Tracy Adams</td>
<td>Customer believes that riders should be fined if they do not have a ticket instead of raising prices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>05/27/2008</td>
<td>12:15 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Ronald LaClair</td>
<td>Customer disagrees with the fare increases and believes there are other ways to save money for SANDAG such as eliminating less populated bus routes throughout the city or charging higher fares during weekends. He believes that the monthly Coaster pass should be around $15/month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>05/27/2008</td>
<td>1:06 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Stephen Doran</td>
<td>Customer believes that fare increases will discourage ridership and it should be reconsidered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>05/27/2008</td>
<td>1:51 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Kelley Rookery</td>
<td>Customer states that she will no longer commute on train if the prices are increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>05/27/2008</td>
<td>3:11 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Barbara Lee</td>
<td>Customer believes that tickets should be checked more often on the Coaster shuttle. As a transit rider she sees people daily evading the conductor when he comes to check tickets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Email/Voicemail</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>05/27/2008</td>
<td>3:28 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Gwen Johnson</td>
<td>Customer believes that the svcc shuttle charge is too expensive along with the monthly costs of riding the actual Coaster.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>05/27/2008</td>
<td>3:48 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Michael Lockerman</td>
<td>Customer pleads not to raise fares when the prices of everything is rising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>05/27/2008</td>
<td>3:53 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Rachelle Graefen</td>
<td>Customer disagrees with the proposed fares for the svcc shuttle. She argues that working middle class patrons who already have to pay for Coaster charges will experience too much of a burden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>05/27/2008</td>
<td>11:46 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Marva Smith</td>
<td>Customer believes that the rider alert notice is vague and hard to understand. Secondly, she believes that seniors and disabled should pay the same rates as everyone else.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>05/27/2008</td>
<td>3:10 PM</td>
<td>Voicemail</td>
<td>Sandra Nurbine</td>
<td>Customer is very unhappy about the fare increases for disabled citizens. She is a disabled citizen that will be getting major cut backs to financial aid. She wonders how she will be able to live with these increases, lower financial aid and higher gas prices?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>05/27/2008</td>
<td>3:15 AM</td>
<td>Voicemail</td>
<td>Barbara Lee</td>
<td>Customer is a Carlsbad Sorrento Valley Coaster rider and does not understand why fare increases are being made when tickets are never checked? She has been a rider for a long time and rarely ever sees tickets being checked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>05/27/2008</td>
<td>8:33 PM</td>
<td>Voicemail</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Customer is very upset that fares are being raised and there are very little routes in La Jolla. She is upset that 48/49 bus was cut.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>05/28/2008</td>
<td>7:09 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Christine Faschini</td>
<td>Customer is glad that tickets are being checked more commonly on the Coaster, but also believes that offenders should be charged a penalty instead of being issued a warning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>05/28/2008</td>
<td>7:42 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Vicki Hoffman</td>
<td>Customer disagrees with the fare increases and believes that many patrons try to use the Coaster to offset fuel costs. After these fare increases are implemented many patrons will be forced to use their cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>05/28/2008</td>
<td>8:17 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Michael Jocelyn</td>
<td>Customer relates that these prices increases are too significant for the average worker and would cause a huge financial burden to many patrons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>05/28/2008</td>
<td>9:16 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Jim Weintre</td>
<td>Customer is upset that fares were just increased a few months ago and they are being increased again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>05/28/2008</td>
<td>10:18 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Cheryl Steffens</td>
<td>Customer is upset with the two increases within one year and is discouraged that during any budgetary crisis, the patrons are the ones who have to take the burden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>05/28/2008</td>
<td>12:17 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Richard Barnes</td>
<td>Customer is upset with the increase in fares and believes that if SANDAG keeps the prices the same, more people will ride and become frequent riders, thus increasing revenue for the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>05/28/2008</td>
<td>1:13 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Jeff Guyer</td>
<td>Customer believes that the only reasons people use transit is time and money and if fares are raised more people will be discouraged from riding transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>05/28/2008</td>
<td>1:48 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Mark E. Smith</td>
<td>Customer is a senior citizen and would like SANDAG to reconsider raising fares because she lives in low income senior housing and would not be able to afford the fare increases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>05/28/2008</td>
<td>3:33 PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Chris Mahon</td>
<td>Customer relates that there will be no good reason to take transit with constant fare increases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>05/28/2008</td>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td>Voicemail</td>
<td>Patricia Maruse</td>
<td>Customer just started taking MTS Access which is $4.50 one way and then saw the fare increases and was very disappointed. $9 for roundtrip is now at $18 fees would be too much for people like her to afford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>06/01/2008</td>
<td>3:03 AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Soiree-Leone Sinclair</td>
<td>Customer has been a COASTER rider from Old Town/Downtown for over 5 years and has relied on the Sorrento Valley shuttles and understands that due to the budget/grant shortfall that a fare will most likely be imposed, but feels it is now time to examine the schedules. As a passenger from the South she waits 15 minutes for the shuttle to depart Sorrento Valley and another 30 minutes for the train. Customer believes the new fare should equal the northbound schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Email/Voicemail</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>06/01/2008</td>
<td>6:54AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Dana Quattrin</td>
<td>Customer cannot believe that the transit agencies are proposing fare increases to the price of public transportation. Customer believes that people who drive cars should be taxed and those who ride transit should be rewarded by discounting the fares and increasing the routes. Instead, you choose to do just the opposite - raise fares and cut routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>06/01/2008</td>
<td>7:14PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Carolina Banuelos</td>
<td>Customer does not agree with increasing public transportation fares.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>06/02/2008</td>
<td>11:12AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Genevieve Caston</td>
<td>Person works for an organization with low income people who are looking for jobs, and feels that the fare increases will have a very negative impact on these people who are already struggling to make ends meet. Without the access to public transport they will not be able to go to interviews and fill out applications. Customer's organization has a small budget to give some of our clients bus passes, and may not be able to purchase as many if the fares go up. Customer does, however, like the change of the monthly pass to a 30 day pass. Customer states that they are afraid of buying too many passes because if they cannot give them out right on the first they are wasted. Consequently they would buy more of the 30 day passes than the current monthly pass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>06/02/2008</td>
<td>2:40PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Lee Van Ham</td>
<td>Customer recommends that discussions of fare changes be held in the context of the increased ridership and also the costs of riding public transit vs. the costs of commuting by car. Also, customer would like to see a calculation of the impact on the environment with increased public transit riders. Customer is a regular senior rider and can agree with a modest increase to 30% of the regular adult fare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>06/02/2008</td>
<td>5:16PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Jennifer Tracy</td>
<td>Customer would like to see an end to the fare increases and feels that it is bad for the economy, families, the environment, working people, seniors and the disabled. Customer feels that transportation is a necessary part of a society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>06/02/2008</td>
<td>6:04PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>David Hope</td>
<td>Customer feels that there needs to be a priority effort to review the allocation of transnet funds and actively seek alternative methods to support for public transport. Now that rising gas prices are forcing more &quot;main stream&quot; San Diegans off the highways, customer feels that the time is ripe for forward thinking solutions to mass transit short fall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>06/02/2008</td>
<td>6:14PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Cassie Lewis-Beevers</td>
<td>Customer disagrees with any proposed fare increases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>06/03/2008</td>
<td>3:09PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Chris Cereghino</td>
<td>Customer feels that the $14 increase to Coaster monthly passes and $1 per one-way trip when using the MTS shuttle (~$40/mo.) is excessive and cost prohibitive for him and his colleagues. Customer believes that it will make more sense for him to carpool, which means one more car on the freeway, more air pollution, more accidents. Customer is not in favor of the rate increases and wonders how many more commuters will resort to driving, which may effectively lower the number of passengers that ride the coaster. In turn, the Coaster may lose money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>06/04/2008</td>
<td>12:07PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>James Humberstone</td>
<td>Customer feels that if the coaster increases any more, it will be cheaper (factoring in gas expenses) to drive, which will not only cause the NCTD to lose money, but it will also increase traffic, increase pollution, and cost him more in the long run due to car expenses. Customer believes that increase will yield a reduction in COASTER riders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>06/04/2008</td>
<td>2:12PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Phil Kasavage</td>
<td>Customer stated that, like many people, he recently started riding the Coaster. Customer feels that the current fares are a good price versus what he pays for gas and believes that a fare increase right now would be poor timing, and bad PR for those new to mass transit. Customer feels that Ridership must be up significantly, especially compared to last year, and would like to see if a delay in the fare increase could cover expenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>06/05/2008</td>
<td>8:23AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Bahram Arezi</td>
<td>COASTER Customer feels that public transit currently makes good economic sense but feels that an increase will force people to drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Email/Voicemail</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>06/03/2008</td>
<td>2:09PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Nancy Ellis</td>
<td>Customer feels that the proposed NCTD service cuts are three times what is needed to balance the next fiscal year’s budget and that these cuts would leave seniors and disabled persons home bound. In Encinitas, Fallbrook, and Ramona customer feels that these two groups are bearing 80-90% of the burden of the proposed cuts who can least afford it. Customer states that SANDAG’s charge is to reduce traffic congestion and air pollution but the individual vehicles needed to rescue all of these folks plus all those who can no longer reach the COASTER station to take the train to UCSD or other places of employment would undo most of the pollution progress made in recent years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>06/05/2008</td>
<td>10:16AM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Jason Lewis</td>
<td>Customer rides the Coaster 4 days a week from Encinitas to Old Town at the current cost of $10.00 per day. Customer states that the proposed increase will make the cost of taking the Coaster $12.00 per day in July and then $14.00 per day in January which is the same cost as driving his truck each day but feels that public transportation should cost a lot less than driving your own vehicle. With this increase, there becomes almost no value to taking the Coaster vs. driving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>06/05/2008</td>
<td>12:23PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Stacey Krahl</td>
<td>Customer commented on the proposed discontinuation of FAST Services and several bus routes in North County. Customer feels that the proposed cuts by the North County Transit District are appalling, unfair, and will cripple a portion of our community. Customer also states that these cuts would effectively strand all residents in Cardiff by the Sea and surrounding neighborhoods. Customer states that she chose not to drive because she can accomplish something during the commute and save the environment at the same time. However, customer questions what the seniors or the disabled in our community supposed to do and state that they would be, effectively, prisoners in their own homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>06/05/2008</td>
<td>1:37PM</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Fox Sutton</td>
<td>Customer feels that an increase in transit fares is needed, but the proposed amount is far too much when compared to the cost of driving. Additionally, customer states that disallowing the Coaster tickets to be used as transfers to the Trolley adds significant expense and inconvenience to Coaster riders. If these changes are approved, he believes that traffic congestion problems will become much worse, due to the costs of public transportation being far too high compared to driving a motor vehicle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Hearing on Fare Change Proposals
Transportation Committee – June 6, 2008

