

# Title VI Evaluation of 2019 Fare Proposals

Submitted by

Sally Goodman, Title VI Program Administrator  
Howard Der, Planning Data Administrator  
Daniel Mao, Compliance & Diversity Intern

## CONTENTS

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	2
II. TITLE VI .....	2
III. METHODOLOGY AND DATA SOURCES .....	3
IV. DESCRIPTION OF FARE PROPOSALS .....	4
V. AC TRANSIT RIDERSHIP PROFILE .....	6
VI. DETERMINING IMPACTS OF FARE PROPOSALS .....	11
VII. IMPACTS OF FARE PROPOSALS .....	12
VIII. ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS .....	17
IX. PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT.....	17
Appendices .....	19

## I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

In December 2018, the Board of Directors approved staff report 19-199b to set a public hearing to receive testimony about proposed changes to the fare structure, a schedule of fare increases, and other fare policy changes going forward. According to Federal Transit Administration (FTA) regulations and District policy, the Board must receive and approve a Title VI analysis to determine if any of the proposals would result in disproportionately high and adverse effects on riders in communities protected by the Civil Rights Act or associated FTA regulations prior to implementing any fare change.

The analysis, conducted by AC Transit staff in February 2019, found that the proposals under consideration do not result in disproportionately high and adverse effects on Title VI-protected populations when compared to the adverse effects on non-protected populations.

It should be noted that the analysis only addresses impacts to people covered by Title VI regulations; it does not look at impacts on populations that might be protected by other laws, such as people with disabilities or seniors, for example. The analysis is based on how riders actually pay their fares (as reported in a recent onboard survey); it does not address riders' ability to pay or what fare would be best for any individual rider. And because the fare proposals do not contain Transbay fares (which recently underwent a full public hearing process and fare equity analysis) or the EasyPass program (for which no changes are proposed), these programs are excluded from the analysis.

AC Transit is also required to provide equitable opportunities to all persons to participate in planning and decision-making processes, such as fare change processes. Section IX of this report provides a short summary of public engagement activities that were carried out to meet this requirement, along with information about the input provided by members of the public, particularly those addressing issues covered by Title VI and associated laws and regulations.

This report will provide details about the fare equity analysis, including methodology, data sources, a profile of AC Transit riders, how impacts on protected populations are determined, findings, and an alternatives analysis.

## II. TITLE VI

---

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states:

“No person in the United States shall, on the ground 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.”

Two Executive Orders extend the protections of Title VI: one to people who don't speak English very well (persons with Limited English Proficiency) and another to people who live in low-income households. In 2012, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) issued guidance to help recipients of federal funding (such as AC Transit) comply with these civil rights laws and orders. Since then, Board policies and the District's Title VI Program have been regularly updated to provide staff with concrete direction and instructions to remain in compliance with those regulations.

To ensure that access to all services is equitably distributed and provided without regard to race, color, national origin, ability to speak English, or low-income status, the District assesses the effects of fare change proposals to determine if they would have higher or more adverse effects on Title VI-protected populations compared to populations not protected by Title VI. It's important to remember that while other demographic groups such as seniors or people with disabilities are protected by other laws and regulations, they are not covered by Title VI and are therefore not covered by this assessment.

### III. METHODOLOGY AND DATA SOURCES

---

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) recommends that recipients of federal aid evaluate fare changes according to the following steps (adapted from FTA Circular C4702.1B, October 1, 2012):

1. Assess the effects of the proposed fare changes on people of color and low-income populations.
2. Engage the public in the decision-making process to develop the thresholds used to identify disproportionate impacts on protected populations.
3. Determine which, if any, of the proposals would result in a disparate impact on minority populations, and modify the proposed changes in order to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts.
4. Determine which, if any, of the proposals would place a disproportionately burden on low-income populations, and take steps to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts where practicable.

#### Methodology

In a fare equity analysis, broadly, staff compare the impacts of the proposals on people in categories protected by Title VI to the impact of the proposals on people who are not in protected categories. Specifically, to determine impacts of the fare proposals under consideration, staff used statistical software to generate an average cost of a complete (linked) one-way trip for each survey respondent.

The analysis assumed that passengers' trip characteristics such as demographics, income, and travel behavior have remained essentially the same since the most recent onboard survey. That is, staff assumed that AC Transit riders will continue riding the way they have been, and that they will continue paying the way they have, with the exception that they will pay a different fare that will save them money if it's easy and available to them. The average fare is based on how people actually pay their fares, not how it would make the most sense for them to pay; so if someone reported that they paid their fares one trip at a time with cash and it would be more affordable and efficient for them to buy a monthly pass on Clipper, staff analyzed their existing single ride, cash paying behavior.

AC Transit uses the average one-way fare analysis process because it considers all the fare proposals as a bundle and applies them dynamically to every survey record. The advantage of this approach is that small changes, which might be hidden when fare products are analyzed individually, become magnified. For example, the proposals under consideration for this analysis include a discount for single rides using Clipper and the proposal to use Clipper as the basis for setting multi-use pass prices; a small discount on the former can therefore turn into a large discount on the latter. The one-way average fare analysis can shine a light on such an issue. The disadvantage of this method is that if the analysis finds

a discriminatory outcome, it can be difficult to identify which element among the fare proposals is most responsible for that finding.

Staff made assumptions about monthly/31-Day pass-usage that were fairly conservative in estimating impacts. The analysis in this report assumes that local pass riders use the monthly/31-Day pass 60 times per month, based upon a rider using the pass for 40 round trips using one bus, and an additional 10 round trips that require 2 buses. Given the fact that almost half of local riders are Transit Dependent (defined by the 44% of local riders who live in households with no vehicles) staff believe that this is an appropriate estimate that lies between using the pass only to commute to work or school and using the pass for other trip purposes.

The one-way average fare was calculated for each survey respondent, then sorted by race and ethnicity and by income to determine the impacts on classes of riders protected under the District's Title VI Program.

## **Data Sources**

District staff used data derived from the 2017-18 Onboard Rider Survey, the most current data that the District has regarding AC Transit passengers. This rich data set includes records from approximately 11,000 in-depth surveys of weekday local riders and allowed staff to obtain very detailed information through cross-tabulation. Each record in the survey contains information about the individual on the day they were surveyed: how they paid, how many buses they took in order to complete their one-way trip, their race or ethnicity, and their household income.

## **IV. DESCRIPTION OF FARE PROPOSALS**

---

When developing new fare policies, staff were guided by the following Fare Policy Goals:

- Goal 1—Simplicity: Fares and the fare structure should be easy to use for passengers, and easy to operate for the District.
- Goal 2—Appropriateness: Fares and the fare structure should provide a good value for passengers.
- Goal 3—Equity: Fares and the fare structure should be fair for all passengers.
- Goal 4—Transparency: Fares and the fare structure should result in predictable costs and cost increases for passengers; and predictable revenue increases for the District.
- Goal 5—Policy Supportiveness: Fares and the fare structure should be supportive of other District goals—service, land use, and social goals—and compliant with other regulatory mandates.
- Goal 6—Affordability: Fares should be affordable to all passengers to ensure their full access to bus service and to prevent adverse impacts on socially vulnerable populations.

Note that the proposals under consideration would amend the phrase “Fares and the fare structure” to include the term “fare payment methods.” So, if adopted, each goal would include the phrase, “Fares, the fare structure, and fare payment methods should [...]

