AGENDA

If requested, this agenda can be made available in appropriate alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by Section 202 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and the Federal Rules and Regulations adopted in implementation thereof. Persons seeking an alternative format should contact Kathy Souza, Executive Assistant, for further information. In addition, a person with a disability who requires a modification or accommodation, including auxiliary aids or services, in order to participate in a public meeting should telephone or otherwise contact Kathy Souza as soon as possible and preferably at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. Kathy Souza may be reached at telephone number (530) 402-2819 or at the following address: 350 Industrial Way, Woodland, CA 95776.

It is the policy of the Board of Directors of the Yolo County Transportation District to encourage participation in the meetings of the Board of Directors. At each open meeting, members of the public shall be provided with an opportunity to directly address the Board on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Board of Directors. Please fill out a speaker card and give it to the Board Clerk if you wish to address the Board. Speaker cards are provided on a table by the entrance to the meeting room. Depending on the length of the agenda and number of speakers who filled out and submitted cards, the Board Chair reserves the right to limit a public speaker’s time to no more than three (3) minutes, or less, per agenda item.

**MEETING DATE:** December 9, 2019
**MEETING TIME:** 8:00 P.M. (Note Start Time)
**MEETING PLACE:** YCTD Board Room
350 Industrial Way
Woodland, CA 95776

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Time</th>
<th>Info/Discussion Deliberation/Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determination of Quorum/Pledge of Allegiance (Voting members: Woodland, Davis, West Sacramento, Winters, Yolo County) (Nonvoting members: Caltrans, UCD)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider Approval of Agenda for December 9, 2019 meeting</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments from public regarding matters NOT on the Agenda, but within the purview of YCTD</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

<p>| 8:00 | Approve YCTD Board Minutes for Meeting of November 18, 2019 (<em>Souza</em>) (<em>pp 1-4</em>) | X |
| 4b   | Approve Schedule of YCTD Meeting Dates for 2020 (<em>Souza</em>) (<em>p 5</em>) | X |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Board Member Reports, Announcements, Other Nominations, Presentations (Oral Reports)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Oral Update from Transdev - David Phillips, Transdev General Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:05</td>
<td>Follow-Up on November 18 YCTD Board Visioning Workshop (Jose Perez) (pp 7-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:20</td>
<td>Update on 2019 Comprehensive Operational Analysis for YCTD (Alan Budde, Jose Perez)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>Public Hearing Regarding Proposed Bus Route, Schedule and Fares for Public Bus Service between UCD Main Campus in Davis and the UCD Medical Center in Sacramento and adoption of Resolution R 2019-12 (Terry Bassett, Jose Perez) (pp 11-43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:50</td>
<td>Consider Director’s Report (Terry Bassett, Jose Perez) (pp 45-50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Oral Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. SacRT Plans to Initiate Supplemental Bus Service between SMF and Downtown Sacramento in Early 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Update on Knights Landing Microtransit Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Update on Pending Bus Purchases, Electric Charging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Update on CNG Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. 1st Quarter Financials0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Adjournment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNLESS CHANGED BY THE YCTD BOARD, THE NEXT MEETING OF THE YOLO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS WILL BE JANUARY 13, 2020 AT 7:00 PM IN THE YCTD BOARD ROOM, 350 INDUSTRIAL WAY, WOODLAND, CA 95776.

The Board reserves the right to take action on all agendized items, including items under the Executive Director's Report, at any time during the meeting, except for timed public hearings. Items considered routine or non-controversial are placed on the Consent Calendar. Any Consent Calendar item can be separately addressed and discussed at the request of any member of the YCTD Board.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing agenda was posted on or before Friday December 6, 2019 at the Yolo County Transportation District Office (350 Industrial Way, Woodland, California). Additionally, copies were FAXED or transmitted electronically to the Woodland, Davis, West Sacramento, and Winters City Halls, as well as to the Clerk of the Board for the County of Yolo.

Kathy Souza, YCTD Clerk to the Board
Item 4a

YOLO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
November 18, 2019
Yolo County Transportation District Board Room
350 Industrial Way, Woodland, CA 95776

Agenda Item 1 – Call to Order/Roll Call/Pledge of Allegiance

Chair Ledesma called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm and confirmed a quorum was present. He asked Mr. Frerichs to lead the assembly in the pledge of allegiance. The following representatives were in attendance:

- Davis – Lucas Frerichs (Primary)
- West Sacramento – Chris Ledesma (Primary)
- Winters – Harold Anderson (Primary)
- Woodland – Enrique Fernandez (Primary)
- Yolo County – Don Saylor (Primary)
- Caltrans – Todd Rogers (Primary)
- UC Davis – Matt Dulcich (Primary) arrived 7:12 PM

Staff present were Terry Bassett, YCTD Executive Director; Jose Perez, YCTD Deputy Director Operations, Planning & Special Projects; Janice Bryan, YCTD Deputy Director Finance, Grants & Procurement; Alan Budde, YCTD Senior Planner; Kathy Souza, YCTD Executive Assistant; Hope Welton, YCTD Legal Counsel.

Also present were Dave Phillips, Charity Oakley, and Gary MacNealy, Transdev; Eric Will, Yolo County; Michael Rosson, SACOG; Yocha Dehe Tribe of the Wintun Nation Councilmember Mia Durham, Lon Hatamiya, Tribal Consultant, and Woodland Councilmember Tom Stallard.

Agenda Item 2 – Consider Approval of Agenda for November 18, 2019 meeting

Minute Order 2019-37

Director Saylor made the motion, seconded by Director Anderson, to modify, to consider Item 7 before Item 6, and approve the agenda for the November 18, 2019 meeting. Roll call resulted in:

AYES: Anderson, Fernandez, Frerichs, Ledesma, Saylor
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

The motion passed.

Agenda Item 3 – Comments from public regarding matters NOT on the Agenda, but within the purview of YCTD

There were no requests by members of the public to speak.

Agenda Item 4 - Consent Calendar

Minute Order 2019-38

Director Saylor made the motion, seconded by Director Frerichs, to approve the items on the Consent Calendar.

Roll call resulted in:

AYES: Anderson, Fernandez, Frerichs, Ledesma, Saylor
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

The motion passed.

**Agenda Item 5 – Board Member Reports, Announcements, Other Nominations, Presentations (Oral Reports)**

Mr. Bassett introduced Yocha Dehe Tribe of the Wintun Nation Councilmember Mia Durham who gave a brief presentation on the donation of ten thousand dollars ($10,000) by the tribe to the Yolobus Kids Ride Free program.

Director Frerichs reported on SACOG’s approval, early that day, of the Environmental Impact Reports for the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

**Agenda Item 7 – Follow-Up on October 21st YCTD Board Visioning Workshop**

Mr. Perez introduced Eric Will, Yolo County staff member, who presented the visioning and goals lists gathered from the October workshop. Directors Saylor and Frerichs made several suggested changes in wording to those lists which would be brought back to the board for action at the December meeting.

**Agenda Item 6– Public Hearing Regarding Proposed Bus Route, Schedule, and Fares for Public Bus Service between UC Davis Main Campus and the UCD Medical Center in Sacramento and adoption of Resolution R2019-12**

Chair Ledesma announced that SacRT had postponed their vote on this same issue until its December 9, 2019 meeting.

Mr. Bassett presented an overview of the project. He reported that, following considerable public input from workshops and by email, adjustments had been made to the proposed schedule. He added that this service would be public transit, open to the public, rather than the current closed door service contracted by the University.

Mr. Perez provided a review of the project progress and added that Yolobus traveling to the Med Center would expand the paratransit boundaries during hours of operation of the Causeway Connection service resulting in lower fares, reducing some fares from Premium service to Intercity service.

Director Frerichs state the final product was still a moving target and the board should postpone action to allow more adjustment to increase rider satisfaction with the service.

Woodland Councilmember Tom Stallard directed the board’s attention to an article in the Davis Enterprise on the project. He urged the board to make decisions for the majority rather than a few potential riders.

Director Frerichs asked if there were any thoughts on providing additional bike capacity and resolving requests for seatbelts. Mr. Bassett responded that staff was looking at a number of bike options. Mr. Perez added that the manufacturer, Proterra, could not definitively state how retrofitted seatbelts might perform in accident situations. Mr. Bassett stated that MCI was introducing a new electric model with seatbelts but it would have a much more limited range and less bike storage.

Director Frerichs asked if UC Davis employees who did not have monthly passes would be able to pay SacRT fares when boarding. Mr. Bassett and Mr. Perez confirmed that would be the case.

Director Frerichs expressed his support for the project.
Director Fernandez stated he also supported the partnership. He asked from where the congestion management funding came. Mr. Bassett responded that funding was from SACOG.

Director Fernandez asked why there was so little funding investment from Sacramento. Mr. Bassett explained that Sacramento had set aside a portion of its Electrify America award for the purchases of the buses for this project.

Director Anderson requested that staff continue to look into the possibility of retrofitting with seatbelts.

Director Saylor suggested a joint meeting with the SacRT board. Mr. Bassett replied that had been suggested before but had not come to fruition.

Director Ledesma stated he was very supportive of the project and asked staff to provide a better picture of the project for the next presentation. He suggested possibly establishing 2 x 2 meetings with Sac RT to keep the board up to date on governance issues.

**Minute Order 2019-39**
Director Frerichs made the motion, seconded by Director Saylor, to continue the item until the December 9, 2019 meeting. Roll call resulted in:

- **AYES:** Anderson, Frerichs, Ledesma, Saylor
- **NOES:** None
- **ABSENT:** None
- **ABSTAIN:** Fernandez

The motion passed.

Director Ledesma directed staff to work toward a steering committee within the resolution for the next meeting.

Ms. Welton stated she would have to do some research as she had concerns about holding a public hearing outside the jurisdiction if a joint meeting were pursued.

Director Anderson stated he supported the motion but had concerns about the project conflicting with the history and formation of the District.

**Agenda Item 8 - Consider Director’s Report**

- **g.** Oral Report
- **h.** SACOG Unmet Transit Needs Hearing for Yolo County
- **i.** Update on Youth Ride Free Program
- **j.** Update on Knights Landing Microtransit Pilot
- **k.** Update on Pending Bus Purchases, Electric Charging
- **l.** Update on CNG Station
- **m.** Attachments
  - **i.** Youth Ride Free Activity for September & October, 2019 vs September and October, 2018
  - **ii.** Ridership Through October 31, 2019
Agenda Item 9 – Adjournment

There being no further business, Chair Ledesma adjourned the meeting at 8:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

[Signature]

Kathy Loza, Clerk to the Board
RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the YCTD Board approve the following meeting dates for its meetings in the 2019 calendar year.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:

2020 YCTD Meeting Dates – Unless there are changes or cancellations, the meeting dates for 2020 will be:

- January 13
- April 13
- July 13
- October 12
- February 10
- May 11
- August 10
- November 9
- March 9
- June 8
- September 14
- December 14

Unless otherwise determined by the YCTD Board, Chair, Vice-Chair, or Executive Director, all YCTD board meetings will be at the Yolo County Transportation District, 350 Industrial Way, Woodland, CA 95776.

BUDGET IMPACT:

None
RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Yolo County Transportation District (YCTD) Board of Directors:

1. Receive presentation from County of Yolo staff on the proposed draft 2019 YCTD Board Vision, Values and Priorities (Attachment 1); and

2. Discuss, refine, and propose, YCTD Priorities and Projects; and

3. Direct staff to incorporate discussion feedback and recommendations into final YCTD Vision, Values, and Priorities, for consideration and adoption in January 2020.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:

The YCTD Board Received and provided feedback on last formally reviewed and updated the YCTD Vision, Values and Priorities in 2012. Discussion of Board Priorities were not completed during the November 2019 meeting, and development and confirmation of Board priorities is a critical component of updating the District Vision and Values. Incorporating the Board’s priorities and associated projects into an updated vision will help guide YCTD in developing and implementing near- and long-term service, projects, opportunities. The recommended actions will allow staff to accurately capture Board direction and return a complete update for their consideration in January 2020.

BACKGROUND:

At the YCTD Board meeting on November 18, 2019, staff presented draft vision and values developed from a Board workshop held on October 21, 2019. While staff had initially planned to spend time during this workshop discussing strategic priorities with the Board, the prescribed time for the meeting did not accommodate further discussion beyond the vision statement and values.

Staff has developed a set of draft priorities for the December 9 Board meeting for the Board’s consideration. Staff seeks direction of these priorities as part of the larger vision, values, and priorities document being drafted.

Attachment 1 includes the revised vision and values revised at the November 18 Board meeting, as well as an initial list of priorities and project for Board discussion.

It is contemplated that YCTD would continue working with County Administrator’s Office staff to finalize YCTD’s Vision, Values, and Priorities after the discussion, and return to the Board in January 2020 with a completed update for their consideration and adoption.

BUDGET IMPACT:

None at this time.
The Yolo County Transportation District facilitates and leads efficient mobility options that meet the needs of the community through meaningful regional partnerships.

**Vision Statement**

The *vision statement* tells us what we intend to become or achieve in the next 3 to 5 years.

**Values**

A *core value* describes our individual and organizational behaviors and helps us to live out our vision.

- Collaboration
- Efficiency
- Transparency
- Innovation
- Service
- Safety
- Economic Sustainability
- Environmental Stewardship
- Equity/Social Justice

**District-Wide Priorities**

*Priorities* align our vision and values with our implementation strategies.

For discussion during the YCTD Board Meeting on December 9, 2019:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priorities</th>
<th>Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Increase efficiency and seamlessness of existing transit systems | • Complete and evaluate Comprehensive Operational Analysis  
• Evaluate declining ridership |
| Increase future mobility options with regional partners to address unmet needs in the community | • Support a managed lane on I-80  
• Evaluate Knights Landing microtransit  
• Evaluate feasibility of system based on special populations needs |
| Increase the use of data to drive decision-making, and increase technology use and transparency | • Develop a mobile app that matches consumer interest |
| Decrease transit system environmental impacts | |
RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Yolo County Transportation District Board of Directors receive and provide feedback on the status of the 2019 Comprehensive Operational Analysis (COA) for YCTD.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has worked with Dan Boyle & Associates in recent weeks to continue developing the COA. A number of important tasks and activities have been completed since the last YCTD Board meeting and regular updates to the Board and feedback is critical to the success of the study.

BACKGROUND:

DBA is currently finalizing the draft components that will go into the draft COA report which include Existing Conditions, Financial Data Collection and Analysis, Paratransit Analysis, Outreach Summary, and draft COA recommendations.

The first phase of public outreach is complete. Subconsultant AIM has delivered summaries of the five in-person pop-up events around the County and the Virtual Workshop. The five pop-ups were held mid-October to early November in Davis, West Sacramento and Woodland. These workshops were also supplemented with outreach opportunities by YCTD staff within the service area, including the Davis Farmer’s Market, and the Salmon Festival in Winters. The Virtual Workshop was open online between October 22 and November 12, receiving 432 responses. The results of the survey as well as other feedback received will be incorporated into the draft COA recommendations provided by DBA. After preliminary recommendations are developed, the YCTD Board and member jurisdictions will have opportunity to review and provide feedback and guidance. A second phase of outreach will be initiated in February and March 2020 to solicit additional feedback on the reviewed/revised recommendations. Summaries of the Pop-ups and Virtual Workshops, including an appendix of comments, are attached to this report.

Financial Data Collection and Analysis and Paratransit Analysis are progressing with drafts expected in December. Draft COA recommendations are expected late December 2019 or early January 2020. DBA and YCTD staff will conduct presentations of the draft COA to the YCTD Board, city councils, county commission, as well as, stakeholder groups as requested.

BUDGET IMPACT:

None at this time.
RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the YCTD board:

1. Review the following YCTD staff report, as well as the attached SacRT staff report, regarding the proposed expansion bus route between the University of California Davis (UCD) main campus and the UCD Medical Center in Sacramento, and associated schedule and fares; and

2. Conduct a public hearing regarding the proposed service expansion with a limit of no more than three minutes per comment; and

3. After taking into consideration the YCTD and SacRT staff reports and public hearing comments:
   a. Adopt the proposed routes and schedules, as described below, or as modified by the Board, and subject to changes made necessary by operational conditions, effective on or after Monday, April 6, 2020; and
   b. Adopt the proposed fare structure, as described below, for the Causeway Connection bus service.

4. Adopt Resolution R 2019-12, authorizing the YCTD Executive Director, or his designee, to negotiate and execute a Memorandum of Understanding between the Yolo County Transportation District (YCTD), the Sacramento Regional Transit District (SacRT), and the University of California, Davis for the Operation of Causeway Connection Public Bus Service.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION:

The proposed modifications have evolved to offer similar running times and limited stops that currently exist but have added trips during peak hours are to establish a regionally coordinated service expansion for YCTD, SacRT, and UCD, connecting the UCD main campus, the City of Davis, the City of Sacramento, and the UCD Medical Center in Sacramento. Establishing the new jointly operated service will increase mobility options for residents of Davis and Sacramento, while also increasing levels of service (i.e., frequency) for those traveling between these communities during peak periods. The service has been developed with sustainable and environmentally beneficial goals. YCTD will further benefit from providing the service by leveraging funding from UCD to expand and enhance service levels to the affected communities. Complementary paratransit service will also be provided to eligible customers, further enhancing mobility and access to public services throughout the region.

BACKGROUND:
There currently exists demand for connections between the UCD main campus and the UCD Medical Center in Sacramento. There currently is a privately operated, closed-door service funded by the University which provides hourly connections to the campuses during weekdays, using over-the-road diesel motor coaches. Over the past year, staff from YCTD, SacRT, UCD, the City of Sacramento, Electrify America (EA), and SACOG have been developing a plan to transition and enhance the service from being a private closed-door intercampus shuttle to being open-door public intercity bus service, which continues to offer the equivalent of express trips while opening up trip opportunities for other riders traveling between Davis and Sacramento, all while deploying and using a new all-electric bus fleet purchased for this purpose. Under the proposed plan, the fleet and operations would be operated jointly by YCTD and SacRT.

**Service Description** – The new service would take effect on or after April 6, 2020 and operate hourly Monday through Friday from as early as approximately 5:30 am to as late as 8:50 pm, and as frequently as three times an hour during morning and afternoon peak hours. Refer to the schedule and map at the end of this report. The overall number of bus trips between the UCD Main campus and the UCD Medical Center will increase from 15 to 26 on most weekdays.

Travel times between the UCD main campus and the UCD Medical Center (referred to as UC Davis Health on the schedule) will be approximately 28-42 minutes from end to end, depending on the time of day and will be relatively consistent with the existing service where possible. Peak hour trips are anticipated to include limited-stop express service to preserve on-time performance and help meet existing demand. Separate from the express service, some trips will also include limited additional stops along Q and O Streets in downtown Sacramento and at the Mace Park-and-Ride lot in Davis to aid in the reduction of congestion along the I-80 corridor and will reduce vehicle emissions and single-occupancy vehicle trips, helping the region strive towards meeting sustainability and environmental goals.

Compared to the existing route and schedule, the new service would add: (1) an East Davis park-and-ride stop for eastbound commuters traveling to the vicinity of the UCD Medical Center, (2) a reverse commuter option, picking up in Downtown and Midtown Sacramento in the morning for commuters working at the UCD main campus in Davis; and (3) a greater variety of departure times during peak hours. Stops on the UC Davis main campus will always include the Mondavi Center, with some trips being extended to the Silo terminal and/or the Genome Biomedical Science Facility (GBSF). The schedules would also be updated to account for the increase in traffic over the past several years.

**Operating Cost** – The gross annual operating cost of the new service is estimated at $1,620,000. For the three-year term of the recommended Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), $710,000 per year in Congestion Mitigation Air Quality funds would cover half the operating cost, net of $200,000 per year in fares, with the other half being covered by UCD ($615,000 per year), the City of Sacramento ($47,500 per year) and SacRT ($47,500 per year).
**Fare Structure** – In order to simplify the fare collection for the proposed fixed route service, the following fare structure is proposed, to be made effective when the Causeway Connection service is initiated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Discount*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash Fare</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
<td>$1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Pass Fee</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Pass</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth, age 18 and under</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>To Be Determined**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCD Undergraduates</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Must show valid ID</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Seniors age 62 up, disabled riders

**YCTD and SacRT each reserve the right to offer reduced fares or free rides to youth, consistent with whatever fare structures each district adopts.

UCD staff has informed YCTD and SacRT staff that UCD is proposing to subsidize employee pass purchases to limit out-of-pocket employee pass prices, in a manner consistent with the following table:

### Out-Of-Pocket Monthly Pass Price
For Major Causeway Connection Rider Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Shuttle</th>
<th>Original Proposal</th>
<th>Updated UC Davis Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis Undergraduates</td>
<td>$45/mo</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis Sacramento Employees</td>
<td>$45/mo</td>
<td>$35/mo *</td>
<td>$35/mo *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis Davis Employees</td>
<td>$45/mo</td>
<td>$65/mo *</td>
<td>$45/mo **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis Graduate Students</td>
<td>$45/mo</td>
<td>$100/mo</td>
<td>$45/mo **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reflects UC Davis subsidy from nominal $100/month transit pass

** UC Davis pledges to implement new program to achieve equal or better out of pocket price.

Note that this level of additional subsidy from UCD is determined solely by UCD and may be subject to change.

**Fleet and Charging** - The fleet will consist of 12 full-size Proterra Catalyst E2 battery-electric buses. Six buses will belong to YCTD, six to SacRT. Overnight charging will take place at the respective District facilities. In-service “opportunity” charging between trips will also be available at the UCD Medical Center terminal and at the UCD main campus terminal (near the Mondavi Center). The fleet and charging infrastructure are being financed, purchased, and constructed by Electrify America in cooperation with YCTD and SacRT, and pursuant to the Volkswagen settlement with the California Air Resources Board (CARB). The buses will be 40-foot low-floor transit buses with 33 seats, two wheelchair spaces, three bicycle racks, free WiFi, and USB charging ports at all seats.
Paratransit – Under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Initiation of the Causeway Connection will require complementary paratransit service within ¾ miles of the new route to persons who have functional disabilities that prevent them from being able to access or ride the fixed route bus. The details for provision of this service are being worked on. YCTD’s obligation is limited to within ¾ mile of the Causeway Connection route, plus ¾ mile of other Yolobus non-commute routes, while Sac RT’s obligation covers other parts of the Sacramento RT bus and light rail service area. (Note that the intercity fare for transporting eligible disabled riders on such complementary paratransit will be $5.00 per ride.)

Marketing and Customer Information – The new service would be branded as the Causeway Connection and jointly operated by YCTD and SacRT. UCD would maintain a central web page for the service. Phone calls would be directed to a single number which will then be routed to SacRT and YCTD. Both agencies would use the same route number (138) and timetables would include trips operated by both agencies. For real-time information, customers would be directed to a single third-party app (being developed) which would present both agencies’ information, to create a seamless customer experience.

Future Changes – As proposed, the Causeway Connection would become a service of both YCTD and SacRT. YCTD’s and Sac RT’s Boards would retain the authority to make alterations; however, under the terms of the MOU, both transit operators would agree to make a good faith effort to coordinate the provision of any changes, working with UCD along the way.

Public Comment – YCTD’s public hearing was first noticed on November 8, 2019 for the November 18th board meeting. It was re-noticed on November 29, 2019 for the December 9th board meeting. As of the publication of the first notice, YCTD staff received numerous comments, questions, and concerns regarding the proposed service. Additionally, UCD facilitated and hosted a series of discussions providing opportunities for existing riders and potential riders to provide comments and feedback. A total of eight sessions in October and November, during midday and early evening hours at various locations in Davis and Sacramento were conducted and included dozens of participants. Further, several individuals (some also having participated in the discussion sessions) also submitted comments to YCTD as part of the public hearing process. Attached are Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) summarized by UCD staff, as well as UCD responses. Other comments submitted to YCTD prior to the November 18th board meeting are also attached to this report.

Since the SacRT and YCTD November 18, 2019 board meetings, extensive discussions ensued on what changes could be considered in response to the comments received. SacRT staff has worked closely with interested riders, YCTD, City of Sacramento, EA, UCD main campus and UCD Medical Center staff and modified the schedules and routes in response. Please refer to the attached SacRT staff report for more details. In that report, there is staff level discussion on the seatbelts, bicycle capacity and other matters.

Because some Yolobus buses will be deadheading out-of-service between the Woodland bus yard and either the UCD Main Campus or the UCD Medical Center, some opportunities may open up for persons living in Woodland to get to and from either UCD facility on one bus, without the need to transfer, and assuming YCTD includes as revenue service such trips that would otherwise be deadhead. Your Board is advised that these deadhead trips may change and be different, depending on real-world experience of the operating range of each bus per electric charge and actual running times.

YCTD staff has also had some communication with Caltrans and SACOG staff about the possibility of “bus on shoulder” opportunities along I-80, which might positively improve bus running times between Davis and Sacramento.

BUDGET IMPACT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross operating cost:</td>
<td>$1,620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare revenue (anticipated):</td>
<td>($200,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net operating cost:</td>
<td>$1,420,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CMAQ contribution: ($710,000) (Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Grant thru SACOG)
Other contributions: ($710,000) (UCD: $615,00, City of Sacramento and Sacramento RT: $47,500 each)

It is proposed that UCD agree to guarantee that any shortages in the budgeted $200,000 in fare revenue be covered by the university.