Introduction

- SANDAG is responsible for establishing transit fares for MTS and NCTD
- Two public hearings will be held
- First reading by TC of ordinance
  June 6, 2008
- Second reading by full Board
  June 13, 2008
Reasons for Fare Changes

- Immediate financial need by both MTS & NCTD
  - State government has not increased transit funding
  - Sales tax revenues are declining
  - Fuel costs have doubled
- Over last year MTS and NCTD have absorbed millions in lost revenue and higher costs
- Continue to reduce complexity
- Compliance with TransNet Extension and FTA

Other Actions

- Fare increases are being taken with other actions to respond to financial crisis:
  - Service and staff reductions
  - Hiring freezes
  - Deferred capital and maintenance projects
Fare Options

- The following slides outline the proposed changes to the Regional Fare Ordinance
- In some cases, an optional amendment is presented for consideration
- The options maintain the revenue levels sought by the transit agencies

### Proposed COASTER Fares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Element</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed July '08</th>
<th>Proposed January '09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Zone Regular Cash Fare</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Zone Regular Cash Fare</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Zone Regular Cash Fare</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5.50</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Zone Regular Cash Fare</td>
<td>$5.50</td>
<td>$6.00</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Zone Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$115.00</td>
<td>$129.00</td>
<td>$144.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Zone Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$126.00</td>
<td>$140.00</td>
<td>$154.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Zone Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$142.00</td>
<td>$156.00</td>
<td>$170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Zone Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$154.00</td>
<td>$168.00</td>
<td>$182.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior/Disabled/Medicare Cash</td>
<td>$38.50</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$45.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior/Disabled/Medicare Monthly</td>
<td>$77.00</td>
<td>$84.00</td>
<td>$91.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Pass</td>
<td>$77.00</td>
<td>$84.00</td>
<td>$91.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50% of Regular Cash
### Proposed BREEZE/SPRINTER Fares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Element</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed July '08</th>
<th>Proposed January '09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$54.00</td>
<td>$59.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$44.00</td>
<td>$49.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Day Pass Option A</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Day Pass Option B</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Recommended)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposed Changes to ADA Paratransit: Lift/Access

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Element</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>All fares: double fixed route regular fare including transfers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NCTD LIFT and MTS Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option A</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>$4.00 $4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option B (Recommended)</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>$4.00 $4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD LIFT Reduced Fare I.D.</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>BREEZE and SPRINTER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Sorrento Valley Coaster Connection Fares

- Proposed interim fare to keep service running for next 9 months
- Proposed effective date: September 1, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Single Trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior/Disabled Medicare</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trolley Fares - Existing

- Complex structure with 7 zones:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Downtown zone: (up to 5 stations)</th>
<th>1 Station</th>
<th>2 Stations</th>
<th>3 Stations</th>
<th>4 - 10 Stations</th>
<th>11 - 19 Stations</th>
<th>20+ Stations</th>
<th>Senior/Disabled/Medicare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Proposed Trolley Fares**

- Both options generate same revenue

**Recommended: Option A**
- Same rules as MTS and NCTD bus, and SPRINTER
- Lowest possible fare to generate required revenue
- Preferable from Title VI impact viewpoint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Element</th>
<th>Option A Sept. 1, '08</th>
<th>Option B Sept. 1, '08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flat fare:</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers:</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Trolley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Pass:</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown zone:</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior/Disabled Medicare:</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposed Change to Senior/Disabled/Medicare/Youth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fare Element</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Sept. '08</th>
<th>Jan. '09</th>
<th>July '09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Day Pass</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$1.10 or $1.25</td>
<td>$5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trolley</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.10 or $1.25</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Express</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Bus</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Trolley</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Bus</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>$1.80</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Bus</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Express S/D/M Pass</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$22.50</td>
<td>$38.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Express Youth Pass</td>
<td>$32.00</td>
<td>$32.00</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Express Senior/Disabled/Medicare Day Pass</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>$5.50</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium/COASTER Day Pass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium/COASTER Senior/Medicare/Disabled Day Pass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Changes Regional Passes

- Monthly Regional Pass converted to rolling pass
  - Responds to request from TC
  - Valid for 30 days from first use
  - Effective January 1, 2009
- NEW rolling 14 Day Regional Pass
  - Priced at 60% of 30 Day Pass ($41.00)
  - Valid for 14 days from first use
  - Effective January 1, 2009
  - Existing 2nd half of the month pass discontinued

NO Proposed Fare Changes

- Regional Monthly pass prices
- Seniors Monthly pass prices
- Youth Monthly Pass prices
- MTS or NCTD bus single trip prices
- MTS Adult Day Pass prices
- Premium Express Adult Pass prices
Fare Study Update

- SANDAG is preparing a Fare and Revenue Sharing Study
  - All recommendations today are consistent with study
  - Aim is develop new simplified fare structure and equitable revenue sharing
  - Since start of study the number of fare types reduced from 200+ to about 45
  - Held well attended public workshops last month
- Delays due to financial crisis facing transit agencies
- Draft report due later this summer
  - Will bring report and public comments to transit boards and Transportation Committee for review

Next Steps

- Hold first reading of proposed changes and finding on Title VI impacts today
- Second reading of Ordinance amendments will be held by Board of Directors at a joint meeting with the Transportation Committee on June 13, 2008
- Adoption of CEQA findings and Ordinance amendments scheduled for joint meeting
Public Hearing on
Fare Change Proposals
Transportation Committee – June 6, 2008
FIRST READING OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO COMPREHENSIVE
FARE ORDINANCE AND TITLE VI FINDINGS RELATING TO AMENDMENTS

Introduction

SANDAG has been responsible for setting all public transit fares in the San Diego region since 2003. The regional fare structure is outlined in the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance (Fare Ordinance). The Fare Ordinance needs to be updated to reflect a number of proposed changes, including fare increases to address FY 2009 budget shortfalls requested by the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and North County Transit District (NCTD), and changes to make the Fare Ordinance more consistent with the TransNet Extension Ordinance and federal regulations.

Public hearings were scheduled in accordance with SANDAG Board Policy No. 025, “Public Participation and Involvement Policy,” and Board Policy No. 029, “Regional Fare Policy and Comprehensive Fare Ordinance.” In addition to the public hearing scheduled for today (Agenda Item 4A), another hearing was held in North County on May 30, 2008, in order to provide the public with opportunities to comment on the proposed changes. In addition, a telephone voice mail number, an e-mail address, and Web site were available for members of the public who wished to comment, but were unable to attend the two meetings.

This report outlines the proposed changes to the Fare Ordinance with optional language in several provisions that require input from the Transportation Committee. Action today would hold the first of two readings on these proposed amendments (the second reading is scheduled for the June 13, 2008, Board of Directors meeting).