## Fare Proposals

- Increase basic cash fares for single rides by \$0.15 cents in 2019, followed by \$0.25 cent increases in 2021 and 2023.
- Increase the Clipper incentive from the current 10 cents to up to 50 cents for the Adult single fare (and from the current 5 cents to up to 25 cents for the Discount fares), with the caveat that no fares would be decreased as a result of applying a Clipper discount.
- Use the Clipper fare as the basis for setting multi-use passes that are bought using non-cash methods (Clipper or mobile app), instead of the cash fare, and set various pass prices.
- Freeze the Discount monthly/31-Day passes at 30 times the single fare once they reach that level. Increase the Adult 31-Day pass fare until it reaches 36 times the single fare.
- Implement the 7-Day pass with the same price formula as existing Board policy (ten times the single ride fare), initially only on the (proposed) mobile application.

Staff used the fare proposals listed above and in the Public Hearing notice to generate the schedule of proposed fare prices in Table 1. Staff used the maximum proposed Clipper discount – 50 cents Adult/25 cents – for this equity analysis.

**Table 1: Proposed Fares and Pass Prices and Schedule**

	EFFECTIVE DATES			
	Current	7/1/2019	7/1/2021	7/1/2023
<b>CASH FARES</b>				
Adult single local fare	\$ 2.35	\$ 2.50	\$ 2.75	\$ 3.00
Y/S/D single local fare	\$ 1.15	\$ 1.25	\$ 1.35	\$ 1.50
Adult Day Pass	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.50	\$ 6.00	\$ 6.50
Y/S/D Day Pass	\$ 2.50	\$ 2.75	\$ 3.00	\$ 3.25
<b>CLIPPER FARES*</b>				
Adult single local fare	\$ 2.25	\$ 2.25	\$ 2.25	\$ 2.50
Y/S/D single local fare	\$ 1.10	\$ 1.10	\$ 1.10	\$ 1.25
Adult Day Pass	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.50
Y/S/D Day Pass	\$ 2.50	\$ 2.50	\$ 2.50	\$ 2.75
<b>MULTI-DAY PASSES</b>				
Adult Local 31-Day Pass	\$ 84.60	\$ 84.60	\$ 84.60	\$ 90.00
S/D Monthly Pass/RTC Sticker	\$ 30.00	\$ 33.00	\$ 33.00	\$ 37.50
Youth 31-Day Pass	\$ 30.00	\$ 33.00	\$ 33.00	\$ 37.50
Adult Local 7-Day Pass	**	\$ 22.50	\$ 22.50	\$ 25.00
Y/S/D Local 7-Day Pass	**	\$ 11.00	\$ 11.00	\$ 12.50

*\*The fares in this table (and analysis) are based on applying the 50 cent Clipper discount under consideration*

*\*\*Although the 7-Day pass has been included in AC Transit fare policy for some time, using the same formula as currently proposed, it was never implemented, so for the purpose of this analysis the 7-Day pass does not have a current price*

Mobile App

In addition to the above proposals, which each contribute to the average fare calculation, the Board of Directors is also considering a recommendation to implement a mobile application. Staff are still working out how exactly the app will function: how a person would add value and how various fares would be charged through the app, for example. The proposal contains the intention that the app will have an accumulator or “fare capping” feature, which would ensure that after a person paid for a specific number of individual rides, they would automatically receive a Day pass; if they continued to ride, they would pay for enough rides to qualify for a 7-Day pass. By using the app, a rider would not have to purchase a pass in advance and would always pay only for the number of rides they actually take. Staff expect any products and features offered on the mobile app will be made available on Clipper as soon as operationally possible.

V. AC TRANSIT RIDERSHIP PROFILE

Using data derived from the 2017-18 Onboard Survey, the District was able to discover much about the who their riders are in addition to how riders make trips and pay fares. The onboard survey data includes over 11,000 detailed surveys of weekday local riders. The following provides a picture of who is using the system and in what manner.

Race and Income

It is important to understand how race and income categories are determined for the purpose of Title VI analyses, and how that influences language used in this report. The Federal Transit Administration requires recipients of federal funds to evaluate fare changes to determine whether those changes have a discriminatory impact on “minority” populations. However, people that traditionally have been called “minority” make up the majority of the population in the AC Transit service area and are also the majority of AC Transit riders, so the term is not very meaningful. In this report, “people of color” is used to refer to people protected by the Title VI ban against discrimination on the basis of race or color. “Latino/a” is used to refer to people who identify as Latino, Latina, Hispanic, or of Spanish-speaking origin (as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau), and because Latino/a populations are protected by Title VI, a person who identifies as white and also as Latino/a is considered part of the protected class in this analysis.

Table 2 presents the race/ethnicity of the District’s weekday local riders, as reported by riders themselves. The largest proportion of riders indicated their race was African-American/Black (32%), followed by riders who identified as non-Latino/a white (23%), Latino/a (21%), and Asian (14%).

Table 2: Race & Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Percent
People of Color	77%
Non-Latino/a White	23%
Not Provided	1%

Due to rounding, some columns may not equal 100%.

The FTA also requires recipients of federal funds to evaluate fare changes to determine whether they would have a discriminatory impact on low-income populations.

For this analysis, staff relied on how a person reported their household income in the onboard survey to determine whether they are low-income or not. According to AC Transit policy, a person is considered low-income if they have household income of less than two times the federal poverty rate as defined by U.S. Census Bureau data; since the federal poverty rate for a family of four is \$25,100, a person was considered low-income if they had household income of under \$50,000. The Census Bureau uses a complicated algorithm which factors in income, age, and number of persons in each household to calculate poverty levels, an algorithm that is not available for our onboard survey data. Additionally, it is difficult to get complete income samples income in surveys, since many people view income as a private matter, so in cooperation with the consultants hired to conduct the survey staff used a data imputation method to ensure a robust sample.

As seen in Table 3, more than two-thirds of weekday local AC Transit riders reported a household income (in 2016) of less than \$50,000, and more than a third of all riders live in households with very low income (less than \$25,000).

**Table 3: Household Income**

Household Income		Percent Low-Income
Below \$25,000	34%	68%
\$25,000-\$49,999	34%	
\$50,000 - \$99,999	24%	30%
\$100,000 or more	6%	
Other*	<2%	

*\*Other includes refused & unable to calculate*

Table 4 presents a cross-tabulation of income and ethnicity of AC Transit weekday local riders.

**Table 4: Race/Ethnicity by Income**

Race/ Ethnicity	Household Income							
	Under \$10,000	\$10,000 - \$24,999	\$25,000 - \$34,999	\$35,000 - \$49,999	\$50,000 - \$74,999	\$75,000 - \$99,999	\$100,000 - \$149,999	\$150,000 or greater
African-American	37%	35%	33%	30%	29%	22%	16%	11%
White	18%	18%	19%	23%	26%	33%	43%	53%
Latino/a	22%	25%	25%	21%	18%	15%	10%	6%
Asian	14%	13%	13%	14%	14%	18%	21%	21%
Other*	9%	10%	9%	12%	14%	12%	10%	9%
<b>TOTAL **</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*\*Other includes Native American, Middle Eastern/North African, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Multiracial, and Refused*

*\*\*Due to rounding, some columns may not equal 100%.*

This table shows that, in general, weekday local white riders make up the largest percentage of high-income riders: more than half of riders with income of \$150,000 or above (53%) are white. Among riders in this income category, 21% are Asians, 11% are African-Americans, and only 6% are Latino/a riders. At lower income levels, African-American riders make up over one-third of weekday local riders with very low income (under \$25,000) and Latino/a riders make up almost one-quarter of these riders. Fewer than one in five riders with household income under \$25,000 are white.

