

Appendix G: Public Comments

Date: October 17, 2017
Source: Online form
Comment: I like how you are planning to incentivize Clipper Card use. I think that upgrading your Clipper tag machines so that card users only have to tag once will definitely improve service. It will be more convenient to riders too.

Date: November 15, 2017
Source: Online form
Comment: I think the plan can be more balanced regarding autonomous vehicles, noting positive factors of the vehicles. For example, they could provide opportunity for vehicles and transit schedules that may be better sized for the demand and don't have to be on fixed routes. Labor costs could be reduced if transit vehicles are autonomous. Fare payments could be electronic. Travel times could be predictable. Low income, disabled and elderly could have better access to better transportation (door to door). I could see "transit" becoming autonomous shared vehicles. Congestion may improve and is not necessarily going to worsen. Autonomous vehicles can have more intelligence about picking routes and, eventually, will not need intersection controls like stop lights, which add to "congestion."

November 16, 2017

Robert Betts
Director of Planning and Operations
Marin Transit
711 Grand Avenue, Suite 110
San Rafael, CA 94901



RE: Comments on Marin Transit's Draft Short Range Transit Plan (S RTP)

Dear Robert:

The Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District (GGBHTD) would like to submit the following comments on items contained in Marin Transit's Draft S RTP for your consideration:

Transit Service Recommendations

We are concerned about the recommended extension of the Muir Woods Shuttle to serve the Golden Gate Bridge Toll Plaza. The Toll Plaza area is heavily congested with vehicle activity, including public transit and tour buses, especially on weekends. There are no opportunities to lay over a bus at the southbound or northbound Toll Plaza bus stops, nor is there room for buses to lay over at any of the bus stops on Cranston Road (the Toll Plaza tunnel road) or Merchant Road. Extended dwell times at any of these bus stops would interfere with existing Golden Gate Transit (GGT), Muni, and PresidiGo operations. Also, it would not be possible to establish a new bus stop on Cranston Road or Merchant Road, as it would interfere with existing car and bicycle travel lanes and would likely not meet ADA requirements.

On pages 1-22, please note that Marin Transit Route 113 is shown as being operated by GGT, when it is not.

Fare Policy Recommendations

As we noted in our meeting on November 9, GGBHTD has comments about several items in Marin Transit's proposed fare plan. We would encourage Marin Transit to begin a program to raise paratransit fares so that they are double the fixed route cash fare because that is consistent with GGT's approach for regional paratransit fares. As you know, GGBHTD is responsible for nearly 25% of the expense for local mandated paratransit. Raising local paratransit fares would improve cost recovery, perhaps shift some riders to more cost effective fixed route service, and help with addressing capacity and peak demand issues.

However, there are other items proposed as part of Marin Transit's fare plan that would be inconsistent with GGT's fare structure, and in one case, greater Bay Area goals.

First, while we understand Marin Transit's desire to move passengers from cash fares to payment by Clipper cards, the proposed rate of the discount for using Clipper (25%) exceeds the rate that GGT offers (20%). We would like to request that you consider a discount rate of 20%, as we would find it difficult to justify offering GGT customers a higher discount for intra-Marin travel.

Second, with regard to Marin Transit's proposal for "Clipper Independence," we are very concerned about the customer impact of eliminating the concept of "tag on-tag off" in favor of a "tag on" only system. Because routes and customers overlap in the U.S. Highway 101 corridor between GGT and Marin Transit, having some buses be tag on-tag off while others serving the same stops or destinations being tag-on only will lead to customer confusion, particularly for low-income riders who may have limited English language or literacy abilities. Should those passengers not tag off on a bus that requires them to do so would create a fare penalty and an undue financial burden for low-income riders.

Finally, although we do understand your rationale for eliminating youth fares, we would not be able to adopt a similar policy. The Bay Area region, through the directive of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, has worked very hard to align youth fare policy throughout the region. GGT changed its youth fare policy in March 2015, and this policy applies to both regional bus and ferry service. We would not be able to join Marin Transit in eliminating youth fares, and would be especially concerned that eliminating those fares on Marin Transit could shift riders to GGT in shared corridors.

Thank you for considering our comments to your Draft SRTP. Should you have any questions about the above items or need clarification, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Ron Downing
Director of Planning

c: Denis Mulligan, Joe Wire, Mona Babauta, Tony Clark

From: Christina Hohorst
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2017 3:00 PM
To: Robert Betts
Cc: Lauren Gradia; Melody Reebbs
Subject: RE: Marin Transit SRTP

Importance: High

Hi. Robert, Lauren and Melody.

As usual, Marin Transit has provided a thorough SRTP. Please forgive me for taking two extra days to comment.

I have two comments:

- 1) The Operating budget needs to show zero deficits in the projections. Please list the expenses and revenues together in one matrix or on two back-to-back pages so that we can see where the potential deficits are. MTC has to make sure that Marin can fund any future service. If there are places where funding can't be identified, the agency has to determine where costs will be reduced in order to fund upcoming expenditures. The Capital budget does not have to be zeroed out, but the Operating Budget needs to be. You can discuss different budget scenarios that identify potential deficits, but the Operating Program must be fully-funded.
- 2) Is there one table with the Measure A Performance Criteria? I may have missed it. I saw the chapter that discussed individual lines in terms of the criteria, but no list of the criteria. It seems to be generally described in the individual route descriptions. SFMTA's SRTP provides a nice table listing its Measure E criteria that you could use as an example.

If you need samples, please let me know.

Best regards,

Christina Hohorst
Transportation Planner/Analyst
Programming and Allocations Section
chohorst@bayareametro.gov

BAY AREA METRO | BayAreaMetro.gov
Association of Bay Area Governments
Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Bay Area Metro Center | 375 Beale Street | Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 778-5269 – direct
(415) 778-6700 – main number

Please note my new email