Discussion

Highlights of Proposed Fare Ordinance Changes

The proposed amendments to the Fare Ordinance reflect the recommendations of SANDAG staff after consultation with NCTD and MTS. The proposed amendments are shown in Attachment 1, and summarized below. In several cases, an optional amendment to the staff recommendation is discussed for the Transportation Committee’s consideration. Potential effects of each option are provided based on discussions between SANDAG, MTS, and NCTD staffs.
Summary of Proposed NCTD Fare Changes

COASTER

- Increase adult cash fares by $0.50 per zone to $4.50-$6.00 (depending the number of zones traveled) on July 1, 2008, and an additional $0.50 per zone on January 1, 2009, to $5.00-$6.50. Senior/Medicare/Disabled (S/M/D) fares would increase to equal 50 percent of the adult cash fare.

- Increase adult monthly pass by $14.00-$15.00 to $129.00-$168.00 (depending on the number of zones traveled) on July 1, 2008, and an additional $14.00-$15.00 on January 1, 2009, to $144.00-$182.00.

- Increase S/M/D monthly pass by $3.50 to $42.00 on July 1, 2008, and an additional $3.50 on January 1, 2009, to $45.50.

- Increase youth monthly pass by $7.00 to $84.00 on July 1, 2008, and an additional $7.00 on January 1, 2009, to $91.00.

BREEZE and SPRINTER

- Increase NCTD day pass by $0.50 to $4.50 on July 1, 2008.

- Increase NCTD S/M/D day pass by $0.25 to $2.25 on July 1, 2008.

- Phase out the NCTD Day Pass and replace it with the $5.00 Regional Day Pass on January 1, 2009. An optional Fare Ordinance amendment would not phase out the NCTD Day Pass at this time.

The advantages of having one day pass throughout the region is that the existence of two day passes with different prices and validity has been a source of confusion and frustration for both passengers and drivers. Elimination of the BREEZE/SPRINTER Day Pass will require the current revenue sharing agreements to be modified in the Fare Ordinance. Discussions with MTS and NCTD are currently underway and revenue sharing recommendations will be made by the fare consultant in the summer of 2008. Elimination of the NCTD Day Pass would also result in an estimated $150,000 in increased revenue to NCTD

- Increase NCTD adult monthly pass by $5.00 to $59.00 on July 1, 2008

- Increase NCTD College Monthly Pass by $5.00 to $49.00 on July 1, 2008

LIFT (Americans with Disabilities Act service)

- Eliminate fares for passengers riding LIFT who also ride BREEZE or SPRINTER on July 1, 2008

Summary of Proposed MTS Fare Changes

Sorrento Valley Coaster Connection

- Implement an adult cash fare of $1.00 and an S/D/M fare of $0.50 on September 1, 2008 (no fares are currently collected).
• Implement an adult monthly passes as a supplement to 2 and 3 Zone Coaster passes of $40.00 per month, an S/D/M pass of $10.00 per month, and Youth passes of $20.00 on September 1, 2008.

Trolley

• Implement a flat cash fare of $2.25 with no transfers between trolley lines. An optional amendment to the Fare Ordinance would implement a flat cash fare of $2.50, with free transfers between trolley lines. Both would retain the existing downtown fare zone with a fare of $1.25.

The $2.25 fare would create consistency between the bus and trolley system in terms of eliminating transfers between routes (bus transfers were eliminated as of January 1, 2008), and having the same $2.25 cash fare. The $2.25 cash fare also minimizes the cost for passengers using the trolleys for shorter distanced travel. Passengers traveling on multiple trolley and bus routes and those making round trips have the $5.00 Regional Day Pass available that allows for unlimited use. This fare has fewer Title VI impacts than the $2.50 option, applies the same basic rules to bus and light rail systems across the entire County and generates the same amount of revenue as the $2.50 option.

The $2.50 fare option would allow for travel anywhere on the trolley system, including free trolley to trolley transfers (but does not allow transfers to/from the bus system). MTS staff feel that this option responds to concerns over the transfers required between the Blue and Green Lines at Old Town, Blue and Orange at 12th and Imperial and Green and Orange at Grossmont. However, based on the fare changes that were implemented in January 2008, passengers making a similar transfer between the Trolley and bus systems must pay twice unless they purchase a Day Pass. Since most passengers make roundtrips, the price of a roundtrip with a transfer under this option (2 x $2.50 = $5.00) is the same as the Regional Day Pass that passengers would already use under first option. The $2.50 results in one way Trolley trips that require one or more transfers being less expensive than one way trips on the bus network that require transfers.

Premium Express

• Implement new S/M/D and Youth monthly passes at $45.00 and $22.50, respectively, beginning on September 1, 2008, consistent with the TransNet Extension Ordinance and regional practice.

Proposed Fare Changes Affecting Both NCTD and MTS

ADA Paratransit - NCTD Lift and MTS Access

• Amend the Fare Ordinance to improve consistency with Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidance and regulations that allow fares to be up to double the fixed-route fare including transfers can be charged, with a maximum one-way trip cost of $5.00. An optional amendment to the Fare Ordinance would not have a $5.00 maximum for a one way trip.

The $5.00 maximum, while not required by FTA guidance, would eliminate the potential for considerably higher fares than at present ($4.50 maximum currently) since the FTA guidance technically would allow transit operators to charge as much as $12.00 (NCTD) or $13.50 (MTS) for an ADA Paratransit trip that requires two transfers. Not having a $5.00 one-way maximum
fare could potentially create a federal Title VI impact to low income and minority riders, and would require additional Title VI analysis. SANDAG will present a Title VI analysis of these two options at the Transportation Committee Meeting on June 6, 2008.

Senior/Disabled/Medicare (S/D/M)

- Amend the Fare Ordinance for S/D/M cash fares on MTS to improve consistency with Federal Transit Administration guidance. With the changes the S/D/M fare will be 50% of the single trip price on each service. S/D/M cash fares will increase on services with fares of more than $2.00 (Trolley, Premium, Express and Urban), and decrease on services with fares of less than $2.00 (downtown Trolley, shuttle).

Regional Passes

- Make two changes to the Regional Monthly Pass: (1) transition the current calendar monthly pass to a 30-day rolling pass; and (2) introduce a 14-day rolling pass. A “rolling pass” allows the user to purchase the pass on any day of the month and is valid from the first day of use for either 14 or 30 days. The proposed changes are in response to issues raised during the last fare change hearing process in 2007 when many people commented on the difficulty of paying for a monthly bus pass at the beginning of the month when rent and other expenses are due. At that time, the Transportation Committee asked that staff evaluate how passes could be made easier to purchase by low income riders. The combination of the rolling pass concept and the ability to purchase either a 14-day or 30-day pass will provide a much higher level of convenience and flexibility for transit riders. Both rolling passes are proposed to be introduced in January 2009, in conjunction with the full implementation of the Compass Card. The 14-day pass would be priced at 60 percent of a 30-day pass to ensure that there is no revenue loss for MTS and NCTD. The consultant preparing the Regional Fare and Revenue Sharing Study will be available at the Transportation Committee to answer questions on the concept and impact of ‘Rolling Passes’.

- Create a new Day Pass valid for travel on the COASTER and Premium Express with a fare of up to $14.00. The pass would become effective July 1, 2009; when the Compass Card is fully deployed and recommendations on revised revenue sharing can be implemented. An optional amendment would not make these changes at this time.

Approving the recommended change would make the fare structure for the Coaster consistent with the rest of regional transit system by creating a Day Pass that allows passengers to transfer to and from SPRINTER, trolley, and bus services. It would also avoid the need to hold a separate set of public hearings were the change to be delayed until 2009. A fare of $14.00 would be required to ensure that a day pass would not be less expensive than a return trip on the COASTER (maximum $13.00), but still less expensive than the current cost of a Premium Day Pass ($10) and a Regional Day Pass combined ($10.00 + $5.00 = $15.00)

Revenue & Ridership Impacts

SANDAG is currently conducting a Transit Fare and Revenue Sharing Study and has a consultant under contract. One of the tasks assigned to the consultant is to develop a computer model to forecast revenue and ridership impacts of different fare scenarios. The consultant was asked to run the model based on the fare change proposals under consideration. The model is based on a calendar year as the last two fare adjustments have been implemented on July 1. The results, shown in Attachment 3, indicate an increase in forecasted revenues of 3 percent regionally for the second
half of calendar year 2008 and 8 percent for calendar year 2009. Ridership impacts from the proposed fare changes are expected to be minimal (1-3% decrease) over this same period; however, the model does not reflect the recent increase in ridership due to increased fuel prices, so actual ridership impacts could be less.

**Title VI Analysis**

Title VI of the federal Civil Rights Act and related federal regulations provide for an analysis to be done to determine if there is a disproportionate impact on people of limited means or minority racial groups prior to the implementation of any fare changes.