Comparing income levels by race/ethnicity in Table 5 shows a similar finding: local weekday white riders are less likely than other groups to be low-income, and riders who are people of color are more likely to live in low-income households.

**Table 5: Income by Race/Ethnicity**

	<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>				
<b>Household Income</b>	African-American	White	Latino/a	Asian	Other*
Under \$10,000	23%	15%	20%	19%	16%
\$10,000 - \$24,999	19%	12%	20%	15%	15%
\$25,000 - \$34,999	17%	13%	19%	14%	14%
\$35,000 - \$49,999	18%	18%	19%	18%	21%
<b>Low-Income</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>65%</b>
\$50,000 - \$74,999	16%	19%	15%	16%	22%
\$75,000 - \$99,999	5%	10%	5%	9%	8%
\$100,000 - \$149,999	2%	8%	2%	6%	4%
\$150,000 or greater	1%	5%	1%	3%	2%
<b>Not Low-Income</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>TOTAL**</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*Other includes Native American, Middle Eastern/North African, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Multiracial, and Refused

\*\*Due to rounding, some columns may not equal 100%.

Over three-quarters of African-American riders and Latino/a riders (76% and 77% respectively) and about two-thirds (65%) of Asian riders have household income under \$50,000, compared to 59% of white riders.

## Fare Payment

Understanding the interconnection between race/ethnicity and income, staff next looked at the connection between riders' demographics and how they paid their fare. If a fare proposal provides extra benefits to users of specific fare products, or places extra burdens on users of specific fare products, it might have a discriminatory impact on a population protected by Title VI. Because the proposals under consideration at this time contain larger discounts for Clipper card use, and extend those discounts to multi-use passes, staff specifically looked at how Clipper cards and monthly/31-Day passes are used by the ridership.



Table 6a shows that a large majority – 82% – of all weekday local riders use a Clipper card and/or buy a monthly/31-Day pass to pay their fares, representing a big increase over the 5 years since the last fare equity analysis was conducted. Passes provide the biggest discount, and they are used by more than half of all riders (55%). However, while only 18% of all weekday local riders pay their fare using cash, those paying with cash are more likely to be African-American than any other race or ethnicity.

**Table 6a: Race/Ethnicity by Fare Payment**

Race/Ethnicity	Fare Media Used		
	Cash (bills and coins)	Cash (value on Clipper)	Pass (on Clipper or RTC sticker)
All Weekday Local Riders	18%	27%	55%
African-American	38%	25%	30%
Latino/a	27%	18%	19%
White	16%	32%	24%
Asian	10%	15%	17%
Other*	9%	11%	11%
<b>TOTAL**</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

*\*Other includes Native American, Middle Eastern/North African, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Multiracial, and Refused*

*\*\*Due to rounding, some columns may not equal 100%.*

Table 6b looks at that same information through a different lens, this time asking about how members of a specific demographic group pay their fares. It shows that about one-quarter of African-American and Latino/a riders pay their fares with cash, compared to only 12% of white and Asian riders.

**Table 6b: Fare Payment by Race/Ethnicity**

Fare Media Used	Race/Ethnicity				
	African-American	White	Latino/a	Asian	Other*
Cash (bills and coins)	23%	12%	25%	12%	15%
Cash (value on Clipper)	23%	35%	25%	27%	27%
Pass (on Clipper or RTC sticker)	54%	27%	50%	61%	58%
<b>TOTAL**</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

*\*Other includes Native American, Middle Eastern/North African, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Multiracial, and Refused*

*\*\*Due to rounding, some columns may not equal 100%.*

That same exercise, this time looking at the connection between fare payment methods and riders' income levels instead of race and ethnicity, is shown in Tables 7a and 7b.

Table 7a demonstrates that paying one's fare with cash (bills and coins) is directly correlated with lower income. That is, the lower a rider's income is, the more likely they are to pay with cash. This is despite the fact that paying with cash does not provide the better value offered by monthly passes or the discount offered by paying with Clipper.

**Table 7a: Income Status by Fare Payment**

Fare Media Used	Household Income							
	Under \$10,000	\$10,000 - \$24,999	\$25,000 - \$34,999	\$35,000 - \$49,999	\$50,000 - \$74,999	\$75,000 - \$99,999	\$100,000 - \$149,999	\$150,000 or greater
Cash (bills and coins)	23%	22%	20%	15%	15%	13%	12%	10%
Cash (value on Clipper)	20%	22%	22%	27%	31%	38%	45%	55%
Pass (on Clipper or RTC sticker)	57%	55%	58%	58%	55%	49%	43%	35%
<b>TOTAL*</b>	100%	99%	100%	100%	101%	100%	100%	100%

*\*Due to rounding, some columns may not equal 100%.*

It is also true that low-income riders buy a pass more often than people who are not low-income, as shown in table 7b, probably because low-income riders are more likely to ride the bus more often and/or to be more reliant on the bus because they do not have as much access to personal vehicles.

**Table 7b: Fare Payment by Income Status**

Fare Media Used	Household Income	
	Less than \$50,000	\$50,000 or Greater
Cash (bills and coins)	20%	14%
Cash (value on Clipper)	23%	37%
Pass (on Clipper or RTC sticker)	57%	50%
<b>TOTAL</b>	100%	100%

Finally, cross-tabulations of Fare Payment Media by Fare Type, below in Table 8, show that use of the monthly/31-day pass or RTC monthly sticker is more popular than cash use in all fare categories.

**Table 8: Fare Payment by Fare Category**

Fare Media Used	Fare Category			
	Adult	Senior	Youth	Disabled
Cash (bills and coins)	18%	16%	29%	10%
Cash (value on Clipper)	31%	25%	10%	7%
Pass (on Clipper or RTC sticker)	51%	59%	61%	84%
<b>TOTAL</b>	100%	100%	100%	101%

*\*Due to rounding, some columns may not equal 100%.*

Monthly/31-Day pass use among riders paying a Discount fare is higher than for people paying the full Adult fare – probably due to the highly discounted pass price for these groups. People paying the

Disabled fare buy a pass much more than all other fare categories; this may be because the RTC sticker not only provides a good value but can make actual fare payment easier for some persons with certain disabilities. People paying the Youth fare are the most likely group to pay with cash – almost three out of ten riders in the Youth category pay using cash.

## VI. DETERMINING IMPACTS OF FARE PROPOSALS

---

The 2017-18 Onboard Rider Survey described above provides the data that staff used to develop and conduct the average fare analysis. The survey data can be sorted and cross-tabulated in any number of ways. Cross-tabulating data to determine average fares is an elaborate process, requiring software designed to handle the volume and complexity of the onboard rider survey. Using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences software (SPSS), staff created a detailed sorting of each survey record so that averages could be derived for every major category, including:

- Fare Category
- Fare Payment Method
- Number of buses used for a one-way trip
- Race/Ethnicity
- Household Income

Staff prepared an average fare analysis incorporating the main fare proposals, reflected in Appendix tables A-1 through A-6. These analyses compare the current fares to the different fares over the five years of the proposal based on many different factors. The tables reflect the average cost of a one-way linked trip for each demographic group or fare payment means and the percentage change of the average cost of one-way linked trip. The tables also show the findings based on two different proposed Clipper discounts to the local single fare.