On the capital side, new vehicle and parts related capital costs (estimated at nearly $12 million for the 12 buses and an undisclosed amount for the charging infrastructure) are fully funded by Electrify America (EA), and EA is absorbing all costs associated with building the charging infrastructure to operate these battery/electric buses.
## Existing Service Schedule

### UC Davis Medical Center to UC Davis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>UC Davis Medical Center</th>
<th>Mondavi Center</th>
<th>Health Science Lot 56</th>
<th>Silo Terminal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:30 AM</td>
<td>5:50 AM</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:20 AM</td>
<td>6:45 AM</td>
<td>6:50 AM</td>
<td>6:55 AM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:10 AM</td>
<td>7:35 AM</td>
<td>7:40 AM</td>
<td>7:45 AM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:10 AM</td>
<td>8:35 AM</td>
<td>8:40 AM</td>
<td>8:45 AM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10 AM</td>
<td>9:35 AM</td>
<td>9:40 AM</td>
<td>9:45 AM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10 AM</td>
<td>10:35 AM</td>
<td>10:40 AM</td>
<td>10:45 AM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10 AM</td>
<td>11:35 AM</td>
<td>11:40 AM</td>
<td>11:45 AM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:10 PM</td>
<td>12:35 PM</td>
<td>12:40 PM</td>
<td>12:45 PM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10 PM</td>
<td>1:35 PM</td>
<td>1:40 PM</td>
<td>1:45 PM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10 PM</td>
<td>2:35 PM</td>
<td>2:40 PM</td>
<td>2:45 PM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:10 PM</td>
<td>3:35 PM</td>
<td>3:40 PM</td>
<td>3:45 PM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10 PM</td>
<td>4:35 PM</td>
<td>4:40 PM</td>
<td>4:45 PM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15 PM</td>
<td>5:40 PM</td>
<td>5:45 PM</td>
<td>5:50 PM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:10 PM</td>
<td>6:35 PM</td>
<td>6:40 PM</td>
<td>6:45 PM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30 PM</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8:00 PM</td>
<td>8:05 PM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UC Davis to UC Davis Medical Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Silo Terminal</th>
<th>Health Science Lot 56</th>
<th>Mondavi Center</th>
<th>UC Davis Medical Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:20 AM</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6:50 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:10 AM</td>
<td>7:13 AM</td>
<td>7:21 AM</td>
<td>7:45 AM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:10 AM</td>
<td>8:13 AM</td>
<td>8:21 AM</td>
<td>8:45 AM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10 AM</td>
<td>9:13 AM</td>
<td>9:21 AM</td>
<td>9:45 AM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10 AM</td>
<td>10:13 AM</td>
<td>10:21 AM</td>
<td>10:45 AM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10 AM</td>
<td>11:13 AM</td>
<td>11:21 AM</td>
<td>11:45 AM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:10 PM</td>
<td>12:13 PM</td>
<td>12:21 PM</td>
<td>12:45 PM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10 PM</td>
<td>1:13 PM</td>
<td>1:21 PM</td>
<td>1:45 PM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10 PM</td>
<td>2:13 PM</td>
<td>2:21 PM</td>
<td>2:45 PM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:10 PM</td>
<td>3:13 PM</td>
<td>3:21 PM</td>
<td>3:45 PM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10 PM</td>
<td>4:13 PM</td>
<td>4:21 PM</td>
<td>4:45 PM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:10 PM</td>
<td>5:13 PM</td>
<td>5:21 PM</td>
<td>5:45 PM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:10 PM</td>
<td>6:13 PM</td>
<td>6:21 PM</td>
<td>6:45 PM</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:45 PM</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7:10 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:10 PM</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8:35 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing Intercampus Shuttle Route (Westbound and Eastbound)
### Proposed Causeway Connection Schedule, Effective on or after April 6, 2020

#### Eastbound to Sacramento

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Silo</th>
<th>UC Davis Health</th>
<th>Davis 300h/R</th>
<th>P/16th</th>
<th>P/7th</th>
<th>Mace</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>GBSF*</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Silo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>RT1</td>
<td>6:17a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y14a</td>
<td>6:57a</td>
<td>7:05a</td>
<td>7:09a</td>
<td>7:12a</td>
<td></td>
<td>7:39a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y14a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y13a</td>
<td>7:07a</td>
<td>7:15a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:10a</td>
<td></td>
<td>8:46a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y14</td>
<td>7:13a</td>
<td>7:20a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:38a</td>
<td></td>
<td>8:47a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT4a</td>
<td>8:07a</td>
<td>8:15a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:05a</td>
<td></td>
<td>9:50a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT5a</td>
<td>8:13a</td>
<td>9:00a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:32a</td>
<td></td>
<td>10:45a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y13a</td>
<td>9:10a</td>
<td>9:14a</td>
<td>9:21a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:46a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y13a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT1</td>
<td>10:10a</td>
<td>10:14a</td>
<td>10:21a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:46a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y13</td>
<td>11:10a</td>
<td>11:14a</td>
<td>11:21a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:46a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y14</td>
<td>1:10p</td>
<td>1:14p</td>
<td>1:21p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:46p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT2</td>
<td>2:10p</td>
<td>2:14p</td>
<td>2:21p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2:46p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT5b</td>
<td>4:10p</td>
<td>4:20p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:00p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT2</td>
<td>5:10p</td>
<td>5:20p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:55p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y14</td>
<td>6:10p</td>
<td>6:20p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:55p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT3</td>
<td>7:10p</td>
<td>7:20p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:55p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y12</td>
<td>8:10p</td>
<td>8:20p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:55p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT5b</td>
<td>10:10p</td>
<td>10:20p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:55p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT5b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT2</td>
<td>11:10p</td>
<td>11:20p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:55p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT2</td>
<td>1:10p</td>
<td>1:20p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2:15p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y14</td>
<td>2:10p</td>
<td>2:20p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3:15p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT2</td>
<td>3:10p</td>
<td>3:20p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:15p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y14</td>
<td>4:10p</td>
<td>4:20p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:15p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT2</td>
<td>5:10p</td>
<td>5:20p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:15p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y14</td>
<td>6:10p</td>
<td>6:20p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:15p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT2</td>
<td>7:10p</td>
<td>7:20p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:15p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y14</td>
<td>8:10p</td>
<td>8:20p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:15p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Westbound to Davis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Silo</th>
<th>UC Davis Health</th>
<th>Davis 300h/R</th>
<th>P/16th</th>
<th>P/7th</th>
<th>Mace</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>GBSF*</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>Silo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>RT1</td>
<td>5:30a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:53a</td>
<td></td>
<td>RT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y14a</td>
<td>6:17a</td>
<td>6:50a</td>
<td>7:05a</td>
<td>7:12a</td>
<td></td>
<td>8:45a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y14a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y13a</td>
<td>7:07a</td>
<td>7:15a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:10a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:05a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y14</td>
<td>7:13a</td>
<td>7:20a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:38a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:47a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT1</td>
<td>8:07a</td>
<td>8:15a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:05a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:45a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT5a</td>
<td>8:13a</td>
<td>9:00a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:32a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:45a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y13a</td>
<td>9:10a</td>
<td>9:14a</td>
<td>9:21a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:46a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y13a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT1</td>
<td>10:10a</td>
<td>10:14a</td>
<td>10:21a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:46a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y13</td>
<td>11:10a</td>
<td>11:14a</td>
<td>11:21a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:46a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y14</td>
<td>1:10p</td>
<td>1:14p</td>
<td>1:21p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:46p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT2</td>
<td>2:10p</td>
<td>2:14p</td>
<td>2:21p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2:46p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT2</td>
<td>4:10p</td>
<td>4:20p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:00p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y14</td>
<td>5:10p</td>
<td>5:20p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:55p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT1</td>
<td>6:10p</td>
<td>6:20p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:55p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y14</td>
<td>7:10p</td>
<td>7:20p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7:55p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT1</td>
<td>8:10p</td>
<td>8:20p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:55p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RT1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 Yolobus Trips (in yellow)
13 RT Trips

*GBSF is the Genome Biomedical Sciences Facility, located near Hutchison Drive just east of State Highway 113*
Proposed Causeway Connection Route
Causeway Connection Bus Branding Concept

STREETSIDE

CURBSIDE
AUTHORIZING YCTD’S EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, OR HIS DESIGNEE, TO NEGOTIATE AND EXECUTE A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE YOLO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT, THE SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT, AND THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS FOR THE OPERATION OF CAUSEWAY CONNECTION PUBLIC BUS SERVICE

WHEREAS, the Yolo County Transportation District (YCTD), in partnership with Sacramento Regional Transit (SacRT), the University of California, Davis (UCD), the Cities of Davis and Sacramento, Electrify America (EA), and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG), is considering introducing a new bus service, known as the “Causeway Connection”; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Causeway Connection service has been designed to be a jointly operated service between YCTD and SacRT to be launched on or after April 6, 2020; and

WHEREAS, UCD will be providing substantial funding for the provision of the jointly operated service; and

WHEREAS, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is desired by the partnership to ensure consistent and equitable implementation and provision of the Causeway Connection service; and

WHEREAS, a series of business points have been drafted and are attached to this Resolution identifying key administrative, operational, and promotional considerations, subject to modification under good faith efforts between YCTD, SacRT, and UCD; and

WHEREAS, YCTD wishes to authorize its Executive Director or his/her designee to negotiate and execute these documents and any amendments thereto.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED, ORDERED, AND FOUND by the Board of Directors of the Yolo County Transportation District, County of Yolo, State of California, as follows:

1. The foregoing recitals, and each of them, are true and correct.

2. That YCTD’s Executive Director, or his/her designee, is hereby delegated authority to negotiate and enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Sacramento Regional Transit District and the University of California, Davis for operation of the Causeway Connection service to be launched on or after April 6, 2020 on substantially the same terms as set out in Exhibit A.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Directors of the Yolo County Transportation District, County of Yolo, State of California, this 9th day of December, 2019, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

________________________________________
Christopher Ledesma, Chair
Board of Directors

ATTEST: Approved as to Form:

________________________________________
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Exhibit A: Memorandum of Understanding Draft Terms

1. Parties
   a. Sacramento Regional Transit District (SacRT)
   b. Yolo County Transportation District (YCTD)
   c. University of California, Davis (UCD)

2. Term
   a. Three year term
   b. Takes effect 4/1/20
   c. Ends 3/31/23

3. Service
   a. Monday through Friday only
   b. Route is from Mondavi Center in Davis to UC Davis Medical Center in Sacramento
   c. Stops are to be determined, but will be approximately 3-4 stops in Davis, 3-5 stops in Sacramento
   d. Trips will take approximately 45 minutes one way
   e. Headways will be approximately hourly, except during peak hours, when there will be additional trips
   f. Combined service will include approximately 26 one-way vehicle trips per day each direction
   g. Service will be approximately 13,500 revenue vehicle hours per year
   h. Service will be operated approximately 50/50 between SacRT and YCTD (i.e., approximately 26 one-way trips per agency)

4. Cost
   a. Gross operating cost of the service will be considered to be $1,620,000 per year for the three year term
   b. Net cost will be gross operating cost minus fare revenue
      i. UC Davis undergraduate student IDs generate no upfront fare revenue for SacRT and YCTD
   c. CMAQ grant funds will pay 50 percent of net cost, split 50/50 by SacRT and YCTD, with a maximum of $810,000
   d. Local match will be equal to CMAQ contribution and will be paid by UCD, SacRT, and City of Sacramento
      i. UCD will contribute first $615,000
      ii. SacRT and City of Sacramento will contribute next $95,000 split 50/50 (separate agreement with City of Sacramento)
         1. SacRT contribution not to exceed $47,500
         2. City of Sacramento contribution not to exceed $47,500
      iii. Final $100,000 will be paid by UCD, if necessary, due to lower-than-expected fare revenue
         1. Total UCD contribution not to exceed $715,000
   e. A fraction of payments from UCD will be treated as fare revenue, to account for use of undergraduate student IDs, as described in Section 7

5. Flow of funds
   a. CMAQ funds will be claimed and collected by SacRT from FTA; YCTD will invoice SacRT for their amount as specified in Section 4; YCTD will not be a direct Federal recipient for CMAQ funds for this project; SacRT shall act as a pass-through agency
   b. SacRT and YCTD will divide CMAQ funds quarterly as follows:
      i. SacRT and YCTD will track ridership and fare collection on the Causeway Connection, separate from the remainder of their routes
      ii. SacRT will provide fare revenue totals for its portion of the service to YCTD
iii. YCTD will total fare revenue from the two agencies, to determine net cost
iv. YCTD will invoice SacRT for CMAQ funds so that CMAQ funds plus fare revenue are
equal for both agencies
c. SacRT and YCTD will invoice UCD as follows:
   i. UCD will be billed quarterly, in advance of service, for their share of gross operating cost
   ii. With each quarterly invoice, payments due from UCD will be adjusted to account for
differences between gross cost and net cost, for prior quarters, once actual fare revenue is
   known
6. Fare structure
   a. Fare structure will change from existing private/closed-door fare structure to public fare structure
   on 4/1/20 when SacRT and YCTD assume operation
   b. Existing fare structure on SacRT and YCTD will be in force except as noted; the transfer
   agreement between SacRT and YCTD will be in effect, except as noted
c. Single fare
   i. Single fare is $2.50
   ii. Discount single fare is $1.25
   iii. Cash will be accepted
   iv. SacRT prepaid mag stripe/QR tickets will be accepted
   v. SacRT Zip Pass will be accepted
   vi. Connect Card will be accepted
   vii. SacRT 90-minute fares (on Zip Pass and Connect Card) will be accepted
d. Senior/disabled
   i. Seniors are eligible for discount fare
   ii. All valid SacRT and YCTD discount IDs are honored
e. Students
   i. SacRT students ride for free with a valid ID
   ii. YCTD youth, up to age 18, ride for free
f. Transfers
   i. Transfers to or from either agency will not be sold or honored
g. Day passes
   i. Day passes from either agency will be honored
   ii. Customers may purchase a SacRT day pass for $7.00 or a discount day pass for $3.50 by
       presenting a valid SACRT discount or Student (TK-12) ID or Medicare card or driver’s
       license
   iii. Customer may purchase a YCTD day pass for $7.00 or a discount day pass for $3.50 by
       presenting a valid YCTD discount youth ID, Medicare card, or driver’s license
h. Monthly passes
   i. SacRT monthly pass will be honored
   ii. YCTD monthly pass will be honored only if it has an express sticker on it
i. Los Rios and CSUS
   i. Los Rios (sticker affixed to Student ID) and CSUS (Student ID with sleeve) will be
       honored as valid fare media
j. New Connect Card fare type
   i. A new Connect Card fare specific to the UCDMC Shuttle will be configured to allow for
      single rides (cash value) to be used and tracked separately from other services.
      1. Like other regional products, revenue from this product will be assigned to SacRT
         upfront and then 50 percent of the total revenue will be paid to YCTD through the
         financial reconciliation process.
      ii. Connect Cards readers will be installed on all buses, the single fare will be charged as
          discussed above and all taps will be recorded
7. Honoring and reimbursing student IDs as valid fare
a. Undergraduate UC Davis student IDs will be honored as valid fare on the service
   i. SRTD and YCTD will count boardings made with undergraduate student IDs
   ii. SRTD will charge UCD a fixed amount per boarding on the undergraduate student ID, to properly account for the fraction of UCD’s payment that represents fare revenue
      1. This amount will be part of, not in addition to, the amount already due from UCD under Section 4

8. Changes to service or fare structure
   a. SRTD and YCTD reserve the right to change service and/or fares according to their own policies; but agree to negotiate in good faith, prior to doing so, to maintain uniformity of service and fare structure and compliance with this MOU

9. Web page
   a. UCD will design, host, and maintain a master/central web page for the service, subject to review by SRTD and YCTD
   b. SacRT and YCTD may present information on the service on their own respective web sites as they see fit, consistent with the branding of the service, but must link to the central/master site

10. Call center
    a. Public information on the service (e.g., at the central web site and on printed materials) will provide a single phone number for customer assistance (rather than phone numbers for both operating agencies)
    b. UCD will establish and maintain the single phone number, which will route incoming calls to SacRT and YCTD customer service on a 50/50 basis

11. Real-time/AVL
    a. SacRT dispatchers will be able to see real-time location for SacRT-operated buses via SacRT’s Clever Devices system and will be able to see real-time location for YCTD buses via YCTD’s public web page
    b. YCTD dispatchers will be able to see real-time location for YCTD-operated buses via YCTD’s AVL system and will be able to see real-time location for SacRT buses via SacRT’s public web page
    c. Customers will be directed to download and install one of several third party apps currently available to end users at no cost and which offer the capabilities to present both agencies’ scheduled and real-time bus locations in one centralized interface

12. Radio control, dispatching, and supervision
    a. Each party will maintain separate dispatching and radio communication via existing channels; supervisors shall communicate via direct telephone access to counterparts at other party's dispatch for issue resolution
    b. Each agency will conduct its own accident investigation and other field supervision; issues identified by one party’s supervisors will be raised to appropriate supervisory personnel at the other agency

13. Lost and found
    a. Lost customer belongings will be collected and stored separately by SacRT and YCTD according to their own policies and procedures depending on which vehicle they are found on
    b. Customers claiming lost belongings will be assisted by relevant customer service personnel to the correct collection location

14. Uniforms
    a. Each party will continue to use standard uniforms; however, a special patch or pin will be worn on the outermost article of clothing (uniform or safety vest) displaying the name or logo of the service

15. Name/branding and vehicle appearance
    a. The service will be referred to as the Causeway Connection
    b. The route number will be Route 138
i. Because the route number is the same for both agencies, information provided by third-party customer information providers (such as Google Maps and the Transit app) will inherently appear to customers to be the same route, with the difference in service provider not necessarily apparent to most users

ii. Use of the number 138 will maximize identifiability, because the existing regular/local SacRT bus serving the UC Davis Medical Center is Route 38 and SacRT customarily uses route numbers in the 100’s for peak-only or express versions of regular/local routes

c. The bus headsign will display the route number and the destination of the route (e.g., UC Davis Medical Center or Mondavi Center)

d. Permanent markings and decals (e.g., on the vehicle exterior sides and interior) of a promotional nature will not feature the route number prominently and will emphasize the name Causeway Connection

e. Reference materials (e.g., printed pamphlets, official notices/bulletins, and online schedules) will include the route number

f. Computerized schedule data made available to third-parties (e.g., Google and app providers) will include the route number, due to most third party platforms using route number as the basis for presenting information

16. Access to facilities, encroachment

a. YCTD and SacRT mutually authorize one another to operate service within one another’s respective service areas by way of a separate transfer agreement. Both parties will update the exhibit to that agreement illustrating where each party is authorized to serve. This update can be approved in writing by the respective General Managers.

b. UCD hereby authorizes SacRT and YCTD to enter and provide transit service within the Unitrans service area

i. SacRT and YCTD both agree to not claim TDA funds available for the parties’ respective jurisdictions due to any changes in eligibility arising from this MOU.

c. UCD grants SacRT and YCTD permission to enter, stop, and layover full-size transit buses on UCD property depicted on the map (including Mondavi Center, Genome Biomedical Sciences Facility parking lot, connecting campus roadways, UC Davis Medical Center temporary bus terminal, future Transportation Hub, and connecting internal roadways)

17. Training (drivers, customer service)

a. Parties may establish special requirements for training that are specific to this service

18. Marketing

a. SacRT and YCTD will use a matching vehicle wrap

19. Spare vehicles (use of other vehicles as backup)

a. In the event of a temporary vehicle shortage, either operating agency may substitute standard unbranded buses from its regular fleet, however, they must be full-size buses (approximately 40 feet in length), ADA compliant (including a compliant lift or ramp and two securable wheelchair spaces), must correctly display the route number and name on the destination sign, and must have the appropriate fare set available in an electronic farebox.

20. Paratransit

a. Each agency will be responsible for fulfilling its own ADA paratransit responsibilities

b. If SacRT experiences a high volume of requests for ADA paratransit trips to Yolo County, the parties agree to negotiate in good faith to arrange for provision of those trips by YCTD, including appropriate cost-sharing/reimbursement

21. NTD reporting

a. The service will be treated as directly operated motorbus service with assets, expenditures, revenue hours, miles, and other operating statistics, and ridership statistics reported separately by both agencies for only the service they operate, the vehicles they own and maintain, etc.

b. The NTD-reported service area for each agency will be enlarged by the 3/4 mile buffer surrounding the route, regardless of presence or lack of stops; however, both parties
UC Davis FAQ Regarding Causeway Connection
(part of November 18th YCTD board meeting packet)

Why are we making any changes in the first place?
For many decades, UC Davis has operated a shuttle with hourly frequency for students and employees. At more than $500,000 per year we wanted to get more service and more convenience for our students and employees. To expand the service and offer more convenience, we needed a true partnership of regional agencies. To best serve our communities, we believe that public agencies should collaborate to build efficient partnerships.

The effort to replace and improve the existing service started with these principles:

- Increase frequency to improve convenience for riders.
- Create an improved service to attract more riders.
- Find additional partners to help share expenses of the service.

Offering direct and continuous transportation between the Davis Campus and UC Davis Health is clearly an important and essential service for the campus. In 2018, the opportunity arose to partner with the City of Sacramento, along with Sacramento Regional Transit and Yolobus, to acquire new, electric buses to provide an express service between the two campuses. The partnership applied for and was awarded grant funding to subsidize the operating cost for the service. With added off-campus stops and opening the service to the public, we hope to be able to attract new riders and make the service more cost-effective and sustainable going forward. By retaining direct, express trips we hope existing riders will continue using the service for their cross-causeway commutes.

Intercampus Shuttle riders will see different service next year. While the private charter service operated by All West will end, shuttle riders will still have reliable, convenient options to travel between campuses with no gap in the service. The existing service will end on a Friday and the new shuttle will start the Monday after.

The shuttle is clearly an important service for the campus, but the high cost of running a private charter isn’t sustainable. Higher ridership in prior years have prompted us to look at other solutions that can provide comparable service, with an eye toward increased service in the future to help boost ridership.

The new service is modeled on both the existing UC Davis/All West Charter service and the similar Yolobus commuter express routes from Davis to Sacramento.

Bus Type
The expanded bus service will use new electric buses built this year in California, specifically for SacRT and Yolobus to use on this route. These new buses will have free Wi-Fi, USB charging, and real time tracking for up to date arrival information.
The buses will have seating capacity for 33. The new buses are battery electric powered, producing zero tail-pipe emissions and will help our region achieve air quality goals and reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. The buses improve boarding and disembarking with:

- No stairs
- Two doors
- Bus lowers at stops making wheelchair loading easier

**Bus Capacity**

The existing All West shuttles have seating for 47 or 56 passengers, while the new buses have seating capacity for 33. While the electric buses have fewer seats than the charter shuttle, because they will run more frequently at peak times, we anticipate being able to accommodate current riders as well as new ones. For example, during the 7am, 8am, 4pm, and 5pm peak-hour trips, the existing shuttle ridership appears to exceed 33 riders only 20% of the time. With two additional trips during these peak hours, the Causeway Connection buses are expected to have adequate seating for all riders.

As with any new service, continued monitoring will be needed to determine whether the buses are crowded in order to adjust with additional buses or schedule changes.

**Route**

The expanded route will continue to offer non-stop service between UC Davis Health and the Davis Campus during morning and afternoon periods with the same scheduled travel time as the existing service. Throughout the day, this expanded service will also include stops in downtown Sacramento and a stop in east Davis.

We are currently considering a single stop on the UC Davis campus at the Mondavi Center and some service to the Health Sciences District at the GBSF Building. The stops will include JUMP bikes for access to other parts of campus to connect with Unitrans and other services. Additional stops in Davis are under consideration at the Mace Boulevard Interchange.

At the Sacramento Campus, the new service will utilize the area on 45th and Y streets, south of the UC Davis Education Building for passenger loading and drop-off. This site is close to Scrubs Café, restrooms, charging infrastructure and with the build-out of Aggie Square, will be the center of the UC Davis Health Campus. There is a planned bike shelter for this site as well, for secure long-term bike parking.

The service will stop near downtown Sacramento on P St. (westbound) and Q St. (eastbound) between. This will provide access to downtown Sacramento while avoiding travel in the most congested areas near the Capitol. It will also provide for good transit connections to RT Light Rail lines, as well as regional express buses from outlying areas, such as Roseville, Elk Grove and El Dorado County.

**Timing:**

From the existing once-per-hour service, we expect that the increased frequency will be during peak commute periods with three trips per hour to provide both quick service between the UC Davis campuses and more flexibility for existing and new riders.

The updated schedule currently is available. Please review and provide input.

**Hours of Operation**

The Causeway Connection service is being planned to run during approximately the same timespan as the current Intercampus Shuttle, with service operating on weekdays only.
The first buses would arrive at each campus around 6:30 a.m., with the last buses leaving each campus at 8:20 p.m.

**Bike Capacity**
The Causeway Connection buses have front racks to accommodate 3 bikes on each bus. When two buses run each hour, that will allow for 6 bikes (and three buses per hour will accommodate 9 bikes).

Folding bikes are allowed to be carried into the bus and will not displace any passengers. Regular bikes are not allowed inside. Secure bike parking will be available at the campus bus stop locations in locked bike cages. Bikeshare and other campus mobility options will also provide connectivity from the bus stops to many campus destinations. Passengers who need mobility or disability assistance will be able to use the Yolobus or SacRT paratransit service or the TAPS mobility assistance shuttle at the Davis campus and the campus shuttles at the Sacramento campus.

**Seatbelts**
*As with other Yolobus and SacRT buses, the new buses will not have seatbelts. Public buses without seatbelts is common and this is the current approach used by both transit districts in their operations throughout the region on freeways including on routes across the I80 causeway.*

The new buses will be operated by the professional drivers from SacRT and Yolobus. The drivers will have training specific to these buses and these routes. The SacRT and Yolobus transit districts have rigorous safety policies, trainings, and refresher trainings.

**Fees:**
The new service will follow the Sacramento Regional Transit fare structure, $2.50 for a single ride and $100 for a monthly pass. Riders will be able to use the regional Connect Card or the RT Mobile Payment app (Zip Pass) to purchase monthly, daily, or single-ride fares, and those passes will be valid on all RT and Yolobus services.

Undergraduate students will ride for free on the new service by showing their student ID. **Monthly Subsidies for UC Davis employees and graduate students:**

- UC Davis Health employees - $65 monthly.
- Davis Campus employees and graduate students - $30 monthly or higher, still under consideration.
### UC Davis Intercampus Shuttle Ridership 2018*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Staff Avg. Riders WB</th>
<th>Visitor Avg. Riders WB</th>
<th>Equiv Days</th>
<th>Daily Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan-18</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>1,964</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-18</td>
<td>1,456</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr-18</td>
<td>1,401</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-18</td>
<td>2,497</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-18</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul-18</td>
<td>1,086</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug-18</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-18</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-18</td>
<td>1,889</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-18</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>16,470</td>
<td>2,257</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data for December 2018 not available at time of posting

### UC Davis Intercampus Shuttle Historic Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data for December 2018 not available at time of posting

'13-'17 chng: -43% -43% -12% -23% -32% -38% -36% -35% -36% -44% -26% -18% -6% -33% -33%
Mary C.