A Title VI assessment has been completed (Attachment 2) on the proposed fare changes and options outlined in this report. The analysis found that there are no disproportionate impacts on low income or minority (LIM) passengers from the proposed Trolley fare changes or and options. The proposed $2.50 Trolley fare impacted LIM passengers slightly more than the $2.25 fare since a higher percentage of LIM riders use the Trolley for short distance trips than longer distanced trips; however, it does not have a disproportionate impact on LIM riders.

**Summary of Proposed Actions**

Based on the proposed fare changes and Title VI analysis outlined above, the Transportation Committee is asked to hold the first reading of the proposed amendments to the Fare Ordinance (Attachment 1). As outlined in the discussion above, there are optional language choices for the amendments that the Transportation Committee may want to make regarding the proposed changes to provisions in the Fare Ordinance concerning the NCTD and Regional Day Passes, the trolley cash fare, the ADA Paratransit fare, and the Coaster/Premium Day Pass. Should the Transportation Committee decide to pursue one or more of these optional amendments, only the language selected on June 6, 2008, will be included in the Fare Ordinance for the second and final reading at the June 13, 2008 joint meeting with the Transportation Committee and Board of Directors.

**Next Steps**

In order to enact the proposed changes to the Fare Ordinance, the SANDAG must hold two readings of the Fare Ordinance amendments. The second reading is scheduled to occur on June 13, 2008.

Unless otherwise specifically identified within the Fare Ordinance, all proposed amendments will go into effect 15 days after final approval by the SANDAG Board of Directors, which is planned for June 13, 2008.

BOB LEITER
Director of Land Use and Transportation Planning

Attachments: 1. Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance with Proposed Amendments  
               2. Title VI Fare Proposal Evaluation for the San Diego Region, September 2007  
               3. Projected Revenue and Ridership

Key Staff Contact: Dan Levy, (619) 699-6942, dle@sandag.org
TITLE VI
FARE PROPOSAL EVALUATION
FOR THE SAN DIEGO REGION

June 2008
The 18 cities and county government are SANDAG serving as the forum for regional decision-making. SANDAG builds consensus, plans, engineers, and builds public transit; makes strategic plans; obtains and allocates resources; and provides information on a broad range of topics pertinent to the region’s quality of life.
**TABLE OF CONTENTS***

INTRODUCTION ..........................................................................................................................................55
  Background and Responsibility.............................................................................................................55
  Title VI Requirements.............................................................................................................................55

CHAPTER IV GENERAL REQUIREMENTS AND GUIDELINES.................................................................77
  Limited English Proficiency....................................................................................................................77

CHAPTER V PROGRAM SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS AND GUIDELINES FOR RECIPIENTS
  SERVING LARGE URBANIZED AREAS ........................................................................................................99
  Methodology for Fare Analysis.............................................................................................................99
  Data Collection ...................................................................................................................................1010
  Description of the Existing Fare Structure and Fare Alternatives ..................................................1111

TITLE VI IMPACT ASSESSMENT ..............................................................................................................1717
  MTS and NCTD Fare Alternative – 2008............................................................................................1717
  MTS and NCTD Fare Alternative – 2009............................................................................................1818
  Summary and Conclusions.................................................................................................................2019

APPENDICES
  A. Population by Census Tract ................................................................................................................21
  B. 2002 On-Board Questionnaire ...........................................................................................................37
  C. Ridership Analysis ...............................................................................................................................41

**LIST OF TABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 1</td>
<td>Language Spoken at Home and the Ability to Speak English (Population age 5 and older)</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2</td>
<td>Total LIM Population by Census Tract in the San Diego Region</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3</td>
<td>Total LIM Population by Ridership Surveys in the San Diego Region</td>
<td>1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4</td>
<td>Existing Fare Structure</td>
<td>1313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 5</td>
<td>July 2008 Fare Structure Alternative</td>
<td>1414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6</td>
<td>January 2009 Fare Structure Alternative</td>
<td>1515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 7</td>
<td>Existing Cash Fare Structure vs. 2008 Cash Fare Structure Alternative</td>
<td>2120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 8</td>
<td>Existing Pass Fare Structure vs. 2008 Pass Fare Structure Alternative</td>
<td>2221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 9</td>
<td>2008 Cash Fare Structure Alternative vs. 2009 Cash Fare Structure Alternative</td>
<td>2322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 10</td>
<td>2008 Pass Fare Structure Alternative vs. 2009 Pass Fare Structure Alternative</td>
<td>2322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Chapter order intentional to reflect the corresponding chapters outlined in the May 13, 2007, Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Circular (FTA C 4702.1A).
INTRODUCTION

This Federal Civil Rights Title VI analysis has been prepared to evaluate amendments to the Regional Comprehensive Fare Ordinance scheduled for implementation in July 2008 and January 2009. The amended ordinance would be approved by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) and implemented by the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North County Transit District (NCTD). The analysis assesses how the proposal will affect different transit rider populations and determines if any of the proposed fare changes will result in disproportionately negative impacts and adverse effects on minority and low-income (LIM) populations within the San Diego region.

Background and Responsibility

With the approval of Senate Bill (SB) 1703 in 2003, the planning and programming functions of the MTS and NCTD were consolidated under SANDAG. Contained within these functions is the responsibility for developing a Regional Fare Policy, including setting fares for transit services in the region through a Comprehensive Fare Ordinance. The MTS and NCTD Board of Directors have requested a fare increase to partially mitigate a revenue shortfall caused by reduced tax revenue, increased fuel costs, and reduced subsidies from the State.

Title VI Requirements

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d) states that: “No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” The scope of Title VI was expanded by the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987 (P.L. 100-209) to include all of a recipient’s and contractor’s programs or activities whether federally assisted or not.

The February 11, 1994, Executive Order 12898, “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations” added low-income populations to minority populations and required that disproportionately adverse impacts be identified and addressed. Environmental justice applies to all programs, policies, and activities being evaluated and is consistent with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Executive Order 12898 also requires public involvement and mandates that transportation agencies ensure there is no exclusion from participation, no denial of benefits, and no discrimination in the services that they provide to LIM populations.

The August 11, 2000, Executive Order 13166, “Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency” introduced the requirement to provide “meaningful access to Limited English Proficient (LEP) persons” (Chapter IV, Part 4). Executive Order 13166 requires Federal agencies to examine the services they provide, identify any need for services to those with Limited English Proficiency (LEP), and develop and implement a system to provide those services so that LEP persons can have meaningful access to them. To fulfill this requirement, FTA recipients must take responsible steps to ensure meaningful access to the benefits, services, information, and other important portions of their programs and activities for individuals who are LEP.

This Title VI assessment was prepared by SANDAG.
CHAPTER IV
EXECUTIVE ORDER 13166
GENERAL REQUIREMENTS AND GUIDELINES

Limited English Proficiency

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) is a term used to describe individuals who are not proficient in the English language. Executive Order 13166 “Improving Access to Services for Persons With Limited English Proficiency (August 2000),” is directed at implementing the protections afforded by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related regulations. Accordingly, it prohibits recipients of Federal financial assistance from discriminating based on national origin by failing to provide meaningful access to service for individuals who are LEP. These protections require that LEP persons be provided with an equal opportunity to benefit from or have access to services that are normally provided in English.

SANDAG defines LEP persons as those individuals who do not speak English as their primary language and who have limited ability to read, write, speak, or understand English. These non-English speaking persons in San Diego County have been identified based on data obtained from the Census 2000, which included response categories such as “Language Spoken at Home and the Ability to Speak English.” Those who responded to the Census by stating that they speak English “not well” or “not at all” are considered to be LEP individuals.

To ensure meaningful access to LEP persons, SANDAG certifies compliance with the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) “Policy Guidance Concerning Recipients’ Responsibilities to Limited English Proficient (LEP) Persons.” The policy guidance includes a “Safe Harbor” provision where the USDOT considers the written translation of vital documents in languages other than English (for eligible LEP language groups consisting of 5 percent or more of the population) to be strong evidence of compliance with the recipient’s written-translation obligations under Title VI.

In the San Diego Region, SANDAG will strive to ensure that LEP services are provided for languages that meet or exceed this 5 percent threshold. Written translations are provided for each eligible LEP language group that constitutes 5 percent or more of the population likely to be served by public transit. This 5 percent trigger serves as the benchmark for continued translations of languages over time. Written language services consist of the written-translation of the following vital documents: (1) All fare-related signs in bus, trolley, and train stations; and, (2) Notices of public hearings regarding recipients’ proposed transportation plans, projects, or changes, reductions, denial, or termination of services or benefits.