Applying AC Transit Board Policy 518, staff then used these tables to compare the impact of the fare changes on riders who are in groups protected by Title VI to the impact of those fare changes on riders who are not, and calculated the absolute change as well as the percent change.

According to the Board Policy, if riders who are people of color experience a 15% or more greater adverse effect than that borne by riders who are not people of color, the fare changes will be considered to have a disparate impact. If the analysis finds that the fare proposals result in disparate impacts, the District must identify alternatives to the proposal that could serve the same legitimate objective with less disparate impact. If a less discriminatory alternative does not exist and AC Transit has substantial legitimate justification that cannot otherwise be accomplished, AC Transit shall identify measures to mitigate the negative impacts of the changes.

Separately, if low-income riders experience a 15% or more greater adverse effect than that borne by riders who are not low-income, the fare changes will be considered to carry a disproportionate burden. If the District finds that the service or fare proposals result in disproportionate burdens on low-income riders, the District shall identify alternatives available to affected low-income riders and take steps to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts where practicable.

## VII. IMPACTS OF FARE PROPOSALS

### Findings: One-way average fare analysis

As stated above, the following main fare proposals were analyzed together in the one-way average fare analysis: increasing the basic single ride cash fare, increasing the Clipper discount to 50 cents, using Clipper as the basis for setting multi-use pass prices, and setting the multipliers for the Adult and Discount monthly/31-Day passes to 36 times and 30 times respectively.

The analysis found that these fare changes, if approved, would result in an average one-way fare increase for all riders of approximately 4.1% (or 9 cents) in 2019, 4.4% (10 cents) in 2021, and 9.3% (22 cents) in 2023.

The proposals were then assessed to determine if they would have disproportionately high and adverse effects on Title VI-protected populations. As seen in Table 9, the analysis found that the average fares for both people of color riders and for non-Latino/a white riders would rise a total of 43 cents over the 5 years proposal. People of color riders would experience a slightly larger percentage increase in the first two rounds of fare changes compared to non-Latino/a whites (4.5% vs. 2.9% in 2019, and 5.2% vs. 3.3% in 2021). In 2023, people of color would experience a slightly smaller percentage increase to their average fares: 8.6% compared to 9.2% for non-Latino/a whites.

In each case, the difference between the impact of the fare proposal on people of color riders and the impact on non-Latino/a white riders is less than 2% – much smaller than the 15% threshold established by Board Policy 518 to find a disparate impact.

**Table 9: One-Way Average Fare Analysis – Race/Ethnicity**

	Current Avg Fare	2019 Avg Fare	Change 2019 - Current	Pct. Change 2019 - Current	2021 Avg Fare	Change 2021 - 2019	Pct. Change 2021 - 2019	2023 Avg Fare	Change 2023 - 2021	Pct. Change 2023 - 2021
People of Color	\$2.22	\$2.32	\$0.10	4.5%	\$2.44	\$0.12	5.2%	\$2.65	\$0.21	8.6%
Non- Latino/a White	\$2.04	\$2.10	\$0.06	2.9%	\$2.17	\$0.07	3.3%	\$2.37	\$0.20	9.2%
<b>Difference</b>				<b>1.6%</b>			<b>1.8%</b>			<b>-0.6%</b>

Table 10 shows the average one-way fare analysis based on income. As seen in this table, the average one-way fare increase would also be slightly larger for low-income passengers, compared to riders who are not low-income: by 3 cents (or 1.4%), 2 cents (0.8%), and 3 cents (0.2%) in 2019, 2021, and 2023 respectively.

Again, however, in each case, the difference between the impact of the fare proposal on low-income riders and the impact on riders who are not low-income is much smaller than the 15% threshold established by Board Policy 518 to find a disproportionate burden.

**Table 10: One-Way Average Fare Analysis – Income**

	Current Avg Fare	2019 Avg Fare	Change 2019 - Current	Pct. Change 2019 - Current	2021 Avg Fare	Change 2021 - 2019	Pct. Change 2021 - 2019	2023 Avg Fare	Change 2023 - 2021	Pct. Change 2023 - 2021
Low- Income	\$2.18	\$2.28	\$0.10	4.6%	\$2.39	\$0.11	4.8%	\$2.61	\$0.22	9.2%
Not L-I	\$2.18	\$2.25	\$0.07	3.2%	\$2.34	\$0.09	4.0%	\$2.55	\$0.19	9.0%
<b>Difference</b>				<b>1.4%</b>			<b>0.8%</b>			<b>0.2%</b>

**Findings: 7-Day Pass**

The fare change under consideration includes a proposal to implement a 7-Day pass with the same price formula as existing Board policy – ten times the cost of a single ride. The pass is intended to provide a discount for people who sometimes use the system heavily but not for a full month. It is also intended to provide a pass product for riders who cannot afford the up-front cost of a monthly pass. The fare equity analysis that was conducted in 2011 when the 7-Day pass was adopted into Board policy found it would carry no adverse effects and was likely to provide a good benefit for protected populations. Unfortunately, however, the District was unable to implement the pass within the current Clipper system. If the proposal is approved the pass would first be implemented via a mobile app and on Clipper as soon as operationally possible.

The current onboard survey dataset does not contain sufficient details about riders’ weekly riding habits to know exactly what percentage of riders would benefit from the pass, or whether those riders belong to Title VI-protected populations. It is also impossible to know if people who currently pay their fares with cash would switch to non-cash fare payment when the pass becomes available. Staff analyzed the 7-Day pass independently of other fare proposals, since this product would not be immediately available. The analysis was based on the small selection of riders whose survey answers show they ride at least ten times a week and do not already purchase a monthly/31-Day pass, making the assumption that such riders would buy the 7-Day pass.

The analysis, shown in Table 11, found the average weekly fare for all weekday local riders, and for all specific classes of riders, would decrease in 2019, stay flat in 2021, and then increase in 2023. The average weekly fare for riders who are people of color would decrease by almost 8% more than for riders who are not people of color in 2019, and would change by the same amount as non-Latino/a whites in 2021 and 2023. The average weekly fare for low-income riders would decrease by over 8% more than for riders who are not low-income in 2019, and would change by almost the same amount as riders who are not Low-Income in 2021 and 2023.

These findings show that protected populations would not bear any additional burdens, compared to non-protected populations, as a result of introducing the 7-Day pass. Additionally, there would be no adverse effects from introducing the 7-Day pass – no other fare product is being eliminated in conjunction with introduction of the pass.