I am a Sacramento resident and faculty at UC Davis. Since 2006 I have travelled daily between Sacramento and Davis and when I first arrived my door to door commute was 23 minutes of driving. As we all know, in the last handful of years that commute has gotten progressively worse. Realizing that I was part of the problem, my family went down to one car and I started riding the UCD/UCDMC shuttle every day. My commute time in the afternoon often exceeds 1 hour and 15 minutes door to door and though it is a substantial increase the only thing that makes it tolerable is that I am able to work. The cancellation of this shuttle and the replacement with the “causeway connection” will dramatically impact me and I will likely need to return to driving. The proposed extra stops will add substantially to the commute time and the projected increase (<15 min) is completely out of touch with commute reality. It is not only the daily commute, but downtown congestion when an event is happening in the Golden One Center (and eventually the Railyards) will make this ride very long. In addition with just about ½ the seats available, I will no longer be certain that I can get a seat and arriving late to a class I am teaching is simply not an option. The minimal express buses during peak commute hours do not make up for this. There is not enough wiggle room in a schedule to tolerate not being able to get on an express bus because of lack of seats, and then waiting 30 minutes for another bus that is not express. Finally, the lack of seatbelts in this type of bus, traveling upwards of 65-70 mph on the I80 corridor is a catastrophic accident waiting to happen.

Let’s be clear and honest – something the UCD administration has definitely not been up to this point. The buses are smaller, less safe, less conducive to working, will carry fewer bikes, cost riders more, and increase the commute time substantially. How is that replacement service? Yes, it may help the greater community, I don’t actually know how many people would cross the causeway on this bus that don’t already use the Yolo transit bus. It will return me to my car each day. Please understand, that no matter how UCD spins this, the current shuttle rider group is large and actively working for a better solution.

Lisa R.

Dear Yolobus planners,

I am a PhD candidate at UC Davis and recently moved from Davis to Sacramento, largely due to the rapidly rising housing prices in Davis. I specifically chose a house 1 mile away from the UCD Medical Center so that I could ride the affordable and efficient shuttle bus that goes between campuses. My story is not unique; I have met countless students, faculty and staff who have bought houses in my neighborhood because during their recruitment, they were promised the option to easily commute from Sacramento.

One month ago, I learned that UC Davis will eliminate the existing shuttle service and replace it with an inferior public transit option that will be operating under the SacRT and Yolobus name. Even though the planning process must have begun at least 2 years ago, why it took so long to disclose the changes and involve us in the process is beyond my comprehension.

I understand that you do not represent UC Davis and the new buses will be 100% owned by SacRT and Yolobus, but UC Davis is still covering the operating costs. Therefore, my voice should matter to you too.

There is a multitude of reasons why the new transit line is not an acceptable substitute for what we have now. To be brief, the new buses will be longer in duration (likely double), 70% more expensive, risk leaving commuters without a seat, less comfortable and less safe. In spite of this, the planners have continued to insist that the new transit line is here to improve our commutes.

I have attended the recent town hall meetings and spent dozens of hours of my free (and working) time to better understand the reasons behind these changes. I have come to the conclusion that the project is not data-
driven, but rather vision-driven, and the planners do not want to adapt to new information from their current shuttle riders. Copied below from Acrossthecauseway.com are some debunked reasons for the new plans:

**Claim:** The impetus for the new buses is to improve the shuttle riders’ experience.  
**Fact:** We believe the experience will be much worse (see the open letter on this website with > 500 signatures) and thus, we requested that they improve the proposed bus route by creating a survey to quantitatively understand our needs. Mr. Dulcich has purposefully delayed our request for a poll until after the deadline for the final schedule on November 18th. The planners are actively denying input from the shuttle riders in order to continue with their misguided plans unobstructed.

**Claim:** The bus services are changing because ridership in recent years has been in decline [1].  
**Fact:** The data used to justify the shuttle cancellation is flawed:  
- The planners have reported on ridership data gathered by headcounts provided by the charter bus service. However, more careful analysis indicates that the dataset is incomplete. By contrast, long-time riders have reported that ridership has steadily increased.  
- The planners are estimating current and future revenue from flawed back-of-the-envelope calculations rather than using real ticket sales. Their calculations of current ticket sales estimate $3.50 in sales per bus (1-2 riders), which is likely off by an order of magnitude.  
- The planners have yet to collate, analyze, and/or provide data collected on ticket sales through TAPS and the cashier’s office.

In the town hall meetings, Mr. Dulcich acknowledged the new transit line is justified by inaccurate ridership and revenue values.

**Claim:** UCD cannot afford to keep the current shuttle line.  
**Fact:** At all four of the Nov 6 and 7 town hall meetings, no budget hardline was provided that indicated that UCD could not afford the current shuttle line. One simple solution that has yet to be explored is to retain the current shuttle system and sell tickets to the general public to offset the costs. Mr. Dulcich responded that it’s an “interesting point”.

**Claim:** The new bus line will save us money and make the university “recession proof.”  
**Fact:** According to Mr. Dulcich during the Nov 7 town hall meeting, UCD plans to contribute the same monetary amount toward the operation of the new public bus line, thus not resulting in any saving. If anything, the new service is more costly; in order to provide the same level of service (passenger capacity, frequency of express routes, etc.) as the current intercampus shuttle, supplementary funding from additional grants, which have not yet been obtained, would be necessary.

As a student at UC Davis, I would expect that our leadership and it’s partners would uphold the same data-driven planning and transparency that my fellow peers and mentors live up to. I am appalled to be associated with such a hypocritical academic institution and I earnestly hope it can address our concerns.

*Mikel D.*

I am writing to express concerns about the proposed service designed to replace the UC Davis shuttle between the Sacramento and Davis campuses.

I have been using the shuttle for over two years, since I began working at UC Davis (I live in Sacramento). I deliberately looked to purchase a home within biking or walking distance of the medical center because of the shuttle service, which certainly was more appealing than commuting by car. I have appreciated the ability to get
work done on the shuttle during my commute. The proposed changes are very stressful to those of us who rely on this shuttle to get us to work safely and on time.

My main concerns about the proposed service include:

- lack of bike storage
- inadequate seating
- safety concerns about the lack of seat belts
- limited stops on the Davis campus: I work on the veterinary campus, and walking from Mondavi is around 25 minutes. Not only is this incredibly inconvenient, but in the dark or inclement weather, this will not be feasible or safe
- increased commute time in addition to the aforementioned difficulty in getting to Mondavi from various points on campus (especially without a bicycle)

I appreciate the attempt to improve service, but a public bus is not a realistic way to serve the ongoing needs of the UC Davis community and will not reduce traffic congestion on the causeway, as many of us will seek alternative ways to get to work, including driving more frequently.

Thank you for your time.

Lisa R.

It seems there is still a notion that increased frequency is the most desirable feature of the new transit line, despite numerous attempts to explain what we want. In my personal letter, the open letter and the 4 recent town halls, we have been saying that we want:

1. hourly express lines (4 is still not enough, especially when we currently have 15),
2. nobody left at the curb during commute hours,
3. the same priced tickets,
4. similar bike capacity,
5. similar comfort (i.e. no standing),
6. and seatbelts (see [here](#) and [here](#) for news about the 2006 intercampus shuttle crash on Hwy 50).

Clearly, the message about what we desire in a service is not getting across and it is in the Partners' best interest to avoid collecting survey data to quantitatively understand our needs. In yesterday's town hall meeting, it was disclosed that the possibility of polling existing riders was intentionally delayed until after the November 18th deadline for a final route and schedule. Actively not collecting data can only be interpreted as intentionally steering away from obstacles that might delay your misguided grand plan opening in April.

Speaking of data, the "26.4% decline in ridership" has been debunked and Matt Dulcich and Anthony Palmere have agreed that the current values you have on ridership should not be trusted. I have looked at those data, as well as budget estimates that your team has relied on, and they vastly underestimate ridership and revenue return. To continue to use these numbers as support for the changes is dishonest and surprising.

Finally, UC Davis is spending the same amount of money, if not more, on the future transit line. In addition, it's investing $1.6 million dollars per year in operating costs, half of which it hopes to get back through grant funding, but that's a lot of financial liability put on the line. I understand that this new transit line must serve other populations, but it seems insensitive to imply that we should feel obligated to sacrifice features we depend on when our institution is spending the same amount.
If you have any more comments to continue this dialogue and more importantly, let us know how you can reassure us that our concerns are being met, please let me know.

Elizabeth G.

I am writing because I would like to express my concerns regarding the new proposed bus service from UC Davis campus to the UC Davis Medical Center campus.

I have several concerns regarding the service:

1.) The proposed schedule does not include enough express routes. The bulk of the ridership is currently a.) commuters, and b.) students shuttling between campuses for classes, labs, and internships. I urge the Yolo Bus planners to please add more express runs especially during peak hours.

2.) The new bus service can only accommodate three bikes. The current buses have room for eight bikes, whereas the new buses will only have room for three bikes. Again, I urge the planners to please consider adding a bike rack to the back of the bus (in addition to the bike rack on the front of the bus) so that the bus service can accommodate more bikes. I understand that many people in Woodland and Sacramento still use cars, but the Davis population of riders heavily rely on bicycles as a form of transportation. Reducing the number of bicycles on the bus effectively cripples those riders who depend on their bikes at either end of the stop as a mode of transportation.

3.) The cost of the monthly bus pass is too high. All students and employees currently pay $45 per month for a pass. Under the new service we would be charged $100 per month for a bus pass. Many of us are low income and this increase in cost is unsustainable. I urge the planners to please consider an alternate fare schedule. I would like to suggest a monthly ride card that is route specific. That is, those of us who are only interested in this particular route (UCD to UCDMC) could buy a pass that only allows us to ride this specific route for a reduced amount. I speak on behalf of many riders when I say that I have no need for the connect card. I do not travel on the bus anywhere else in Sacramento, nor would I even if I had the connect card. A route specific card for a discounted price (~$50 per month) would be much appreciated.

4.) Lack of data. I think that many of these concerns would not have been an issue in the first place if the university and the city had collected data on the current ridership, and the demand for an expanded route. I think that the city would find that we are employees and students who work long hours and we simply want to take an express bus to/from work. I would also like to ask the city to poll the current ridership to help inform their work as they continue to build the schedule, and make improvements to the bus.

Frank S.

It is essential there are direct buses between UCD campus and UCDMC medical center. Having multiple stops and increasing commute times will result in most of us driving. The direct buses are only needed at the start of work and end of work.

Amy F.

I’m writing to express my concerns about the new proposed transit line between the UCD campuses. I have been a shuttle commuter for over three years and have structured much of my life around the shuttle and it’s timing. My wife also recently took a job at UCD based on the ability to utilize the shuttle service to commute.

I’m all for transit, I could drive but I choose to use the shuttle even though it takes longer because of the reduction of my carbon footprint as well as the community and ability to work on the shuttle. However, the
proposal as it stands is simply not feasible for myself, my wife, or many of my fellow riders. The final proposal is due in just a few weeks, yet the first public forum wasn’t held until October.

Numerous concerns were brought up included safety, bike capacity, and schedule which have yet to be resolved. We have also asked for the data driving these decisions and have yet to be provided with it.

Many of my fellow riders and myself have purchased homes, sold cars, and made major life decisions around this shuttle, so while I understand that in starting a transit route there is always uncertainty this is not simply a new transit route it’s replacing a service that has existed for 20 years. This is evidenced by the nearly 600 people who have signed a letter in protest of the proposed changes.

I am writing to ask the board to delay the implementation of this shuttle to allow time to collect public comments and data allowing them to best service this population. We are excited by this partnership but have real concerns about its ability as proposed to serve the ridership

Richard L.

I am one of the more senior users, I expect. I live in Davis and use the shuttle daily to get to my laboratory on the medical campus. I can’t claim any special hardship since I am in charge of my own schedule, but the availability and convenience of the shuttle allows me to save driving each day, and affords a chance to catch up on my massive e-mail backlog. But it’s still 1.5-2 h of travel. If there aren’t going to be express routes, and all buses have to spend time navigating to lots of stops in Davis and Sacramento, that will add at least 30 min if not more to the commute. That would be a great step down in convenience and quality of life (and the famous work-life balance).

Also, if capacity is such that many people have to stand, then it will be impossible to read or do any text-based activities, so it will be very important that there should be adequate seating available.

Diana T.

Although I am an infrequent rider of the UCD bus from the Davis campus to the Sacramento campus, I am writing to protest the proposed changes. I am able to use the bus in its current form because it does not have additional stops. The proposed new line with additional stops will not be practical for me. As such, I would incur the additional cost of driving to and parking in Sacramento when I need to visit the medical campus. Furthermore, I would contribute to traffic and air pollution to a greater extent then I currently do.

Please reconsider these changes,

Renee T

I wanted to provide input about the planned Yolobus replacement for the UCD Shuttle, as a rider who commutes to UCDMC from UC Davis.

The plus: I am happy about the plan to have electric buses.

However, my biggest concern is the lack of seatbelts on the new buses. A colleague of mine was on the bus that overturned on the highway 10 years ago, and was injured. I would not be keen to ride a bus on the highway (especially I-80 through Sacramento where all the highways meet) with no seatbelt. I would drive rather than taking the risk of riding in a bus on the highway with no seatbelts.

Also, the elimination of the UC Davis West Campus stop would make it inconvenient for me to ride the bus. I currently bike to the West Campus stop.
To make other stops (like Mace Park & Ride) feasible, there would need to be bike lockers. I would not leave my bike unattended all day at Target or at the Park and Ride unless it is locked in a bike locker.

Thank you for considering these concerns!

**Heike W.**

I use the shuttle between GBSF and the Education building for teaching. Abolishing the GBSF stop will force me to drive and will make me reconsider my teaching commitments. Maybe I should just stop being IOR of a major medical school course if the school no longer provides a fast and save way to connect the medical school campuses. Mrak Hall is only convenient for administrators and not educators.

The proposed changes absolutely do not serve my needs. There has to be a stop at GBSF and the Silo to effectively connect the campuses. If not, why even pretend that this would serve UC Davis? It would be another Yolo county bus that stops at the hospital.

**Nycole C.**

I use the inter campus shuttle regularly and rely on it to get to classes on the main campus and meetings back on the medical campus.

Removing the bus and elongating the commute time will make work and school next to impossible.

This transportation is incredibly important to me and many fellow students/faculty.

I hope the committees involved reconsider the discussed changes for the sake of all commuters between campuses.

**Kevin K.**

I would like to provide commentary on the proposed causeway connection. I attended one of the town hall meetings, and I learned the activists in that meeting did not represent my needs and had ZERO interest in representing any needs other than their own. I am grateful to have the opportunity to provide my perspective.

I currently use SacRT bus 23, blue train, and yolobus 43R express. I am interested in the expansion portion of the shuttle that could give me more commute options. I do use the shuttle between campus and ucdh occasionally as I have official business at ASB and Davis Tower now and then.

I am looking to expand the use of the shuttle in my commute. It is my perspective that ONE well placed stop at a triple train light rail station that could open up westward option. Bewteen gold, green, and blue trains (and connecting busses) there is a huge coverage of the region. If the campus shuttle were to stop at one light rail station that has all 3 trains, it could serve a huge potential population. In my opinion, the shuttle currently only helps commuters in a small pocket around UCDH. I think the the expanded shuttle service could do the same service for a good portion of the region semi-near light rail and provide a greater good over the small pocket of folks around ucdh.

For folks who do not live around UCDH, the options to Davis are limited. If you were in Davis, there are more targeted options (multiple 43 express) that are simply a focus of yolobus serving yolo residents. I’m ok with that (in my past I have spent 27 years living in Davis and Woodland). Im grateful yolobus operates the single 43R. I do wish there was more 43R since 42A/B has so many stops, but i do have a way to/from davis with either bus. The folks complaining about adding 10-15 minutes to their shuttle commute need to experience a bus, to
the train, to bus 42A. Public transit is not about getting door to door without any waiting. That is a fact I accept. I wish others would too.

As can be seen in yolobus 43R, express busses can have a few stops and still be quick. In my opinion a few well placed stops could serve the greater good. I suggest that riders wanting to use the causeway connection could be responsible for getting themselves to a transit center or light rail station. So it seems natural that a stop anywhere between 7th and Cap and 13th and Q would hit all 3 train lines. Another natural stop could be yolobus transit center on West Cap near Jefferson. And as riders of 43R know, west cap is quicker when 50 west is clogged up going to the causeway...so a stop in west sac might actually save some time considering how much 50 west has been slowing down recently.

I felt like people in the town hall were being bullies, unprogressive, selfish, and un-green. I am not part of that crowd.

Thank you for your time. I hope you can see that the region is full of UCD workers. I think the super vocal folks who live around UCDH do not represent the region. I think there are more commuters who could be served by just a few stops in the causeway connection.

Please feel free to contact me to answer questions or provide any more commentary. I am not sure I can make the hearing since I work a later shift. I do want my opinion to be heard so if there are any clarifications we can work, I'm game.

**Added 11/12/19**

I thought of one more thing over the weekend. The folks being vocal about this want campus to campus express and they are complaining about the price increase from $1.50. My perspective is that $1.50 is below market value and likely to be unsustainable. Yolobus has a $1 premium on express commuter rides like 43R. I am thankful that a SacRT daily covers that extra $1 so my commute costs top out at $7. I think if the causeway connection were to follow the same model, the price for campus to campus direct ride would be $3.50 each way. They should be grateful the price being tossed around is $2.50 and doesn't pull the extra $1 into the cost for express.

_Eleonora G._

I live in the Bay Area where my family is based, run a research lab on Davis campus, but teach in the medical school campus in Sacramento. I vanpool to Davis and depend on the UC-dedicated shuttle service to ensure I can show up on time to teach my classes. If the cancellation goes through, my commute to work and to Sacramento will be dramatically impacted, as I will need to drive my car to go to work instead of relying on more environmentally friendly choices.

Thanks for your consideration of UC Davis employees.

**Daniel M.**

I am writing to comment on the new UCD Med Center route. I currently rely on the UCD/UCMC shuttle to get me to work at UC Davis from my home in Sacramento. I take the bus nearly every day, typically at rush hour times (between 7:00am and 9:00 am). I live in Sacramento because I cannot afford a home in Davis.

I am concerned that due to the smaller capacity of the buses as compared to the current shuttle buses (approximately half the size) and the plan for just a single morning express route, I will have an incredible amount of difficulty making it to work to teach or lead meetings if I have to be on campus at 8:00 or 9:00am. Given the fact that morning buses are already at or near capacity, the single morning express route for the new service is sure to be impacted, and I can imagine frequently being forced to wait to take the next bus, thus
missing my class or meeting. I have back issues and I'm unable to stand for 30-40 minutes at a time, so I would not be able to ride the bus if it were standing room only. I absolutely cannot be twenty or thirty minutes late for class, so if this new route is scheduled as planned I will no longer take the bus and drive instead.

I am hoping additional morning express routes will be considered.

**Thomas J.**

I have started a research collaboration early this year that requires me and my students/staff to travel regularly from UC Davis to UCDMC in Sacramento. Using the bus provides an escape from using cars, which must navigate severe traffic congestion during parts of the day and search hard for a parking spot in Sacramento. For that reason, my staff prefers to take the bus. Moreover, the staff feels that taking the bus helps reduce the carbon effluent contributing to global warming.

Over the years, I've used the bus to meet and work in Sacramento. The service helps bridge the 2 UCD campuses in Davis and Sacramento. I hope you will reconsider your recent plan, which appears penny-wise but very pound foolish.

**Jason M.**

**Comments from a concerned Sacramento citizen and Intercampus Shuttle rider regarding the proposed SacRT/YCTD/UCD public transit route**

November 10, 2019

SacRT and YCTD Board Members,

I have ridden the UCD Intercampus Shuttle daily for the last 4.5 years. Neither my wife nor I own a car and I either walk, bicycle, or use mass transit to get everywhere I need to go in life and have done so for 18 years. I accepted my job at UC Davis and chose my home location in Sacramento based on the fact that there is a **flexible hourly direct transit option** from the UCD Med Center to the UCD campus. This is a service UCD has offered to their employees consistently for over 30 years, which is by now inherently an employee benefit. This allows my wife and I to have good jobs in the two cities, although the commute for me is still just tolerable.

Unfortunately, **UC Davis is abandoning me and upwards of 500 other students, staff, faculty, and patients** by eliminating this shuttle as we know it.

I am an ardent supporter of public and private efforts to reduce the number of cars in our transportation system by introducing options that are better, more convenient, and more affordable than driving an automobile. The most obvious and maximally impactful solution for lowering emissions, reducing traffic congestion, reducing traffic fatalities, and increasing people’s travel happiness is removing single occupancy vehicles from the road in favor of mass transit. For example, moving a passenger from a single occupancy vehicle to a diesel bus reduces per person total emissions 9 times more than switching a passenger from a diesel bus to an electric bus1.

Unfortunately, there is no evidence that the proposed elimination of UCD's Intercampus Shuttle will reduce the number of cars. In fact, the riders’ anecdotal and emerging objective evidence points to many of the 500 shuttle riders finding other ways to get across the causeway, most likely in single occupancy vehicles. SacRT and YCTD are banking almost completely on UCD providing 500 weekly riders and more that $600,000 per year to subsidize this public route.
People chose among commute options based on a large set of factors, some of which are transit frequency and transit power energy source. But research shows that commute duration is a vastly larger concern than frequency, especially for travel between cities [1]. Research also shows that happiness in one’s commute is a large factor in choosing the commute option [2,3]. For better or worse, private shuttles for workers are consistently rated better than public options for happiness and preference [1]. The good thing is that any well occupied bus, public or private, is removing cars from the roads.

$$1.89 = \frac{(410 \text{ gCO}_2/\text{passenger}/\text{mile} \text{[SOV]} - 11 \text{ gCO}_2/\text{passenger}/\text{mile} \text{[EV Bus Freeway]})}{(56 \text{ gCO}_2/\text{passenger}/\text{mile} \text{[Diesel Bus Freeway]} - 11 \text{ gCO}_2/\text{passenger}/\text{mile} \text{[EV Bus Freeway]})}$$

With this research in mind, UC Davis did zero investigation of the 500+ current shuttle riders to determine whether they would prefer the proposed new transit route before they made seemingly immovable decisions that drastically affect mine and the other riders’ lives. SacRT, YCTD, the City of Sacramento, and the City of Davis followed suit and collected little to no hard evidence to support their claims that making the change as proposed will decrease vehicles on the causeway or make for a better commute for the likely riders. The parties involved have now been awarded millions of public dollars with virtually no evidence to back their inflated claims in the associated grant proposals. This is not how public agencies and research universities should be making decisions. As a professor that explicitly trains engineers to stick to evidence informed decision making, it is shameful that the agencies involved would violate this social contract with the public, their students, and their employees.

I do not yet understand why UC Davis, SacRT, YCTD, and the cities’ leadership are so fixated on this exact proposed plan when hundreds of current shuttle riders have repeatedly and clearly expressed how this plan will negatively affect them. Two hundred of the ~500 current riders concerns are expressed in detail at our website: www.acrossthecauseway.com

Nearly 600 individuals have signed their names to the letter to express their support for the terms outlined there. Chancellor May and Vice Chancellor Lubarsky, Health Campus CEO, did not respond directly to our letter and have seemingly dismissed our requests of retaining the shuttle and having seats at the decision making table.

If they and you gave us a seat at that table, we could discuss the many alternatives that are both better for the public and for the current shuttle riders. Why the involved agencies are not considering these is unbeknownst to me and the other riders. For example, here are some alternatives that should satisfy all concerned parties:

1. Retain the UCD shuttle exactly as it is, except allow the public to buy tickets. The fares from the public ticket sales can be used to increase capacity if there is demand. The buses awarded to the regional transit agencies can then be used to improve other routes. There is a SacRT/YCTD 2036 goal to ultimately convert all buses to electric, so why can’t it be started on other existing public routes where there would be no turmoil?

2. Retain the UCD shuttle exactly as it is. Add the planned public bus route adjacent as proposed with the electric buses. Do both. This increases capacity, frequency, and transit options for the public and does not degrade the current service.

3. Retain the UCD shuttle exactly as it is. Use the electric buses to make the 42A/B have higher frequency and express options AND/OR to make the 43/43R/44 more frequent.

4. Implement the proposed line and eliminate the existing shuttle but retain all of the most important features that the current shuttle riders want: hourly direct service med center<->mondavi center, no increase in direct service commute duration, seat belts on all seats, $1.50/ride cost, $45/month cost, seats for all people at peak times, 5:30AM-9:00PM operating time, extra stops on campus for those that don’t/can’t walk as far (genome center/silo), 10+ bicycles carried per bus, etc.
All of these options and more are possible. The leaders can make changes without enraging the current riders and causing them to find other transportation across the causeway or, even worse, quitting their jobs.

The concerned 200+ riders have reached out directly to Chancellor May and Vice Chancellor Lubarsky over a week ago. Both have dismissed our letter and concerns for all intents and purposes. We do not understand why the Chancellors have so little regard for their staff’s, students’, faculty’s, and patients’ opinions. Chancellor May, just last week, addressed 500 other employee’s concern about lack of pay almost instantly yet we only get to talk to the Chancellor’s stonewalling government relations officer. We are not government! We are UCD’s employees and students.

SacRT and YCTD still have a chance to be outstanding public agencies by postponing the decisions that will result in the elimination of the UCD Intercampus Shuttle and telling UC Davis that they must address the riders’ concerns. With this extended time and a requirement to include the riders in decision making, surely an alternative solution that suits all parties involved (including the actual riders) can be reached, likely with a design that makes transit better for everyone across the causeway. I plead with the transit agencies to do this for me, the existing 500+ riders, and potential future riders.

**Nadean B.**

I live and as faculty, am based on the Davis campus. I used the current bus for 5 years to teach on the Sac campus to med students, allowing me to maintain my normal bike commute to and from home to Davis campus. I stopped using the bus only after buying an EV vehicle. The planet is dying, UC Davis states it has a "sustainable" philosophy that apparently has been abandoned.

The current University run buses are heavily used, I have had to wait an hour for the next bus during peak times when capacity is reached multiple times. It is inconvenient, but people do this because the service fits their work-life balance. Many people also take a bike on the bus to facilitate their car-less transportation philosophies. The proposed new schedule is inadequate and will fail to achieve its goals. You will be putting more people back in their cars, further contributing to the Causeway daily log jam.