Table 1 highlights the Census data for “Language Spoken at Home and the Ability to Speak English” in the MTS and NCTD service areas, as well as for the region as a whole. Based on the Census 2000 data, Spanish is the only language in the San Diego Region that meets or exceeds the 5 percent LEP trigger in the combined categories of English spoken “not well” or “not at all.” Within the MTS service area, the total population who speak English “not well” or “not at all” is 5 percent, within the NCTD service area the total population who speak English “not well” or “not at all” is 7 percent and in the entire San Diego Region, the total population who speak English “not well” or “not at all” is 6 percent. Vital documents related to the Fare Ordinance amendments proposed for implementation in July 2008 and January 2009 were provided in Spanish to meet the requirements of Executive Order 13166.
### Table 1
**Language Spoken at Home and the Ability to Speak English†**
*(Population age 5 and older)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prominent Household Language</th>
<th>Ability to Speak English</th>
<th>MTS</th>
<th>NCTD</th>
<th>Regional Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Speak English Only</td>
<td>1,234,316</td>
<td>518,328</td>
<td>1,752,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>410,137</td>
<td>161,441</td>
<td>571,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Speak English “well”</td>
<td>314,871</td>
<td>108,904</td>
<td>423,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“not well” or “not at all”</td>
<td>95,266</td>
<td>52,537</td>
<td>147,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Island</td>
<td>Speak English “well”</td>
<td>163,249</td>
<td>22,182</td>
<td>185,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“not well” or “not at all”</td>
<td>134,730</td>
<td>19,138</td>
<td>153,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>81,899</td>
<td>23,660</td>
<td>105,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speak English “well”</td>
<td>72,574</td>
<td>22,036</td>
<td>94,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“not well” or “not at all”</td>
<td>9,235</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td>10,859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Based on Census 2000 data
Methodology for Fare Analysis

In order to comply with Executive Order 12898, which mandates the inclusion of “minority and low-income populations (LIM)” in the analysis of environmental justice, SANDAG first defined the LIM populations in the San Diego region by transit district service area; and for the region as a whole. LIM populations were defined by Census Tract and a LIM Census Tract was identified as any Census Tract where the total percentage of the LIM population was greater than the LIM percentage for the service area as a whole. Based upon the Census data, SANDAG determined the LIM averages to be 51 percent in the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) service area, 40 percent in the North County Transit District (NCTD) service area, and 49 percent regionwide (shown in Table 2). A complete table of LIM populations by Census Tract in the San Diego region can be found in Appendix A of this document.

Table 2
Total LIM Population by Census Tract in the San Diego Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Total LIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>2,017,725</td>
<td>1,045,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>796,108</td>
<td>332,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Total</td>
<td>2,813,833</td>
<td>1,378,136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To conduct this Title VI assessment for proposed changes to the current fare structure, information generated from the SANDAG 2002 Onboard Ridership Survey was analyzed to understand the region’s transit ridership in relation to fare usage patterns and LIM populations. Using the information from ridership surveys allows for a more thorough evaluation while simultaneously indicating whether LIM riders are more likely to use the mode of service, payment type, or payment media that would be subject to the proposed fare adjustments.

By using the data derived from the ridership surveys, staff was able to create a regional ridership profile that better defines the proportion of LIM and Non-LIM populations who use public transit in the region. In the MTS service area, 77 percent of riders are considered to be LIM, while 65 percent of NCTD riders are LIM. The regionwide average is 73 percent. In order to provide a reasonable comparison, SANDAG utilized the ridership survey LIM average to assess Title VI impacts, instead of using the LIM averages by Census Tract included in Table 2. Table 3 provides the overview of LIM populations based on ridership as described above.¹

¹ Ridership surveys were not available for ADA Paratransit service riders. As a result, Census 2000 crosstab data was used which confirmed that the disabled population of San Diego County was more likely to be in poverty than the general population.
Table 3
Total LIM Population by Ridership Surveys in the San Diego Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Total Surveys</th>
<th>Total LIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTS</td>
<td>21,073</td>
<td>16,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>10,556</td>
<td>6,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Total</td>
<td>31,629</td>
<td>23,168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Based on Valid Surveys

In order to provide the Title VI evaluation, a complete analysis of transit modes and fare payment type/media was conducted using the data derived from the onboard survey. Specific route types (i.e. local, urban, express, etc.) as well as specific pass types (i.e. adult monthly, premium express, etc.) were categorized based on method of payment (cash or pass) and ridership status (LIM vs. Non-LIM). In general, Title VI impacts would be likely when fare increases occur on routes (or groups of routes) that support a larger than average percentage of LIM riders. It should be noted that for the purposes of this report, staff has assumed that the passenger demographics and travel behavior have not changed since the 2002 survey was conducted. A copy of the SANDAG 2002 Onboard Transit Survey is included in Appendix B of this document.

Data Collection

To collect the information for the Onboard Passenger Survey, surveyors rode onboard buses, Trolleys, and the COASTER, offering survey forms to passengers as they boarded the vehicle. Surveys were self-administered; however, the surveyors were available for questions. When passengers completed the questionnaires, they were collected and tracked by route, date, trip time, and direction. The data then was coded, entered, and analyzed. MTS routes and NCTD routes had a slightly different survey form (see Appendix B). While slightly different, the survey questions were worded so that the forms could be combined in the analysis. An average of 314 completed questionnaires per route were collected and efforts were made to survey in both directions and during all time-periods (A.M. Peak, Midday, P.M. Peak, and Other).

LIM riders were those individuals who stated on the survey that they considered themselves anything other than white (non-Hispanic) and/or they indicated that their household income was below $20,000. The $20,000 threshold was determined through an application of average household size combined with the federal poverty guidelines. Ridership surveys from the NCTD area were used to determine the average household size (4.00 persons per household), while data from the MTS service area was unavailable. However, Census data for both service areas exhibited similarities which made the application of NCTD household size to the region logical. Since the federal poverty threshold in 2002 was set at $18,392-27,588 for a family of four‡ (when the survey was performed), any respondent who stated that their household income was “Under $10,000,” or between $10,000 and $19,999, and between “$1020,000 and $1929,999,” and were considered “low-income” for the purposes of this evaluation.

‡ The poverty threshold is based on 150% of the poverty level from federal SAFETEA-LU (Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users) guidance.
From the survey responses given, the data then was analyzed by transit mode (bus and Trolley) and payment type (cash, pass, transfers) to determine the absolute number and percentage of LIM riders that could be impacted from any of the proposed fare alternatives. A complete table containing this LIM evaluation by route and payment types can be found in Appendix C of this document.

While every attempt was made to evaluate each component of the proposed fare changes, a few minor categories were not available or needed to be adjusted based on the limitations of the available data. Specifically, a thorough evaluation of Senior, Disabled and Medicare (SDM) riders (monthly pass holders and cash riders) was not available since the data enabled only the identification of seniors within this category. Additionally, several of the proposed fare changes (including changes to day passes, and SVCC COASTER Connection fares) were not available since the survey form did not enable identification of these ridership subsets or the service/fare product was not available at the time the survey was conducted. Additionally, youth monthly pass changes (available to youth ages six through 18) were not evaluated since the survey did not include individuals under 13 years old.

Description of the Existing Fare Structure and Fare Alternatives

The following fare alternatives have been proposed by MTS and NCTD and evaluated by SANDAG to determine if the fare adjustment alternatives will have disproportionately adverse effects on LIM populations in the San Diego region. This proposed alternative includes recommended changes to July 2008 and January 2009 cash fares, regional pass fares, and other discounted pass fares. Table 4 provides an overview of the existing fare structure (cash and pass), while Tables 5 and 6 detail the possible alternatives for both 2008 and 2009.

Cash Fares

Possible cash fare changes include increases to MTS Express SDM fares (2008), MTS Urban SDM fares (2008), MTS Premium Express SDM fares (2008), COASTER Regular and SDM fares (2008 and 2009), SVCC COASTER Connection fares (2008), MTS Access fares (2008) and NCTD LIFT fares (2008). A flat fare is proposed on the Trolley with two possible alternatives: a $2.25 fare with each line considered a separate service with no transfers between lines (except at Old Town) and a $2.50 fare allowing transfers between Trolley lines. The alternatives also include two price reductions; a $0.25 cent reduction to both the MTS shuttle and MTS downtown fares (2009).

Changes to the ADA Paratransit fares include two potential alternatives. The first alternative would allow the transit operators to charge as much as involves charging double the current fixed-route fare with a maximum fare of $4.50 for NCTD LIFT and MTS Urban Paratransit service (2008), and a $5.00 maximum fare in 2009. MTS Suburban Paratransit service would be increased to double the current fixed route fare with a maximum cap of $4.00 (2008), which would be rolled into MTS Urban Paratransit service in 2009. The second ADA alternative would allow the transit operators to charge as much as double the current fixed-route fare, but would not instituteing any maximum fares.