**Table 11: Weekly Average Fare Analysis**

	Current Avg Weekly Fare	Proposed 2019 Avg Weekly Fare	Change 2019 - Current	Pct. Change 2019 - Current	2021 Proposed Avg Weekly Fare	Change 2021 - 2019	Pct. Change 2021 - 2019	2023 Proposed Avg Weekly Fare	Change 2023 - 2021	Pct. Change 2023 - 2021
<b>All Riders</b>	25.85	20.87	-\$4.98	-19.3%	20.87	\$0.00	0.00%	23.23	\$2.36	11.31%
People of Color	26.23	20.80	-\$5.43	-20.7%	20.80	\$0.00	0.0%	23.15	\$2.35	11.3%
Non- Latino/a White	24.28	21.15	-\$3.13	-12.9%	21.15	\$0.00	0.0%	23.53	\$2.38	11.3%
<b>Difference*</b>				<b>-7.8%</b>				<b>0.0%</b>		
Low- Income	26.32	20.61	-\$5.71	-21.7%	20.61	\$0.00	0.0%	22.94	\$2.33	11.3%
Not Low- Income	24.77	21.45	-\$3.32	-13.4%	21.45	\$0.00	0.0%	23.86	\$2.41	11.2%
<b>Difference*</b>				<b>-8.3%</b>				<b>0.0%</b>		

Note that a negative "Difference" figure indicates the protected population will see a larger decrease in fare than the non-protected population

Full details of the weekly average fare analysis of the 7-Day pass can be found in Appendix tables A-7 and A-8. The lack of adverse effects and the probable positive impacts for protected populations lead to the conclusion that no discriminatory effects would be associated with implementation of the 7-Day pass.

### **Findings: Mobile fare payment app**

As stated earlier, staff are still working out details about how exactly the mobile fare payment app will function. For the purpose of the fare equity analysis, however, the analysis simply must answer: will the app provide more benefits to populations that are not protected by Title VI at the expense of people who are protected by Title VI? Or will implementing the app somehow cause some additional burden to be borne by Title VI-protected populations? This analysis finds that the answer to both questions is no.

### Current Access to Clipper

The District has known for some time that there is a shortage of Clipper retail outlets in some parts of the service area; staff have been trying to remedy this, but have had little success since the District doesn't control Clipper processes. According to the 2017-18 Onboard Rider Survey, 85% of all weekday local riders own smartphones and 91% of them have available data. An app therefore potentially provides a way for over three-quarters of riders to pay their fares without having to find a Clipper retail outlet. While it's generally thought that the Clipper access problem will be addressed with the introduction of Clipper 2, adoption of the mobile app fare proposal now means that riders in these "Clipper deserts" won't have to wait, and this analysis finds that there are only benefits to the app.

### Access to Mobile App

Staff first dug a little deeper to understand if access to the mobile app would be available to all riders regardless of race or ethnicity. The onboard survey shows that 77% of riders who identify as people of color have smartphones and also had access to data on the day they were surveyed. It also found that 80% of riders who are not people of color had access to data at the time of the survey, a difference of only 3%, well less than the 15% threshold for finding a disparate impact on populations of color. Next, the survey shows that 75% of low-income riders and 83% of not low-income riders owned smartphones and also had access to data on the day they were surveyed, a difference of 8%. Again, this is lower than the 15% threshold for finding a disproportionate burden on low-income populations. Accordingly, the analysis finds that the benefits associated with the proposal would be equitably available to both protected and non-protected riders.

### Adverse Effects

If the proposal included discounts for users of the app that were tied to fare increases for non-users, it might be considered to have an adverse effect on people who did not use the app. However, app fare prices would be the same as Clipper fares, and any feature available on the app will be made available on Clipper as soon as possible. Therefore, the analysis finds no adverse effects associated with the proposal. It is worth mentioning that the analysis assumes that no additional costs will be associated with using the app or with adding money to the app for purchasing fares; if any costs are identified during implementation, the Board of Directors can direct staff to conduct an additional fare equity analysis.

### Additional Benefits

As described in the proposals, a mobile app provides the possibility of “fare capping” – i.e. that someone can pay as they go. This is already available on Clipper: a person pays for single rides until they’ve paid the cost of a Day Pass and then automatically receives a Day Pass, allowing them free rides for the rest of the day. The mobile app would expand that feature to the 7-Day pass: once a person has ridden enough to have paid the equivalent of ten single rides, the app would reward them a 7-Day pass, allowing them free rides for the rest of the week. As mentioned above, staff intend that the expansion of this benefit will eventually be offered on Clipper as well.

It is true that a person who wants to use the mobile app must have access to a smartphone and they might have to have access to data in order to add value or purchase a fare, however data above shows that riders in the protected classes have similar access as non-protected riders. When details are worked out about how value will be added to the app in order to purchase fares, staff may need to investigate whether any obstacles exist for riders in the protected classes through an additional fare equity analysis. The analysis finds no discriminatory effect of these additional benefits.

### **Findings: Fare analysis for other categories**

In the course of developing the fare equity analysis, staff conducted the one-way average fare analysis using other variables, including other demographic groups and various means of payment. Since these categories are by themselves not protected by Title VI, these results do not impact the findings of the Title VI fare equity analysis. However, based on past history staff felt it was appropriate to share with

the Board as they consider the fare proposals. As mentioned above, these complete one-way fare analyses tables can be found in tables in the Appendix.

#### Alternate Clipper Discount

The fare proposals under consideration include a Clipper discount of “up to 50 cents” for the Adult single fare. In addition to analyzing the maximum discount included in the proposal, staff also analyzed a discount of 25 cents on the Adult single fare (and the other fares that would change as a result of applying this smaller discount). The results of this analysis are shown in Appendix Tables A4-6.

Initially, a smaller discount would have very little different effect on the average fare (because of the provision in the proposals that no fares would be decreased due to implementing a Clipper discount), although people in households that are not low-income would see a slightly bigger fare increase than low-income people. In 2021, fares for almost all riders would increase by more than in the 50 cent discount scenario, however, the difference in the one-way average fare of protected populations compared to non-protected populations would be smaller than with the larger Clipper discount. At the third and final fare change in 2023, fares would rise slightly more than they would in the 50 cent discount scenario, but the difference between effects on Title VI-protected populations and non-protected populations would be very small.

#### Category Breakdowns

The tables provide a breakdown of how the fare proposals (with both possible Clipper discounts) would affect specific racial/ethnic groups and household income categories. For example, the tables illustrate that the proposed fare changes would result in a slightly larger increase for people who identify as African-American or as Latino/a, and a slightly lower increase for people who identify as Asian, compared to the category of people of color as a whole. In addition, riders who live in extremely low-income households would experience slightly larger fare increases than low-income riders as a whole until the third fare change in 2023.

The tables also provide a breakdown by how people paid their fares – whether they paid with cash or not and what specific form of payment they used or fare product they bought. Initially, people paying for individual rides with cash would incur a slightly smaller fare increase than a person who bought a day pass, but this situation would be reversed by the second round of fare increases.

#### Discount Passes

As mentioned above, youth, seniors, and people with disabilities are not protected by the Title VI mandate or the District’s Title VI Program and are not covered by regulations requiring a fare equity analysis. To the extent people who pay discount fares are also people of color or live in low-income households, they are already covered by the analysis discussed in the report. Historically the Board has aimed to keep Youth/Senior/Disabled fares to approximately one-half of Adult full-price fares; if these fare proposals are approved, the tables show that Discount passes will cost less than 42% of the non-Discout passes by the final fare change date.



## VIII. ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

---

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) recommends that recipients of federal aid assess alternatives available for people affected by fare change proposals, and describe the actions the agency proposes to minimize, mitigate, or offset any adverse effects of the proposals on minority and low-income populations.

