Presentation Outline

• Plan Purpose – Recap
• Draft Plan released August 2012, public outreach fall 2012
• Summary of comments
• Proposed Revisions – March 2013
• Next Steps
More of what works
- Improve service where our customers need it

Less of what doesn’t work
- Discontinue routes or segments that aren’t working

Try new things
- Try innovative ways of delivering transportation services
Plan Approach

SSP Framework

- Guiding Principles
  - Customers
  - Service
  - Service Markets
  - Financial Stability
  - Coordinated Planning

Understanding our service performance
Taking customers where they want to go
Providing service where it’s needed
Crafting the Draft Plan

• Balance various elements of our guiding principles
• Focus the plan to improve efficiency, effectiveness, and ridership for the system as a whole
• Understand the tradeoffs needed to move SamTrans into the future
Weekday Ridership (2011)

Weekday Boardings
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Weekday Ridership (2011)
Route Performance (2011)
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Financial Effectiveness vs. Productivity
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## Draft Plan Resources

### Annual In-service Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Draft Plan Aug 2012</th>
<th>Percent Differential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>335,505</td>
<td>311,208</td>
<td>-7.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>36,052</td>
<td>34,445</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>32,287</td>
<td>33,174</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>403,843</td>
<td>378,827</td>
<td>-6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Engaging the Community

- Involved the community in locally focused conversations
- Utilized community organization partnerships to create additional awareness
- Engaged all levels of the community in the process:
  - SamTrans riders
  - Public
  - Operators
  - Stakeholders
  - City Councils
Public Feedback

- Engaged public provided extensive input
- Outreach in fall 2012 yielded more than 1,200 comments:
  - 9 public meetings
  - E-mail and U.S. mail
  - Multiple operator outreach sessions
  - Online survey
  - 16 City Council meetings
  - Dedicated project phone line
  - 3 tabling events
Major Comment Themes

• Route-specific
  - Keep route the same
  - Change the route in a different way
  - Expand route and increase frequency
  - Concern about how changes to route will impact specific populations

• General
  - Amenities
  - Customer service
Response to Public Input

• We evaluated every comment
• For underperforming routes, major effort to meet customers needs
  - Careful analysis of options
  - Improve nearby routes (e.g., Route 275)
  - Use new information to improve service (e.g., Route 251)
• Our response to customers
  - Restored service where it’s appropriate
## Final Draft Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Proposed August 2012</th>
<th>Revised March 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>no change</td>
<td>added morning schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>discontinue</td>
<td>restore peak hour service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>discontinue mid-day service</td>
<td>restore mid-day service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>route change: no service to Beach Park</td>
<td>restore service to Beach Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>route change: no service east of 101, no Saturday service</td>
<td>maintain service east of 101 and provide service to new county jail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>new route</td>
<td>Saturday trips to Canada College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>discontinue</td>
<td>no changes without East Palo Alto shuttle coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>increased frequency</td>
<td>no changes without East Palo Alto shuttle coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Discontinue off-peak &amp; weekend service to SF</td>
<td>restore off-peak and weekend service to SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Route 110 Revised

August 2012 Draft: no changes

March 2013 Revision: early morning trips added; schedule starts at 6 a.m.
Route 118 Revised

August 2012 Draft: discontinue route

March 2013 Revision: peak-hour service restored; enhanced morning service from Route 110
August 2012 Draft: discontinue some mid-day trips

March 2013 Revision: mid-day service restored
Route 251 Revised

August 2012 Draft: discontinue service to Beach Park

March 2013 Revision: restore service to Beach Park service restored.
August 2012 Draft: change route, no service east of 101

March 2013 Revision: service east of 101 restored
August 2012 Draft: Add new service

March 2013 Revision: select Saturday trips to Cañada College (subject to performance of this segment in the future)
Route 280 Revised

August 2012 Draft: discontinue route

March 2013 Revision: service changes subject to East Palo Alto shuttle coordination
August 2012 Draft: increase frequency

March 2013 Revision: service changes subject to East Palo Alto shuttle coordination
August 2012 Draft: discontinue off-peak/weekend service; reduce service to SF

March 2013 Revision: Off-peak/weekend service to SF restored
## Resource Estimates

### Annual In-Service Hours (revised March 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing In-Service Hours</th>
<th>Draft Plan</th>
<th>Net Hours restored</th>
<th>Revised Draft Plan (March 2013)</th>
<th>Percent Differential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>335,505</td>
<td>311,208</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>317,914</td>
<td>-5.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>36,052</td>
<td>34,445</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36,252</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>32,287</td>
<td>33,174</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34,822</td>
<td>7.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>403,844</td>
<td>378,827</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>388,988</td>
<td>-3.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridership Estimates</td>
<td>Existing Ridership</td>
<td>Draft Plan (August 2012)</td>
<td>Revised Draft Plan (March 2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Ridership</td>
<td>237,060</td>
<td>241,790</td>
<td>244,220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Ridership</td>
<td>12,327,310</td>
<td>12,572,900</td>
<td>12,699,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Gain (Weekly)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4,720</td>
<td>7,160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Gain (Annual)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>245,580</td>
<td>372,290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

- March 13: Call for public hearing, release of draft final SSP, CEQA documents
- March: Five public meetings
- April 3: Board public hearing
- April 15: Comment period closes
- April: Revise draft final SSP as needed
- May 1: Board adoption of SSP, CEQA documents, Title VI analysis
- Fall 2013-Spring 2014: Phased implementation of changes subject to additional review