Pass Fares

The current regional pass fares are $64.00 for a regular regional pass, $90.00 for a premium regular express pass, $16.00 for a regional SDM pass, $32.00 for a Regional Youth pass, $54.00 for an NCTD BREEZE/SPRINITER Regular Monthly pass, $115.00 to $154.00 for a COASTER Regular Monthly pass, $11.00 for a Premium Express day pass, $5.00 for a Regular-Regional Day pass, $4.00 for an NCTD

---

Sorrento Valley COASTER Connection
Regular Day pass, and $2.00 for an NCTD SDM Day pass. There are currently no Regular-Regional SDM Day passes or 14-day passes of any kind other than the half-month Regional pass, which can be purchased on the 15th day of each month.

Monthly pass alternatives explored in this report include increases to NCTD BREEZE Monthly passes (2008); MTS Premium Express SDM and Youth Monthly passes (2008); COASTER Regular, SDM, and Youth Monthly passes (2008 and 2009); MTS Rural Regular, SDM and Youth Monthly passes (2008); SVCC Regular, SDM and Youth Monthly COASTER pass supplement (2008); Regular, SDM and Youth Regional Monthly passes (2009); and the institution of a 14-consecutive day Regular-Regional Monthly pass (2009). Day pass alternatives under discussion include increases to NCTD BREEZE Regular Day passes (2008 and 2009); applicability of the Regular-Regional Day pass to SVCC COASTER Connection services (2008); Premium Express Day passes (2009); Regional SDM Day passes (2009); and the applicability of Premium Express Day passes for COASTER services (2009). No Monthly or Day pass price decreases are explored for 2008 or 2009.

Other Discounted Pass Fares and Fare-Related Programs

Proposed amendment to Other discounted pass fares and fare-related programs include changes to the BREEZE College Monthly Pass and the temporal cycle of the Regular, SDM, and Youth Monthly passes. The BREEZE College Monthly pass would increase by $5.00 in 2008 and, with the full implementation of the regional CompassSmart Card, the calendar month system currently used for the Regional Monthly passes would be converted to a rolling 30-day pass. In addition, the current fare proposals also have implications for the ADA services offered by both of the transit agencies. Consideration is being given to a proposal that the fare ordinance be amended to fix the fare for Complementary ADA services at double the price of fixed-route service as permitted by federal regulation. In addition, consideration is being given to permitting passengers holding a valid NCTD Paratransit Reduced Fare Identification Card to ride the NCTD fixed-route services without payment of any fare. A personal care attendant also would be able to ride any of the fixed-route or demand responsive services without payment of any fare. None of the above mentioned discount pass fares or changes to other fare-related programs are evaluated in this report given the lack of available survey data for the affected populations. Assuming that the youth ridership data would be consistent with the general population data and the senior ridership data would be consistent with SDM, however, the proposed amendments would be consistent with Title VI requirements.
## Table 4
### Existing Fare Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Single Ride Fare</th>
<th>Day Pass</th>
<th>14-Day Pass</th>
<th>30-Day Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regular/Youth</td>
<td>Senior/Disabled</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>Senior/Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>MTS Bus (Local/Urban)</td>
<td>$2.00-2.25</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BREEZE</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>Trolley‡</td>
<td>$1.50-$3.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPRINTER</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Express</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>MTS Premium Express</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COASTER§</td>
<td>$4.00-5.50</td>
<td>$2.00-2.75</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>MTS (2 zones)</td>
<td>$5.00-10.00</td>
<td>$2.50-5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>MTS Shuttle</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Downtown</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD FAST</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SVCC COASTER Connector</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>MTS Access</td>
<td>$3.50-$4.50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD LIFT</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* Indicates change from previous year
† No transfers between vehicles or services; separate fare (or pass) required for each boarding
‡ Regional half-month pass currently good for the last half-month only
§ COASTER – 4 zones
* NCTD-only; Regional/MTS passes also accepted on BREEZE, SPRINTER, and NCTD Rural service; no NCTD-only S/D or Youth passes; no NCTD-only 14-Day Pass

**College passes:** College Monthly Pass (MTS) = $51.20; BREEZE College Pass = $39.00 to $44.00; College Semester Pass = $1.34/day
### Table 5
July 2008 Fare Structure Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Single Ride Fare†</th>
<th>Day Pass</th>
<th>14-Day Pass</th>
<th>30-Day Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adult/ Youth</td>
<td>Senior/ Disabled</td>
<td>Adult/ Youth</td>
<td>Senior/ Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>MTS Bus (Local/Urb)</td>
<td>$2.00-2.25</td>
<td>$1.00-1.10</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BREEZE</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trolley (Alt 1)†</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trolley (Alt 2)†</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPRINT R</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Express</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>MTS Premium Express</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COASTER§</td>
<td>$4.50-6.00</td>
<td>$2.25-3.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS (2 zones)</td>
<td>$5.00-10.00</td>
<td>$2.50-5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Shuttle</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Downtown</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Access Urban (Alt 1)</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD LIFT (Alt 1)</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Suburban Urban (Alt 1)</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Access Urban (Alt 2)</td>
<td>No Max‡</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD LIFT Urban (Alt 2)</td>
<td>No Max‡</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Suburban Urban (Alt 2)</td>
<td>No Max‡</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No transfers between vehicles or services; separate fare (or pass) required for each boarding; 5 percent bonus when loading $10.00 or more on Compass Card
† Trolley – (1) No “zones,” each line considered separate service; however, free transfer between Trolley lines at Old Town only; (2) Transfers allowed between Trolley lines
§ COASTER – 4 zones (same as current structure)
* NCTD-only; Regional/MTS passes also accepted on BREEZE and SPRINT R; no NCTD-only S/D or Youth passes, no NCTD-only 14-Day Pass
** Actual 2008 implementation pending discussion with operators
†† Double the current fixed-route fare but with a fare maximum
‡‡ Double the current fixed-route fare with no fare maximum

** College passes: College Monthly Pass (MTS) = $51.20, BREEZE College Pass = $49.00, College Semester Pass = $1.34/day
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Single Ride Fare</th>
<th>Day Pass</th>
<th>14-Day Pass</th>
<th>30-Day Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>MTS Bus (Local/Urban)</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BREEZE</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trolley† (Alt 1)</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>$1.10</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trolley† (Alt 2)</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPRINTER</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Express</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>MTS Premium Express</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$14.00**</td>
<td>$2.00 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COASTER‡</td>
<td>$5.00-6.50</td>
<td>$2.50-3.25</td>
<td>$14.00**</td>
<td>$2.00 N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>MTS (2 zones)</td>
<td>$5.00-10.00</td>
<td>$2.50-5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>MTS Shuttle</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Downtown</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SVCC COASTER Connector**</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>MTS Access Urban (Alt 1)</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$5.00*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD LIFT (Alt 1)</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$5.00*</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Suburban (Alt 1)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Access Urban (Alt 2)</td>
<td>No Max‡</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD LIFT (Alt 2)</td>
<td>No Max‡</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Suburban (Alt 2)</td>
<td>No Max‡</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicates change from July 2008 fare structure

* No transfers between vehicles or services; separate fare (or pass) required for each boarding; 5 percent bonus when loading $10.00 or more on Compass Card

† Trolley – (1) No “zones,” each line considered separate service; however, free transfer between Trolley lines at Old Town only; (2) Transfers allowed between Trolley lines

‡ COASTER – 4 zones (same as current structure)

§ NCTD-only; Regional/MTS passes also accepted on BREEZE, SPRINTER, and NCTD Rural service; no NCTD-only S/D or Youth passes, no NCTD-only 14-Day Pass

** Actual 2009 implementation pending discussion with operators

¶ Double the current fixed-route fare but with a fare maximum

† Double the current fixed-route fare with no fare maximum

College passes: College Monthly Pass (MTS) = $51.20, BREEZE College Pass = $49.00; College Semester Pass = $1.34/day
TITLE VI IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Since the proposed Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) fare alternatives are specific to identified time periods (July 2008 and January 2009) the impact assessment was prepared to compare between the changes proposed in each of these intervals and the preceding time period. The data from which the conclusions were derived is included in Tables 6 and 7 for proposed July 2008 fare changes and Tables 8 and 9 for proposed January 2009 fare changes. Service area minority and low-income (LIM) thresholds were used to evaluate cash fare increases. However, since many of the affected passes are regional in nature, regional LIM thresholds also were applied to calculate any impacts from the proposed pass increases.