The analysis found no disparate impacts from the proposals. Accordingly, outside of the additional analyses conducted in the course of this fare equity process, staff did not analyze alternative proposals.

Going forward if this fare proposal is approved, staff hope to implement the 7-Day pass, which has been in Board policy since 2011. Staff believe the 7-Day pass is a good, low-cost alternative for persons affected by the proposals, and would serve to minimize any effects resulting from the fare changes.

Staff also intend to implement a mobile app, which will provide a way for people who live in geographic areas where it's difficult to currently buy and use a Clipper card to access all the financial benefits associated with non-cash fare payment. This proposal should also serve to mitigate any effects resulting from the fare changes.

## IX. PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

---

Under District policy and the Title VI Program, AC Transit is required to provide equitable opportunities to all persons to participate in planning and decision-making processes related to fare changes. This section provides an overview of the various elements of public engagement that were carried out to meet this requirement, along with information about the input provided by members of the public, particularly concerning issues impacting populations protected by Title VI and associated laws and regulations.

### **Community Meetings**

Three community meetings were held on January 27, 28, and 29, 2019. Attendance was as follows: Hayward (17), El Cerrito (5), and Oakland (AC Transit offices) (7). In total, nineteen written comments were received at the meetings, including some comments that were turned in for members of the community who did not attend the meetings. No attendees utilized provided language interpretation or requested additional interpretation.

### **Accessibility Advisory Committee (AAC)**

The fare proposal was presented for discussion at the AAC's February 12, 2019 meeting, attended by 11 people. One written comment, from a member of the AAC, was received at that meeting.

## **Public Hearing**

The public hearing for the fare proposal was held on February 13, 2019 at 2:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m. There were a total of 11 speakers at the 2:00 p.m. hearing, and 7 attendees utilized the Chinese language interpreter. There were 9 total speakers at the 5:00 p.m. hearing.

## **Public Comment Received**

Two hundred total comments were received prior to the close of the public hearing process.

Twenty members of the public provided testimony at the public hearings, and 4 additional attendees indicated they agreed with comments expressed by earlier speakers. In addition, 169 comments were received by email, in the form of written comments or postcards submitted by mail or directly to staff, by phone/voice mail, or by social media; there was also one petition signed by 7 individuals.

The concerns raised by the comments fell into some general categories: while a few were favorable to higher Clipper discounts and the mobile app, almost all opposed fare increases. A number of commenters tied their opposition to their concerns about AC Transit service reliability and/or geographic coverage. The largest number of comments referenced the proposed Senior and Disabled Pass fare increases and/or being low-income or on a fixed income, or being concerned for people with limited income; many of these comments made reference to recent price increases for the monthly/31-day Discount pass.

## **Title VI Concerns**

Several commenters touched on issues which could generally be categorized as Title VI issues. This information is provided to the Board of Directors to consider alongside the fare equity analysis data analysis process. Where appropriate, staff have addressed the issues directly in the analysis narrative.

These comments include:

- The fare increases will be too difficult for people with low-income or on a fixed income
- Bigger Clipper discounts won't be as available to people without credit cards
- Discounts associated with the mobile app won't be available to people who don't have smartphones (or who have smartphones with older operating systems)
- Fare increases would impact immigrants more than others
- AC Transit should have a reduced fare for low-income people
- The District should fund significantly improved outreach to make Clipper more available
- The fare increases affect people who can't drive and are dependent on transit
- The public hearing and fare change proposals should have been better publicized

As more details about the remainder of the comments are compiled, the Board will be updated prior to the scheduled March 13, 2019 meeting where the fare change proposals are scheduled for a vote.

## Appendix Table A-1

### Average One-Way Local Fare Analysis – 2019 vs. Current (Based on \$0.50 Clipper Discount)

	Current average one-way fare	Proposed average one-way fare 2019	Change 2019 vs current
<b>All Riders</b>	2.18	2.27	4.1%
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>			
Person of Color	2.22	2.32	4.50%
White alone, non-Latino/a	2.04	2.10	2.9%
African-American alone, non-Latino/a	2.25	2.37	5.3%
Asian alone, non-Latino/a	1.99	2.06	3.5%
Latino/a, any race	2.34	2.45	4.7%
Other	2.20	2.29	4.1%
<b>Household Income</b>			
Low-Income	2.18	2.28	4.6%
Not Low-Income	2.18	2.25	3.2%
Below \$10,000	2.10	2.21	5.2%
\$10,000-\$24,999	2.22	2.33	5.0%
\$25,000-\$34,999	2.28	2.39	4.8%
\$35,000-\$49,999	2.13	2.22	4.2%
\$50,000 - \$74,999	2.20	2.28	3.6%
\$75,000 - \$99,999	2.22	2.30	3.6%
\$100,000 - \$149,999	2.06	2.12	2.9%
\$150,000 or more	2.10	2.13	1.4%
<b>Fare Category</b>			
Adult	2.45	2.54	3.7%
Senior	1.10	1.18	7.3%
Disabled	0.86	0.94	9.3%
Youth	1.01	1.09	7.9%
<b>Fare Media</b>			
Clipper/RTC sticker	1.66	1.67	0.6%
Cash or Paper	3.37	3.66	8.6%
Cash (coins and bills)	2.43	2.59	6.6%
Day Pass bought earlier in day	4.60	5.07	10.2%
Day Pass purchased on this bus	4.68	5.15	10.0%
Cash value on Clipper	2.45	2.45	0.0%
Monthly/31-Day pass	1.20	1.21	0.8%

## Appendix Table A-2

### Average One-Way Local Fare Analysis – 2021 vs. 2019 (Based on \$0.50 Clipper Discount)

	Proposed average one-way fare 2019	Proposed average one-way fare 2021	Change 2021 vs 2019
<b>All Riders</b>	2.27	2.37	4.4%
<b>Race/ethnicity</b>			
Person of Color	2.32	2.44	5.2%
White alone, non-Latino/a	2.10	2.17	3.3%
African-American alone, non-Latino/a	2.37	2.49	5.1%
Asian alone, non-Latino/a	2.06	2.13	3.4%
Latino/a, any race	2.45	2.58	5.3%
Other	2.29	2.39	4.4%
<b>Household Income</b>			
Low-Income	2.28	2.39	4.8%
Not Low-Income	2.25	2.34	4.0%
Below \$10,000	2.21	2.32	5.0%
\$10,000-\$24,999	2.33	2.45	5.2%
\$25,000-\$34,999	2.39	2.51	5.0%
\$35,000-\$49,999	2.22	2.31	4.1%
\$50,000 - \$74,999	2.28	2.38	4.4%
\$75,000 - \$99,999	2.30	2.38	3.5%
\$100,000 - \$149,999	2.12	2.18	2.8%
\$150,000 or more	2.13	2.16	1.4%
<b>Fare Category</b>			
Adult	2.54	2.66	4.7%
Senior	1.18	1.23	4.2%
Disabled	0.94	0.98	4.3%
Youth	1.09	1.14	4.6%
<b>Fare Media</b>			
Clipper/RTC sticker	1.67	1.67	0.0%
Cash or Paper	3.66	4.00	9.3%
Cash (coins and bills)	2.59	2.84	9.7%
Day Pass bought earlier in day	5.07	5.53	9.1%
Day Pass purchased on this bus	5.15	5.62	9.1%
Cash value on Clipper	2.45	2.45	0.0%
Monthly/31-Day pass	1.21	1.21	0.0%