Over the longer term you will drive people out of this area by replacing the current service with something woefully less user friendly and inadequate. Thank you for weakening the tax base further and helping the earth die all that much faster. Yolobus cannot substitute for the UCD Davis intercampus shuttle. To assume this is the case shows you do not use these services and have no first-hand information about how either system works. It is the stupidest plan ever in the 8 years I've been at UC Davis.

**Ana-Maria I.**

I am not a regular shuttle user, but my husband has been taking the shuttle daily for the last 10 years. We have one car and carpool to the Heath Sciences Lot, where he takes the shuttle. I also use the shuttle occasionally, for meetings in Sacramento, so I do not need to drive (and find parking). My department for example uses the shuttle for visitors, when they have to go to SOM campus. First time I rode the shuttle was actually when I interviewed for my job at UCD; I had 1 day of interviews in Sacramento and 1 in Davis, so I used the shuttle to get to Sacramento. Other current users of the shuttle are graduate students who TA classes for the classes in Sacramento.

The proposed new buses will not be of interests to most of the current riders (daily or occasional users), both due to the lack of amenities (no seats, no seat-belts, no space for bikes, no convenient stops, no way of working during the ride, inconvenient for those with disabilities or mobility issues) and to the increase commute time (likely at least double the current one). Over the past few years the commute time has increased even for the
shuttle; my husband actually changed his schedule to take a later shuttle, because the peak time was often full and he had to wait for the next one anyway.

I used public transportation myself in Davis and Sacramento for more than 1 year before buying a car, and I know how inefficient (and unreliable) it can be. There is no hard data to support the claim that the proposed new buses will have a commute time that is only 15 min longer. And since stops will be eliminated on UCD campus, people will need additional time to get to the Mondavi stop. If the UCDMC shuttle will be discontinued, we will become a two car household. This will allow us to commute at times that are less busy and not add more time (that cannot be used to work) to the commute.

Rose C.

I have been riding the shuttle for nine years and I can tell you that upon learning about the proposed shuttle changes, the past few weeks have been extremely frustrating, stressful and unnecessary. I have gleaned three points from the five town halls I attended and the information on the website.

1. The university is making important decisions based on inaccurate data.
2. The university is not interested in efficiency.
3. The university is not putting the values or needs of its employees, faculty, staff, or students first.

We are a world class university and we should be able to figure out a simple transit route that shuttles between Davis and Sacramento. We have experts on campus in green transportation, data analysis and marketing yet the shuttle has not been appropriately advertised, data about how many people ride/how much money is generated has not been collected and it seems the university is focusing on the green transportation solution being zero emissions buses. Zero emissions buses are great, however if they are empty because all of the current riders choose to take their low occupancy vehicles, then the questions is, does it actually solve the problem it is trying to solve?

I am on the shuttle now, in traffic from the long weekend. This bus holds 56 people and there are 45 passengers. Meaning with the new bus system that only seats 33, 12 people would have been left behind today. That is unacceptable.

A few years back when the shuttles broke down more frequently I was left behind a few times. I chose to take Lyft with a few other riders to ensure I did not get to work late. Unfortunately many riders will give up on the shuttle after being left behind once because the most important thing we have found for shuttle riders is reliability. If the shuttle is not dependable I will not be able to ride because getting to work on time is important. The proposed extra stops will only add to my commute and potentially fill the shuttle before it even arrives at my stop.

Over the nine years that I have been riding the shuttle I have seen ridership increase, however the official university stance is that the ridership is decreasing. I believe that is false. Many on the shuttle are trying to lower their carbon footprint and the shuttle is a great way to do that. If the goal is to decrease congestion on the causeway the university needs to look closely at how the new shuttle proposal focuses on that goal. Or not.

Communication between campuses has been horrible. Riders at the health system get different information than riders at the Davis campus. This is a shuttle that literally connects our campuses yet TAPS and PATS can’t even figure out how to communicate timely and effectively with all who ride the shuttle. A bigger question is why we have two different departments, or at the very least someone overseen both of them. Shuttle riders have been able to work together (many times while stuck in traffic) to ensure that all are properly informed...and it’s not even our job!
My biggest question is why is the university still moving forward even though almost all of the shuttle riders are sharing feedback that the new proposal will not work for them. If the shuttle was a cost savings I would see how that may be a reason to move forward, however the university officials have told us that the same money will be spent, so no cost savings. The original plan was to have the new buses come online in September of 2020. Given the lack of accurate information and pushback from riders my request is that the university push back to the original timeline to ensure the new bus rollout can be done efficiently and effectively.

I also request that the shuttle riders have a seat at the table in the decision making process. Clearly the people making the decisions do not ride the shuttle therefore don’t have an accurate understanding of how it works in reality.

I have attached the notes compiled from the meetings held last week in case you would like to read the detailed questions and answers.

**Mandy R.**

I am a staff member at UC Davis and I am a supporter of public transport. Commuters between Sacramento and UC Davis could benefit a lot from the proposed Causeway Connection, if it builds a reputation for being reliable and timely. I want as many incentives for commuters to take public transport, and increasing the price by almost than double, making a longer commute, and making it more crowded are counterintuitive to that. Please do what you can to decrease the price, offer as many express busses as possible during peak commuting hours, and offer as many busses on this route as possible.

**Note from the Clerk to the Board:** A comment was received from a shuttle user who later requested the comments not be made public due to personal information contained therein.

**Nichole L.**

I am a graduate student at UC Davis and I use the shuttle everyday to get from my home in Davis to my workplace at Shriners Children’s Hospital. I am very concerned about the proposed changes to the shuttle. For one I think the stop in downtown Davis is unnecessary. According to one map I have seen the downtown stop is very lose to the Mondavi center and I don’t see much of a point in putting a stop downtown when there is no free daylong parking downtown anyway to avoid paying at the university. I think a much better use of the other Davis stop would be either at the genome center or silo. Many people taking this shuttle (myself included) often have to drop off samples or attend meetings at either the genome center or silo area. Getting rid of these stops will require students, staff, and faculty who need to get these areas to walk 20 minutes or more which for some is not feasible.

I am also very concerned about how long this route will take. I understand that it was originally estimated to take no longer than the current shuttle does but I do not see how this is possible given all of the extra stops in Sacramento. The shuttle also already chronically runs late in the late afternoon/evening starting around 5 pm. It has taken me almost an hour to get from Sacramento to Davis before with the current route at the 5:15 departure time because the shuttle was about 15-20 minutes late getting to Sacramento from Davis and then there was traffic going back to Davis. This will still be a problem and I foresee it being much worse, with the new route. It should not take almost an hour to go 20 miles. Davis and Sacramento need to come together and work
on a plan to make getting between the two cities more efficient given that more and more people are commuting between the two. Perhaps a bus only lane or something to that effect.

Lastly, I am still unclear on the cost of the monthly pass. I am a UC Davis graduate student but not a UC Davis Health Employee. What will I have to pay? Additionally, I am frustrated that UC Davis undergraduate students will be getting this service for free. Yes as a graduate student I am paid a stipend but honestly it is barely livable and, because I chose to do my dissertation work in a lab in Sacramento, I have extra commuting costs that most other graduate students do not. I am currently paying $45 a month for the intercampus shuttle pass. I am unclear if I will be paying $30 or $70 but either way I urge you to consider the financial burden you are putting on riders, including students. If the pass ends up being $70 for me, a UC Davis graduate student, it is possible I will no longer be able to afford it and will have to figure out alternatives for getting to work or will just be even tighter on money than I already am. I urge to make it clear what graduate students will be paying and advocate that because graduate students are in fact students we should be able to use it for free just like undergraduate students. If for whatever reason this is just not possible then I advocate for the $30 rate.

Please consider these points as well as others mentioned in the letter. 500+ people signed it and it is indeed representative of most riders. I have had conversations with several other riders and we are all very concerned about how this will impact our commute, finances, and ultimately quality of life as commuting staff.

**Neil F.**

I do not use the shuttle regularly any more, but we have a large number of undergraduate student research assistants supporting a number of clinical research studies. This shuttle is key to their being able to participate in these studies where they are exposed to clinical medical practice, trained in clinical research and paid enough to make it worth their while. The proposed change would severely limit the ability of many of them to continue in this program.

**Hyun K.**

My name is Hyun and I am a 4th year PhD Candidate in the Biomedical Engineering Department at UC Davis. I live in Sacramento and take the bus everyday to get to the Davis campus for both research and teaching obligations (3 classes + office hours every week). I actually lived in Davis during my first year of graduate school but moved after 9 months after my husband and I decided to forego the high-rent apartment and instead purchase a home close to the Med Center. I echo other commuters when I say that the cost of buying a home/renting in Davis was not within budget and therefore not an option for us. One of the main factors that went into our home buying process was the fact that there was a well-established, consistent transit option that would make the possibility of a convenient commute for me — and now my husband, who recently accepted a position at Davis — possible. It is *not* an exaggeration when we say that major life decisions were based around this commute. My time and quality-of-life matters to me and I would hate for it to be treated like an abstract non-issue.

The impending changes that are said to take place in April has been a source of anxiety for me already. I am excited about the idea of having a more sustainable, Earth-conscious commute option. However, I believe that this new option with its current intended route is a deterrence to those who currently ride the bus. The current route is already a long commute so to add not even just one stop but *multiple* new stops is very alarming. I have already had multiple conversations with my husband about the possibility of moving to different cities/our future job outlook at Davis and elsewhere and the possibility of perhaps driving to Davis. I feel that I am not the only one who has been stressed and am sure that others have been considering the pros and cons of driving personal automobiles to/from work as well. I very much so wish to continue taking the bus and not contribute to causeway traffic, but I am weary about giving up even more of my time/life to a longer commute that I might not even have a guaranteed seat on. I get a lot of work done on the bus currently and am not excited by the possibility of having to stand on a bus in the midst of busy causeway traffic for over an hour after a day of work.
I ask that decision-makers listen to the current ridership’s thoughts and feelings regarding new plans and make a bigger effort to acknowledge that this affects many people’s quality of life and job satisfaction. Davis and Sacramento are both great places to live and work — but only if we’re not sitting (or maybe soon even standing) in a bus for such an extended period of time. The ridership's requests are delineated in our open letter; we look forward to working with the transit leadership to implement a positive change for our campus and broader communities. Thank you.

John W.

I think the shuttle bus is necessary to promote interaction between the campuses. I use it occasionally, but some of my undergraduates and graduate students use it daily. They would not be able to work in my lab without it. Please do not discontinue this service.

Jarrod B.

I would like to submit the following comments for the public hearing on Monday, even though I will not attend:

I support the Yolobus-RT replacement shuttle bus between Davis and Sacramento, and would prefer to have the East Davis stop at the Mace Park and Ride lot, in order to allow easier transfers onto the 42 route. However, there is a caveat in that a significant number of researchers who work at Research Park Drive by the I-80/Richards intersection would be neglected. Depending on funding levels, a second county microtransit pilot program could be offered to ferry people between Research Park Drive and the 1st and C stop.

I fully support the proposed fare structure, and would like to suggest a fare of either 25 cents or $1 for minors, as only one denomination is needed to pay.
RECOMMENDATION:

The following are Board updates regarding various YCTD matters. Specific recommended actions from staff are highlighted with an asterisk. Your Board also reserves the right to take action on all items below, except for oral report items.

BACKGROUND:

a. **Oral Report**

b. **SacRT Plans to Initiate Supplemental Bus Service between SMF and Downtown Sacramento in Early 2020**

Sacramento Regional Transit (SacRT) Board of Directors recently announced an expansion of fixed-route service from downtown Sacramento to the Sacramento International Airport (SMF) terminals. This was apparently a product of the SacRT Forward process that SacRT finished in the Spring. The airport related service expansion is anticipated to go into effect as soon as Sunday, January 5, 2020. On Tuesday, December 10, 2019 SacRT staff will meet with YCTD staff to discuss service, schedule and bus stop coordination issues. No significant operational impacts to YCTD services are anticipated; however, there are unknown impacts on Yolobus airport related ridership.

SacRT plans to operate hourly bus service during off-peak times, with Sac RT’s schedule offset from the Yolobus schedule by roughly 30 minutes off from the Yolobus times, thus offering 30-minute public transit frequency between the airport and downtown Sacramento during off-peak hours, at least when Yolobus operates. For peak hours, SacRT is proposing two buses per hour, which when combined with Yolobus will offer 20-minute public transit service frequency.

Minor impacts to Yolobus customer rides originating/terminating at SMF stops can be anticipated, though the overall increase in service frequency may also positively impact ridership to Yolobus Route 42 A/B through increased awareness of public transit and improved reliability/frequency. An initial proposed SacRT service schedule and alignment are presented below. It needs to be corrected to reflect the fact that Yolobus does not run the same route 42 schedule seven days a week.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lv L/13th</th>
<th>SMF Term A</th>
<th>SMF Term B</th>
<th>Arv J/8th</th>
<th>Arv L/13th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:25a</td>
<td>3:45a</td>
<td>3:47a</td>
<td>4:04a</td>
<td>4:10a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:55a</td>
<td>4:15a</td>
<td>4:17a</td>
<td>4:34a</td>
<td>4:40a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:25a</td>
<td>4:45a</td>
<td>4:47a</td>
<td>5:04a</td>
<td>5:10a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45a</td>
<td>5:05a</td>
<td>5:07a</td>
<td>5:24a</td>
<td>5:30a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5:05a</td>
<td>5:25a</td>
<td>5:27a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5:25a</td>
<td>5:25a</td>
<td>5:42a</td>
<td>5:48a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:25a</td>
<td>5:45a</td>
<td>5:47a</td>
<td>6:04a</td>
<td>6:10a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45a</td>
<td>6:05a</td>
<td>6:07a</td>
<td>6:24a</td>
<td>6:30a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6:05a</td>
<td>6:25a</td>
<td>6:27a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6:25a</td>
<td>6:25a</td>
<td>6:42a</td>
<td>6:48a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:25a</td>
<td>6:45a</td>
<td>6:47a</td>
<td>7:04a</td>
<td>7:10a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:45a</td>
<td>7:05a</td>
<td>7:07a</td>
<td>7:24a</td>
<td>7:30a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7:05a</td>
<td>7:25a</td>
<td>7:27a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7:25a</td>
<td>7:25a</td>
<td>7:42a</td>
<td>7:48a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:25a</td>
<td>7:45a</td>
<td>7:47a</td>
<td>8:04a</td>
<td>8:10a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:45a</td>
<td>8:05a</td>
<td>8:07a</td>
<td>8:24a</td>
<td>8:30a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8:05a</td>
<td>8:25a</td>
<td>8:27a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8:25a</td>
<td>8:45a</td>
<td>8:47a</td>
<td>9:04a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:25a</td>
<td>8:45a</td>
<td>8:47a</td>
<td>9:04a</td>
<td>9:10a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:45a</td>
<td>9:05a</td>
<td>9:07a</td>
<td>9:24a</td>
<td>9:30a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>9:05a</td>
<td>9:25a</td>
<td>9:27a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>9:25a</td>
<td>9:25a</td>
<td>9:42a</td>
<td>9:48a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>9:25a</td>
<td>9:25a</td>
<td>9:42a</td>
<td>9:48a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>9:35a</td>
<td>9:55a</td>
<td>9:57a</td>
<td>10:14a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>10:05a</td>
<td>10:25a</td>
<td>10:27a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>10:25a</td>
<td>10:25a</td>
<td>10:42a</td>
<td>10:48a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>10:35a</td>
<td>10:55a</td>
<td>10:57a</td>
<td>11:14a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11:05a</td>
<td>11:25a</td>
<td>11:27a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11:25a</td>
<td>11:25a</td>
<td>11:42a</td>
<td>11:48a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11:35a</td>
<td>11:55a</td>
<td>11:57a</td>
<td>12:14p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>12:05p</td>
<td>12:25p</td>
<td>12:27p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lv L/13th</th>
<th>SMF Term A</th>
<th>SMF Term B</th>
<th>Arv J/8th</th>
<th>Arv L/13th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1:05p</td>
<td>1:25p</td>
<td>1:27p</td>
<td>1:40p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1:25p</td>
<td>1:27p</td>
<td>1:40p</td>
<td>1:42p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1:35p</td>
<td>1:55p</td>
<td>1:57p</td>
<td>2:14p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2:05p</td>
<td>2:25p</td>
<td>2:27p</td>
<td>2:40p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3:45p</td>
<td>4:05p</td>
<td>4:07p</td>
<td>4:24p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4:25p</td>
<td>4:45p</td>
<td>4:47p</td>
<td>5:04p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4:45p</td>
<td>5:05p</td>
<td>5:07p</td>
<td>5:24p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5:05p</td>
<td>5:25p</td>
<td>5:27p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5:25p</td>
<td>5:45p</td>
<td>5:47p</td>
<td>6:04p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5:45p</td>
<td>6:05p</td>
<td>6:07p</td>
<td>6:24p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6:05p</td>
<td>6:25p</td>
<td>6:27p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6:45p</td>
<td>7:05p</td>
<td>7:07p</td>
<td>7:24p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7:05p</td>
<td>7:25p</td>
<td>7:27p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7:25p</td>
<td>7:45p</td>
<td>7:47p</td>
<td>8:04p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7:45p</td>
<td>8:05p</td>
<td>8:07p</td>
<td>8:24p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8:05p</td>
<td>8:25p</td>
<td>8:27p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8:25p</td>
<td>8:45p</td>
<td>8:47p</td>
<td>9:04p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8:45p</td>
<td>9:05p</td>
<td>9:07p</td>
<td>9:24p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>9:45p</td>
<td>10:05p</td>
<td>10:07p</td>
<td>10:24p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>10:05p</td>
<td>10:25p</td>
<td>10:27p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>10:45p</td>
<td>11:05p</td>
<td>11:07p</td>
<td>11:24p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11:45p</td>
<td>12:05p</td>
<td>12:07p</td>
<td>12:24p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#142 Airport
YCTD staff is reviewing the early morning Sacramento to SMF Yolobus trips, as well as the late evening SMF to Sacramento Yolobus trips, to determine if any of those should be eliminated in SMF/downtown corridor.

SacRT proposes to route its buses virtually identically to the Yolobus Route 42A and 42B buses in downtown, with the exception that SacRT buses would stay on L Street and not be diverted to Capitol Mall. YCTD staff is considering re-routing Yolobus Routes 42A and 42B back onto L Street between 9th Street and the I-5 freeway. (Yolobus was forced off of L Street due to the Golden One Center activities; however, now, we believe L Street should be reconsidered, especially since SacRT is moving a few of its routes back to L Street.)

On Sac RT’s December 9th agenda is a proposal to allow airport passengers to ride the SacRT routes for free in January 2020, as a promotional item. Sac RT’s base cash fare is $2.50. The Yolobus base fare to or from the airport is $2.25.

c. **Update on Knights Landing Microtransit Pilot**
The YOUR Ride service continues to be well received by the Knights Landing community and customers. Recent completion of construction along County road 102 into/out of Knights Landing has resulted in improved travel times for YOUR Ride customers.

YOUR Ride Data:
Total Trips: 296
Percent Shared: 74.1%
Trips/Hour (Past 90 Days): 1.4 (No Change from October 2019)

d. **Update on Pending Bus Purchases, Electric Charging**

6 Battery-Electric Buses
All six of YCTD’s zero-emission battery-electric buses have been delivered and are onsite at the District’s
facilities.

These buses will be tested and available for training purposes (drivers, mechanics, utility workers, first responders) between now and when the UCD Medical Center/UCD Main Campus service known as Causeway Connection starts. We hope to enter one battery-electric bus into the December 14th Woodland Holiday Parade.

Charging equipment construction is progressing, with the charging dispensers installed. Final construction will also require new equipment and work from PG&E; however, that could be delayed until late January or sometime in February, meaning YCTD will need to find interim charging (e.g., SMF or something at the YCTD facility) to provide charging capability until the PG&E work is done.

Proterra Battery-Electric Buses

Construction of Bus Charging Facilities

**Other Buses**

All eight new Gillig CNG buses have been delivered and inspected. They are being retrofitted with two-way radios, fare processing equipment and automatic vehicle location system equipment and will be placed into service afterwards. There will also be bus naming contest initiated in or around January 2020.
The three new cutaway buses have been delivered and initial inspections completed. The buses are being finalized and getting wrapped with “YOUR Ride” branding in the next few weeks before being placed into microtransit and paratransit service shortly thereafter.

Gillig CNG Buses

e. **Update on CNG Station**

Trillium has taken delivery of replacement compressor equipment skids, and related equipment, and pending the necessary permits from the City of Woodland, is set to install this equipment and make the facility fully operational during the week of December 16, 2019. Training of emergency personnel and YCTD and contracted staff is being coordinated for shortly thereafter.
### Attachment

#### i. 1st Quarter Financials

**Yolo County Transportation District Performance Indicators**

**FY 2019/20 vs 2018/19**

**YEAR TO DATE THROUGH FIRST QUARTER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2019/20</th>
<th>FY 2018/19</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed Route</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>295,939</td>
<td>318,904</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expense</td>
<td>$3,526,972</td>
<td>$3,381,092</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare revenue</td>
<td>$518,225</td>
<td>$552,151</td>
<td>-6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare Box Recovery</td>
<td>14.69%</td>
<td>16.33%</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/ride</td>
<td>$11.92</td>
<td>$10.60</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue miles</td>
<td>497,086</td>
<td>495,618</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue hours</td>
<td>25,369</td>
<td>25,351</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare revenue/ride</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td>$1.73</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rides/hour</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>-7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rides/mile</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/revenue hour</td>
<td>$139.03</td>
<td>$133.37</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/revenue mile</td>
<td>$7.10</td>
<td>$6.82</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles per collision*</td>
<td>54,843</td>
<td>86,182</td>
<td>-36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles per road call</td>
<td>9,849</td>
<td>9,576</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% on-time</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare revenue per revenue mile</td>
<td>$1.04</td>
<td>$1.11</td>
<td>-6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare revenue per revenue hour</td>
<td>$20.43</td>
<td>$21.78</td>
<td>-6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Paratransit</strong></th>
<th>FY 2019/20</th>
<th>FY 2018/19</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>5,805</td>
<td>6,053</td>
<td>-4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expense</td>
<td>$444,827</td>
<td>$473,894</td>
<td>-6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare revenue</td>
<td>$28,566</td>
<td>$27,665</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare Box Recovery</td>
<td>6.42%</td>
<td>5.84%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/ride</td>
<td>$76.63</td>
<td>$78.29</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue miles</td>
<td>67,525</td>
<td>78,229</td>
<td>-13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue hours</td>
<td>3,743</td>
<td>4,071</td>
<td>-8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare revenue/ride</td>
<td>$4.92</td>
<td>$4.57</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rides/hour</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rides/mile</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/revenue hour</td>
<td>$118.84</td>
<td>$116.41</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost/revenue mile</td>
<td>$6.59</td>
<td>$6.06</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles per collision</td>
<td>80,846</td>
<td>90,884</td>
<td>-11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles per road call</td>
<td>40,423</td>
<td>18,177</td>
<td>122.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% on-time</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare revenue per revenue mile</td>
<td>$0.42</td>
<td>$0.35</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare revenue per revenue hour</td>
<td>$7.63</td>
<td>$6.80</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Preventable collision accidents, including mirror taps.*
YoloGO
Planning for the future of transit in the region

Outreach Phase 1 Summary
Introduction
During October and November 2019, more than 150 people participated in a series of pop-up workshops as part of the Yolo County Transportation District (YCTD) Comprehensive Operational Analysis, also known as YoloGO. The pop-up workshops provided an opportunity for the YoloGO Project Team to engage with various communities throughout Yolo County and get their input on how Yolobus can improve their services.

Project Overview
YoloGO will re-evaluate Yolobus’ level of service, consider new transit technologies, and identify potential changes in routes and schedules to better serve the region. YoloGO will allow Yolobus to potentially improve rider experience through more frequent service, extended service hours or additional service destinations.

Purpose, Format, and Schedule
The pop-up workshop series engaged Yolo County residents in a conversation about what they like, want to change, or see more of regarding Yolobus. At each of the pop-up workshops, the project team provided an opportunity for community members to learn about the analysis and provide their input through interactive boards.

The interactive board questions are listed below:
- Which would you choose: A faster bus ride or easier access to bus stops?
- Which would you choose: Longer hours of service or more frequent service?
- If you were king/queen for a day at Yolobus, which improvements would you make first?
- What do you think is the greatest need for transit in the region: Improved local service or improved commuter/express service?

Community members placed a sticker dot next to their answers or underneath a spectrum of answers on the interactive boards. To encourage participation and have some fun, the project team also brought a prize wheel where community members could spin the wheel and win prizes.
Board #1: Which would you choose: A faster bus ride or easier access to bus stops?
This board presented a spectrum, which asked participants to share if they would rather walk farther but have a short wait for their bus or walk a short distance and wait longer for their bus. The spectrum included five potential responses:
- I’ll avoid a walk, even if it means waiting longer
- I mostly prefer shorter walks
- I’m not sure / I don’t have a preference
- I mostly prefer shorter waits
- I will do whatever it takes to get to my destination soonest

Board #2: Which would you choose: Longer hours of service or more frequent service?
This board presented a spectrum, which asked participants to share if they would rather have Yolobus extend their hours of service or have more frequent service. The spectrum included five potential responses:
- I need to travel early mornings or late nights
- I would like to travel before or after regular commuting hours, but don't want less frequent buses
- I’m not sure / I don’t have a preference
- I would rather not wait as long, but I don't want shorter hours
- I will only take buses that come every 30 minutes
Board #3: If you were king/queen for a day at Yolobus, which improvements would you make first?
This board asked participants to prioritize potential improvement options for Yolobus. Participants were asked to place a dot next to their top three priorities on the board which included six potential responses as well as an “Other” option:

- Higher Frequency Service
- Covering places that don't currently have service
- Bus stops closer to where I go
- Weekday night service
- More Saturday service
- More Sunday service

Board #4: What do you think is the greatest need for transit in the region: Improved local service or improved commuter/express service?
This board asked participants to share if they would rather have improved local service or improved commuter/express service. This board included three options:

- Local Service (bus routes that travel within cities)
- The current distribution of bus service types is just right.
- Commuter/Express Service (bus routes that travel between cities)
There were five pop-up workshops throughout the months of October and early November. The table below shows the dates and locations of each workshop:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 18</td>
<td>UC Davis, Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 22</td>
<td>Sacramento City College, West Sacramento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 26</td>
<td>Trick-or-Treat on Main Street, Woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1</td>
<td>County Fair Mall, Woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2</td>
<td>Davis Farmers Market, Davis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The YoloGo project team received more than 150 responses from community members. Below is a compilation of feedback the project team received.