MTS and NCTD Fare Alternatives - 2008

Cash Fare Assessment

The 2008 proposed cash fare changes include a 25 percent increase to MTS express Senior, Disabled and Medicare (SDM) fares, between 9 percent and 13 percent increases (depending on zone) in North County Transit District (NCTD) COASTER fares, between 13 percent and 29 percent in both agencies' ADA paratransit fares, as well as the initiation of a fare on the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS). MTS Trolley services were evaluated under two flat fare proposals. The first of which involves a $2.25 fare, which carries a potential of increasing fares by between 13 percent and 50 percent for some riders, while reducing the fare for others by between 10 percent and 25 percent, with the remainder experiencing no fare change. This is due to the existing zone-based fare structure on the Trolley. Under the other flat fare alternative, some fares would increase by between 11 percent and 67 percent, others reduced by between 9 percent and 17 percent, with others remaining unchanged.

MTS and NCTD ADA services were evaluated under two alternatives. The first alternative allows up to double the equivalent fixed-route fare (as allowed by federal law), but institutes a maximum of $4.50 ($4.00 for MTS Suburban service). The second alternative allows for doubling the fixed-route fare but, does not include a fare maximum.

The two only majority LIM services are the Trolley service and the ADA services, based on those evaluated with proposed changes as discussed above. The evaluation of ADA services reveals that there are no impacts from the first alternative (with maximum fare) but there would potentially be impacts from the second alternative if a transit agency imposed the maximum fare. This is due to the increase in average fares based on a sample of daily ridership from MTS service which currently ranges between $3.50 and $4.50 (NCTD passengers pay $4.00). This analysis revealed that the average fare (with no fare maximum would be $7.32 for MTS Suburban ADA service (currently $3.50) and $9.61 for MTS Urban ADA service (currently $4.50). This represents 109 percent and 114 percent increases respectively, which is significantly more than the percentage increases from other proposed fares. On the other hand, the ADA fare increase with the fare maximum discussed above would not have a statistically significant impact on LIMs when compared with the other current fare change proposals.

MTS Trolley services were evaluated under two flat fare proposals. The first of which involves a $2.25 fare, which carries a potential of increasing fares by between 13 percent and 50 percent for
some riders, while reducing the fare for others by between 10 percent and 25 percent, with the remainder experiencing no fare change. This is due to the existing zone-based fare structure on the Trolley. Under the other flat fare alternative, some fares would increase by between 11 percent and 67 percent, others reduced by between 9 percent and 17 percent, with others remaining unchanged. These statistics establish that the proposed fare change to $2.25 has a disproportionately high and adverse effect on LIMs.

It also was determined that there is a greater Title VI impact on LIMs from the $2.50 fare scenario since more LIM riders use the Trolley for short distance trips, however they are not disproportionate. Those traveling between one and three stops include 39 percent cash riders (40% LIM) who would experience up to a 67 percent increase in fares under the $2.50 flat fare (compared to 50% price increase under the $2.25 fare). Therefore, the short distance riders would be more negatively affected by the $2.50 flat fare, with those currently traveling between one and three stops (the most cash and most LIM riders), experiencing the largest Trolley fare increase by dollar amount and percentage.

Under Title VI, if a proposed fare increase would cause a disproportionately high and adverse effect on LIMs, SANDAG must demonstrate that its preferred alternative meets a substantial need that is in the public interest and that other alternatives would have more severe adverse effects than the preferred alternative. Although the $2.25 fare has a disproportionate impact, it is in the public interest to simplify the fare structure to reduce rider confusion and to decrease the MTS budget deficit, and the preferred alternative has a less severe impact than the alternative of charging $2.50.

**Title VI Impacts:** No disproportionate impacts caused by either Trolley fare option. There would be no disproportionate impacts from the ADA fare option with a maximum one-way fare. There would potentially be disproportionate impacts on protected populations if a transit agency implemented an ADA Paratransit one-way fare in excess of the proposed maximums. Disproportionate impacts would be caused by either Trolley fare option; however, imposition of the $2.25 fare is in the public interest and has less severe impacts than the alternative $2.50 fare.

**Pass Fare Assessment**

Several pass categories would experience price increases under the proposed alternative in July 2008. For the alternatives for passes which could be evaluated, the potential increases for monthly passes increases range between 9 percent and 41 percent. The only majority LIM service affected by the proposed changes is the BREEZE/SPRINTER regular monthly pass, which would experience an increase of 9 percent. However, this increase is tempered by increases of the same percentage and higher (up to 41% for MTS Premium Express pass increases). Therefore, there are no disproportionate negative and adverse effects on LIM populations from this proposal. In addition, NCTD day passes include increases under the fare proposal, but were not evaluated since day passes were not in existence when the fare survey was conducted.

**Title VI Impacts:** NONE

**MTS and NCTD Fare Alternatives - 2009**

**Cash Fare Assessment**

Proposed cash fare changes in January 2009, compared to the proposed July 2008 prices, include a 13 percent increase on MTS Local bus fares, between 8 percent and 11 percent increases on NCTD COASTER fares, a 75 percent increase on MTS regular shuttle fares, but a 25 percent price
reduction on shuttle SDM fares, between a 25 percent reduction (SDM) and a 40 percent increase (regular fare) on MTS downtown services. This increase does not generate a Title VI impact because it does not cause disproportionately adverse effects on LIM populations within the San Diego region since the MTS Local bus is not considered a majority LIM service.

MTS and NCTD ADA services also were evaluated under two alternatives for 2009. The first alternative is similar to the 2008 increase, which involves allowing up to doubling the equivalent fixed-route fare (as allowed by federal law) to be charged, but institutes a maximum of $4.50 ($4.00 for MTS Suburban ADA service). The 2009 increase involves the same variable rate fare, but with a cap of $5.00 (MTS Suburban ADA service would be rolled into MTS ADA Urban service). The second alternative involves allowing up to double the fixed-route fare to be charged, but does not include a fare maximum.

As with the 2008 fare increase scenario, the ADA fare evaluation reveals that there are no impacts from the first alternative (with maximum fare) because it is proportional to non-LIM population fares (i.e. COASTER fares). However, should the ADA fare be increased in 2009 without imposition of a maximum fare, the same potential impacts could occur as detailed in the discussion of 2008 ADA cash fares if a transit agency chose to impose an ADA Paratransit one-way fare in excess of the proposed maximums.

**Title VI Impacts:** There are no disproportionate impacts from the ADA fare option that would impose a maximum one-way fare. There would potentially bear disproportionate impacts on protected populations if there is no maximum ADA Paratransit one-way fare implemented and a transit agency imposes an ADA Paratransit one-way fare in excess of the proposed maximums.

**Pass Fare Assessment**

Similar to the monthly pass assessment for 2008, several pass categories would experience price increases under the proposed alternative in 2009. Of the passes which could be evaluated, the Senior/Disabled pass and the Regular-Regional Monthly pass would both increase by 6 percent equally. While adult Monthly pass holders represent a higher than average LIM percentage, the Senior pass category is not disproportionately LIM. In addition, the COASTER Monthly pass increases are larger (in both dollars and percentages) than the increases experienced by regular-regional pass riders. The COASTER service also is a decidedly more Non-LIM service. The Premium Express Day pass price increases also are proposed to be the largest percentage fare increase in the pass category and also a service that is a majority Non-LIM. Therefore, the proportional pass increases would not cause disproportionately negative impacts and adverse effects on minority and LIM populations. In addition, NCTD day passes include increases under the fare proposal, but were not be evaluated since day passes were not in existence when the fare survey was conducted.
Summary and Conclusions

Based on the Title VI evaluation conducted for the proposed July 2008 and January 2009 MTS and NCTD service area fare changes, SANDAG staff has concluded there are no disparate Title VI impacts from the proposed changes to fixed-route fares. The proposed $2.50 Trolley fare impacted low income and minority passengers slightly more than the $2.25 fare since a higher percentage of low income and minority riders use the trolley for short-distance trips than longer-distance trips; however, it does not have a disproportionate impact on LIM riders.