### Appendix Table A-3

#### Average One-Way Local Fare Analysis – 2023 vs. 2021 (Based on \$0.50 Clipper Discount)

	Proposed average one-way fare 2021	Proposed average one-way fare 2023	Change 2021 vs 2019
<b>All Riders</b>	2.37	2.59	9.3%
<b>Race/ethnicity</b>			
Person of Color	2.44	2.65	8.6%
White alone, non-Latino/a	2.17	2.37	9.2%
African-American alone, non-Latino/a	2.49	2.72	9.2%
Asian alone, non-Latino/a	2.13	2.32	8.9%
Latino/a, any race	2.58	2.81	8.9%
Other	2.39	2.60	8.8%
<b>Household Income</b>			
Low-Income	2.39	2.61	9.2%
Not Low-Income	2.34	2.55	9.0%
Below \$10,000	2.32	2.53	9.1%
\$10,000-\$24,999	2.45	2.67	9.0%
\$25,000-\$34,999	2.51	2.73	8.8%
\$35,000-\$49,999	2.31	2.52	9.1%
\$50,000 - \$74,999	2.38	2.59	8.8%
\$75,000 - \$99,999	2.38	2.61	9.7%
\$100,000 - \$149,999	2.18	2.38	9.2%
\$150,000 or more	2.16	2.38	10.2%
<b>Fare Category</b>			
Adult	2.66	2.89	8.6%
Senior	1.23	1.37	11.4%
Disabled	0.98	1.09	11.2%
Youth	1.14	1.27	11.4%
<b>Fare Media</b>			
Clipper/RTC sticker	1.67	1.83	9.6%
Cash or Paper	4.00	4.35	8.7%
Cash (coins and bills)	2.84	3.11	9.5%
Day Pass bought earlier in day	5.53	5.99	8.3%
Day Pass purchased on this bus	5.62	6.09	8.4%
Cash value on Clipper	2.45	2.72	11.0%
Monthly/31-Day pass	1.21	1.30	7.4%

## Appendix Table A-4

### Average One-Way Local Fare Analysis – 2019 vs. Current (Based on \$0.25 Clipper Discount)

	Current average one-way fare	Proposed average one-way fare 2019	Change 2019 vs current
<b>All Riders</b>	2.18	2.27	4.1%
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>			
Person of Color	2.22	2.32	4.5%
White alone, non-Latino/a	2.04	2.10	2.9%
African-American alone, non-Latino/a	2.25	2.37	5.3%
Asian alone, non-Latino/a	1.99	2.06	3.5%
Latino/a, any race	2.34	2.45	4.7%
Other	2.20	2.29	4.1%
<b>Household Income</b>			
Low-Income	2.18	2.28	4.6%
Not Low-Income	2.18	2.26	3.7%
Below \$10,000	2.10	2.21	5.2%
\$10,000-\$24,999	2.22	2.33	5.0%
\$25,000-\$34,999	2.28	2.39	4.8%
\$35,000-\$49,999	2.13	2.22	4.2%
\$50,000 - \$74,999	2.20	2.28	3.6%
\$75,000 - \$99,999	2.22	2.30	3.6%
\$100,000 - \$149,999	2.06	2.12	2.9%
\$150,000 or more	2.10	2.13	1.4%
<b>Fare Category</b>			
Adult	2.45	2.54	3.7%
Senior	1.10	1.19	8.2%
Disabled	0.86	0.95	10.5%
Youth	1.01	1.10	8.9%
<b>Fare Media</b>			
Clipper/RTC sticker	1.66	1.67	0.6%
Cash or Paper	3.37	3.66	8.6%
Cash (coins and bills)	2.43	2.59	6.6%
Day Pass bought earlier in day	4.60	5.07	10.2%
Day Pass purchased on this bus	4.68	5.15	10.0%
Cash value on Clipper	2.45	2.45	0.0%
Monthly/31-Day pass	1.20	1.22	1.7%

## Appendix Table A-5

### Average One-Way Local Fare Analysis – 2021 vs. 2019 (Based on \$0.25 Clipper Discount)

	Proposed average one-way fare 2019	Proposed average one-way fare 2021	Change 2021 vs 2019
<b>All Riders</b>	2.27	2.48	9.3%
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>			
Person of Color	2.32	2.54	9.5%
White alone, non-Latino/a	2.10	2.30	9.5%
African-American alone, non-Latino/a	2.37	2.59	9.3%
Asian alone, non-Latino/a	2.06	2.25	9.2%
Latino/a, any race	2.45	2.68	9.4%
Other	2.29	2.50	9.2%
<b>Household Income</b>			
Low-Income	2.28	2.49	9.2%
Not Low-Income	2.26	2.47	9.3%
Below \$10,000	2.21	2.41	9.0%
\$10,000-\$24,999	2.33	2.55	9.4%
\$25,000-\$34,999	2.39	2.60	8.8%
\$35,000-\$49,999	2.22	2.42	9.0%
\$50,000 - \$74,999	2.28	2.49	9.2%
\$75,000 - \$99,999	2.30	2.52	9.6%
\$100,000 - \$149,999	2.12	2.32	9.4%
\$150,000 or more	2.13	2.34	9.9%
<b>Fare Category</b>			
Adult	2.54	2.78	9.4%
Senior	1.19	1.31	10.1%
Disabled	0.95	1.04	9.5%
Youth	1.10	1.20	9.1%
<b>Fare Media</b>			
Clipper/RTC sticker	1.67	1.83	9.6%
Cash or Paper	3.66	4.00	9.3%
Cash (coins and bills)	2.59	2.84	9.7%
Day Pass bought earlier in day	5.07	5.53	9.1%
Day Pass purchased on this bus	5.15	5.62	9.1%
Cash value on Clipper	2.45	2.72	11.0%
Monthly/31-Day pass	1.22	1.30	6.6%

## Appendix Table A-6

### Average One-Way Local Fare Analysis – 2023 vs. 2021 (Based on \$0.25 Clipper Discount)

	Proposed average one-way fare 2021	Proposed average one-way fare 2023	Change 2023 vs 2021
<b>All Riders</b>	2.48	2.72	9.7%
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>			
Person of Color	2.54	2.77	9.1%
White alone, non-Latino/a	2.30	2.52	9.6%
African-American alone, non-Latino/a	2.59	2.83	9.3%
Asian alone, non-Latino/a	2.25	2.46	9.3%
Latino/a, any race	2.68	2.92	9.0%
Other	2.50	2.73	9.2%
<b>Household Income</b>			
Low-Income	2.49	2.72	9.2%
Not Low-Income	2.47	2.7	9.3%
Below \$10,000	2.41	2.64	9.5%
\$10,000-\$24,999	2.55	2.78	9.0%
\$25,000-\$34,999	2.60	2.85	9.6%
\$35,000-\$49,999	2.42	2.65	9.5%
\$50,000 - \$74,999	2.49	2.73	9.6%
\$75,000 - \$99,999	2.52	2.75	9.1%
\$100,000 - \$149,999	2.32	2.55	9.9%
\$150,000 or more	2.34	2.58	10.3%
<b>Fare Category</b>			
Adult	2.78	3.04	9.4%
Senior	1.31	1.43	9.2%
Disabled	1.04	1.15	10.6%
Youth	1.20	1.32	10.0%
<b>Fare Media</b>			
Clipper/RTC sticker	1.83	2.01	9.8%
Cash or Paper	4.00	4.35	8.7%
Cash (coins and bills)	2.84	3.11	9.5%
Day Pass bought earlier in day	5.53	5.99	8.3%
Day Pass purchased on this bus	5.62	6.09	8.4%
Cash value on Clipper	2.72	2.99	9.9%
Monthly/31-Day pass	1.30	1.43	10.0%



## Appendix Table A-7

### Weekly Average Fare Analysis for 7-Day Pass (Based on \$0.50 Clipper Discount)

	Current weekly fare	Proposed weekly fare 2019	Proposed weekly fare 2021	Proposed weekly fare 2023	Pct Change 2019 vs current	Pct Change 2021 vs 2019	Pct Change 2023 vs 2021
<b>All Riders</b>	25.85	20.87	20.87	23.23	-19.3%	0.0%	11.3%
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>							
Person of Color	26.23	20.80	20.80	23.15	-20.7%	0.0%	11.3%
White alone, non-Latino/a	24.28	21.15	21.15	23.53	-12.9%	0.0%	11.3%
African-American alone, non-Latino/a	26.15	20.60	20.60	22.93	-21.2%	0.0%	11.3%
Asian alone, non-Latino/a	24.95	21.15	21.15	23.53	-15.2%	0.0%	11.3%
Latino/a, any race	26.48	20.86	20.86	23.21	-21.2%	0.0%	11.3%
Other	27.57	21.05	21.05	23.42	-23.6%	0.0%	11.3%
<b>Household Income</b>							
Low-Income	26.32	20.61	20.61	22.94	-21.7%	0.0%	11.3%
Not Low-Income	24.77	21.45	21.45	23.86	-13.4%	0.0%	11.2%
Below \$10,000	26.15	19.93	19.93	22.20	-23.8%	0.0%	11.4%
\$10,000-\$24,999	26.24	20.12	20.12	22.41	-23.3%	0.0%	11.4%
\$25,000-\$34,999	26.83	21.34	21.34	23.74	-20.5%	0.0%	11.2%
\$35,000-\$49,999	26.11	21.12	21.12	23.50	-19.1%	0.0%	11.3%
\$50,000 - \$74,999	24.94	21.20	21.20	23.59	-15.0%	0.0%	11.3%
\$75,000 - \$99,999	25.77	21.70	21.70	24.13	-15.8%	0.0%	11.2%
\$100,000 - \$149,999	23.08	21.65	21.65	24.07	-6.2%	0.0%	11.2%
\$150,000 or more	23.31	22.10	22.10	24.57	-5.2%	0.0%	11.2%
<b>Fare Category</b>							
Adult fare	27.74	22.50	22.50	25.00	-18.9%	0.0%	11.1%
Senior fare	14.40	11.00	11.00	12.50	-23.6%	0.0%	13.6%
Disabled fare	17.90	11.00	11.00	12.50	-38.5%	0.0%	13.6%
Youth fare	13.99	11.00	11.00	12.50	-21.4%	0.0%	13.6%
<b>Fare Media*</b>							
Clipper	23.94	21.42	21.42	23.83	-10.5%	0.0%	11.3%
Cash or Paper	27.79	20.30	20.30	22.61	-27.0%	0.0%	11.4%
Cash (coins & bills)	27.98	19.80	19.80	22.06	-29.2%	0.0%	11.4%
Day Pass bought earlier in day	28.04	20.83	20.83	23.19	-25.7%	0.0%	11.3%
Day Pass bought on this bus	26.23	21.31	21.31	23.70	-18.8%	0.0%	11.2%
Clipper cash value	23.94	21.42	21.42	23.83	-10.5%	0.0%	11.3%

\*Excludes riders who currently buy a Monthly/31-Day pass

## Appendix Table A-8

### Weekly Average Fare Analysis for 7-Day Pass (Based on \$0.25 Clipper Discount)

	Current weekly fare	Proposed weekly fare 2019	Proposed weekly fare 2021	Proposed weekly fare 2023	Pct Change 2019 vs current	Pct Change 2021 vs 2019	Pct Change 2023 vs 2021
<b>All Riders</b>	25.85	20.87	23.23	25.51	-19.3%	11.3%	9.8%
<b>Race/ethnicity</b>							
Person of color	26.23	20.80	23.15	25.43	-20.7%	11.3%	9.8%
White alone, non-Latino/a	24.28	21.15	23.53	25.85	-12.9%	11.3%	9.9%
African-American alone, non-Latino/a	26.15	20.60	22.93	25.19	-21.2%	11.3%	9.9%
Asian alone, non-Latino/a	24.95	21.15	23.53	25.85	-15.2%	11.3%	9.9%
Latino/a, any race	26.48	20.86	23.21	25.50	-21.2%	11.3%	9.9%
Other	27.57	21.05	23.42	25.73	-23.6%	11.3%	9.9%
<b>Household Income</b>							
Low-Income	26.32	20.61	22.94	25.20	-21.7%	11.3%	9.9%
Not Low-Income	24.77	21.45	23.86	26.23	-13.4%	11.2%	9.9%
Below \$10,000	26.15	19.93	22.20	24.37	-23.8%	11.4%	9.8%
\$10,000-\$24,999	26.24	20.12	22.41	24.60	-23.3%	11.4%	9.8%
\$25,000-\$34,999	26.83	21.34	23.74	26.09	-20.5%	11.2%	9.9%
\$35,000-\$49,999	26.11	21.12	23.50	25.82	-19.1%	11.3%	9.9%
\$50,000 - \$74,999	24.94	21.20	23.59	25.92	-15.0%	11.3%	9.9%
\$75,000 - \$99,999	25.77	21.70	24.13	26.52	-15.8%	11.2%	9.9%
\$100,000 - \$149,999	23.08	21.65	24.07	26.46	-6.2%	11.2%	9.9%
\$150,000 or more	23.31	22.10	24.57	27.02	-5.2%	11.2%	10.0%
<b>Fare Category</b>							
Adult	27.74	22.50	25.00	27.50	-18.9%	11.1%	10.0%
Senior	14.40	11.00	12.50	13.50	-23.6%	13.6%	8.0%
Disabled	17.90	11.00	12.50	13.50	-38.5%	13.6%	8.0%
Youth	13.99	11.00	12.50	13.50	-21.4%	13.6%	8.0%
<b>Fare Media*</b>							
Clipper	23.94	21.42	23.83	26.19	-10.5%	11.3%	9.9%
Cash or Paper	27.79	20.30	22.61	24.83	-27.0%	11.4%	9.8%
Cash (coins & bills)	27.98	19.80	22.06	24.21	-29.2%	11.4%	9.7%
Day Pass bought earlier in day	28.04	20.83	23.19	25.47	-25.7%	11.3%	9.8%
Day Pass purchased on this bus	26.23	21.31	23.70	26.05	-18.8%	11.2%	9.9%
Clipper cash value	23.94	21.42	23.83	26.19	-10.5%	11.3%	9.9%

\*Excludes riders who currently buy a Monthly/31-Day pass