**Compilation of Feedback**

Community members submitted feedback by writing on post-it notes and placing dots on the interactive boards.

1. **Which would you choose: A faster bus ride or easier access to bus stops?**

   When asked whether they would prefer a faster bus ride or easier access to bus stops on a spectrum of answers, a slight majority of the participants chose the option “I mostly prefer shorter waits.”

   ![Feedback Chart]

   - I mostly prefer shorter waits: 34%
   - I will do whatever it takes to get to my destination soonest: 33%
   - I mostly prefer shorter walks: 19%
   - I’ll would rather avoid a walk, even if I have to wait longer: 9%
   - I’m not sure / I don’t have a preference: 5%
2. Which would you choose: Longer hours of service or more frequent service?
When asked whether they would prefer longer hours of service or more frequent service on a spectrum of answers, a very slight majority of the participants chose the option “I will only take buses that come every 30 minutes.”

- 36% I will only take buses that come every 30 minutes
- 35% I need to travel early mornings or late nights
- 10% I’m not sure / I don’t have a preference
- 10% I would rather not wait as long, but I don’t want shorter hours
- 9% I would like to travel before or after regular commuting hours, but don’t want less frequent busses

3. If you were king/queen for a day at Yolobus, which improvements would you make first?
When asked which improvements they would make at Yolobus if given the opportunity, a majority of the participants chose the option “Higher frequency service.”

- 23% Higher Frequency Service
- 20% Covering places that don’t currently have service
- 17% Bus stops closer to where I go
- 16% Weekday night service
- 13% More Saturday service
- 11% More Sunday Service
4. What do you think is the greatest need for transit in the region: Improved local service or improved commuter/express service?

When asked whether they would prefer improved local service or improved commuter/express service, a majority of the participants chose the option “Commuter/Express service.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commuter/Express service</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local service</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current distribution of bus service is just right</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

The following is a compilation of comments gathered at the pop-up workshops, separated by location and interactive board number.

1. UC Davis, Davis
   - Board #3
     - Bike racks on the buses so when I get here (UC Davis) I can bike to class. (x10)
     - Wifi. (x7)
     - More bike racks & bike assistance. (x4)
   - Board #4
     - I have no other way to get to other cities.
     - I live in Sacramento and commute to UC Davis every day.
     - Additional service to the Bay Area.

2. Sacramento City College, West Sacramento
   - Board #1
     - The bus stop should be within certain limits. I have trouble walking and the closest stop is several blocks from me.
   - Board #2
     - Driving is just easier, and I like my car. I don’t take the bus because it doesn’t come enough.
     - Buses need to come more often and stop closer to where I am. Every 15 minutes would be good.
     - Monday – Friday 42 bus service should run later to make maximum connections in between cities. Higher frequency at times that people need it, like at night and in coordination with the trains. More frequency during the peak commute hours.
Every 15-30 minutes would be good.
The buses should have more frequency. I used to wait an hour to get to school.

- Board #3
  - More accurate travel time information.
  - 42A & 42B: Run later at night and more frequently during peak travel hours.
  - More bike racks & bike assistance.
  - A phone app is important because a lot of people have cell phones.

- Board #4
  - Our students need to move more fluidly between campuses. Look at Toronto’s bus system, it is great.

3. Trick-or-Treat on Main Street, Woodland
   - Board #3
     - Service to Travis Air Force Base (x2)
     - Make space for strollers. (x2)

4. County Fair Mall, Woodland
   - Board #2
     - More frequent service.
     - Later service in East Woodland.
   - Board #3
     - Better wheelchair access.
     - Better on time performance.
     - Secure bike parking at stops.
     - Better lighting and safer bus stops.

5. Davis Farmers Market, Davis
   - Board #2
     - Later service on 42 and 220 weekdays and Saturday.
     - Later express buses in AM and PM (Davis departures 7-8 AM, and Sacramento after 5PM).
   - Board #3
     - Dedicated bus lanes.
     - Better ADA access on buses.
   - Board #4
     - Connection to Davis Amtrak station.
     - More direct express buses (point to point if possible).
Public Notification
Community members were notified about the pop-up workshops through traditional print flyers, digital flyers, email blasts, personal calls and emails, regional community event calendars and websites, and social media channels including Facebook and Twitter. Below is a list of organizations and communication channels which shared information about the workshops:

- City of Davis Bicycling, Transportation and Street Safety Commission
- El Rio Villa
- Sacramento City College – West Sacramento Center
- UC Davis Unitrans
- YCTD’s Citizens Advisory Committee

Appendix
- Board Displays
- Virtual Workshop Business Card
- Comment Card
- Notification Flier
Introduction
During October and November 2019, more than 400 people participated in a virtual workshop as part of the Yolo County Transportation District (YCTD) Comprehensive Operational Analysis, also known as YoloGO. The virtual workshop provided an opportunity for various communities throughout Yolo County to give their input on how Yolobus can improve their services.

YoloGO will re-evaluate Yolobus’ level of service, consider new transit technologies, and identify potential changes in routes and schedules to better serve the region. YoloGO will allow Yolobus to potentially improve rider experience through more frequent service, extended service hours or additional service destinations.

Virtual Community Workshop Report
From October 22 to November 12, 2019, the project team held a three-week online virtual community workshop to obtain input from community members regarding their experiences riding the bus through Yolo County as well as input on proposed improvements. This report provides compilation of all the responses received throughout the three-week period.

Virtual Community Workshop Results
Yolobus received **432 submissions** from October 22 through November 12. The virtual workshop included ten questions focused on the following topics:

- Key public transit planning tradeoffs, including:
  - Frequent service versus wider bus coverage
  - Faster bus rides versus easier access to bus stops
  - Longer hours of service versus more frequent service with limited hours
  - Improved local service versus improved commuter/express service
- Public transit improvements
- Current transit ridership information
- Potential improvements to existing bus routes
Compilation of Feedback
A total of 432 community members participated in the Virtual Community Workshop. Below is a summary of findings based upon answers received. The graphs and short descriptions of key themes included in this summary represent the variety of divergent opinions as well as the frequency of opinions among the participants which were expressed in questions that included a comment section. The opinions expressed in this summary are not intended to be representative of all virtual workshop participants.

A comprehensive list of comments submitted as part of the virtual workshop is available in this document’s appendix.

1. If you had a choice between more frequent service and more bus routes serving more destinations, which would you choose?

62% More frequent service
38% More routes serving more places
2. *If you had a choice between a faster bus ride or easier access to bus stops, which would you choose?*

- 38% I mostly prefer shorter waits
- 20% I will do whatever it takes to get to my destination soonest
- 19% I mostly prefer shorter walks
- 15% I'm not sure / I don't have a preference
- 8% I would rather avoid a walk, even if I have to wait longer
3. If you had a choice between longer hours of service and more frequent service, which would you choose?

- 33% would rather not wait as long, but I don't want shorter hours.
- 24% will only take buses that come every 30 minutes or faster within regular commuting hours.
- 21% would like to travel before or after regular commuting hours, but don't want less frequent buses.
- 13% are not sure / I don't have a preference.
- 9% need to travel early mornings or late nights.
4. What do you think is the greatest need for transit in the region: improved local service or improved commuter/express service?

- Improved commuter / express service: 70%
- Improved local service: 20%
- The distribution of bus service types is just right: 10%

5. If you were king/queen for a day at Yolobus, which improvements would you make first? Choose your top three.

9% of the responses given for Question 5 were “Other.” The full list of “other” responses submitted for this question is available in this document’s appendix.
6. *Do you currently use Yolobus transit services? If yes, please list the services you use.*
Many of the participants who responded to the second part of this prompt shared that they primarily ride bus routes 42A and 42B. A full list of responses submitted for this question is available in this document’s appendix.

![Pie chart showing 60% Yes, 40% No]

7. *If you currently ride Yolobus, how would you adjust your bus route’s schedule to make it better?*
Many of the workshop participants mentioned extended hours of service and fewer bus stops with additional last mile connections. A full list of responses to Question 7 is available in this document’s appendix.

8. *Before choosing the place you currently live/work in, did you know about or look for nearby transit options?*

![Pie chart showing 57% Yes, 43% No]
9. What would motivate you to take public transit more often? Choose your top three.

A route connecting me where I need to go 23%
More direct express buses and less time spent in traffic 21%
More service on existing routes 12%
Better on-time performance 11%
Real-time information 10%
Less expensive fares or subsidized passes 7%
Nicer / more accessible bus stops and transit stations or more 6%
Different / newer vehicles or more environmentally friendly vehicles 5%
Personalized help understanding / using the system 3%
Better customer service or website 2%

10. Please share any additional thoughts or comments you have related to YoloGO.

A multitude of participants mentioned the infrequency of bus routes, unsafe or unsanitary conditions, and a lack of coordination with other transit services such as light rail, Amtrak, and Unitrans.

A full list of responses submitted for this question can be found in this document’s appendix.
Public Notification

Email notifications were sent to more than 1,400 interested community members and Yolobus transit riders. The project team reached out to key stakeholder groups throughout the Yolobus service area (including West Sacramento, Woodland, Davis, Winters, and Vacaville) to further promote the virtual community workshop with their individual organizations at meetings and through newsletters, social media, and website updates.

The virtual community workshop was shared and promoted by the following business interests, community-based organizations, jurisdictions, neighborhood associations, residential developments, and schools:

- Resident Advisory Board
- Davis Downtown
- Yolo County Supervisor, Don Saylor
- Yolo County Housing
- Yolo-Solo Air Quality Management District
- UC Davis Unitrans
- West Sacramento Chamber of Commerce
- Woodland Chamber of Commerce

Appendix

- Comprehensive List of Virtual Workshop Comments
- Notification Flyer
If you were king/queen for a day at Yolobus, which improvements would you make first?
Choose your top three.
The below responses reflect submissions in the “Other” category.

- 42A & B: To midnight, 7 days a week.
- Accessible stops, sheltering area, and routes for disabilities.
- Expand RT to West Sac & Davis.
- More direct service: the bus takes 2x as long as biking.
- Three out of five cities within Yolo County now have Jump bikes and scooters thus making first mile last mile within those cities easier. Yolobus should be working to improve mobility like this in other cities and working to integrate it into their transportation network.
- Would have it going to Sacramento from Southport throughout the whole day, not just commuter service.
- More direct routes between where I live and work.
- Service to the airport and multiple stops in Sacramento.
- Easier connection between routes.
- New express busses, more reliable stops (the bus is on time), better/more reliable GPS tracking for riders.
- A stop at the Amtrak Station in Davis.
- Longer commute hours/express hours (e.g. running express/commute buses from, say, 6-9am rather than 7-8am).
- Ability to carry bikes.
- Faster service to airport, coordinate schedule with Light Rail.
- Mail info periodically identifying routes and times.
- Trips that don’t take so long. West Sacramento to downtown should not take an hour.
- On-demand service
- Golden 1 Arena events. Took it once, but heard it was discontinued.
- Have an evening express route that stops in West Sacramento.
- Better and longer training for new drivers.
- Scrub clean the buses, train the drivers in customer interaction, then add more services for commuters, nights, and weekends.
- Improve use of West Sacramento Transit Center, route more buses through Transit Center with a regular shuttle into downtown.
- Bus routes that don't zig-zag like 35 & 39.
- Extend commute hours in the middle of the day.
- Commuter buses that were express style that got people from different areas in West Sacramento to downtown quicker than they could if they drove and parked.
• Space bus stops 1/2 mile distance, fewer stops and less coverage.
• Coordinate with JUMP/Bikeshare/Scootershare to have more devices near bus stops for the final mile/half-mile of travel.
• Safety, fewer homeless people, sanitary riding conditions.
• Buses that show up on schedule/time.
• Address the homeless that have taken over the bus shelters on West Capital Ave.
• I'm not the right person to ask. I'd use commuter service occasionally to the city of San Francisco, and to various airports in the region. But most of the time I'll use my car to save hours of travel time and waiting time.
• The Davis/Sacramento Express routes should offer slightly later options into the evening -- the last bus on my route leaves from Sacramento at 5:15. Having an option on the same route at 5:30 or 5:45 would allow me to take the bus more often instead of driving to work.
• More direct commuter buses. Less frequent stops in West Sacramento (i.e. straight up Jefferson with commuter parking nearby.
• Improved reliability of bus schedule. Better customer service.
• Buses that get to Downtown Sacramento faster - this is the only thing I want.
• Specific to the 42A/42B, later service hours for late-night arrivals and red-eye departures.
• More late-night service on all days.
• There is no bus service to the East Bay if you're not a UCD student. The train is $50 round trip when discounted. It's outside of Yolo, but a once or twice a day service to at least BART would make a big difference for me.
• Better connections between routes. Schedule set up so short/no wait at connection locations.
• If a bus is empty, or just a rider of two, then the route should be eliminated. Stop wasting money. We don’t need buses anymore. This is not 1950.
• Direct line from Sacramento City College West Sacramento Center to the main campus in Sacramento (out of county).
• Cleaner buses. On time buses.
• When we lived on Anderson Road, we always took the bus to and from the airport. Now we live near the post office and there's no nearby bus stop that goes to airport.
• More express buses.
• Bus from Davis to Woodland needs a better way to get to the courthouse.
• Service to hospitals and health care services to and from Davis, Woodland and Sacramento.
• Faster rides, more bicycle capacity.
• Cleaner buses.
• Better drivers that take customer service very seriously and that do not abuse their customers. My kids have been intentionally left at the bus station several times by the same male driver to wait for the next bus even upon arriving and seeing them. He never stops unless there were other persons of noncolor. He is a long-time driver. Drivers should be evaluated and trained on diversity.
• Cleaner buses.
• Better on-time service.
• Consistency of on-time departures, particularly during high commute times, such as Thursday and Friday nights.
• Phone app bus location finder.
• Haven't looked recently but for me to get to 10th street I had to walk to a bus to take me to a train and 45 mins later I would get the 13 blocks I needed to go.
• More frequent afternoon express buses, and ones that start before 4.
• "Shopper's special" in Davis and other cities -- Saturday and Wednesday afternoon evening service to bring people to farmer's market, Target, downtown, etc. Also, extend rapidbus service from Yolo to Sacramento so parents can take the bus after dropping kids off at school.
• More direct routing for commuters.
• Make easier to buy a ticket. When I looked online, I couldn't figure out how to do that.
• Express routes extended earlier and later on weekdays.
• I would like the bus to be on time when picking up in Sacramento.
• Express buses to/from Sacramento have been running late or not show up at a higher rate than in years past. I will pay more for better service.
• Fewer bus stops on express and commuter service.
• Making sure the buses leave from stops on time.
• I would add bus routes that go on East St. and Main St. and go on Cottonwood and West St. and Pioneer and 102 and Matmore Rd. and 3rd St. and College St and Cross and Beamer. I would add 8 local routes and make Woodland Transit center have a bus route that goes on Main St. This makes more bus routes for Woodland where people benefit with all service on weekends and frequency changing from 1 hour to 15 mins.
Do you currently use Yolobus transit services? If yes, please list the services you use.

- 42 to/from airport, bus to/from from West Sacramento to Downtown Sacramento
- 240 usually.
- Yolobus 240, 35, and 40.
- Winters route.
- Yolobus.
- 41, 42, 240.
- The Davis bus 42A and 42B to the airport via Woodland!
- Davis express service. Route 42 intercity bus service in particular to SMF. I also have used the local services in Woodland and West Sacramento.
- Have used 35 a few times to get to the post office on Merkley Ave.
- 42.
- Mainly Route 39. Route 35 and connecting routes on occasion.
- Yolobus 42A/B to the Airport / Davis from Sacramento.
- Express bus to Sacramento
- Express bus 43 in the morning and afternoon
- 43 (daily), 42A/42B (1/week), 230/232 (rarely).
- 42B.
- Rides from Davis to Sacramento International Airport.
- Express Davis to Sacramento 43.
- Davis to Woodland and Davis to Sacramento.
- 42, 210/211, 214, 215, 243.
- 45 express.
- 220C.
- 230 Yolobus express.
- 241 AM/PM 7th and Capitol to Seaport Postal Facility (Destination: McKesson)
- Express from Davis to Sacramento, local from Davis to Woodland
- Express service 43 between Davis and West Sacramento.
- 45, 45X, 46, 43, 44, 230.
- Davis, local Woodland, Sacramento.
- Route 39.
- Bus 40, 41, and 35.
- To airport and from airport.
- To Sacramento and to Davis.
- Paratransit and regular bus service.
- Route 39 express.
- 42A, 42B.
- Woodland to Sacramento commute roundtrip. Woodland to UC Davis roundtrip.
• 40, 41, 43A, 43B, 240.
• Yolobus routes to/from Woodland and Davis.
• Mostly commute Woodland/Davis roundtrip.
• 242/243 commute.
• I occasionally ride buses into downtown Sacramento from the West Sacramento Transit Center (42 A/B, 240, 40/41). The 35 and 39 buses take far too long to get to downtown or the Transit Center from the Southport Area.
• Daily to and from work.
• 40, 41, 240, 241, 42A, 42B.
• 39.
• Route 42A and 42B and the downtown Shuttle.
• Route 39 commute.
• Intercity Loop.
• 240, 42, 40, 41.
• This is a qualified "yes." I have ridden the bus to work but found it inconvenient and it took too long. My route sent me on a scenic tour of our town, and it took a long time to get to my destination. Now that JUMP Bikes services my area, I ride a bikeshare/scooter and get to my destination in less than half the time the bus takes.
• Southport commuter to Downtown Sacramento.
• 46AM, 45X, 46PM.
• Local City of West Sacramento.
• Express to Sacramento.
• Yolobus 43 - Express between East Davis and Sacramento.
• Davis-Sacramento commute.
• 45AM & 45PM.
• 42, express buses especially 43.
• 42A and 42B, between Davis and Sacramento.
• 42-line, Winters commute bus.
• I use the 42A & 42B.
• 39, 43A.
• West Sacramento to and from Sacramento International Airport. West Sacramento to Davis and back. West Sacramento to Downtown Sacramento.
• 39 AM and PM service.
• 42A, 42B, 210, 211, 212, 214.
• 35, 39, 40, 41, 240, 42A/B.
• 42A/B.
• 42A 42B
• 42A.
• 42B.
- 43.
- 44.
- 230.
- 232.
- Occasional Express Commuter Bus, Airport Shuttle.
- SMF Airport to/from Downtown. Formerly used Downtown to/from Davis.
- Yolobus to and from the airport.
- 42, 43.
- Yolobus.
- 40, 41, 240, 35, and sometimes the 42's.
- 42B and 42A.
- 42A, 42B.
- 42A and 42B.
- 42A.
- 42B.
- 42A and 42B from Davis to Sacramento and back.
- Bus to Sacramento.
- 42.
- 45 Express.
- 42 A&B.
- 42.
- Between Davis and Sacramento downtown.
- Via.
- Yolobus 42A/B.
- Bus 39.
- Primarily to and from airport; many friends would take Yolobus from Woodland to Da Vinci Jr. High School.
- I use the express bus occasionally but would prefer to ride the bus every day. I currently drive because the Yolo bus doesn't have an express bus back to Davis until later in the day (after I'm off work). It also takes double the amount of time, or longer, to get to downtown Sacramento than it does to drive and park. I would like greater afternoon options for express buses, and shorter routes (fewer stops). A bus that goes frequently between Downtown Sacramento and the Davis ‘park and ride lot' would be a game changer.
- 43 & 42.
- 43 primarily, and occasionally the 42A/B.
- I ride the 42B/A buses to/from work several times a week (although I'm currently on maternity leave) from Woodland to UC Davis West Village.
- I used to take the express bus from Davis into Sacramento/Sacramento to Davis daily for a year until I switched jobs. Now I use for airport service, or occasional travel into Sacramento.
• 42A and 42B.
• Davis/Sacramento bus airport bus.
• 42A and 42B.
• 42A, 42B.
• 42, 43.
• Yolobus 43 and 42 to/from residence and workplace. Yolobus 42 to/from SMF. Very occasionally Yolobus 42 from residence to Downtown Davis (Amtrak).
• 210, 211, 42A, 42B, 243.
• 42A/B.
• I occasionally catch a bus to and from Davis and Woodland.
• From downtown Sacramento to Sacramento Airport.
• Yolobus Davis to SMF.
• 42A/B, 43, 220.
• 42A / 42B.
• 7:09 am 230 Express from Arthur/Alameda stop to Sacramento and the 4:48 pm 230 Express from the Capitol at 7th stop from Sacramento to Davis
• I use the 43 AM and 43 PM bus 5 days a week.
• Mainly the 45 which is always late! Sometimes the 42 A or B.
• I ride the 241 and the 41 bus.
• 230 express AM and PM.
• Bus service from my apartment complex in Woodland to UC Davis.
• 43 Commuter.
• Commuter bus (Route 39).
• Yolobus 42A/B.
• Local routes and intercity.
• Routes 40,41,42A/42B, 240.
Please share any additional thoughts or comments you have related to YoloGO.

- Please say thank you to everyone driving/taking care of the buses. You are all very nice and very kind.
- Shut down & have RT expand service area to include Davis & West Sacramento.
- I love the senior fares for 62 and up! Awesome. Love the airport buses! So handy.
- Yolobus needs to make major improvements to their whole transportation system that is more than just bus service. It includes being innovative in providing better mobility service to the cities and citizens within Yolo County. It means they need to get out of the transit box they are in and think about what political and capital investment need to be made to improve transportation for Yolo County.
- My biggest wish is that I can get to Sacramento from where I live, which is Southport. There are not many destinations in West Sacramento where I go to, but when I do there is no direct service taking me there and the transfer wait is like 13 minutes - I'm talking about Riverpoint shopping center and Goodwill. Also, The Barn and all the new condos near it. I don't think any bus goes near there, while this area is supposed to get much more retail/housing in the future from what I've read. Also, what often causes me not to take the bus is not having the exact change! I will use a Jump bike instead just because I can pay on my phone.
- I've never found Yolobus easy to use and it takes too much time from pickup to destination.
- A compliment to the bus drivers. They are always professional and helpful and do a great job, which makes the commute much more enjoyable.
- Yolobus has a ton of potential! Transit is the future!
- A service that I could use along with my bike or jump bike or with uber.
- Living in Davis, I am able to go everywhere I need by bike. However, I see many people commuting by car from Woodland to UCD campus; long lines of cars in the morning exiting the freeway and looking for parking. If there were more frequent service between Woodland and UC Davis, I expect more people would take the bus. This would also be more fair for students who have to choose between higher rent in Davis and the ability to commute by bike, or lower rent in Woodland and being forced to commute by car (1 bus every hour just doesn't work when you have a busy student schedule).
- I would prefer public transportation over driving, but there is not a direct route for me to get from home to work and back, yet. Tons of people are commuting now from Woodland to Davis, not just students and it would be great if there was more coverage.
- We need better service desperately and I really do want to use public transit. Other places in the world are so different with really useful public transit, super frequent and goes everywhere.
- The 43AM/PM express bus is so crowded, often full with standing room only or even skipping stops because the bus is full. More express 43 routes and newer buses please.
- As an older member of the community, I expect to use public transportation more in the coming years. My major concerns are the ease of connections (e.g. with Amtrak, Light Rail), how to plan a trip, and personal safety.
• Public transportation in the USA overall is expensive. I live in China from time to time. I was there last time for four months and took the subway every day in Beijing. It was fast, clean and affordable. I went at least 20 miles a day and my total cost for four months was only $37 for the entire time. I use BART and the Trains from Sacramento from time to time along with the bus lines. One trip to the Bay Area will exceed this amount. It is not your problem at Yolo Transportation but if you want people to use public transportation it needs to be much less expensive.

• Overall, a great service to our community. I hope it is able to expand.

• Focus on express and commuter buses especially for Davis folks. Lots of us go to Downtown Sacramento.

• Please go as green as possible. Electric, mouse treadmill, etc. Truly, global warming is a thing.

• I ride Yolobus only occasionally (e.g., once in a while to the airport or into Sacramento). I live in Davis and have access to Unitrans for any public transportation needs I have here in town. I appreciate the availability of Yolobus.

• Currently in-town service in Davis is provided by Unitrans; but all their routes lead only to campus. If you want to go somewhere else in Davis for instance, from Stonegate/far west Davis to downtown to go out for lunch or dinner, or to the bank, or to a class, or shopping downtown you have to go to campus and change buses. Ugh! Not going to do that, thank you. It would be great if Unitrans or Yolobus would provide transportation directly to downtown without having to detour to campus to change buses. Also, it would be easier to use Yolobus on those infrequent occasions when we fly somewhere from Sacramento Int’l Airport but there is no bus stop nearby for the route to the airport, so then you have to leave your car in some public lot, since the bus pickup location (last time I checked) was more than a mile away. Too far to walk with suitcase as we get older.

• We need more partnerships with microtransit. We also need more Jump Bikes everywhere, including at key bus stops in Woodland and Davis.

• I took public transit from Folsom to West Sacramento. It cost me 2 hours and $5.00. In my car it takes me 30 minutes and about $5.00. Why would I choose public transit? Not acceptable.

• My husband and I both commute from Southport West Sacramento to Davis, a 13-mile commute, 5 days a week. At this time if we wanted to take the bus it would take approx. 1 hour and 45 minutes. I just mapped it here is the shortest choice 4:03 PM - 5:55 PM (1 h 52 min), We can drive in 25 mins or I can bike in 1 hr. 10 mins. There has to be a way to get across the causeway in less than 2 hours.

• Sometimes, either the 40 or 41 is completely out of service during the 5-6 commute rush hour. I’ve stood at my downtown Capitol Mall stop and watched 3-4 mostly empty Davis express buses going by while having to wait up to an hour before the next 40/41 bus comes by. So, maybe not the route schedule, but the consistency of buses being in service.

