



ALAMEDA-CONTRA COSTA TRANSIT DISTRICT

Master Minute Order

File Number: 21-145a

Report ID: 21-145a

Type: Regular - Finance & Audit

Status: Received

Agenda
Section:

Meeting Body: Board of Directors -
Regular Meeting

Report Created: 05/14/2021

Final Action: 10/13/2021

ded Action: Consider receiving an update on the work of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Fare Integration Task Force. [Requested by Director Walsh - 12/9/2020]

this will be a presentation from MTC/BART staff who are PMs for fare integration project
should be 21-145a

Moved to 9/8/21 per Chris A. (6/29 JH)

Item moved to 10/13 LN (7.27)

Sponsors:

Enactment Date:

Attachments: STAFF REPORT, Att.1. FCIS Presentation, RED
FOLDER Letter from EBTRU, RED FOLDER:
2021-10-12 Fare Integration Support letter_ACTransit

Enactment Number:

Hearing Date:

Effective Date:

History of Legislative File

Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
Board of Directors - Regular Meeting	10/13/2021	Received				Pass
Action Text:	MOTION: PEEPLES/BECKLES to receive an update on the work of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Fare Integration Task Force. The motion carried by the following vote:					
Notes:	[Written comment received prior to the meeting is incorporated into the file by reference.]					
Chief Financial Officer Chris Andrichak introduced William Bacon from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and Michael Eisenman from the Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) who presented an update on the work of MTC’s Fare Integration Task Force, including an overview of the study, key findings and recommendations, and recommended near-term actions.						
Public Comment:						
John Minot, EBTRU, presented personal views and reasons for Board approval of						

the fare integration study (also submitted a written comment on file).

Sheela Gunn-Cushman noted that the fare integration study questions were not helpful for people with disabilities and elderly riders and were inadequate because questions did not elicit suggestions.

Hayden Miller offered support for proposals moving toward Tiers 3 and 4 in the report for a regionwide system. Miller noted that AC Transit lacks a time-based window to allow bus transfers and that AC Transit needs to fix internal fare issues before addressing inter-regional fare issues.

Ben Keller expressed support for the recommendations of task force and excitement for the idea of an inter-agency transit pass.

Derek Sagehorn, EBTRU, expressed support of MTC efforts and programs, noting the benefits of expanded travel across transit agency areas, saying that any future plans must ensure an integrated system can be created and sustained as outlined in Tiers 3 and 4 of the report.

Anne Olivia Eldred noted the positive impact of an integrated transit system and offered personal experience with regard to the difficulty of Bay Area travel without an integrated transit system.

George Spies was encouraged by idea of seamless trips between transit regions. Spies urged the Board to support the study and added comments about economic equity issues and the promotion of a lower cost system for all people to use transit, which will maximize ridership.

Liam Cain offered personal commuter experience regarding the work commute involving travel across several agency regions. Cain expressed support of the Fare Integration Study and encouraged the Board to implement the recommended strategy.

Chonita Chu, United Seniors of Oakland and Alameda County, offered support of integrated fares and noted concerns focused on getting free transit for seniors.

Board Discussion:

Vice President Young appreciated the efforts to study fare integration and asked a number of penetrating questions about the development of the model and how it was used to formulate the findings and recommendations outlined in the presentation.

Mr. Bacon advised that MTC used the highly technical Regional Travel Model 1.5 to analyze potential ridership impacts, vehicle miles traveled impacts, and to forecast the impact of transportation investments and the price of a transit trips in different fare policy price options. He added that the analysis of the modeling is publicly available to the extent it can be presented in an intelligible manner. It was also reported that the model works by representing every single person in the Bay Area based on income distribution, location and accounts for the spectrum and the diversity of the Bay Area. In addition, a financial model was used to analyze the financial impacts associated with changes in fare policies.

Vice President Young also asked if there was any modeling representative of new transit riders on any given day by gender, age, race, etc. and what the guarantee

was in terms of ridership gains. Mr. Bacon advised that the modeling anecdotally accounted for this, but there was no guarantee that AC Transit would have an increase in ridership as a result of the proposal because the models were not certain, and it was hard to predict the future. Vice President Young further asked if the project was creating additional uncertainty that transit agencies could not handle at this time and what the models suggest in terms of increased transit usage post-covid. Mr. Bacon advised that it was one more thing to consider, but the recommendations were founded on the idea that transit systems would have to do a lot of things to recover from the pandemic in order to make transit more attractive to riders. In addition, post-covid scenarios were developed to gauge how the fare integration proposals might be affected, but were highly speculative. It was suggested that long-distance and regional service might recover more slowly than local services.

Lastly, Vice President Young asked what the drawbacks were for transit agencies as a result of the proposal. Mr. Bacon advised that staff is treading carefully with respect to investing scarce resources and wants to ensure that any proposal that advances in the process is efficient and aids in recovery. General Manager Michael Hursh advised that as the project is built out, the greater the risk is to local agencies that stand to lose local authority and local decision-making in setting fare policy. He added that there are two major hurdles that he has asked the Task force to consider: 1) how to pay for this; and 2) the loss of local control in setting fare policy. Vice President Young offered that another risk is to do this work and not have the impact that models suggest.

Director Peeples addressed a misrepresentation by one of the speakers that AC Transit did not have fare capping, when it does through a fare accumulator. He also raised the following scenarios that did not appear to be considered by the study: 1) that some parts of the Bay Area and AC Transit Special District 1 are very supportive of land use and transit, while other areas are not at all supportive; and 2) some areas are very supportive of taxing themselves to support transit, while others are not. He believed that these situations would eventually lead to equity issues. He also pointed out that BART's financial model did not support the idea of monthly passes. Mr. Eisenman responded that BART has an interest in pursuing a pilot and commented further on BART's financial model. Director Peeples expressed concern that the program will work to the extent there is a willingness by MTC to financially support it.

Director Walsh supported the recommendations and called attention to the support letter signed by 47 groups, which she believed was a testament to public support of fare coordination/integration. She further believed that fare integration represented a salient plan to bring riders back to transit in the midst of service reductions and unvaccinated workers. Director Beckles agreed.

Director Williams supported the idea of fare integration in general, but remained cautious that the District could remain financially sound. General Manager Hursh

appreciated the effort put forth on the study, saying that while comments about the study have been positive in general, funding was a concern. He added that the early recommendations presented required further vetting by the Commission and agency boards who have a fiduciary responsibility to their constituencies and urged everyone to stay engaged in the process.

President Ortiz spoke in support of the effort and inquired about the issue equity and whether minorities would be part of the Committee. Mr. Bacon advised that the committee he talked about was a stakeholder advisory body that included representatives from minority communities.

Director Peebles appreciated the complexity of the work being done and complimented the presenters.

Director Beckles suggested collaboration with Contra Costa County to determine how Measure X funds might be used to fund this effort.

Ayes: 6 President Ortiz, Vice President Young, Director Walsh, Director Beckles,
Director Williams, Director Peebles
Absent: 1 Director Shaw