The proposed ADA fare increase with a maximum one-way fare does not create any disproportionate impacts; however, without a maximum one-way fare there are disproportionate impacts.
Table 7
Existing Cash Fare Structure vs. 2008 Cash Fare Structure Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>July 2008</th>
<th>% Price Change from Existing</th>
<th>Service Area LIM %</th>
<th>LIM %</th>
<th>% Difference (Service Area LIM vs. Actual LIM %)</th>
<th>LIM or Non-LIM Route</th>
<th>Disproportionate LIM Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>Trolley (Alt 1)</td>
<td>$1.50-$2.00</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>13% to 50%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>NO/YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trolley (Alt 1)</td>
<td>$2.25-$3.00</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>25% to 0%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>LIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trolley (Alt 2)</td>
<td>$1.50-$2.25</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>+11% to +67%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trolley (Alt 2)</td>
<td>$2.50-$3.00</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>-17% to 0%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>LIM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Express (SDM)</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td>Non-LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>MTS COASTER (Regular and SDM)</td>
<td>$2.00-$2.75</td>
<td>$2.75-$3.00</td>
<td>+9% to +13%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>Non-LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>SVCC COASTER Connector (Regular and SDM)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.50-$1.00</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>-36%</td>
<td>Non-LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>MTS Access Urban (Alt 1)</td>
<td>$3.50-$4.50</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>0% to +20%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>N/A-LIM</td>
<td>N/A-YNO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD LIFT (Alt 1)</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>N/A-LIM</td>
<td>N/A-YNO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Suburban (Alt 1)</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Access Urban (Alt 2)</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$6.64</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD LIFT (Alt 2)</td>
<td>$4.90</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTS Suburban (Alt 1)</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>$7.32</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† No existing fare product for service, fare products are new
‡ Actual 2008 implementation pending discussion with operators
¶ Census 2000 data used in lieu of ridership surveys which are not available for ADA services
†† Fare average based on statistical evaluation of daily ridership data

N/A = Data not available
### Table 8
**Existing Pass Fare Structure vs. 2008 Pass Fare Structure Alternative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>July 2008</th>
<th>% Price Change from Existing</th>
<th>Service Area LIM %</th>
<th>LIM %</th>
<th>% Difference (Service Area LIM vs. Actual LIM %)</th>
<th>LIM or Non-LIM Route?</th>
<th>Disproportionate LIM Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day Pass (NCTD)</td>
<td>Day Tripper (Regular &amp; SDM)</td>
<td>$2.00 or $4.00</td>
<td>$2.25 or $4.50</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Day Pass (SDM)</td>
<td>Day Tripper (SDM)</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>Non-LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Day Pass as it applies to SVCC COASTER Connection</td>
<td>Regiona COASTER Service to Business Parks</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular NCTD BREEZE/SPRINTER Pass</td>
<td>Good on NCTD Only</td>
<td>$54.00</td>
<td>$59.00</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD COASTER Pass</td>
<td>Good on COASTER Only</td>
<td>$115-$154</td>
<td>$129-$168</td>
<td>+9% to +13%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-37%</td>
<td>Non-LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Premium Express Pass (SDM)</td>
<td>Senior Disabled Medicare Pass</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$22.50</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-52%</td>
<td>Non-LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Premium Express Pass (Youth)</td>
<td>Ages 6 to 18</td>
<td>$32.00</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTS Rural Pass</td>
<td>MTS Rural Services</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>$130-$168</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† No existing fare product for service, fare products are new

N/A = Data not available
### Table 9
#### 2008 Cash Fare Structure Alternative vs. 2009 Cash Fare Structure Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>July 2008</th>
<th>July 2009</th>
<th>% Price Change from Existing</th>
<th>Service Area LIM %</th>
<th>LIM %</th>
<th>% Difference (Service Area LIM vs. Actual LIM %)</th>
<th>LIM or Non-LIM Route</th>
<th>Disproportionate LIM Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>MTS Bus (Local)</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$2.25</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>+1%†</td>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>MTS COASTER (Regular and SDM)</td>
<td>$2.25-$3.00</td>
<td>$2.50-$3.25</td>
<td>+8% to +11%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td>Non-LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>MTS Shuttle (Regular)</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>Non-LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>MTS Shuttle (SDM)</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>-50%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>-13%</td>
<td>Non-LIM</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>MTS Downtown (Regular and SDM)</td>
<td>$1.25-$1.00</td>
<td>$1.75-$1.00</td>
<td>-25% to +40%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>MTS Access Urban (Alt.1)</td>
<td>$4.50†</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>NCTD Lift (Alt. 1)</td>
<td>$4.50†</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>MTS Suburban (Alt. 1)</td>
<td>$4.00†</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>MTS Access Urban (Alt.2)</td>
<td>$4.50†</td>
<td>$9.61</td>
<td>114%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>NCTD Lift (Alt. 2)</td>
<td>$4.50†</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>MTS Suburban (Alt. 1)</td>
<td>$4.00†</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Not considered a significant difference to warrant a determination of disproportionate impacts
‡ Census 2000 data used in lieu of ridership surveys which are not available for ADA services

### Table 10
#### 2008 Pass Fare Structure Alternative vs. 2009 Pass Fare Structure Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Category</th>
<th>Service</th>
<th>July 2008</th>
<th>July 2009</th>
<th>% Price Change from Existing</th>
<th>Service Area LIM %</th>
<th>LIM %</th>
<th>% Difference (Service Area LIM vs. Actual LIM %)</th>
<th>LIM or Non-LIM Route</th>
<th>Disproportionate LIM Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day Pass (NCTD)</td>
<td>Day Tripper (Regular and SDM)</td>
<td>$2.25 or $4.50</td>
<td>$2.50-$5.00</td>
<td>+11%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium Express Day Pass (MTS)</td>
<td>Premium Day Tripper</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>$14.00†</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>Non-LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Regional 14-Day Pass</td>
<td>14-Day Consecutive Day Pass</td>
<td>$11.00</td>
<td>$40.00†</td>
<td>†</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCTD COASTER Pass</td>
<td>Good on COASTER Only</td>
<td>$129-$168</td>
<td>$144-$182</td>
<td>+9% to +13%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-37%</td>
<td>Non-LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Regional Monthly Pass</td>
<td>Local, Urban, Trolley</td>
<td>$64.00</td>
<td>$68.00</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior, Disabled, Medicare Regional Monthly Pass</td>
<td>Ages 60-plus</td>
<td>$16.00</td>
<td>$17.00</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td>Non-LIM</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Pass</td>
<td>Ages 6 to 18</td>
<td>$32.00</td>
<td>$34.00</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† No existing fare product for service, fare products are new
‡ Actual 2009 implementation pending discussion with operators
Alternative Amendments for Fare Ordinance

1. Day Pass

Current Ordinance language shows a phase out the NCTD Day Pass and replaces it with the $5.00 Regional Day Pass on January 1, 2009. **Alternative:** status quo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page of Ordinance Affected</th>
<th>Section of Ordinance Affected</th>
<th>Amendment to language if alternative of status quo is selected.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Language currently showing as deleted would remain in ordinance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>Asterisks in section would be deleted and sentence that states “BREEZE/SPRINTER Day Pass will be discontinued on December 31, 2008” would be deleted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>Sentence that states “The NCTD SPRINTER/BREEZE Day Pass shall not be sold after December 31, 2008” would be deleted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Exhibit 1</td>
<td>Added text on new revenue sharing provisions would be removed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Premium/COASTER Day Pass

Current Ordinance language shows status quo. **Alternative:** Create new $14.00 Premium/COASTER Day Pass valid on all services, except two zone rural bus trips to replace existing Premium Express Day Pass.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page of Ordinance Affected</th>
<th>Section of Ordinance Affected</th>
<th>Amendment to language if alternative of creating new $14.00 Premium/COASTER Day Pass is selected.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Delete current language and replace with language that states: A Premium/COASTER Day Pass shall be available for $14.00 for unlimited same day travel on all services except two zone-designated rural services. The Premium/Coaster Day Pass shall be available from TVMs and on buses. This section shall become effective on January 1, 2009, if new fare revenue sharing provisions are established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Remove reference to Premium Day Pass in second sentence and delete last paragraph.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Trolley Fares

Current Ordinance language sets Trolley fare at $2.25 with no free transfers. **Alternative:** Set Trolley fare at $2.50 and allow free Trolley to Trolley transfers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page of Ordinance Affected</th>
<th>Section of Ordinance Affected</th>
<th>Amendment to language if alternative of Trolley fare of $2.50 and free Trolley to Trolley transfers is selected.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>The first sentence in this section would be deleted and replaced with the following language: Effective September 1, 2008, the fare for a single, one-way trip shall be $2.50 for an adult and free transfers shall be permitted between Trolley lines. Tickets shall be valid for two hours from time of purchase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Sentence would be added that states: “This section does not apply to transfers directly between one Trolley line and another Trolley line.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. ADA Paratransit Fares

Current Ordinance language shows adoption of the federal language with no set maximum fare. **Alternative:** Adopt federal language with a maximum one way fare.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page of Ordinance Affected</th>
<th>Section of Ordinance Affected</th>
<th>Amendment to language if alternative of adopting federal language and imposing a maximum fare is selected.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>At the end of the first paragraph, add the following: to a maximum of: Effective July 1, 2008 Effective January 1, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NCTD LIFT $4.50 MTS Suburban $4.00 MTS Access $5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Rolling Passes

Current Ordinance language shows adoption of 30 and 14 day rolling passes. **Alternative:** Status Quo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page of Ordinance Affected</th>
<th>Section of Ordinance Affected</th>
<th>Amendment to language if alternative of status quo for monthly passes is selected.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Sentence that states: “Effective January 1, 2009, the Half Price Pass shall be replaced with a 14-Day pass priced at $41.00” would be deleted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Entire section would be deleted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>All references to 30-Day and 14-Day passes would be deleted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>