• Need a direct route from Davis to Woodland Community College.
• I have been skipping the Yolo buses as they do not match up with the Light Rail. I can walk faster to the light rail from my house in West Sacramento than take the bus to due to wait times for the next bus. If I take the bus, then I have a greater wait time at the Light Rail.
• Buses are never on time. Always either early or late. There is no live information to help mitigate these inconsistencies.
• Include Sacramento Valley Station on Intercity Express routes, increase frequency at peak commute times for routes 241 AM/PM, 42B headed to Sacramento, add route that loops Sacramento Valley Station, Sutter Health Field, Jefferson Blvd to Southport/River City High, then north on Lake Washington Blvd to Industrial Blvd, Industrial Blvd to Enterprise, Enterprise to West Capitol, then return to Sac Valley Station. Propose/develop with City of West Sacramento/SACOG a Southport Transit Center.
• Having more frequent direct routes to the Sac airport would be a plus.
• Buses should be environmentally friendly, if not already. Routes should accommodate those who not only choose not to drive, but those who cannot drive, such as the disabled, elderly, and minors (students). Fares should be free for WUSD students and those attending the college campus. Bus routes should take people to these locations, if not already. I think more people would ride the bus if they did not have to walk long distances to get to a nearby bus stop or to a stop that took them on the route they need to be on. The reasons I stopped riding Yolobus are the stop was too far away to walk to and there were not enough times for pick-up downtown in case there was an emergency and I needed to get to my children in West Sacramento.
• Buses need to run till at least 9pm.
• For a short while, I once rode my bike from home (in Spring Lake) to the Woodland bus stop (E Main @ Matmor). But, within the first month, my bike was vandalized at that site. I also can't count on fitting the bike onto the bus both ways, so I don't try. Maybe have EITHER the 46 or 45X go to E Main @ Matmor, and the other can go straight from Spring Lake to Sacramento? (Also, skip Costco as a park-and-ride site; it takes too long to get in-and-out of that area.)
• I'd love to see more ways to get to downtown from where I live. Small vans, things like trolley cars that you just step up onto, fun things to ride to work.
• I lived in two different areas of West Sacramento my whole life. First in the Bryte area and now at Bridgeway Island. I would like to use the Yolobus system however a normal 15 minute car ride would take me 1 hour plus on the Yolobus system routes.
• Yolo bus is doing a fantastic job. Thank you.
• Better service to downtown areas.
• I really would like West Sacramento to have a bus route that took people to downtown Sacramento. That would help a lot of commuters who work and enjoy restaurants downtown.
• I would like to see more frequent schedule options. There is a bus stop (route 39) right by my house, but the bus only arrives every hour and then it takes one hour to get to my office in downtown Sacramento. I would have to take the 6:11 a.m. bus to arrive downtown at 7:11 a.m. and walk to my office. My start time is 7:30 a.m. and my end time is 5:00 p.m. I would have to catch the 5:16 p.m. bus downtown to arrive home at 5:51 p.m. Currently it takes me 20 -25
minutes to drive to work in the morning and about 30 minutes to drive home. I would definitely consider the bus if it didn't take so long to get to work (6:45 a.m. pickup with 7:15 a.m. arrival would be ideal.) As it is now, taking the bus would add approximately 1 hour to my commute every day.

- Have not ridden the bus in years. You all do a great job given limited resources. Ridership seems to be way down in viewing the empty buses traveling around. With Via, Jump, and other new travel opportunities, it seems a very difficult path to increase ridership. Hard financial decisions have to be made to either limit, reduce or more effectively route transit services. I do not have the answers, but that is your mission and problems to solve.

- I would share a positive list why people should ride the bus to motivate riders to join. Leave the driving to Yolo while you can relax, read, organize thoughts (and purse/briefcase), plans, work, iPad, cell phone emails/text. Less stress on your neck and no hassle with traffic and safe from auto accidents. Get a monthly pass and don't pay for gas, parking, wear and mileage on car. Don't have to drive in Rain/Storm. Just gear up and jump on bus. Socialize or not. Take a nap. Enjoy the views. Nice to not drive in the gridlock at end day. I worked downtown and had an express route pretty much. I also jumped a downtown bus for downtown Dr appts when needed. If you go home off schedule or urgent, you can ask a coworker or friend for a ride usually if rare happening. I saved a lot of monies and headaches, while my car stayed new (safe) and shiny in the garage:) Also, I did not have the bus option in Southern CA and commuted from Irvine Orange County to Long Beach L.A. County. It was exhausting. So, I really appreciated coming back to live and work West Sacramento to Downtown Sacramento.

- The reason I do not ride Yolobus is because it takes too long to get anywhere.

- So glad we have bus service in town. Thank you. Perhaps we need to advertise bus service between downtown and Target/ Costco shopping area.

- I was happy to see that there is a bus stop one half block away from me, but when I stopped driving and needed to use the bus, I found that the bus route had been cancelled. I have had no choice but to use uber.

- More bus stops in Woodland. Could not access your map so would like to see a bus that went to and from Davis Amtrak and bus that went to and from Kaiser Davis.

- The bus stop at West Capitol and Jefferson near Walgreens is always filthy. It is my understanding that the responsibility of cleaning this location rests on the City of West Sacramento. I will follow-up with them regarding this issue.

- A survey should be done on where people work and their work schedule. My guess is downtown. If there was a direct bus from where I live to downtown, I would take it instead of paying 240 a month and dealing with traffic.

- The commuter bus needs to get to UC Davis before the workday starts and leave after the workday ends.

- Love to see more express/commute busses into downtown Sacramento from West Sacramento. With State buildings cramming more staff onto each floor and transit subsidies about to
increase, it's an opportunity for Yolobus (and a huge need for us State workers), especially since Sacramento isn't adding any new parking.

- Yolobus should provide integration between other transit options. I would ride Yolobus if there were more buses, less wait time, better and real-time schedule information that took me to light rail, AMTRAK, Golden 1 Center, Sacramento International Airport.
- We've only used the bus a few times, a few years ago, to go to events at Golden 1 Arena - it was convenient but was disappointed that we had to be dropped off several blocks from the Arena.
- Friendlier and more helpful drivers would be a plus. Accurate real-time information would help prevent long frustrating wait time at the bus stop. Solution for dark winter stops where drivers can't see people waiting at the stop. More bike racks or ability to bring larger electric scooters on the bus.
- I live in Spring Lake and would like an express bus to Sacramento that leaves a little later in the morning. My work hours are 9-5:30. Also, I often host UC Davis exchange students and often times the commuter bus to UC Davis does not get my students to their classes on time in the morning, so then I have to drive them to school and then have to drive myself to my job in Sacramento.
- The drivers are great, at least most of the regulars on the routes I've been using show great customer service. I would be happy to ride a bike to the mall but I can't leave it there if the bus rack is full, so instead, I need local routes to expand their hours, earlier in morning Mon-Fri, and through at least 10:00pm 7 days a week (take it home after a movie). Locals would be great if every 30 minutes, not 60. Thanks for asking my opinion.
- Bring back regular train transportation to/from Woodland to Sacramento (every 30 minutes) and to/from Woodland to Oakland (every hour), like it used to be. No traffic and no delays. Set daily schedules for commuters to get to/from work & recreation in Sacramento and the Bay Area. This would eliminate a majority of the constant traffic nightmare of the current road transportation.
- I am close to a bus stop but would take it if it runs more frequently and to places in the City of Sacramento such as downtown or midtown where there are shops I would like to visit and the Sacramento City Library.
- Use smaller busses and transition to electric/hydrogen fuels.
- I have always had very good experiences with Yolobus Drivers, good job with your customer service there. I think the West Sacramento Transit Center needs to better used as a hub to get folks from West Sacramento to Sacramento. Buses from the south should be able to get people to the Transit Center and then use shuttle to go down J St down to 15th and then back on L St on a frequent basis makes a lot of sense. Most of the buses leaving the Transit Center are clustered, are following each other and if spaced out would be easier to commute.
- I’d like to see a regular non-stop bus from West Sac to UC Davis M-F between 7 am and 7 pm.
- It would be great to have an express bus from Southport into old WS and into North Area.
- One-time performance is important. Sometimes I notice a bus will be early, and I end up missing it, but the next bus will be running behind, so I'm having to wait 30+ minutes for the bus.
• I live and work in West Sacramento (only 2.5 miles commute). However, it takes TWO buses to get to my office, with a long wait time in between. Ridiculous! It takes 35 mins or more (including walks) on the bus and only 10 mins to drive.

• Right now, it seems that Yolobus is trying to weave around neighborhoods to pick people up and passenger wait time is far too long. People need express routes and can use Uber/Lyft, walk or bike to express transit stops. People don't want to ride a bus that takes an hour to get where they need to go. Nobody has time to waste riding around a big empty bus and stopping at bus stops with nobody there. Faster, fewer stops, more frequent service (20-minute headways) on major road networks connecting with other transit and urban centers.

• I live near Village Parkway and Stonegate. I go downtown a lot. There is a bus at Northbeach and Gateway that goes downtown, but it's quite a walk. Maybe when more homes are built here on Village parkway – we'll get a few bus stops here. I look forward to riding the bus more often.

• I work in Natomas and I have worked Downtown. Yolobus needs to service these areas more so that the residents have options. Both of these places border Yolo County and many residents are employed there. I know you can ride over to Sacramento and buy a RT pass but when you are so close it makes more sense for Yolo Bus to take on this area to increase riders. Many of these are state jobs and reimburse employees 75% up to $65.00 a month. It would be a nice option for me and my staff that live in West Sacramento but work in these areas outside if West Sacramento. Thank you!

• I used to take the 35 bus in West Sacramento. The route was temporarily changed due to roadwork on Village Parkway. Once the roadwork was completed the bus route never returned. It is now too inconvenient for me to get to the bus route.

• Yolobus needs to think about how to integrate better with bikeshare/scooters. Don't compete with them. Figure out how to make them work well together.

• Bus stops in high traffic areas are unsafe and unsanitary.

• It really comes down to frequency and quality of buses that will encourage me to take the bus more often. Ideally I would like to take the bus from home to work but currently it takes 2 times longer and is almost just as expensive to take the bus than my fuel saving car. Live bus tracking is also a great tool that encouraged me to take the bus in Davis and Santa Barbara.

• When I did take the bus, the issues I had were that they didn't come early enough, and the wait times were way to long. I could get to the stop early and the bus would come 10-15 mins late and then I would be late to work.

• Yolobus provides a valuable service but it needs to change with the times. This survey is a hopeful sign that you are trying to do that. In my view, services like Via in West Sacramento, as well as Uber, Lyft, and shared bikes/scooters have obviated some of Yolobus’ traditional role of moving people around within communities. A bigger and more important issue is moving people between cities. For example, low-income West Sacramento residents need an easier way to get to Woodland for services; commuters who can't afford to live in Davis need an easier way to get from (say) West Sac to Davis; West Sacramento residents need better connections to Downtown; and we all need to get to the airport more conveniently and without having to
circulate through the entire region on the way. Also, I used to ride Yolobus every day when I lived in Davis. I can recall how gross and scary the Route 42 bus was. This was partly due to the clientele, which I understand is out of your control, but also the rolling stock was decrepit, and the drivers were surly. I have been more comfortable on BART, the DC Metro, and even the New York subway. The Express buses to Davis were helpful, but even those had so many stops that it took forever.

- Generally speaking, I would like to see Yolobus re-orient itself to focus on connecting cities and focus intra-city routes on areas that will generate sufficient ridership to be meaningful. For years I have seen empty buses circulating around West Sacramento and wondered how much that must be costing. There has to be a better way, and I applaud you for taking the time to ask the public for their opinions as part of your effort to find it.
- We need to get people out of their cars for traffic, parking, and greenhouse gas emission reductions. To do this public transit should be fully subsidized. Also, making it clear to first time riders through yolo bus advertisements that while you’re riding the bus you can relax, read, listen to music/podcasts/audio books, and watch the world go by while your driver gets you where you need to go safely and on time, may encourage new ridership.
- The more routes, the more people the more the frequency, the more the ridership, the more the ridership, the more revenue.
- Less stops on the Express routes.
- The 39 bus zigzags through neighborhoods in West Sacramento. Took 30-45 minutes to get to work. I can drive it in about half the time.
- Better bike racks would also encourage me to ride. I switched from commuting between Davis and Sac on Yolobus to Amtrak because the train is more reliable and provides better bike racks. I do not want to put my bike in a luggage container beneath a bus.
- It takes too long to get from 1300 I street in Sacramento to Anderson and Hanover in Davis. I can’t get from work to temple in the evening on an express bus.
- I would like express service from Davis to the Sacramento Airport.
- I live in the Southport area of West Sacramento. There are so many commuters driving on Jefferson Boulevard to get to downtown Sacramento. It is such an obvious candidate for high-frequency commuter service. I would love not to have to drive to work every day.
- Just need faster service.
- I live in Winters and am a parent to a 12-year-old and a 15-year-old. Teens in Winters often complain of not having access to jobs and fun things to do in our small town. Many would like more frequent and easily accessible transportation to places like Davis and Woodland where there are movie theaters, shopping centers, parks, etc. Yolobus is a trustworthy mode of transportation, but the timing and availability of the routes that come through Winters are not ideal.
- I think Yolo should really work better on-time performance. The 39 is routinely late.
- Taking the bus from West Sacramento into Sacramento is laborious. It takes too long. I would ride if I could get somewhere in less than an hour.
• I'm very happy that you are working on this! I think it is incredibly important to have a more effective public transit system so that more people will use it.

• I choose to take transit to not have to deal with the logistics of car travel (driving, gas, parking) mainly to destinations that this would be a real hassle. I prefer express routes especially given how spread out Yolo county is and the service that Yolobus provides.

• Similar to many Davis residents, I work in Sacramento. To take the bus to my work, I have a 2 to 2.5-hour commute, depending on how the transfers go. It's just not practical. I realize that this is really because the Sacramento bus service from downtown to my work area is infrequent and slow - not Yolobus' problem. That said, faster service to the Arden Arcade area (preferably somewhere near Morse or Fulton and Arden or Alta Arden, would allow me to commute by bus.

• If Yolobus and Unitrans could work something out to cover some of the Unitrans gaps it would help a lot. Usually it all works great between the two (except if I want to get to the Bay Area), but on Unitrans breaks it's not enough.

• No more buses. Spend money on Via or more common-sense options.

• There are not enough commuter/express services from the West Sacramento neighborhoods to downtown Sacramento locations. Please add more routes along Lake Washington Blvd. so people can walk from their residence in West Sacramento to the bus stop for a commuter bus to the downtown Sacramento locations like near Sheraton hotel or near memorial auditorium.

• Bus service does not run frequently enough for us to be able to utilize it.

• A hybrid of the two proposed options is really a better idea than trying to go with one or the other. Most will understand that a low frequency routing is best for both city to city as well as commuter. However, in towns and cities with additional routes higher frequency is needed to help better serve the public. So, a 30-minute doctors visit doesn't take two hours to get to because you have to wait nearly an hour for a connecting bus. Or skip certain purchases at the grocers because even with an ice chest or keep cool bag you run the risk of food spoiling because the buses only run once an hour.

• Not sure if it's a viable option but using short buses that still have ADA accommodations during off peak hours and having 2 or more per line during certain times of day might make a difference.

• Used to live in the outer suburbs of Boston, could hop a bus, catch a couple of transfers and be at the wharves in roughly 30 to 40 minutes during peak traffic.

• I don’t ride Yolo bus. I tried years ago to use to get to work but even though my stop is only 2.5 miles from my office I would have to get on bus one hr. before my start time and spend another hour on return. My 20 min round trip commute turned in to 2 hr. commute.

• Website and real-time information are still really important. The webpage is really, really, really bad.

• I wish there was better transportation between Davis and Woodland without having to go through the MU at UC Davis. Direct bus from Davis to Woodland Community College and Costco just makes sense -- but right now transit center in Woodland at dead mall is involved and buses have to be changed. Not ideal in terms of time, comfort (weather), and safety.
• Personally, I think Yolobus is great, but could get me to Sacramento faster, and go further in Sacramento. I often don’t take the bus because the walk to my destination is too far. It seems that if one isn’t going to the capitol or near there, he/she/they is out of luck.

• I wasn't able to put a pin on the map, but I'd like a route that goes from Davis to Spring Lake and Costco, and back. I wish there was more space on the bus for bikes. Sometimes I don't take the bus because I need to be able to bring my bike to get from the bus stop to my destination, but I can't be sure there will be space for my bike.

• Routes between Davis and Woodland are timed for commuters; that is from Woodland to Davis in the morning and from Davis to Woodland in the evening. This makes doing business in Woodland for Davis residents difficult. For example, serving on a jury at the Woodland Court house for a Davis resident means getting to the Court house at the crack of dawn, before the building opens, in order to be on time. Afternoon jury appointments aren't much easier. Also, even where there are bus "shelters", they offer little shelter from rain and wind. The seats are intentionally uncomfortable if you have an hour wait, and many "shelters" face streets with earsplitting traffic and splashed rainwater. Also, Yolo Bus doesn’t make particularly good connection with Sacramento Transit buses & trains.

• Please run buses more often. Free WiFi on buses. Dedicated bus lane for faster service will incentivize more ridership. Subsidized fares along with the above suggestions will make people seriously consider getting out of their cars and onto Yolobus.

• I really think Yolobus has potential, the community needs to invest more in public transportation for all!

• I have ridden Yolo Bus for 10 years I use to be satisfied with the service I can no longer say that the buses tend to run late and they are very dirty. Your service is very inconsistent regarding being on time and I have seen many former riders now driving to work. I am considering driving myself. I am tired of being late in the morning and after a long day at work waiting 30 to 45 minutes for a bus to come. I have adjusted my work schedule, but I am still late and have a long wait at night. I would provide my name and email, but I have complained about the above many time and have never had the courtesy of a return email or phone call even though I was told I would receive one.

• Extend the 220 from the Memorial Union to the Davis Amtrak Station so that Winters have a connection to Amtrak at Davis. Provide Sunday Service on the 220. Extend the 215 from the County Fair Mall in Woodland to the Amtrak Station in Davis so that people can use Amtrak and Yolobus to visit Cache Creek Casino. Make it an Amtrak Thruway route in the same way that Santa Cruz Metro’s Highway 17 Express bus is.

• Some older buses are very uncomfortable.

• I live in Davis and would love to take the bus to Sacramento for shopping and for Sutter Hospital. Friends and family need transportation to UCD Hospital, Woodland Health in Davis, and Woodland Hospital for appointments as well as visiting patients. I would also like to take the bus from Davis to the Nut Tree Stores and other shopping in Vacaville. It would be great to have a bus connection from Davis to a Bart station for an affordable way to travel to San Francisco.
• Coordination with the ZipPass app used by SacRT would be nice so that I can continue to avoid using cash.
• Please work on customized outreach, for instance, reaching out to schools/parents at schools to find a way to better serve inter-city needs. Schedule is vitally important for students.
• Service needs to be expanded significantly but not with big buses that will be mostly empty. More neighborhood shuttles and on-demand service. Think outside the box. Traditional bus service has failed and is not sustainable. No one will stand at a bus stop in 100-degree weather and wait an hour for a bus when they can get an Uber in ten minutes or less.
• I need to go from Natomas (any bus stop would be ok) and then to Research Park Drive in Davis. I currently have zero alternatives for this commute.
• Thank you!
• Train bus drivers and occasionally investigate their performance on bus stops in less affluent neighborhoods relative to actually stopping to pick up passengers. Create a different fair for students versus workers. Make routes dependable -- which goes to the driver performance as well. Better on-time performance as well
• I rode Yolobus for 7+ years. Service was so unreliable that my employer commented on it and so I looked for other options. Then Yolobus fares went up for Express buses and ultimately my commute costs didn't increase much after buying an economy car and parking. Plus, I saved an hour a day in commute time.
• The Yolo bus website needs an update, but more than that, we need more frequent express buses between Sacramento and Davis.
• I live in Davis and recently retired from UCD. I have some issues with walking distances, so I often drive. I use the Unitrans to go to campus occasionally. But I would be open to using Yolobus to get to places besides UCD- which is the focus of Unitrans. Like Target, Costco, or Woodland Healthcare or Downtown Davis to avoid parking just to meet friends for food or a movie. That's really not an option now. I grew up in the Boston area and used public transportation as a teen and adult for recreation, shopping, exploring, cultural events, etc. Here that is just not possible since the buses don't go where I need them to go.
• I would use the bus more frequently between Davis and the airport if the route weren't so indirect. I would also use the bus between Davis and Downtown Commons before and after events if the buses came more frequently. But again, the most important factor for me, as a regular commuter, is better on-time performance.
• This survey is great! I love the framing of coverage v. frequency. Great job Yolobus. But please consider a micro transit shuttle.
• I am not sure you should accept any of my comments: I have a car and rarely use the bus. And to be honest, as long as I have a car, I likely won't use public transit. Having said that, there were many years when I did not have a car. I feel very fortunate to live in Yolo County where there is great service! I have taken the bus to Winters, Dixon, Vacaville, Cache Creek. It really is amazing to me how much service we get! When I have ridden the bus (and, as I said, for several years, it was a daily experience) I understood I'd have to wait, that I would have to walk to destinations,
that I’d have to make transfers. None were difficult for me to accommodate. (Oh, I do like the real time idea. Would be cool if at the bus stops this was something a rider could see! A ticker notice. Totally unreasonable, I am sure. I am not too tech savvy, but I do think this is something one can get on their phone.

- I live in West Sac Southport and work at Highway 50 and Watt. When I tried taking Yolobus line 39 then light rail to work, I had to assume a one-way commute time of 1.5 hours to account for waiting for the bus, taking Line 39 from the south side of Southport, walking and waiting for light rail, then walking to work from the light rail station. If there was a way to speed up the route and drop off closer to light rail in downtown Sac, I would consider taking public transportation again.
- Would be willing to take Yolobus to Sacramento daily for work, but bus travel time, plus walking to/from my destination, is substantially longer than driving myself. Perhaps partner with a bikeshare/scooter company to make it easier to reach a bus stop.
- Connecting Yolobus with UC Davis intercity transit bus stops (Mondavi) would be helpful for those going to UCDMC or UC Berkeley.
- I need weekly transportation between Davis and Rumsey. Not the Casino, but Rumsey. Once or twice a week.
- In Davis the preference for public transport seems to be for those who need commuter transport to Sacramento and the student population. That still leaves a large segment of the population in Yolo outside the bus system, so we continue to drive. One only needs to look at I-80 to see the gridlock. I don’t know enough about where Yolobus goes but I would be more than willing to take it if it was a practical alternative to driving everywhere here. For example, travel to and from the airport would be great, to and from Sacramento, to and from the Davis train station- these are at least some basic routes that most people would use if it is reliable, frequent and efficient, e.g. charge more for service to the airport that has limited stops along the way.
- A frequent express bus to and from the park and ride lot in Davis to downtown Sacramento. I would prefer the bus, but I drive because the “express” bus takes so long, and leaves Sacramento so late in the afternoon.
- I could put the pins in the map. Don’t have a right click on my computer as the instruction advise to use. Airport and downtown Sacramento are my main destinations in using Yolobus.
- There are often people with mental issues or alcohol/substance abuse on your buses. Several times these people insult other riders or say things which make it feel unsafe. Drivers do nothing. Need to address this if you want to grow ridership.
- It would be great to get rid of the "monthly" pass and just charge the lowest price for every boarding. As it is right now, if I go to work fewer than 19 days in a month, I've overpaid for my pass! That's easy to do since there's only 21 workdays in a month plus holidays, sick time, vacation, and the times when I miss the bus, or my work schedule requires me to stay late.
- Surprised there were no questions related to older adults or persons with disabilities that may need and use your services.
• I was trying to find out about taking the bus from Davis to the Sacramento airport. I could not figure out how to buy a ticket. This needs to be made clearer and people need to be able to do it online, or on the bus easily.

• Service routes/times are so disconnected here, I don’t know anyone who rides the bus and when I do see a bus, it is usually empty. Via is a great way to get around and I know lots of people who love this service. I would rather my tax dollars go toward subsidizing Via, than waste it on empty buses. Might be time to focus on routes to and from the transit center in West Sacramento, to other cities in the region.

• I used to use Yolobus system daily between 2001 and 2003. I didn’t have a car back then. Having a car made travel by bus inconvenient. I’d like to be able to take a Yolobus from Davis to the airport without it having to be a 1-2-hour ride. I’d take it to go to Sacramento as an express bus on weekends (to Old Sacramento) and I’d rather not have to go through West Sacramento to get there. I primarily bike in Davis.

• Need to better sync with other transit schedules, Amtrak, Unitrans, hourly connection to SMF and downtown Sacramento.

• I hope Jarrett Walker can come in and help with much of the work. He did wonders on Houston’s and Sacramento’s bus systems.

• I like the buses, but they’re too few and far between and don't go the places I need - namely to my home outside of Davis and back for work.

• I don't think it's possible to do what is necessary given the current budget. There would need to be a significant influx of funding to provide a level of service that is attractive enough to get riders to pick Yolobus as a choice. Right now, many people don't even consider it as an option with the possible exception of going to the airport, but even the airport service is only useful to those with a lot of time available. There are people who are willing to try Yolobus, but those that do get discouraged quickly, given the quality of the service.

• Wish the 230-route had better consistency, especially for the PM commute. The past few weeks, often one 230 bus is either late or is traveling in tandem with another 230 bus. Also, perhaps GPS would help new drivers from getting lost, taking the wrong exits or missing riders. On 10/21, the 230, 7:09 am bus did not pick up passengers at the Arlington/Alameda stop. Instead we saw the bus drive onto the freeway. It wasn't helpful that the next 230 bus, scheduled for 7:19 am was late by almost 15 minutes.

• I appreciate the bus system, I wish there was more frequent and faster service to and from Davis, that had less stops in Sacramento. It would be cool if passengers could be picked up/dropped off in a central downtown hub area rather than being so scattered across Sacramento and stopping every quarter mile. This adds on a lot of time. Also, a designated bus lane would make a big difference! Oh, so many hopes and dreams. Thanks for all your efforts, Yolobus!

• My drivers have told me that they could have better on time performance if you would switch the bus at 4:35 start time with the bus that starts at 4:45. Reason being the second bus comes from the yard and the first bus comes from a West Sacramento route. I know many riders who
have gone back to driving because they are so late almost every day. Also, the 45 in the morning that picks up at the hospital at 7:05 is late most of the time as well. Hence many riders no longer take the bus. I would leave my name and email, but I never receive a response back when I have emailed in the past. Also, if I call and make a complaint, I am told someone will contact me, but it never happens. I have used your service for 11 years and it has steadily gone downhill. I may after all these years make a change. Being late every day is really getting very frustrating!

- The buses are often dirty. It would make more sense to me if the seats on the buses were plastic rather than fabric, so that they were easier to clean.
- It would help if Yolobus tracked its own performance. When we report that the first PM bus never showed up, it is like Yolobus had no idea and was not tracking.
DATE: December 9, 2019

TO: Sacramento Regional Transit Board of Directors

FROM: Laura Ham, VP, Planning and Engineering

SUBJ: CAUSEWAY CONNECTION INTERCITY BUS SERVICE

RECOMMENDATION

Adopt the Attached Resolutions.

RESULT OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

Approves Title VI analysis, service changes, memorandum of understanding, and fare changes to establish new Causeway Connection intercity bus service, effective April 6, 2020.

FISCAL IMPACT

Estimated operating costs are $1,620,000 per year and would be funded by: (1) a $3 million Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) grant; (2) operating assistance from University of California, Davis (UCD); (3) fare revenue; and (4) SacRT operating funds. This program is a 3-year commitment. Parties will work together to evaluate future year increases and determine the appropriate funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross operating cost</td>
<td>$1,620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated fare revenue</td>
<td>($200,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ contribution</td>
<td>($710,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated UCD contribution*</td>
<td>($615,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sacramento contribution**</td>
<td>($47,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated SacRT net fiscal impact</td>
<td>($47,500)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The MOU would provide for UCD to pay a fixed annual contribution not-to-exceed $715,000, regardless of SacRT or YCTD’s actual costs. Fifty percent of the fare revenue received for the service would be deducted from this UCD contribution. If the fares received equal the estimate of $200,000, the UCD contribution would be reduced to $615,000 per year.

** This funding contribution has been pledged by City of Sacramento representatives as a means to provide more frequent peak-hour service and is approvable by the City Manager.
New vehicle costs are fully funded by Electrify America (EA) through the Cooperative Agreement approved by the Board of Directors on September 24, 2018. The service would total approximately 13,500 revenue hours per year, split approximately evenly between SacRT and YCTD.

**DISCUSSION**

This item was presented to the SacRT Board of Directors on November 18, 2019, but the Board declined to take action at that time and directed staff to re-examine the route, stops, and schedules, the data and assumptions on which the schedule was based, and on other concerns raised by riders of the existing UC Davis Medical Center (Medical Center) shuttle.

The Resolutions before the Board are the same in terms of dollar amount, parties, and basic scope of work; however, the stops and schedule have been revised significantly, as a result of the work staff has done following the Board’s direction on November 18. Part I of the report below provides a history and overview of the project and key terms of the recommended actions. Part II discusses public engagement efforts and responses, both before and after November 18.

**Part I: Project History, Overview, and Key Terms**

UCD currently runs an hourly shuttle bus between the UCD main campus in Davis and the Medical Center in Sacramento. The shuttle bus operates Monday through Friday on hourly headways, is funded by UCD, and is operated by a private carrier.

Over the past year, staff from SacRT, UCD, Yolo County Transportation District (YCTD), the City of Sacramento, Electrify America (EA), and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) developed a plan to change the service from a private closed-door intercampus shuttle to an open-door public intercity express bus. The route will have stops in Downtown Sacramento and Davis, and the Medical Center. The service will be provided using a new all-electric bus fleet. Under the proposed plan, SacRT will operate half the vehicles and trips and YCTD will operate the other half.

**Service Description**

Upon approval, the new service would begin on April 6, 2020 and operate hourly Monday through Friday from approximately 6:00 am to 8:00 pm, with approximate 20-minute frequency during morning and afternoon peak hours (i.e., three trips per hour). Travel times would be approximately 45 minutes from end to end, consistent with the existing service. The number of round trips would increase from 15 to 26 per day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Davis Stops</th>
<th>Sacramento Stops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silo Terminal</td>
<td>UC Davis Medical Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genome Facility</td>
<td>P/7th Streets*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mondavi Center</td>
<td>P/16th Streets*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mace Park-and-Ride</td>
<td>29th/R Streets*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T/34th Streets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P Street stops would be on Q Street in reverse direction
29th/R stop would be at 30th/R in reverse direction
There would be a total of four Davis stops and five Sacramento stops; however, the Mondavi Center and the Medical Center are the only two stops that would be served by every trip. The remainder of the stops would be served only on certain trips. As shown in the map on Page 3, there would be a variety of express options, each of which would have limited stops.

Compared to the existing route and schedule, the new service would add: (1) an East Davis park-and-ride stop (at Mace Blvd.) for commuters working in Sacramento, (2) a reverse commuter option, picking up in Downtown and Midtown Sacramento in the morning for commuters working in Davis; and (3) frequent peak-hour service (e.g., three trips per hour or approximate 20-minute headways) to provide a greater variety of departure and arrival times.

The schedules would also be updated to account for the increase in traffic over the past several years. The proposed schedule is shown on Pages 12 and 13.

Causeway Connection Route Map

Fare Structure
SacRT fares would be in effect (i.e., $2.50 base fare, $1.25 discount fare, $100 monthly passes, free for TK-12 students). Connect Card and Zip Pass would both be accepted. Like many major employers, UCD currently subsidizes employee monthly pass purchases, which will reduce the out-of-pocket monthly pass price to $35 per month for employees at the Medical Center and $70 for UCD main campus employees (for Medical Center employees, this would be a reduction in out-of-pocket price from the existing $45 monthly pass for the shuttle and the pass would be valid throughout the SacRT and YCTD systems, other than on YCTD express service.) UCD undergraduate student ID cards would be valid for unlimited rides on the service, but not on other SacRT routes.

Fleet and Charging
The fleet will consist of 12 full-size Proterra Catalyst E2 battery-electric buses. Six buses will belong to SacRT, six to YCTD. Overnight charging will take place at SacRT and at Yolobus bus yards. In-service charging will also be available at the Med Center terminal and at the Mondavi Center. The charging infrastructure is being paid for, purchased, and
constructed by EA with the assistance of SacRT and YCTD, and pursuant to the Volkswagen settlement with the California Air Resources Board (CARB), as detailed in the Cooperative Agreement approved by the SacRT Board September 24, 2018. Buses will be 40-foot low-floor transit buses with 33 seats, two wheelchair spaces, three bicycle racks, free WiFi, and USB charging ports at all seats.

Example 40-Foot Proterra Catalyst E2

Paratransit
Initiation of the Causeway Connection service would enlarge the SacRT service area (i.e., along I-80 and into Davis, along the new route). Accordingly, SacRT would acquire a legal duty under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to provide complementary paratransit service within 3/4 of a mile of the route. Staff expects demand for these trips to be around 150 passenger trips per year, costing approximately $6,500 per year; however, if ridership proves substantial, SacRT and YCTD would arrange for paratransit trips across the Sacramento River to be directed to and provided solely by YCTD, with an appropriate cost-sharing arrangement in place.

Marketing and Customer Information
The new service would be branded as the Causeway Connection and jointly operated by SacRT and YCTD. Telephone information, web page, and real-time customer information would be centralized, with details to be worked out following approval of the new service.

Future Changes
As proposed, the Causeway Connection would become a service of both SacRT and YCTD. The SacRT Board would have the authority to make alterations, subject to SacRT’s major service change policy; however, under the terms of the MOU, SacRT would agree to make a good faith effort to synchronize any changes with YCTD and SacRT would be bound to provide the approximate level of service, route, and schedule set forth in the MOU.

Title VI Analysis
Under SacRT’s major service change policy, initiation of this new route would be considered a major service change and required a 30-day public review of the proposed changes, as well as a Title VI service equity analysis which considers the impacts of the new service and fare changes on low-income and minority populations. The proposed changes and a draft Title VI analysis was made available for public comment on October 14, 2019. A revised version was presented on November 18, 2019 for approval, but the Board did not take action at that time. That version has been included in this report for consideration once again.
Title VI Finding
Although the users of the service are expected to be higher-income and lower percentage minority than the existing SacRT system, the analysis concluded that initiation of this service and the related fare changes would be more beneficial to minority and low-income populations than the no-action scenario (i.e., continuation of the existing service as closed-door service), and that the no-action scenario is the only realistic alternative to the new service.

With respect to Title VI and SacRT’s public review requirements, the proposal has not been changed materially—the level of service, number of round trips, vehicle hours and miles, and service area are unchanged or negligibly changed. What has changed are some of the stops, as well as the time points in the proposed schedule. These factors are not significant enough to alter the Title VI results.

Causeway Connection Bus Wrap

Part II: Public Engagement

A total of 46 public comments were received by SacRT from October 14 through November 12 through SacRT’s formal public review process, and were included in the November 18 agenda item.

In addition to SacRT’s formal process, UCD coordinated two rounds of open houses, four in October, four in November, which were directed primarily at existing shuttle riders. The open houses were attended by SacRT and YCTD staff and were well-attended by riders, generating significant discussion and follow-up correspondence. There was also extended public comment and discussion on this item at the November 18 Board meeting.

On November 19, the project team met with a group of approximately a dozen riders on campus at UCD for additional discussion on their concerns. On November 22, the riders sent to the project team a “Path to Yes” document outlining their preferences in each of five areas: (1) seatbelts, (2) bicycle racks, (3) governance and monitoring, (4) fares, and (5) stops and schedule.

The letter from the riders requested responses by midnight, the night of November 25. The project team provided responses on the subjects of seatbelts, bike racks, fares, and stops/schedule on or in advance of that time, which are summarized below.

Seatbelts
Riders expressed concern about the lack of seatbelts on the proposed fleet. SacRT and YCTD explored the cost and feasibility of a seatbelt retrofit with EA, the bus manufacturer, and its equipment vendors:

- Seatbelts cannot be retrofitted onto the existing seats; therefore, replacement seats would need to be procured.
- Seatbelt-equipped seats could not be mounted to the floor at the existing mounting points; new mounting points would have to be installed.
- There may not be adequate space under the floor to install new mounting points, because the electric battery array is located under the floor. It is also uncertain if steel mounting points can be retrofitted onto the composite shell of the vehicle.
- The battery array would likely need to be removed as part of the retrofit, adding time and labor cost to the installation.
- Seatbelt-equipped seats are wider than the existing seats, which would change the dimensions of the ADA area and the aisle ways, potentially in unacceptable ways.
- Seatbelt-equipped seats would be heavier than the existing seats. Given that the battery array and composition of the frame make the bus heavy to begin with, additional weight could violate regulatory limits or result in performance-related safety problems (e.g., with braking, acceleration, turning/handling, etc.)
- The cost was estimated at between $240,000 and $480,000 for parts, installation labor, and engineering design for the twelve bus fleet.
- The buses have already been built and testing/acceptance is under way. EA considers the buses paid for as specified and would not pay for a retrofit. Between limited engineering support from the manufacturer and a complicated installation, the timeline for a retrofit could be protracted.
- YCTD would also need to approve any retrofit, to assure uniformity of the fleet.

A summary of these issues was relayed to the rider group on November 25. For the reasons, expressed above, it is not feasible to retrofit the current vehicles with seatbelts. At the time of vehicle procurement, higher capacity, freeway-style over-the-road coaches (as used on the current shuttle) which would typically be designed more for longer journeys (including seatbelts) were not widely available in a battery electric format. In the long run (i.e., if the Causeway Connection became a permanent service beyond the three-year term of the MOU and if the existing buses were repurposed to another route satisfying EA’s use conditions) SacRT and YCTD could seek funds for over-the-road coaches for the service.

**Bike Racks**

The buses used for the existing Medical Center shuttle have capacity for nine bicycles in the baggage area under the coach. The buses procured for the Causeway Connection will be equipped with a three-bike rack in the front of the bus.

During peak hours, there would be three Causeway Connection buses per hour, so the bicycle capacity is equivalent to existing capacity (at nine bikes per hour); however, staff and the riders remain concerned that bicycle capacity could be an issue, particularly for commuters going to Davis, where bicycle use is greater. Staff investigated the cost and feasibility of retrofitting rear bicycle racks:

- At least one major manufacturer offers a rear bicycle rack with capacity for five bicycles; however, this model has not been installed on a Proterra Catalyst.
The vehicle code does not allow a rear bicycle rack if a front bicycle rack is also installed, so total bicycle capacity would only increase from three to five.

Bicycle theft can reportedly be an issue with rear bicycle racks and there have been reported incidents of people trying to ride on a rear bicycle rack or skateboarders grabbing hold of the rack to be “towed.”

The bus operator may need to exit the bus to assist customers with loading, unloading, and securement and to assure that no one is near the rear bike rack when the bus resumes the route. This would also add dwell time at each stop with bicycle activity.

Rear bicycle racks may obstruct access to maintenance compartments.

The turning radius would be reduced.

Staff estimates a retrofit would cost between $25,000 and $50,000; EA considers the buses paid for and built to specification and would not pay for the retrofit.

YCTD would also need to approve a retrofit, to assure uniformity of the fleet.

A summary of these issues was relayed to the rider group on November 22. Several first/last mile solutions also exist or are in development, which may help mitigate potential bicycle capacity issues and give customers more options. The Medical Center stop will feature a bicycle storage area with space for about 40 bicycles which will be available to University affiliates via free badge-controlled access. JUMP bike share is also available in Davis and several shared mobility device providers now serve the Medical Center area.

Fares

Riders of the existing shuttle currently pay $1.50 for a single ride or $45 for a monthly pass. Existing SacRT fares would be in effect on the Causeway Connection, including free rides for TK-12 students and other discount programs available to the general public. Many Causeway Connection riders would likely be eligible for additional discount programs through UCD, according to their affiliation:

Undergraduates – Undergraduates would ride the Causeway Connection for free with their student ID cards, as an extension of an existing program that is funded by undergraduate student fees.

Sacramento Employees - For employees working at the Medical Center in Sacramento, the out-of-pocket price for a monthly pass would decrease from $45 to $35 (and the pass they receive would also allow unlimited rides on SacRT system-wide). The Sacramento campus subsidizes $65 of the full cost of a $100 monthly pass, consistent with the tax code’s maximum allowable tax deduction for employee transportation subsidies (and comparable to most other large public employers in Sacramento).

Davis Employees - The Davis campus currently subsidizes $35 of a $100 monthly pass, so the out-of-pocket price for Davis employees would increase from $45 to $65 per month; however, UCD has pledged to increase the employer subsidy to at least $55. This would keep out-of-pocket costs at parity with the existing shuttle at $45 per month for Davis employees.

Graduate Students - Graduate students have not opted into a student fee program, so if they are not also employees of UCD, they are subject to the general public price of $100 for a monthly pass. UCD has pledged to implement a program to keep graduate student out-of-pocket costs at today’s $45 per month price.
Members of the general public (i.e., not affiliated with UCD) would be subject to existing SacRT fares, including existing discount programs. Staff has maintained that both transit agencies intend to adhere to the existing fare structure. SacRT encourages all employers to subsidize employee transit passes; however, staff has maintained that this is an issue for UCD to pursue unilaterally, like any other major employer.

### Out-Of-Pocket Monthly Pass Price
**For Major Causeway Connection Rider Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Shuttle</th>
<th>Original Proposal</th>
<th>Updated UC Davis Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UC Davis Undergraduates</strong></td>
<td>$45/mo</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UC Davis Sacramento Employees</strong></td>
<td>$45/mo</td>
<td>$35/mo *</td>
<td>$35/mo *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UC Davis Davis Employees</strong></td>
<td>$45/mo</td>
<td>$65/mo *</td>
<td>$45/mo **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UC Davis Graduate Students</strong></td>
<td>$45/mo</td>
<td>$100/mo</td>
<td>$45/mo **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reflects UC Davis subsidy from nominal $100/month transit pass
** UC Davis pledges to implement new program to achieve equal or better out of pocket price.

### Governance and Monitoring

The "Path to Yes" letter from the Causeway riders group outlined a number of monitoring and accountability measures they requested of UCD. Areas included performance monitoring, a plan for continuity of service after the three-year term of the MOU, UCD having a formal role in SacRT/YCTD decision making, and riders having the opportunity to review the MOU prior to finalization.

**Data Analysis and Monitoring** – All Causeway Connection buses will be equipped with electronic fareboxes and SacRT’s fleet will include Automatic Passenger Counters (APCs) that provide stop-by-stop boarding, alighting, and schedule adherence data. This will be a significant improvement over the manually collected rider tallies on the existing shuttle. SacRT will share this data with UCD or anyone who requests it.

**Governance** – SacRT would retain authority to alter the Causeway Connection, subject to SacRT’s own major service change policy; however, the proposed MOU would obligate SacRT to provide service meeting the specified route and level of service description and to work in good faith with YCTD and UCD to coordinate any changes. Were UCD to become dissatisfied with SacRT’s performance, UCD would have the option to not renew the agreement or to pursue termination, subject to concurrence from YCTD and other relevant conditions.

Although the actual MOU language has not been finalized, the principle terms have been outlined and included in this agenda item (as well as in the November 18, 2019 agenda item) which have been available online for public review (in accordance with SacRT’s open meeting requirements under California law). The Resolution would direct the General Manager/CEO to execute an agreement adhering to those principle terms.
Stops and Schedule
Draft schedules were shared with members of the public during open houses that took place in November. Based on feedback, revised schedules were included in the November 18 agenda item. Since that time, staff has made additional revisions, based considerably on additional engagement with members of the public, and which are reflected in the final proposed schedule on Pages 12 and 13 and in the Resolution to approve the service.

Since November 18, staff had multiple meetings with representatives from the existing shuttle riders, both by phone and in person, on both the stops and schedule as well as running time data. Staff believes that the revised schedule reflects both a sound strategy for attracting new riders as well as an approach that is more favorable to and more likely to retain riders from the existing shuttle.

Schedule Highlights - As proposed, the Causeway Connection route and schedule would resemble the existing shuttle, but would be augmented in several key ways, including:

- Additional trips during peak hours (up to 3-4 trips per hour) would provide a greater variety of stops and time slots during popular commuting hours.
- Reverse commuter service from Downtown Sacramento to Davis and back in the afternoon, would serve a potentially large and underserved market.
- New peak-hour stops in East Davis would provide a free park-and-ride option that would not require East Davis residents to backtrack to the Mondavi Center.
- Updated running times would make the schedule more accurate and make departure times more consistently reliable.

Express Trips – Throughout the public review process, existing shuttle riders urged that the Causeway Connection maximize the number of express trips and minimize the number of trips with stops in Downtown Sacramento, due to both a preference for faster, more direct service, as well as concern about schedule reliability.

Although prior versions of the schedule did feature a significant amount of express service during peak hours, more recent versions of the schedule provide an even greater level of express service as shown in the current proposal. Although the final schedule features fewer new stops, staff believes that the issues raised by the existing shuttle riders are legitimate concerns, and that this more cautious approach will maximize retention of riders from the existing shuttle. Staff believes that the modified schedule is sound, provides genuine opportunities for ridership growth, and achieves a considerable improvement in schedule reliability over the existing service.

Reverse Commute Service - Currently, YCTD provides numerous commuter bus routes into Sacramento, but only one trip on one commuter route from Sacramento to Davis, with service to the UCD Memorial Union. The only other public transit options from Sacramento into Davis are the Capitol Corridor and hourly local-stop service on YCTD Route 42, with numerous stops in West Sacramento and throughout Davis. Based on ridership data from the existing Med Center shuttle, which shows 50/50 ridership splits between Davis and Sacramento, staff believes the reverse commuter service proposed for the Causeway Connection would serve a major untapped market.

Running Times - As existing shuttle riders have pointed out, schedules on the existing shuttle are outdated, with an assumed 25 minute travel time across the causeway,
regardless of time of day. The proposed schedules for the Causeway Connection adjust running times by both direction and time of day and range from 24 minutes at night to 46 minutes in the afternoon, headed eastbound, when traffic congestion is heaviest.

Using data from the existing service provider, drive time data by hour of the day, running time data recorded by existing shuttle riders, as well as field testing, each trip in the schedule was re-timed. In the afternoon, median running times back to Sacramento approach 50 minutes across the causeway. There is also an extreme amount of variance, with times ranging from 35 to 80 minutes.

To account for the extreme variance in running times, schedules have been rebuilt to not only allow more time across the causeway, but to also add fairly generous schedule recovery at each end of the route. This helps assure that longer-than-usual delays on one trip do not jeopardize the on-time departure of the next trip and that operators can expect reasonable break time throughout their shifts.

**Davis Stops** — The original concept for the Causeway Connection was to eliminate two of the three stops on the UCD campus—the Silo terminal and the Genome Biomedical Science Facility (GBSF)—to allow time for new stops in Downtown Davis and Downtown Sacramento. The Mondavi Center was proposed to be the single UCD stop, based on its proximity to I-80, and the ability to install charging infrastructure at this location for the electric vehicles. Although the Mondavi Center is not within convenient walking distance of many campus destinations, it was felt that first/last-mile solutions could be used by riders to complete their journeys.

Over the course of several revisions, the Downtown Davis stop was dropped to allow for other stops or more direct service. As discussed above, service to the Downtown Sacramento stops was also reduced over several schedule iterations as well.

Originally, the Downtown Sacramento stops were to be served bi-directionally throughout the entire day. In the November 18 schedule, they were to be served mono-directionally at peak and bi-directionally off-peak. With the new current version, the off-peak service has been dropped, so that the Downtown Sacramento stops are served strictly as a reverse commute service. This has essentially allowed the new schedule to continue to include the Silo and GBSF stops on an all-day, hourly basis, consistent with the existing shuttle.

The GBSF is located on the west end of campus and is used as a park-and-ride by commuters working in Sacramento as well as a destination for veterinary and medical center employees. The Silo is located closer to the center of campus. Although it is farther from the freeway, it is closer to more destinations, and is currently the most popular Davis stop, accounting for 40 percent of Davis boardings. Staff felt that the limited bicycle capacity of the new fleet was another reason to continue direct service to the Silo (i.e., because biking would be less feasible as a first/last-mile solution from the Mondavi Center).

In the long run, the parties may want to consider elimination of one or more of the Davis stops, to allow time for more stops in Downtown Sacramento, but for the initial launch, staff believes that maintaining greater similarity to the existing shuttle is a prudent strategy to maximize ridership retention and customer satisfaction, while still allowing some opportunities for growth. This also makes evaluation of the new service easier. With fewer changes, it will be easier to pinpoint what is working well and what is not.
Capacity – Seat and bicycle capacity have been areas of concern for existing riders related to the route and schedule. The over-the-road coaches used on the existing shuttle seat 47 or 56 persons and have capacity for 9 bicycles. In comparison, the new electric transit buses seat 33 passengers with bicycle capacity limited to a 3-slot bicycle rack.

With three trips per hour, seat capacity on the new service will actually be greater, and bicycle capacity will be equal to the existing shuttle during peak hours; however, if there is uneven distribution of passengers or especially bicycles, there could still be capacity problems. For this reason, during peak hours, the schedule has been written to essentially have two buses shadow one another, to provide double the capacity, with a third bus slotted within twenty minutes.

Compared to the original plan of even 20 minute headways throughout the peak hours, this provides fewer time slots to choose from, but greater assurance of capacity for the busy 8:00 am and 9:00 am shifts. Again, this strategy represents a shift to a more cautious approach, partly to compensate for the reduced capacity of the vehicles. This approach was urged by existing shuttle riders and staff felt it was reasonable to initiate the service with a more cautious approach such as this.

Next Steps

Staff recommends the Board approve the four attached resolutions, which would: (1) approve the Title VI analysis of the service and fare changes; (2) approve creation of the new service; (3) delegate authority to the General Manager/CEO to approve the MOU, which would secure operating funding, establish the general parameters for operation of the service, and authorize YCTD and SacRT to serve bus stops at UCD and the Medical Center; and (4) recognize the UCD undergraduate student ID as Fare Equivalent for use only on the Causeway Connection service.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Davis</th>
<th>Silo</th>
<th>GBSF</th>
<th>Mondavi</th>
<th>Mace</th>
<th>Downtown Sacramento</th>
<th>UC Davis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q/7th</td>
<td>Q/16th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>6:09a</td>
<td>6:15a</td>
<td>6:23a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>7:07a</td>
<td>7:15a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>7:13a</td>
<td>7:20a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>8:07a</td>
<td>8:15a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>8:13a</td>
<td>8:20a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>9:00a</td>
<td>9:10a</td>
<td>9:21a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10a</td>
<td>10:14a</td>
<td>10:21a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10a</td>
<td>11:14a</td>
<td>11:21a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10p</td>
<td>1:14p</td>
<td>1:21p</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10p</td>
<td>4:20p</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:13p</td>
<td>4:21p</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:10p</td>
<td>5:20p</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>5:13p</td>
<td>5:21p</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:10p</td>
<td>7:14p</td>
<td>7:21p</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:10p</td>
<td>8:14p</td>
<td>8:21p</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**East Davis Express trips**

**Sacramento Reverse Commuter trips**
## Causeway Connection
### Proposed Schedule

**Westbound to Davis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UC Davis</th>
<th>Downtown Sacramento</th>
<th>Davis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>30th/R P/16th P/7th</td>
<td>Mace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5:53a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:17a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6:45a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:57a</td>
<td>7:05a 7:09a 7:12a</td>
<td>7:39a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:10a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7:40a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:10a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7:40a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:57a</td>
<td>8:05a 8:09a 8:12a</td>
<td>8:39a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:10a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8:40a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:10a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8:40a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:57a</td>
<td>9:05a 9:09a 9:12a</td>
<td>9:39a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9:40a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10:35a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10a</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11:35a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:10p</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12:35p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10p</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1:35p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10p</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2:35p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:10p</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3:35p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:50p</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4:15p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10p</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4:40p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:10p</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4:40p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:50p</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5:16p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:20p</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5:55p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:20p</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5:55p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45p</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6:10p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:20p</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6:45p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:20p</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7:45p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:20p</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8:45p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**East Davis Express trips**

**Sacramento Reverse Commuter trips**
(This page intentionally left blank)
Attachment 1

“Path to Yes” Letter
From Medical Center Shuttle Riders
Across the Causeway Transit Riders Collective

Safety

WHAT YES LOOKS LIKE: All bus seats have lap and shoulder belts.

Point person: Mike Tentis

- Unlike intra-city buses, these buses travel at 70 mph on the freeway, increasing the risk to riders by not having seat belts or forcing them to stand.
- “Because of safety concerns, the university does not allow people to ride while standing in the aisle,” Contreras said. In other words: no seat, no ride (UCD Shuttle Article 2008)
- In 2017, Governor Brown signed a law (SB20) requiring passengers to use seatbelts on transit buses when they are provided, indicating the risk in not wearing a seatbelt is recognized by California. In the very near future, all transit buses will be required to have seatbelts.
- Seatbelts are the single most effective traffic safety device for preventing death and injury in the event of a crash. (US Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration)
- For example, Russell (long time rider with accessibility needs) and patients at UCDMC require a seatbelt. From Russell: “[T]he reduced seating capacity and lack of seat belts on the new electric buses recently purchased by the University, through a grant from Electrify America, present safety concerns for me and other shuttle users with disabilities because riders could be required to stand, which could result in falling, or be thrown forward if seated, when the driver needs to suddenly stop to avoid a collision with another vehicle.”

Seatbelts are safe for everyone

Example of seatbelts on public transit

November 22, 2019
Across the Causeway Transit Riders Collective

Bicycles

WHAT YES LOOKS LIKE: Current capacity for direct hourly express service should be at least matched (8 full size bikes per vehicle).

Point Person: Alana Firl

- Environmentally friendly: Since we are looking to reduce overall emissions and be a model of environmentally responsible transit in the future, this is an opportunity to showcase the future of public transit by being as green as possible.
- Increases ridership: This is an effective way to solve the issue of “First Mile, Last Mile” which can be a barrier to transit and aligns with Davis’s notability as the Bicycle Capital of the USA.
  Given the number of riders who currently take bikes (and the fact that frequently bikes are turned away even with a capacity of 8 and previous capacity of 15), it is clear the demand is present for bike capacity on this route. Allowing more bikes expands the distance around each stop where riders are willing/able to travel from home/work to the stop, which will increase ridership.
- Current bike capacity is 120 full sized bikes per day (15 runs and 8 bikes per bus) while new bike capacity is only 78 (26 runs with only 3 bikes per run) leaving unacceptably limited bike capacity in the express service where it is most needed.
- While helpful, more storage isn’t an adequate solution since many people use bikes on both sides of their commute, to/from home and to/from work. Both secure storage at the bus stops and use of public bike share (as suggested by UCD administration) increases costs.
- Increasing bike capacity decreases the need for people to drive to the shuttle which represents a cost savings to the university as they will need to build fewer parking structures/lots (along with the added health benefit of biking)

Example: Swiss Poste Bus - Six bike rack capacity

Six bicycles wait to board at UC Davis Mondavi Center

November 22, 2019
Across the Causeway Transit Riders Collective

UCD’s Commitment to Students, Employees, Patients

WHAT YES LOOKS LIKE: UCD makes a formal commitment that it will continue to provide direct connectivity between campuses and that the form of connectivity (e.g., public transit, charter buses) will be driven by UCD affiliate needs. UCD will collect and analyze data.

Point Person: Tara Ursell

The MOU should include:
- UCD will develop a data collection plan and measurable criteria for determining whether the new transit model can meet the needs of current and potential future riders.
- UCD will monitor UCD affiliate transit usage separately, so that it can determine whether UCD needs are being met.
- UCD will adjust routes or modes of transit to meet UCD stakeholder needs (based on data findings).
- State explicitly how UCD will ensure its stakeholders retain access to intercampus express transit if SacRT and YCTD cease to provide intercampus express transit service during or at the end of the MOU period.
- UCD will retain FTEs dedicated to analyzing data and using the data to represent the needs of UCD employees/students/staff/faculty/patients on both campuses. Communication and collaboration across campuses is key.
- UCD will have a formal role in SacRT/YCTD decision making
- State explicitly what UCD will do to meet its stakeholders' needs if there is a significant reduction in mass transit usage after the shuttle is cancelled.
- UCD will adequately advertise service using printed and electronic communications
- Current riders will be given the opportunity to review the MOU prior to finalization to confirm that it meets the needs of current riders.

November 22, 2019
Across the Causeway Transit Riders Collective

Fare

WHAT YES LOOKS LIKE: Maintain current fare structure ($1.50/single ride and $45/month) for UCD affiliates. If SaCRT/YCTD change fares in the future, UC Davis affiliates will continue to pay a proportionally scaled fare. This arrangement should be explicitly stated in the MOU.

Point People: Abbey Hart (**********), Clare Cannon (**********)

○ In order to better connect the UC Davis and UCDMC campus, fares should be consistent. Asking one campus to pay more/less than other can create uncomfortable dynamics and asymmetries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOARDING PASSES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ONE WAY PASS</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEN RIDE PASS</td>
<td>$15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTHLY PASS (unlimited rides)</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Fare Structure as displayed on UC Davis Intercampus Shuttle Website

UC Davis is continuing to evaluate options for equalizing the fare structure for Davis and Sacramento-based employees.

UC Davis is working to ensure UC Davis affiliates pay the same low fares for the Causeway Connection as they currently pay on the intercampus shuttle. We expect to announce a final fare structure in December.

Announcement regarding fare structure for proposed Causeway Connection as displayed on Causeway Connection UC Davis website

November 22, 2019
Across the Causeway Transit Riders Collective

Schedule, Route, and Passenger Capacity

WHAT YES LOOKS LIKE: Hourly (or more frequent) direct service that is capable of meeting current demand (i.e. no UCD affiliate is left at the curb). We propose that the best way to ensure this is by doing a pilot study blending existing service and the proposed new service.

Point Person: Alana Firl

- A pilot study that has been optimized using objective measures of usage and surveys of riders should be used to design any new service (e.g. run during the academic year, tested for long enough to allow riders to try options).
- Since this is also incorporating new service areas, SacRT and Yolobus should provide data that shows a current unmet need from their existing ridership.
- Comparing the existing service directly with the new service will provide clear evidence whether this new service solves an unmet transit need, while not eliminating any needed attributes from existing ridership during the trial.
- The trial should maintain three existing UCD stops OR equivalent stops so that no UC Davis affiliates have to travel more than they currently do to their final destination or if that’s not possible UCD will provide means to add travel around campus (e.g. shuttles similar to the UCDMC shuttles around the parking lots).
- The trial period should not end until the long-term service begins operating following the parameters and findings determined by the pilot.

Autonomous Olli bus at Sacramento State transports community throughout campus

UCD Health System Shuttles transport community to parking, light rail, Midtown
RESOLUTION NO. 19-12-0137

Adopted by the Board of Directors of the Sacramento Regional Transit District on this date:

December 9, 2019

APPROVING A TITLE VI SERVICE AND FARE EQUITY ANALYSIS

WHEREAS, SacRT is considering introducing new bus service, known as the Causeway Connection, which would meet the definition of a major service change, as defined in Resolution 15-12-0137, and which would also allow undergraduate students with a University of California, Davis student ID to ride the service at no cost, resulting in a fare change, as defined in Resolution 15-11-0129; and

WHEREAS, a Title VI service and fare equity analysis of the proposed changes has been prepared, was made available for public review on October 14, 2019 for a 30-day comment period, and was publicized in accordance with SacRT policy on major service changes and on fare changes; and

WHEREAS, the Title VI change equity analysis has been revised to reflect adjustments to the proposed changes; and

WHEREAS, the Title VI equity analysis found that there might be potential disparate impacts to minority populations and that there might be potential disproportionate burdens to low-income populations from adopting the proposed service changes because the proposed service is expected to be less utilized by minority and low-income populations than SacRT’s overall system; and

WHEREAS, the Title VI equity analysis found that there were no potential disparate impacts to minority populations and that there were no potential disproportionate burdens to low-income populations from the proposed fare change.

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT AS FOLLOWS:

THAT, the Board of Directors has reviewed, is aware of, and approves the Title VI equity analysis set forth in Exhibit A; and

THAT, the Board of Directors recognizes that the proposed service will effect a transition of an existing private, closed-door shuttle service into a public, open-door service, which will be more beneficial to minority and low-income populations than existing conditions; and

THAT, the Board of Directors recognizes that the operating and maintenance cost of the proposed service would be fully funded for a three-year period by a discretionary grant and by third-party operating assistance from the University of California, Davis, both of which are conditioned upon the new service being implemented as planned; and

THAT, recognizing these facts, the Board of Directors finds that the only alternative to the proposed new service would be a no-action scenario, which would confer fewer benefits to minority and low-income populations; and
THAT, the Board of Directors therefore finds that there is a substantial legitimate justification to implement the service and amend the fare structure as specified in the Title VI analysis.

ATTEST:

HENRY LI, Secretary

By:

Cindy Brooks, Assistant Secretary

PATRICK KENNEDY, Chair
Exhibit A

Title VI Service and Fare Equity Analysis
(This page intentionally left blank)
RESOLUTION NO. 19-12-0138

Adopted by the Board of Directors of the Sacramento Regional Transit District on this date:

December 9, 2019

CONDITIONALLY ADOPTING SERVICE CHANGES TO ESTABLISH A NEW CAUSEWAY CONNECTION BUS SERVICE TO UC DAVIS MEDICAL CENTER

WHEREAS, SacRT is considering introducing new bus service, known as the Causeway Connection, which would meet the definition of a major service change, as defined in Resolution 15-12-0137; and

WHEREAS, a Title VI equity analysis of the proposed service has been prepared, was made available on October 14, 2019 for a 30-day comment period, and publicized in accordance with SacRT policy on major service changes; and

WHEREAS, the Title VI equity analysis found that there might be potential disparate impacts to minority populations and that there might be potential disproportionate burdens to low-income populations from adopting the proposed changes; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors reviewed, made itself aware of, and approved the Title VI equity analysis and found that there was a substantial legitimate justification to implement the service changes and amend the fare structure; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors anticipates approval and execution by the General Manager/CEO of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the University of California, Davis (UCD), and the Yolo County Transportation District (YCTD) to fully fund the operating and maintenance cost of the service for the three-year term of the MOU; and

WHEREAS, because operations, maintenance, and capital costs for the proposed service have been fully-funded under the MOU and prior agreements, the Board of Directors intends to exempt the new service from the route sunset process described in Resolution 15-12-0137, which would otherwise subject the new service to potential automatic elimination, if minimum ridership productivity standards were not met.

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT AS FOLLOWS:

THAT, the proposed changes are exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act, per California Public Resources Code, Section 21080(b)(10) and Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Section 15275(a); and

THAT, conditioned upon full execution of the MOU by UCD, SacRT and YCTD, SacRT will implement the Causeway Connection bus service shown in Exhibit A, effective April 6, 2020, and coordinate shared operations of the service with YCTD in accordance with the MOU, for the duration of the three-year MOU; and
THAT, the Board of Directors hereby exempts the service from the route sunset process of Resolution 15-12-0137, Section 3.

A T T E S T:

HENRY LI, Secretary

By:

Cindy Brooks, Assistant Secretary
Exhibit A

Causeway Connection Map and Schedule
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>East Davis Express trips</th>
<th>Sacramento Reverse Commuter trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:30a</td>
<td>6:45a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:17a</td>
<td>6:32a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:05a</td>
<td>6:20a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:53a</td>
<td>6:08a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:41a</td>
<td>5:56a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:29a</td>
<td>5:44a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:17a</td>
<td>5:32a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:05a</td>
<td>5:20a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:53a</td>
<td>4:59a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:41a</td>
<td>5:04a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:29a</td>
<td>4:35a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:17a</td>
<td>4:22a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:05a</td>
<td>4:0a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:53a</td>
<td>3:59a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:41a</td>
<td>3:46a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:29a</td>
<td>3:35a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:17a</td>
<td>3:22a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:05a</td>
<td>3:0a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:53a</td>
<td>2:59a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:41a</td>
<td>2:46a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:29a</td>
<td>2:35a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:17a</td>
<td>2:22a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:05a</td>
<td>2:0a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:53a</td>
<td>1:59a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:41a</td>
<td>1:46a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:29a</td>
<td>1:35a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:17a</td>
<td>1:22a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:05a</td>
<td>1:0a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:53a</td>
<td>0:59a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:41a</td>
<td>0:46a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:29a</td>
<td>0:35a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:17a</td>
<td>0:22a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:05a</td>
<td>0:0a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Exhibit A**

Updated 12/3/19

Prepared for 12/9/19 SacRT Board Meeting
RESOLUTION NO. 19-12-0139

Adopted by the Board of Directors of the Sacramento Regional Transit District on this date:

December 9, 2019

DELEGATING AUTHORITY TO THE GENERAL/MANAGER CEO TO APPROVE A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (MOU) BETWEEN THE SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT, THE YOLO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT (YCTD), AND THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS (UCD) FOR OPERATION OF THE CAUSEWAY CONNECTION

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT AS FOLLOWS:

THAT, the General Manager/CEO is hereby delegated authority to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Yolo County Transportation District and the University of California, Davis for operation of the Causeway Connection on substantially the same terms as set out in Exhibit A.

PATRICK KENNEDY, Chair

A T T E S T:

HENRY LI, Secretary

By: ___________________________________________________________________
    Cindy Brooks, Assistant Secretary
Exhibit A

Memorandum of Understanding
Draft Terms
(This page intentionally left blank)
1. Parties
   a. Sacramento Regional Transit District (SacRT)
   b. Yolo County Transportation District (YCTD)
   c. University of California, Davis (UCD)
2. Term
   a. Three year term
   b. Takes effect 4/1/20
   c. Ends 3/31/23
3. Service
   a. Monday through Friday only
   b. Route is from Mondavi Center in Davis to UC Davis Medical Center in Sacramento
   c. Stops are to be determined, but will be approximately 3-4 stops in Davis, 3-5 stops in Sacramento
   d. Trips will take approximately 45 minutes one way
   e. Headways will be approximately hourly, except during peak hours, when there will be additional trips
   f. Combined service will include approximately 26 one-way vehicle trips per day each direction
   g. Service will be approximately 13,500 revenue vehicle hours per year
   h. Service will be operated approximately 50/50 between SacRT and YCTD (i.e., approximately 26 one-way trips per agency)
4. Cost
   a. Gross operating cost of the service will be considered to be $1,620,000 per year for the three year term
   b. Net cost will be gross operating cost minus fare revenue
      i. UC Davis undergraduate student IDs generate no upfront fare revenue for SacRT and YCTD
   c. CMAQ grant funds will pay 50 percent of net cost, split 50/50 by SacRT and YCTD, with a maximum of $810,000
   d. Local match will be equal to CMAQ contribution and will be paid by UCD, SacRT, and City of Sacramento
      i. UCD will contribute first $615,000
      ii. SacRT and City of Sacramento will contribute next $95,000 split 50/50 (separate agreement with City of Sacramento)
         1. SacRT contribution not to exceed $47,500
         2. City of Sacramento contribution not to exceed $47,500
      iii. Final $100,000 will be paid by UCD, if necessary, due to lower-than-expected fare revenue
         1. Total UCD contribution not to exceed $715,000
   e. A fraction of payments from UCD will be treated as fare revenue, to account for use of undergraduate student IDs, as described in Section 7
5. Flow of funds
   a. CMAQ funds will be claimed and collected by SacRT from FTA; YCTD will invoice SacRT for their amount as specified in Section 4; YCTD will not be a direct Federal recipient for CMAQ funds for this project; SacRT shall act as a pass-through agency
   b. SacRT and YCTD will divide CMAQ funds quarterly as follows:
Exhibit A

Memorandum of Understanding
Draft Terms

i. SacRT and YCTD will track ridership and fare collection on the Causeway Connection, separate from the remainder of their routes

ii. SacRT will provide fare revenue totals for its portion of the service to YCTD

iii. YCTD will total fare revenue from the two agencies, to determine net cost

iv. YCTD will invoice SacRT for CMAQ funds so that CMAQ funds plus fare revenue are equal for both agencies

c. SacRT and YCTD will invoice UCD as follows:
   i. UCD will be billed quarterly, in advance of service, for their share of gross operating cost
   ii. With each quarterly invoice, payments due from UCD will be adjusted to account for differences between gross cost and net cost, for prior quarters, once actual fare revenue is known

6. Fare structure
   a. Fare structure will change from existing private/closed-door fare structure to public fare structure on 4/1/20 when SacRT and YCTD assume operation
   b. Existing fare structure on SacRT and YCTD will be in force except as noted; the transfer agreement between SacRT and YCTD will be in effect, except as noted
   c. Single fare
      i. Single fare is $2.50
      ii. Discount single fare is $1.25
      iii. Cash will be accepted
      iv. SacRT prepaid mag stripe/QR tickets will be accepted
      v. SacRT Zip Pass will be accepted
      vi. Connect Card will be accepted
      vii. SacRT 90-minute fares (on Zip Pass and Connect Card) will be accepted
   d. Senior/disabled
      i. Seniors are eligible for discount fare
      ii. All valid SacRT and YCTD discount IDs are honored
   e. Students
      i. SacRT students ride for free with a valid ID
      ii. YCTD youth, up to age 18, ride for free
   f. Transfers
      i. Transfers to or from either agency will not be sold or honored
   g. Day passes
      i. Day passes from either agency will be honored
      ii. Customers may purchase a SacRT day pass for $7.00 or a discount day pass for $3.50 by presenting a valid SACRT discount or Student (TK-12) ID or Medicare card or driver’s license
      iii. Customer may purchase a YCTD day pass for $7.00 or a discount day pass for $3.50 by presenting a valid YCTD discount youth ID, Medicare card, or driver’s license
   h. Monthly passes
      i. SacRT monthly pass will be honored
ii. YCTD monthly pass will be honored only if it has an express sticker on it

i. Los Rios and CSUS
   i. Los Rios (sticker affixed to Student ID) and CSUS (Student ID with sleeve) will be honored as valid fare media

j. New Connect Card fare type
   i. A new Connect Card fare specific to the UCDMC Shuttle will be configured to allow for single rides (cash value) to be used and tracked separately from other services.
      1. Like other regional products, revenue from this product will be assigned to SacRT upfront and then 50 percent of the total revenue will be paid to YCTD through the financial reconciliation process.
   ii. Connect Cards readers will be installed on all buses, the single fare will be charged as discussed above and all taps will be recorded

7. Honoring and reimbursing student IDs as valid fare
   a. Undergraduate UC Davis student IDs will be honored as valid fare on the service
      i. SRTD and YCTD will count boardings made with undergraduate student IDs
      ii. SRTD will charge UCD a fixed amount per boarding on the undergraduate student ID, to properly account for the fraction of UCD’s payment that represents fare revenue
         1. This amount will be part of, not in addition to, the amount already due from UCD under Section 4

8. Changes to service or fare structure
   a. SRTD and YCTD reserve the right to change service and/or fares according to their own policies; but agree to negotiate in good faith, prior to doing so, to maintain uniformity of service and fare structure and compliance with this MOU

9. Web page
   a. UCD will design, host, and maintain a master/central web page for the service, subject to review by SRTD and YCTD
   b. SacRT and YCTD may present information on the service on their own respective web sites as they see fit, consistent with the branding of the service, but must link to the central/master site

10. Call center
    a. Public information on the service (e.g., at the central web site and on printed materials) will provide a single phone number for customer assistance (rather than phone numbers for both operating agencies)
    b. UCD will establish and maintain the single phone number, which will route incoming calls to SacRT and YCTD customer service on a 50/50 basis

11. Real-time/AVL
    a. SacRT dispatchers will be able to see real-time location for SacRT-operated buses via SacRT’s Clever Devices system and will be able to see real-time location for YCTD buses via YCTD’s public web page
b. YCTD dispatchers will be able to see real-time location for YCTD-operated buses via YCTD’s AVL system and will be able to see real-time location for SacRT buses via SacRT’s public web page.

c. Customers will be directed to download and install one of several third party apps currently available to end users at no cost and which offer the capabilities to present both agencies’ scheduled and real-time bus locations in one centralized interface.

12. Radio control, dispatching, and supervision

a. Each party will maintain separate dispatching and radio communication via existing channels; supervisors shall communicate via direct telephone access to counterparts at other party’s dispatch for issue resolution.

b. Each agency will conduct its own accident investigation and other field supervision; issues identified by one party’s supervisors will be raised to appropriate supervisory personnel at the other agency.

13. Lost and found

a. Lost customer belongings will be collected and stored separately by SacRT and YCTD according to their own policies and procedures depending on which vehicle they are found on.

b. Customers claiming lost belongings will be assisted by relevant customer service personnel to the correct collection location.

14. Uniforms

a. Each party will continue to use standard uniforms; however, a special patch or pin will be worn on the outermost article of clothing (uniform or safety vest) displaying the name or logo of the service.

15. Name/branding and vehicle appearance

a. The service will be referred to as the Causeway Connection.

b. The route number will be Route 138.

i. Because the route number is the same for both agencies, information provided by third-party customer information providers (such as Google Maps and the Transit app) will inherently appear to customers to be the same route, with the difference in service provider not necessarily apparent to most users.

ii. Use of the number 138 will maximize identifiability, because the existing regular/local SacRT bus serving the UC Davis Medical Center is Route 38 and SacRT customarily uses route numbers in the 100’s for peak-only or express versions of regular/local routes.

c. The bus headsign will display the route number and the destination of the route (e.g., UC Davis Medical Center or Mondavi Center).

d. Permanent markings and decals (e.g., on the vehicle exterior sides and interior) of a promotional nature will not feature the route number prominently and will emphasize the name Causeway Connection.

e. Reference materials (e.g., printed pamphlets, official notices/bulletins, and online schedules) will include the route number.

f. Computerized schedule data made available to third-parties (e.g., Google and app providers) will include the route number, due to most third party platforms using route number as the basis for presenting information.

16. Access to facilities, encroachment
Memorandum of Understanding
Draft Terms

Exhibit A

a. YCTD and SacRT mutually authorize one another to operate service within one another's respective service areas by way of a separate transfer agreement. Both parties will update the exhibit to that agreement illustrating where each party is authorized to serve. This update can be approved in writing by the respective General Managers.
b. UCD hereby authorizes SacRT and YCTD to enter and provide transit service within the Unitrans service area
   i. SacRT and YCTD both agree to not claim TDA funds available for the parties' respective jurisdictions due to any changes in eligibility arising from this MOU.
c. UCD grants SacRT and YCTD permission to enter, stop, and layover full-size transit buses on UCD property depicted on the map (including Mondavi Center, Genome Biomedical Sciences Facility parking lot, connecting campus roadways, UC Davis Medical Center temporary bus terminal, future Transportation Hub, and connecting internal roadways)

17. Training (drivers, customer service)
a. Parties may establish special requirements for training that are specific to this service

18. Marketing
a. SacRT and YCTD will use a matching vehicle wrap

19. Spare vehicles (use of other vehicles as backup)
a. In the event of a temporary vehicle shortage, either operating agency may substitute standard unbranded buses from its regular fleet, however, they must be full-size buses (approximately 40 feet in length), ADA compliant (including a compliant lift or ramp and two securable wheelchair spaces), must correctly display the route number and name on the destination sign, and must have the appropriate fare set available in an electronic farebox.

20. Paratransit
a. Each agency will be responsible for fulfilling its own ADA paratransit responsibilities
b. If SacRT experiences a high volume of requests for ADA paratransit trips to Yolo County, the parties agree to negotiate in good faith to arrange for provision of those trips by YCTD, including appropriate cost-sharing/reimbursement

21. NTD reporting
a. The service will be treated as directly operated motorbus service with assets, expenditures, revenue hours, miles, and other operating statistics, and ridership statistics reported separately by both agencies for only the service they operate, the vehicles they own and maintain, etc.
b. The NTD-reported service area for each agency will be enlarged by the 3/4 mile buffer surrounding the route, regardless of presence or lack of stops; however, both parties acknowledge that provision of this service does not affect their statutorily-authorized service areas and that operation outside of the parties' respective service areas is authorized solely by virtue of this MOU

22. Title VI compliance
a. Each party will be responsible for fulfilling its own requirements under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964
RESOLUTION NO. 19-12-0140

Adopted by the Board of Directors of the Sacramento Regional Transit District on this date:

December 9, 2019

CONDITIONALLY RECOGNIZING THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT ID CARD AS FARE EQUIVALENT FOR THE CAUSEWAY CONNECTION

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution No. 16-09-0104, the Board of Directors may recognize an ID badge to serve as valid Fare, subject to the terms and conditions; and

WHEREAS, the University of California, Davis intends to provide an operating subsidy for the Causeway Connection fixed-route public transit service through a Memorandum of Understanding; and

WHEREAS, a portion of the operating assistance is intended to subsidize undergraduate student fares that would otherwise be paid to access the services and compensate SacRT and YCTD for lost fare revenue for allowing undergraduate students access to the service.

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT AS FOLLOWS:

THAT, a current University of California, Davis undergraduate student identification card bearing the name and likeness of the individual presenting it will serve as a valid Fare Equivalent on the Causeway Connection fixed-route bus service conditioned upon execution, and only during the duration, of a Memorandum of Understanding between the Sacramento Regional Transit District, Yolo County Transportation District, and University of California, Davis providing an operating subsidy for the Causeway Connection.

PATRICK KENNEDY, Chair

ATTEST:
HENRY LI, Secretary

By: ___________________________
    Cindy Brooks, Assistant Secretary
STAFF REPORT ROUTING SHEET

STAFF REPORT TITLE: CAUSEWAY CONNECTION INTERCITY BUS SERVICE

ORIGINATOR/AUTHOR OF STAFF REPORT

RESPONSIBLE EMT/DESIGNEE*

FINANCE — BUDGET/GRANTS REVIEW FOR FUNDING SOURCE FORM, IF NECESSARY

CLERK TO THE BOARD FOR LOGGING ON THE AGENDA

*RESPONSIBLE EMT/DESIGNEE —
Please indicate routing approval below by checking below next to the reviewer’s title.

☒ VP, FINANCE/CFO

☐ VP, INTEGRATED SERVICES & STRATEGIC INITIATIVES

☐ VP, OPERATIONS

☐ VP, PLANNING & ENGINEERING

☐ VP, SAFETY, SECURITY & CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

☒ LEGAL COUNSEL

AFTER DESIGNATED APPROVALS ABOVE, PLEASE PROVIDE A REVISED CLEAN STAFF REPORT TO THE CLERK, NO LATER THAN
4:00, Thursday, November 28, 2019
(EXCEPT WHEN IT FALLS ON A HOLIDAY, THEN DUE THE DAY BEFORE).
THIS IS THE FINAL DEADLINE. NO EXCEPTIONS WILL BE MADE.

THE CLERK WILL PROVIDE THE STAFF REPORT FOR FINAL REVIEW TO:

LEGAL COUNSEL

RETURN TO THE CLERK TO THE BOARD FOR GENERAL MANAGER SIGN OFF

GENERAL MANAGER/CEO

COMMENTS: