

SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

**Title VI Assessment for the Proposed
Productivity-Adjusted Inflation-Based Fare
Increase effective January 1, 2016**

July 16, 2015

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To ensure compliance with federal and state civil rights regulations, including but not limited to, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and FTA Circular 4702.1B [October 1, 2012 (Circular)], BART performs an analysis of any fare change to determine if the change has a disparate impact on minority riders or a disproportionate burden on low-income riders when compared to overall users. In accordance with the Circular, disparate impact and disproportionate burden thresholds are defined in a Disparate Impact and Disproportionate Burden Policy (DI/DB Policy), adopted by the BART Board on July 11, 2013.

The fare change discussed in this report is a productivity-adjusted inflation-based fare increase valued at 3.4% proposed to be implemented on January 1, 2016. This increase is the second in BART's program of productivity-adjusted inflation-based fare increases, which began in 2006, and has been extended to include increases in 2014, 2016, 2018, and 2020. In October 2013, the Board approved findings of the Title VI analysis for the 2014 fare increase. For each increase, once the inflation percentage increase is known for that year and public input is solicited, a Title VI analysis must be updated, finalized, and approved by the Board. Implementation of each increase is subject to Board approval of the finalized Title VI analysis for that year's increase. Fare revenue from these increases by Resolution 5208, as confirmed by Board motion passed on March 28, 2013, goes into a separate fund that can only be used to help fund BART's highest priority capital renovation projects, including new rail cars, a train control system, and the Hayward Maintenance Complex. In addition, by Resolution 5261, the current \$6.00 fare for trips to or from the Oakland International Airport Station is to remain at \$6.00 through December 31, 2017 in order to encourage ridership growth, and so this fare will not be increased by the proposed inflation-based 3.4% in 2016.

Fare Change Analysis Findings

The proposed 2016 inflation-based fare increase is an across-the-board fare increase of 3.4%. The DI/DB Policy states that an across-the-board fare change will be considered to have a disproportionate impact if the difference between the changes for protected riders (i.e., minority or low-income riders) and non-protected riders is equal to or greater than 5%.

The analysis results for the proposed 2016 productivity-adjusted inflation-based fare increase compared to the 5% threshold are as follows:

Minority Disparate Impact Fare Change Analysis

- The study found that minority riders would experience virtually the same percentage increase and dollar fare increase compared to non-minority riders (3.49% compared to 3.47%, and 13.3 cents compared to 13.4 cents). The difference between the change for minority riders and non-minority riders is 0.02%, which is less than the DI/DB Policy's 5% threshold.

- In addition, the finding is made that the cumulative effect of fare increases from 2012 through the proposed increase in 2016 would not result in a disparate impact on minority riders because the percent increase is the same for minority riders and non-minority riders, and thus falls below the DI/DB Policy's 5% threshold.

Low-Income Disproportionate Burden Fare Change Analysis

- The study found that low-income riders would experience virtually the same percentage increase and a slightly lower dollar fare increase compared to non-low income riders (3.50% compared to 3.48%, and 12.8 cents compared to 13.5 cents). The difference between the changes for low-income riders and non-low income riders is 0.03%, which is less than the DI/DB Policy's 5% threshold.
- In addition, the finding is made that the cumulative effect of fare increases from 2012 through the proposed increase in 2016 would not result in a disproportionate burden on low-income riders because the difference in the percent increases between low-income and non-low income riders is 0.05%, which is less than the DI/DB Policy's threshold of 5%.

Public Participation

Consistent with BART's Public Participation Plan as revised in July 2011, BART solicited input from all riders, including minority, low-income, and Limited English Proficient (LEP) riders. BART made available in English, Spanish, and Chinese, as well as other languages upon request, information about the proposed fare increase as well as a survey for gathering rider comments and demographic data. The survey was available in print or online at bart.gov. BART received 485 surveys (281 print and 204 online surveys) that included 286 comments, and 49 comments were submitted through e-mail and phone. All comments received on the proposed fare increase were related to the increase's impact on personal income; no comments were submitted regarding the impact of the increase on minority riders. Compared to BART's overall ridership, print survey respondents are significantly more minority and low-income, while online survey respondents are substantially less minority and low-income. In addition to the survey, riders could provide comments through e-mail, by phone, by fax, or by US Mail, but did not provide demographic information.

Approximately two-thirds of all respondents (66.3% or 354 respondents) did not comment at all or commented on other aspects of BART (e.g., service enhancements). The remaining one-third of survey respondents can be grouped into two categories, comments "In Support" (61 comments or 11.4%) and "Not in Support" (119 comments or 22.3%). Comments from print survey respondents, who are significantly more minority and low-income than BART's overall ridership, showed more support for the proposed fare increase than overall respondents; many who completed the print survey attended BART outreach events at which staff was able to explain the fare increase and how revenue from it would be used for capital projects. All comments are provided in Appendix C. Sample rider comments include:

- "It's a reasonable increase for the items listed." *Online survey minority respondent*

- “No more increase to fare we are low income families.” *Print survey minority and low-income respondent*
- “I don’t mind the fare increase a little bit. I just expect service to be the same or better.” *Family Bridges meeting attendee*
- “Please don’t raise fare as it will effect [sic] my monthly savings. Thanks.” *Print survey minority respondent*
- “I think it is still cheaper than driving.” *Print survey minority respondent*

Input was also provided by members of BART’s Title VI/Environmental Justice Advisory Committee and Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Advisory Committee. BART formed the two committees to ensure that the District provides meaningful opportunities for public input from minority and/or low-income communities in BART’s transportation decision-making. Committee members are appointed to represent the needs and viewpoints of minority, low-income, and/or LEP populations and are active participants in local community-based organizations that serve one or more of these groups.

Four meetings were held with the advisory committees, two with each committee. Staff presented background on the inflation-based fare increase program, explaining that revenue from inflation-based increases by Board resolution will only be used to help fund BART’s highest priority capital renovation projects including new rail cars, a train control system, and the Hayward Maintenance Complex.

Committee members were generally supportive of the increase based on their understanding that the additional fare revenue is dedicated to funding critical capital needs. Committee members did express concern that low-income riders may be negatively impacted by the fare increase, however small. BART has implemented measures to address this concern. BART’s low-income definition of 200% of the federal poverty level takes into account the high cost of living in the Bay Area and provides a more rigorous standard in assessing impacts on low-income riders. Additionally, BART conducts a triennial analysis of minority and low income populations to further evaluate impacts of transportation decisions. At the meetings at which the comments were made, BART staff acknowledged that the impact of an approximately 13 cent fare increase on a low-income rider could be greater than the increase on a non-low income rider. BART staff acknowledged the need for such consideration and explained that BART is currently taking additional steps in this area, notably by participating in the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s current Regional Means-Based Transit Fare Pricing Study, which is examining ways to make transit more affordable for low-income residents.

Committee member comments include the following:

- “While transit fares are raised based on inflation, salaries are not raised for our LEP constituents based on inflation. I am worried because fares are really high already.

This increase will impact domestic workers.” *LEP Advisory Committee member, February 24, 2015, meeting*

- “Inflation based fare increase seems like the right path to take. It also seems like we can’t ignore it and forego a fare increase. Those problems don’t go away and expenses do compound and the longer we neglect the issues that require attention the more expensive they get to fix in the long run. I can understand and appreciate this fare increase. My position is that the reason why we have these fare increases and the reason why these expenses get so high is that we keep building in a way that we can’t maintain/operate/afford. So then everyone has to pay for it.” *Title VI/EJ Advisory Committee member, May 11, 2015, meeting*
- “Need to clearly explain the whole problem, why it affects the service if we don’t have an increase. The way you ask the question can impact the response. I think that number is not in favor of the increase, because they truly don’t understand what the increase is for.” *LEP Advisory Committee member, May 19, 2015, meeting*
[Member’s support of the fare increase and belief that if survey respondents had a better understanding that revenue from the fare increase goes only to capital needs, the member believed that most survey respondents would have favored or supported the increase.]

Equity Findings for Proposed 2016 Fare Increase

An equity finding is made after considering both fare change analysis findings and public input.

Minority Disparate Impact Equity Finding

Analysis results show that minority riders would experience virtually the same percentage increase and dollar fare increase compared to non-minority riders (3.49% compared to 3.47%, and 13.3 cents compared to 13.4 cents). The difference between the change for minority riders and non-minority riders is 0.02%, which is less than the DI/DB Policy’s 5% threshold. In addition, the finding is made that the cumulative effect of fare increases from 2012 through the proposed increase in 2016 would not result in a disparate impact on minority riders because the percent increase is the same for minority riders and non-minority riders, and thus falls below the DI/DB Policy’s 5% threshold. No comments were received regarding the proposed fare increase’s impact on minority riders. Thus, the equity finding is that the proposed 2016 fare increase would not result in a disparate impact on minority riders.

Low-Income Disproportionate Burden Equity Finding

Analysis results show that low-income riders would experience virtually the same percentage increase and a slightly lower dollar fare increase compared to non-low income riders (3.50% compared to 3.48%, and 12.8 cents compared to 13.5 cents). The difference between the changes for low-income riders and non-low income riders is 0.03%, which is less than the DI/DB Policy’s 5% threshold. In addition, the finding is made that the cumulative effect of fare increases from 2012 through the proposed increase in 2016 would not result in a disproportionate burden on low-income riders because the difference

in the percent increases between low-income and non-low income riders is 0.05%, which is less than the DI/DB Policy's threshold of 5%.

Comments from the BART Title VI/Environmental Justice Advisory Committee and Limited English Proficiency Advisory Committee who also represent BART's low-income riders generally support this finding, as members commented they understood that the additional fare revenue is dedicated to funding critical capital needs to keep the system safe and reliable. Advisory committee members also commented that a fare increase of any amount, however small, presents challenges for low-income riders. BART has implemented measures to address this concern including defining low-income as 200% of the federal poverty level to account for the Bay Area's high cost of living so that more riders are considered low-income in the analysis. BART is taking additional steps in this area, notably by participating in the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's current Regional Means-Based Transit Fare Pricing Study, which is examining ways to make transit more affordable for low-income residents.

Taking into consideration both analysis findings and public comment, the equity finding is that the proposed 2016 fare increase would not result in a disproportionate burden on low-income riders.

1. INTRODUCTION

To ensure compliance with federal and state civil rights regulations, including but not limited to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and FTA Circular 4702.1B [dated October 1, 2012 (Circular)], BART performs an analysis of any fare change to determine if the change has a disparate impact on minority riders or a disproportionate burden on low-income riders when compared to overall users. In accordance with the Circular, BART makes this determination by comparing the analysis results against a threshold, as defined in its Disparate Impact and Disproportionate Burden Policy (DI/DB Policy), which was adopted by the BART Board on July 11, 2013.

In 2003, the BART Board approved the productivity-adjusted inflation-based fare increase program to increase fares by small, inflation-based amounts every two years between 2006 and 2012. In February 2013, with Resolution 5208, the Board approved extending the productivity-adjusted inflation-based fare increase program for four more increases, in 2014, 2016, 2018, and 2020, subject to final Title VI analysis. The formula to calculate the amount of the increase is based on the average of national and local inflation over a two-year period, less one-half percent to account for improvements in BART productivity. Fare revenue from the second series of increases by Resolution 5208, as confirmed by Board motion passed on March 28, 2013, goes into a separate fund that can only be used to help fund BART's highest priority capital renovation projects, including new rail cars, a train control system, and the Hayward Maintenance Complex. In addition, by Resolution 5261, the current \$6.00 fare for trips to or from the Oakland International Airport Station is to remain at \$6.00 through December 31, 2017 in order to encourage ridership growth, and so this fare will not be increased by the proposed inflation-based 3.4% in 2016.

District staff used estimated future inflation-based percentage increases to perform preliminary analyses of the second series of proposed fare increases to determine if any of the increases has a disparate impact on minority riders or places a disproportionate burden on low-income riders. These analyses and public comment are documented in the February 2013 reports, "Title VI Assessment for the Extension of the Productivity-Adjusted Inflation-based Fare Increase Program" and "Public Participation Summary Report for the Extension of the Productivity-Adjusted Inflation-based Fare Increase Program." The preliminary analyses showed that the four biennial inflation-based fare increases would not result in a disparate impact on minority or low-income riders because the proposed changes would increase fares by virtually identical amounts for minority riders and non-minority riders when compared to overall users. These findings were subject to the application of thresholds contained in the then-under development DI/DB Policy, which the BART Board adopted on July 11, 2013.

In October 2013, the Board approved findings for the 2014 fare increase, as documented in the report "Final Title VI Assessment for the 2014 Inflation-Based Fare Increase, An Update to the February 13, 2013 Draft Title VI Assessment for the Extension of the Productivity-Adjusted Inflation-Based Fare Increase Program." The findings demonstrated that the proposed 2014 increase would increase fares by virtually identical amounts for minority riders and low-income riders when compared respectively to non-

minority riders and non-low income riders. Therefore, the calculated differences between the fare increases for protected groups and nonprotected groups fall below the 5% DI/DB Policy threshold. In addition, the proposed fare changes apply to all fares and fare types and the fare types are projected to increase at the same percentage. Although each fare type has differing constituencies, all fare types are affected equally.

The fare change discussed in this report is the fare increase scheduled to be implemented on January 1, 2016, which is the second of the current series of four productivity-adjusted inflation-based fare increases. As stated in Resolution 5208, “Title VI analyses for the 2016, 2018, and 2020 fare increases will be updated and finalized, once the inflation percentage increase is known for those years and public input is solicited. Implementation of each of the future year increases in 2016, 2018, and 2020, will be subject to Board approval of the corresponding and finalized Title VI analysis, which will be in compliance with federal and state law in effect at the time.” In January 2015, the Bureau of Labor Statistics released the final inflation data for 2014, which allowed for actual calculation of the 2016 increase. This calculation results in overall inflation of 3.9% over two years. After subtracting the 0.5% productivity factor, the actual fare increase to be implemented in 2016 will be 3.4%. In addition, BART has undertaken public outreach to receive public input on the proposed fare increase from low-income, minority, and LEP populations, in accordance with BART’s Public Participation Plan, completed in May 2010 and revised in July 2011, and FTA Circular 4702.1B. Public outreach results are reported in Section 3 of this report.

2. MINORITY DISPARATE IMPACT ANALYSES AND LOW-INCOME DISPROPORTIONATE BURDEN ANALYSES

2.1 Assessing Fare Increase Effects

This section describes the data and methodology used to assess the effects of a fare change on minority and low-income riders, in accordance with the fare equity analysis procedures in FTA Circular 4702.1B and BART’s DI/DB Policy.

The procedures include four steps for assessing the effects of proposed, across-the-board fare changes:

- i. Determine the number and percent of users of each fare media being changed;
- ii. Review fares before the change and after the change;
- iii. Compare the differences between minority users and non-minority users; and
- iv. Compare the differences for each particular fare media between low-income users and non-low-income users.

As stated in Circular App. K-11, comparing protected riders and nonprotected riders can “yield even clearer depictions of differences.” For purposes of across-the-board fare changes, BART’s Disparate Impact and Disproportionate Burden Policy (Policy) follows this guidance. Once the comparison analysis is completed, the appropriate threshold from the DI/DB Policy is applied to the difference in fare change between (a) minority and non-minority riders and (b) low-income and non-low income riders.

Should BART find that minority riders experience disproportionate impacts from the proposed change, BART should take steps to avoid, minimize, or mitigate disparate impacts. If the additional steps do not mitigate the potential disparate impacts on minority riders, pursuant to FTA Circular 4702.1B, BART may proceed with the proposed fare change if BART can show that:

- A substantial legitimate justification for the proposed fare change exists; and,
- There are no alternatives serving the same legitimate objectives that would have a less disparate impact on minority populations.

If a finding is made that the proposed fare change would place a disproportionate burden on low-income riders compared to non-low income riders, BART will take steps to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts where practicable. BART shall also describe alternatives available to low-income populations affected by the fare change. Mitigation is neither necessary nor required where no disparate impact and/or disproportionate burden is found.

2.2 Data and Methodology Used

FTA Circular 4702.1B states that for proposed changes that would increase fares on the entire system, the agency shall analyze any available information from ridership surveys.

The primary data used to analyze the proposed fare increases are the following:

- 2014 BART Customer Satisfaction Study. Conducted every other September, the Customer Satisfaction Study allows BART to track trends in rider satisfaction, demographics, and BART usage across the system. The 2014 study had a sample size of 5,609, including weekday peak, off-peak, and weekend riders.
- Current and projected BART fares. The projected fares are based on an actual inflation-based increase of 3.4% in 2016; these are the full fares and do not reflect the various discounts available to riders.
- Actual 2014 BART ridership by station as recorded by BART's automated fare collection system.

Methodology

BART uses its FTA-approved methodology to assess the effects of a fare increase. The methodology compares the weighted average fare increase between (a) minority and non-minority riders and (b) low-income and non-low income riders to determine if any of the increases would have either a disparate impact on minority riders or result in a disproportionate burden on low-income riders. In accordance with FTA Circular 4702.1B, BART makes this determination by comparing the analysis results against the appropriate threshold defined in the DI/DB Policy. Fare change data for overall users continues to be provided for information purposes. In addition, pursuant to the DI/DB Policy, staff reported the cumulative impacts over its three-year triennial reporting periods¹, as well as for the productivity-adjusted inflation based increases in 2014, 2016, 2018 and 2020.

¹ BART's current reporting period, approved by FTA, includes changes implemented before December 31, 2013. BART's subsequent triennial reporting period will include all changes occurring as of January 1, 2014.

Actual 2014 Customer Satisfaction Survey responses are used to determine the percent of riders at each station that are minority and that are low-income. Since BART has a distance-based fare structure, determining this information by station rather than systemwide allows for the development of weighted average fares. Both home-based origin and non-home origin responses are used to assign demographics to a station. Non-home origins at a station include all trips starting from locations other than home, such as work, school or shopping. Thus, using both home-based and non-home origin responses is more encompassing than using only home-based origins because it reflects all riders at a station.

Non-minority includes only those who are White alone (single race) and non-Hispanic. Minority persons include American Indian and Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander. According to the 2014 Customer Satisfaction Survey responses, 62.0% of BART riders are minority.

Consistent with BART's Title VI Triennial Program standards, low-income is defined as 200% of the federal poverty level. This broader definition is used to account for the region's higher cost of living when compared to other regions. Approximating 200% of the federal poverty level is done by considering both the household size and household income of respondents to the 2014 Customer Satisfaction Survey. The table to the right shows the household size and household income combinations that comprise "low-income."

LOW INCOME	
Household Size	Household Income
1+	Under \$25K
2+	\$25-\$29.9K
3+	\$30-\$39.9K
4+	\$40-\$49.9K
5+	\$50-\$59.9K

As an example, a household of two or more people with an income of \$28,000 would be considered low-income. According to 2014 Customer Satisfaction Survey responses, 29.2% of BART riders are considered low income.

The steps used to assess the effects of an across-the-board fare change are described in Appendix A. Oakland International Airport Station trips are not included in this analysis because the station opened after the 2014 Customer Satisfaction Survey was completed. Future stations or expansion projects, such as the extension to Warm Springs, are not included in this analysis as fares for those projects have not yet been adopted.

2.3 Analysis Results

Systemwide weighted average fares for (a) minority and non-minority riders and (b) low-income and non-low income riders, as well as for overall users, have been calculated using the methodology described in Appendix A. This process was performed to determine if the proposed fare increase would have either a disparate impact on minority riders or result in a disproportionate burden on low-income riders.

Note that the percent fare changes shown may not exactly equal the proposed percent fare change since BART's fares paid by passengers are rounded to the nearest nickel and the data below represent an average across riders. Also note that the percentage and dollar

changes as published in the following tables may not add up as the figures are not rounded to the nearest hundredth- or thousandth-decimal place.

The proposed inflation-based fare increase of 3.4% is an across-the-board fare increase. BART's DI/DB Policy provides that an across-the-board fare change will be considered to have a disproportionate impact if the difference between the fare changes for protected riders and nonprotected riders is equal to or greater than 5%.

2.3.1 Minority Disparate Impact Analysis Results

The table on the next page presents the results for minority riders of the calculation for the proposed inflation-based increase of 3.4% in 2016. Applying the 5% DI/DB Policy threshold to the calculated difference, this report finds that the proposed inflation-based fare increase would not result in a disparate impact on minority riders because the difference in the increase for minority riders and non-minority riders is less than 5%. In addition, the finding is made that the cumulative effect of fare increases from 2012 through the proposed increase in 2016 would not result in a disparate impact on minority riders because the difference in the percent increase between minority and non-minority riders is less than 5%.

Disparate Impact Analysis: Proposed 2016 Inflation-based Increase to All Fares

Fare Increase %	Current		Proposed	Cumulative
	2012 Fares	2014 Fares	2016 Fares	Change 2012 to 2016 ¹
Minority	\$ 3.609	\$ 3.800	\$ 3.932	\$ 0.323
Non-Minority	\$ 3.668	\$ 3.862	\$ 3.996	\$ 0.329
Overall	\$ 3.631	\$ 3.823	\$ 3.964	\$ 0.333
Minority		% Change	3.49%	8.96%
Non-Minority		% Change	3.47%	8.96%
Difference		0.02%	0.00%	
Disparate Impact?		No	No	
Overall	% Change		3.68%	9.17%
Minority	\$ Change		\$ 0.133	\$ 0.323
Non-Minority	\$ Change		\$ 0.134	\$ 0.329
Overall	\$ Change		\$ 0.141	\$ 0.333

¹To ensure consistency in calculating cumulative impact, the 2014 average weekday trip table was used to calculate 2012, 2014, and 2016 weighted fares.

2.3.2 Low-Income Disproportionate Burden Analysis Results

The table below presents the results for low-income riders of the calculation for the proposed inflation-based increase of 3.4% in 2016. Applying the 5% DI/DB Policy threshold to the calculated difference, this report finds that the proposed inflation-based

fare increase would not result in a disproportionate burden on low-income riders because the difference in the increase for low-income riders and non-low income riders is less than 5%. In addition, the finding is made that the cumulative effect of fare increases from 2012 through the proposed increase in 2016 would not result in a disproportionate burden on low-income riders because the difference in the percent increase between low-income and non-low income riders is less than 5%.

Disproportionate Burden Analysis: Proposed 2016 Inflation-based Increase to All Fares

Fare Increase %	2012 Fares	2014 Fares	Proposed 2016 Fares	Cumulative Change 2012 to 2016 ¹
	+3.4%			
Low Income	\$ 3.474	\$ 3.659	\$ 3.787	\$ 0.313
Non-Low Income	\$ 3.693	\$ 3.889	\$ 4.024	\$ 0.330
Overall	\$ 3.631	\$ 3.823	\$ 3.964	\$ 0.333
Low Income		% Change	3.50%	9.00%
Non-Low Income		% Change	3.48%	8.95%
Difference		0.03%	0.05%	
Disproportionate Burden?		No	No	
Overall	% Change		3.68%	9.17%
Low Income	\$ Change	\$ 0.128	\$ 0.313	
Non-Low Income	\$ Change	\$ 0.135	\$ 0.330	
Overall	\$ Change	\$ 0.141	\$ 0.333	

¹To ensure consistency in calculating cumulative impact, the 2014 average weekday trip table was used to calculate 2012, 2014, and 2016 weighted fares.

2.4 Alternatives Available for People Affected by the Proposed Fare Increase

This section analyzes alternative transit modes, fare payment types, and fare payment media available for people who could be affected by the proposed fare increase. The analysis compares fares increased by the inflation-based amount with fares paid through available alternatives. The section also includes a demographic profile of users by BART fare payment type.

2.4.2 Alternative Transit Modes including Fare Payment Types

BART operates a heavy rail system and an automated people mover that links the BART Coliseum Station and Oakland International Airport. There are four major operators in the BART service area that provide service parallel to some segments of the BART system:

- AC Transit: Bus operator with service in Alameda County and parts of Contra Costa County, and between parts of Alameda County and downtown San Francisco.

- Caltrain: Commuter rail with service from Gilroy in the South Bay through to downtown San Francisco.
- SamTrans: Bus operator with service in San Mateo County.
- San Francisco Muni: Bus and light rail operator serving the City and County of San Francisco.

The table below compares BART fares and the fares of operators providing service in parts of the BART service area.

BART	Adult Local Fare	Adult Monthly Pass Price
Current minimum fare	\$1.85	N/A
2016: Inflation-based 3.4% increase	\$1.95	N/A
Other Operator Fares (as of July 1, 2015)		
AC Transit	\$2.10*	\$75
Caltrain (zone-based)	\$3.25-\$13.25**	\$73-\$338
SamTrans	\$2.00	\$64
San Francisco Muni	\$2.25	\$83***

*Clipper fare is \$2.00.

**Clipper fare is \$0.50 less.

***This pass is also good for unlimited rides on BART within San Francisco.

In comparing the other operators' fares to BART fares, the local cash and Clipper fares of the other operators are higher than BART's minimum fare with the scheduled 3.4% inflation-based fare increase. A rider could pay a fare using another operator's monthly pass that would be less expensive than the 2016 \$1.95 BART fare under the following circumstances:

- AC Transit: Rider takes more than 38 trips per month.
- Caltrain: Rider takes more than 37 trips per month (based on \$73 pass).
- SamTrans: Rider takes more than 32 trips per month.
- San Francisco Muni: Rider takes more than 43 trips per month.

2.4.3 BART Fare Payment Types, Fare Payment Media and Payment Method by Protected Group

The demographic profile of each fare type user from BART's 2014 Customer Satisfaction Survey data is shown in the table below. Those data show minority riders are similar to overall riders in their usage of ticket types and fare media, although minority riders are somewhat less likely to use the 62.5% discounted tickets for seniors. Low-income riders are more likely to use the regular fare product and less likely to use the high-value 6.25% discount (HVD) fare product, compared to overall riders.

Fare Type	Fare Media	Payment Method	Estimated trips					
			Minority	%	Low income	%	Overall	%
Regular BART fare	Magnetic stripe, Clipper smart card	Cash, credit/debit, check, transit benefit payments	192,050	77.3%	99,062	84.7%	306,740	76.6%
High Value Discount			34,406	13.9%	6,150	5.3%	54,476	13.6%
Senior			5,910	2.4%	3,055	2.6%	15,779	3.9%
Disabled			4,591	1.8%	4,242	3.6%	6,766	1.7%
Muni Fast Pass *	Clipper card only		8,682	3.5%	3,179	2.7%	13,026	3.3%
Student	Magnetic stripe only	Cash, credit/debit, check	773	0.3%	274	0.2%	858	0.2%
Other	No fare type reported		---		1,984	0.8%	1,023	0.9%
Total			248,395	100.0%	116,986	100.0%	400,637	100.0%

* San Francisco Muni monthly Fast Pass accepted on BART within San Francisco.

The following table details the percentage and value of the proposed increase by fare type. The proposed fare change impacts all fare types and fare media, with the exception that these changes do not apply to the Muni Fast Pass, which is the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's fare instrument. Since the proposed fare change applies to all BART fares and fare types, the fare types are projected to increase at the same percentage. Although each fare type has differing constituencies, all fare types are affected equally.

Fare Type	Average Fare		Change	
	2014 Existing	2016 Proposed	%	\$
Regular BART fare	\$ 3.82	\$ 3.96	3.68%	\$ 0.14
High Value Discount	\$ 3.58	\$ 3.72	3.68%	\$ 0.13
Senior/Disabled	\$ 1.43	\$ 1.49	3.68%	\$ 0.05
Muni Fast Pass	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Student discount	\$ 1.91	\$ 1.98	3.68%	\$ 0.07
Other	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

2.5 Analysis Findings

Pursuant to FTA Circular 4702.1B, BART performs an analysis of any fare change to determine if the change has a disparate impact on minority riders or results in a disproportionate burden on low-income riders. As provided in Circular App. K-11, comparing minority riders to non-minority riders and low-income riders to non-low income riders can “yield even clearer depictions of differences” than the comparison between minority and low-income riders to overall users. For purposes of across-the-board fare changes, BART’s DI/DB Policy follows this guidance and calls for comparison of the fare change experienced by minority riders to that experienced by non-minority riders, and the fare change experienced by low-income riders to that experienced by non-low income riders. BART also compares fare change of minority riders and low-income riders to that of overall users for information purposes. In accordance with the Circular, BART then measures the analysis results against the appropriate threshold defined in BART’s DI/DB Policy.

The proposed inflation-based fare increase is an across-the-board fare increase. The DI/DB Policy states that an across-the-board fare change will be considered to have a disparate impact if the difference between the changes for minority riders and non-

minority riders is equal to or greater than 5%. The fare change will be considered to have a disproportionate impact if the difference between the changes for low-income riders and non-low income riders is equal to or greater than 5%.

2.5.2 Minority Disparate Impact Analysis Findings

The analysis results for the proposed 2016 biennial productivity-adjusted inflation-based fare increase compared to the 5% threshold are as follows:

- Under the 3.4% increase scenario, the difference between the changes for minority riders and non-minority riders is less than the DI/DB Policy's 5% threshold. Minority riders would experience virtually the same percentage increase and a slightly lower dollar fare increase compared to non-minority riders (13.3 cents compared to 13.4 cents).
- In addition, the finding is made that the cumulative effect of fare increases from 2012 through the proposed increase in 2016 would not result in a disparate impact on minority riders because the difference in the percent increases between minority and non-minority riders is less than 5%.

Therefore, this report finds that the proposed change does not have a disparate impact on minority riders.

2.5.3 Low-Income Disproportionate Burden Analysis Findings

The analysis results for the proposed 2016 biennial productivity-adjusted inflation-based fare increase compared to the 5% threshold are as follows:

- Under the 3.4% increase scenario, the difference between the changes for low-income riders and non-low income riders is less than the DI/DB Policy's 5% threshold. Low-income riders would experience virtually the same percentage increase and a slightly lower dollar fare increase compared to non-low income riders (12.8 cents compared to 13.5 cents).
- In addition, the finding is made that the cumulative effect of fare increases from 2012 through the proposed increase in 2016 would not result in a disproportionate burden on low-income riders because the difference in the percent increases between low-income and non-low income riders is less than 5%.

Therefore, this report finds that the proposed change does not result in a disproportionate burden on low-income riders.

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Consistent with BART’s Public Participation Plan completed in May 2010 and revised in July 2011, BART conducted outreach to inform the public and solicit feedback on the proposed 2016 fare increase. Multilingual outreach was conducted both to the general public and also specifically to low income, minority and Limited English Proficient (LEP) populations in the BART service area.

3.1 Process for Soliciting Public Input

BART made available in English, Spanish, and Chinese, as well as other languages upon request, information about the proposed fare increase as well as the survey for gathering rider comments and demographic data. The survey was available online at bart.gov or in print. An English version of the survey is provided in Appendix B.

The public was made aware of the public outreach effort and survey through the following methods:

- BART informed the news media that it was seeking comment on the increase, and the media widely broadcast this news story along with direction to BART’s website for more information and the survey. Examples of print, broadcast, and radio media that reported to the public on the increase are the following:
 - San Francisco Chronicle
 - Telemundo (Spanish language television)
 - San Mateo Daily Journal
 - ABC Channel 7
 - CBS Channel 5
 - Fox Channel 2
 - Oakland Tribune
 - PBS Channel 9
 - Contra Costa Times
 - KGO radio
 - KTSF Channel 26 (Asian language television)
- BART posted on its website a link to a YouTube webinar on the fare increase, available in English, Spanish, or Chinese.
- BART sent 480 community-based organizations (CBOs) through e-mail or letter information about the increase and directions for taking the survey, as well as notification that BART staff would bring the survey and information on-site to a CBO upon request. At the request of La Clinica de la Raza in Pittsburg and Lao Family Community Development and Family Bridges in Oakland, staff presented information on the fare increase and handed out surveys to their communities.
- BART staff attended a Cinco de Mayo event in San Francisco on May 2, 2015 to gather input. Over 100 surveys were completed, mostly by protected riders.

- BART staff conducted a “Town Hall” via telephone on May 7, 2015, at which the Fiscal Year 2016 budget, which includes the proposed January 2016 fare increase, was discussed and the public could phone in questions. As part of the phone-in process, callers were offered the option of completing the survey by phone.

Input was also provided by members of BART’s Title VI/Environmental Justice Advisory Committee and Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Advisory Committee. BART formed the two committees to ensure that the District is taking reasonable steps to incorporate Title VI and Environmental Justice principles and the needs of LEP populations in BART’s transportation decisions. Committee members are appointed to represent the needs and viewpoints of minority, low-income, and/or LEP populations and are active participants in local community-based organizations that serve one or more of these groups. Staff met with the Title VI/Environmental Justice Advisory Committee on March 9 and May 11, 2015, and the Limited English Proficiency Advisory Committee on February 24 and May 19, 2015. At these meetings, staff presented background on the inflation-based fare increase program and that fare revenue by Board policy goes into a separate fund that can only be used to help fund BART’s highest priority capital renovation projects including new rail cars, a train control system, and the Hayward Maintenance Complex.

3.2 Survey Respondent Demographics

The table on the next page shows the demographics of respondents to the survey, both online and in print. 485 surveys were collected in total (print: 281, online: 204). Demographics from the 2014 Customer Satisfaction Survey are provided for comparison. Print survey respondents are significantly more minority and low-income than BART’s overall ridership. Online survey respondents are significantly less minority and low-income than BART’s overall ridership.

		2016 CPI Fare Increase				2014 Cust Sat Survey %
		Print Survey		Online Survey		
		%	N=	%	N=	
Minority		86.3%	240	41.5%	81	62.0%
Non-Minority		13.7%	38	58.5%	114	38.0%
Total		100.0%	278	100.0%	195	100.0%
Low Income		74.2%	190	11.6%	22	29.2%
Non-Low Income		25.8%	66	88.4%	167	70.8%
Total		100.0%	256	100.0%	189	100.0%

Survey results do not include those respondents who chose not to report ethnicity, race, income, and/or household size.

3.3 Public Comments: Impacts on Low-Income Riders

The public could provide comments on the proposed 2016 fare increase by completing the online or print survey, by e-mail, by phone, by fax, or by US mail. BART received 485 surveys (281 print and 204 online surveys) that included 286 comments, and 49 comments were submitted through e-mail and phone. The 335 comments have been sorted and

placed into a comments database (Appendix C). The most comments, 171, came from online survey respondents. Print survey respondents provided 115 comments. In addition, the YouTube webinar had 68 views (40 in English, 18 in Spanish, and 10 in Chinese). All comments received on the proposed fare increase were about the increase's impact on people's income; no comments were submitted regarding the impact of the increase on minority riders.

To provide a general indication of the points that those who commented wished to communicate, comments have been generally categorized and reviewed for popular themes. Respondents to print and online surveys could comment by answering the survey

question, "Do you have any comments?" The table above shows that approximately two-thirds of all respondents (66.3% or 354 respondents) did not comment at all or commented on other aspects of BART (e.g., service enhancements). The remaining one-third of survey respondents can be grouped into two categories, comments "In Support" (61 comments or 11.4%) and "Not in Support" (119 comments or 22.3%).

The next table shows the number of comments and the percentages of comments in support and not in support of the fare increase by the method the commenter used to communicate:

	Print Survey	Online Survey	E-mail, voice mail, and telephone Town Hall
Comments on Fare Increase:	N=41	N=116	N=23
In Support	44.0%	33.6%	17.5%
Not in Support	<u>56.0%</u>	<u>66.4%</u>	<u>82.5%</u>
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

As noted above, print survey respondents are significantly more minority and low-income than BART's overall ridership, and this group showed more support for the proposed fare increase than overall respondents; many who completed the print survey attended BART outreach events at which staff was able to explain the fare increase and how revenue from it would be used for capital projects. Online survey respondents are significantly less minority and low-income than BART's overall ridership, and this group provided a higher percentage of comments that were not in support. The final group, a combination of e-mail, voice mail, and telephone Town Hall comments, provided the highest percentage of comments that were not in support.

Of those who commented in support of the fare increase, many consider the proposed 3.4% to be a small and reasonable increase, and they are willing to pay more for enhancements to service and capacity. Sample comments from this group include:

- “It’s a reasonable increase for the items listed.” *Online survey minority respondent*
- “I don’t mind the fare increase a little bit. I just expect service to be the same or better.” *Family Bridges meeting attendee*
- “I think it is still cheaper than driving.” *Print survey minority respondent*
- “Subject: please let fare increases = service increases. I don’t mind modest fare increases if the “capital improvements” it funds result in longer trains running more frequently. Currently, BART is chronically overcrowded because there are too many 3- and 5-car trains running at 15-20 minute intervals.” *E-mail respondent*

A common theme among survey respondents whose comments did not support the fare increase was that BART fares are already too high, and 25 respondents also noted that increasing parking fees was a significant issue for them. Many commenters expressed the opinion that they should not be paying more for service they consider to be less reliable, overcrowded, and lacking in cleanliness. Sample comments from this group include:

- “Please don’t raise fare as it will effect my monthly savings. Thanks.” *Print survey minority respondent*
- “My income isn’t increasing at the same rate as my already expensive BART fare.” *Online survey respondent*
- “No more increase to fare we are low income families.” *Print survey minority and low-income respondent*
- “I am calling about the proposed increase. I am really against it. I can’t afford to keep paying higher and higher prices for BART. The parking in Daly City where I take it has already gone up \$3 dollars a day and now you guys want to increase the fare. I just wanted to voice my opinion and say that I do not favor the fare increase and pretty soon I will have to start driving into work because it will be cheaper than taking BART. Thank you.” *Voice-mail respondent*

The third group of respondents did not comment on the fare increase but provided comments on other subjects. Many of these comments related to service and capacity enhancements, such as the need for more reliable service during peak commute times. Comments also addressed train delays and overcrowding during the peak commute and expanding service hours and station locations. At BART outreach events, attendees asked about how to get Clipper cards. Additionally, some survey respondents expressed a need for enhanced safety and security efforts in BART stations and on rail cars. Lastly, a number of respondents emphasized the need for cleaner restrooms and rail cars.

Members of BART’s Title VI/Environmental Justice Advisory Committee and Limited English Proficiency Advisory Committee were generally supportive of the increase, based on their understanding that the additional fare revenue is dedicated by Board policy to funding critical capital needs. Committee members voiced concern that low-income riders could be negatively impacted by any fare increase, however small. BART has implemented measures to address this concern. BART’s low-income definition of 200% of the federal poverty level takes into account the high cost of living in the Bay Area and provides a more rigorous standard in assessing impacts on low-income riders.

Additionally, BART conducts a triennial analysis of minority and low income populations to further evaluate impacts of transportation decisions. At the meetings at which these comments were made, BART staff acknowledged that the impact of an approximately 13 cent fare increase on a low-income rider could be greater than the increase on a non-low income rider. BART staff acknowledged the need for such consideration and explained that BART is currently taking additional steps in this area, notably by participating in the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s current Regional Means-Based Transit Fare Pricing Study, which is examining ways to make transit more affordable for low-income residents.

Comments from Committee members included the following:

- “While transit fares are raised based on inflation, salaries are not raised for our LEP constituents based on inflation. I am worried because fares are really high already. This increase will impact domestic workers.” *LEP Advisory Committee member, February 24, 2015, meeting*
- “Inflation based fare increase seems like the right path to take. It also seems like we can’t not ignore it and forego a fare increase. Those problems don’t go away and expenses do compound and the longer we neglect the issues that require attention the more expensive they get to fix in the long run. I can understand and appreciate this fare increase. My position is that the reason why we have these fare increases and the reason why these expenses get so high is that we keep building in a way that we can’t maintain/operate/afford. So then everyone has to pay for it.” *Title VI/EJ Advisory Committee member, May 11, 2015, meeting*
- “Need to clearly explain the whole problem, why it affects the service if we don’t have an increase. The way you ask the question can impact the response. I think that that number is not in favor of the increase, because they truly don’t understand what the increase is for.” *LEP Advisory Committee member, May 19, 2015, meeting* [Member’s support of the fare increase and belief that if survey respondents had a better understanding that revenue from the fare increase goes only to capital needs, the member believed that most survey respondents would have favored or supported the increase.]

4. EQUITY FINDINGS FOR PROPOSED 2016 FARE INCREASE

This section provides equity findings for the proposed 2016 fare increase. An equity finding is made after considering both the fare change analysis results described in Section 2 and public comment received described in Section 3.

4.1 Minority Disparate Impact Equity Finding

Analysis results show that minority riders would experience virtually the same percentage increase and dollar fare increase compared to non-minority riders (3.49% compared to 3.47%, and 13.3 cents compared to 13.4 cents). The difference between the change for minority riders and non-minority riders is 0.02%, which is less than the DI/DB Policy's 5% threshold. In addition, the finding is made that the cumulative effect of fare increases from 2012 through the proposed increase in 2016 would not result in a disparate impact on minority riders because the percent increase is the same for minority riders and non-minority riders, and thus falls below the DI/DB Policy's 5% threshold. As noted in Section 3.3 above, no comments were received regarding the proposed fare increase's impact on minority riders. Thus, the equity finding is that the proposed 2016 fare increase would not result in a disparate impact on minority riders.

4.2 Low-Income Disproportionate Burden Equity Finding

Analysis results show that low-income riders would experience virtually the same percentage increase and a slightly lower dollar fare increase compared to non-low income riders (3.50% compared to 3.48%, and 12.8 cents compared to 13.5 cents). The difference between the changes for low-income riders and non-low income riders is 0.02%, which is less than the DI/DB Policy's 5% threshold. In addition, the finding is made that the cumulative effect of fare increases from 2012 through the proposed increase in 2016 would not result in a disproportionate burden on low-income riders because the difference in the percent increases between low-income and non-low income riders is 0.05%, which is less than the DI/DB Policy's threshold of 5%.

Comments from the BART Title VI/Environmental Justice Advisory Committee and Limited English Proficiency Advisory Committee who also represent BART's low-income riders generally support this finding, as members commented they understood that the additional fare revenue is dedicated to funding critical capital needs to keep the system safe and reliable. Advisory committee members also commented that a fare increase of any amount, however small, presents challenges for low-income riders. BART has implemented measures to address this concern including defining low-income as 200% of the federal poverty level to account for the Bay Area's high cost of living so that more riders are considered low-income in the analysis. BART is taking additional steps in this area, notably by participating in the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's current Regional Means-Based Transit Fare Pricing Study, which is examining ways to make transit more affordable for low-income residents.

Taking into consideration both analysis findings and public comment, the equity finding is that the proposed 2016 fare increase would not result in a disproportionate burden on low-income riders.

APPENDIX A: Methodology Used to Assess the Effects of an Across-the-Board Fare Change

The following steps outline the methodology BART uses to assess the effects of a fare change, in this case, the proposed 3.4% productivity-adjusted inflation-based fare increase to take effect on January 1, 2016.

Step 1: For the proposed productivity-adjusted inflation-based fare increase, estimate weighted average fares “Before Fare Increase” and “After Fare Increase” for each BART station.

In Step 1, the weighted average fare paid by riders boarding at each of BART’s existing 44 stations is estimated. The Oakland International Airport Station is not included in this analysis because 2014 average weekday entries were used, and this station opened about six weeks before the end of 2014. The more riders boarding at a station that pay a certain fare, the closer the weighted average fare will be to that more-often paid fare. This is in contrast to a simple average fare where each fare has the same weight. A sample of stations is shown below, with the “2014 Fares” reflecting BART’s current fares and the “2016 Fares” reflecting the proposed 3.4% inflation-based fare increase for 2016.

Sample of Weighted Average Fare Data for Proposed 2016 Increase

<i>Origin Station</i>	2014 Fares	2016 Fares
Richmond	\$ 3.63	\$ 3.76
El Cerrito del Norte	\$ 3.83	\$ 3.97
El Cerrito Plaza	\$ 3.35	\$ 3.47
North Berkeley	\$ 3.61	\$ 3.72
Downtown Berkeley	\$ 3.31	\$ 3.42

For each station, a station-to-station fare table is multiplied by the 2014 station-to-station average weekday trip table (composed of actual trip data recorded by BART’s automated fare collection system) and the results are then summed. That sum is divided by the total number of average weekday trips for that station. The resulting dividend is the weighted average fare for that station. This calculation is performed to obtain average weighted fares before and after the fare increase using the appropriate fare table. The following chart shows the fare tables that were used in the calculations for the proposed fare increase.

Fare Table used in “Before Fare Increase” Calculation	Fare Table used in “After Fare Increase” Calculation
Actual 2014 Fare Table	2014 Fare Table increased by 3.4% (“2016 Fare Table”)

Step 2: For the proposed productivity-adjusted inflation-based fare increase, estimate weighted average fares for minority, non-minority, low-income, non-low income, and overall riders.

The percentage of minority and of low-income riders at each station is determined based upon reported responses in the 2014 Customer Satisfaction Survey. These percentages are then multiplied by the 2014 actual station-specific entries to estimate the number of minority and low-income riders at each station. A weighted average fare for minority riders systemwide is then calculated by multiplying, at the station level, the minority riders times the average fare, summing the total and dividing by the number of minority riders. This same step is repeated to calculate the average weighted fare for low-income riders and for non-minority and non-low income riders.

Step 3: For the proposed productivity-adjusted inflation-based fare increase, calculate the percent increase paid by minority riders, non-minority riders, low-income riders, non-low income riders, and overall users.

Using the systemwide weighted average fares calculated in Step 2 above, the percent increase in fares paid by minority riders, non-minority riders, low-income riders, non-low income riders, and overall riders is calculated “before” and “after” each proposed fare increase.

Step 4: For the proposed four productivity-adjusted inflation-based fare increase, to determine if the fare increase would have a disparate impact on minority riders or result in a disproportionate burden on low-income riders, apply to the differences in percent increases obtained in Step 3 above the appropriate Disparate Impact and Disproportionate Burden Policy threshold.

The difference in percent increase in fares “before” and “after” the increase is calculated for (a) minority riders compared to non-minority riders and (b) low-income riders compared to non-low income riders. The proposed inflation-based fare increase is an across-the-board fare increase. BART’s Disparate Impact and Disproportionate Burden Policy states that an across-the-board fare change will be considered to have a disproportionate impact if the difference between the changes for protected riders and nonprotected riders is equal to or greater than 5%. Therefore, a 5% threshold is applied to the difference in percent increase in fares.

APPENDIX B: Survey to Gather Comments and Demographic Data



2016 Inflation-Based Fare Increase

Below-Inflation Fare Increase to Fund Capital Priorities Scheduled for January 2016

- January 2016 fare increase of 3.4% calculated by measuring the change in inflation between 2012 and 2014 and subtracting ½ percent for BART productivity improvements.
- This increase is part of BART's program of small fare increases every two years.
- Fare increase revenue goes only to help fund BART's extensive capital needs, including new rail cars, an automated train control system, and an expanded maintenance facility.

Please answer the questions below. Your answers will help us evaluate how well we're reaching the communities we serve. BART values your input. Information will be treated confidentially, and all comments will be given to the BART Board.

1. What is your gender?

Male Female

Note: Please answer BOTH Questions 2 and 3.

2. Are you of Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin?

No Yes

3. What is your race or ethnic identification?

(Categories based on US Census)

White
 Black/African American
 Asian or Pacific Islander
 American Indian or Alaska Native
 Other (please specify) _____

4. Do you speak a language other than English at home?

No Yes _____

5. If you answered "Yes" to Question 4, how well do you speak English?

Very well Well Not well Not at all

6. What is your total annual household income before taxes?

<input type="checkbox"/> Under \$25,000	<input type="checkbox"/> \$50,000 - \$59,999
<input type="checkbox"/> \$25,000 - \$29,999	<input type="checkbox"/> \$60,000 - \$74,999
<input type="checkbox"/> \$30,000 - \$39,999	<input type="checkbox"/> \$75,000 - \$99,999
<input type="checkbox"/> \$40,000 - \$49,999	<input type="checkbox"/> \$100,000 and over

7. Including yourself, how many people live in your household?

1 2 3 4 5 6 or more

8. About how often do you ride BART?

6 - 7 days a week
 5 days a week
 3 - 4 days a week
 1 - 2 days a week
 1 - 3 days a month
 Less than once a month

9. Do you have any comments?

If you need language assistance services, please call (510) 464-6752. • Si necesita servicios de asistencia de idiomas, llame al (510) 464-6752.

如需語言協助服務，請致電 (510) 464-6752。• 통역이 필요하신 분은, 510-464-6752 로 문의하십시오.

Kung kailangan mo ang tulong ng mga serbisyo ng wika, paki tawagan ang (510) 464-6752.

Nếu quý vị cần dịch vụ trợ giúp về ngôn ngữ, xin vui lòng gọi số (510) 464-6752.

APPENDIX C: Public Comments Database

Count	Re-sponse ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
Comments in Support						
1	67	Lao Family ESL Class	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Increase is good
2	68	Lao Family ESL Class	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Increase is good
3	82	Lao Family ESL Class	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Increase is good
4	212	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Do it. Would love nicer cars
5	245	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Would still ride
6	250	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Non-Low-Income	I think it is still cheaper than driving
7	269	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	not a problem
8	39	Family Bridges	Print	Minority	Non-Low-Income	Agree to reasonable increase
9	43	Family Bridges	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Fare should increase
10	45	Family Bridges	Print	Minority	No Response	It's okay to increase the fare a little. Enhanced security.
11	46	Family Bridges	Print	Minority	Low-Income	It's not a problem to increase the fare a little. [BART] should focus on security.
12	21	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Increase the fares as much as you have to, just do something about the overcrowding during commute hours.
13	23	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Raise the prices more please. Inflation adjustment isn't enough, you need to expand service.
14	42	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	i agree with the increase
15	46	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	BART needs to upgrade their trains and stations - I support a fare increase to make it happen!
16	67	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Increase is necessary if it will help with keeping BART running and improvements to trains, stations, tracks, etc.
17	88	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Long past time to revise fares. If charging by distance, then the mileage component should be much higher. The cost in maintenance of both tracks and cars does not decrease on longer routes.
18	108	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	small increase is ok for me
19	117	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	Yes, thank you. I ride BART every day and would happily pay more money into the system to keep it clean, safe, and on-time. Please hike up the rates as much is feasible and necessary; our system is currently much cheaper than similar systems in other cities. You may also want to implement something like what they have in Washington DC, where Clipper Card holders get slight discounts and paper tickets cost more. It would make the transition more efficient, cut costs, and could keep the cost down for locals while charging tourists only slightly more. We have to keep funding for BART as a priority!
20	141	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	I am strongly in favor of a substantially larger fare increase to fund necessary improvements for the BART system. Specifically, I would love to see money put towards shorter intervals between trains, lower peak loads for trains, new equipment, increased reliability, and more stations in the East Bay.

Count	Re-spon se ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
21	144	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	I think this (the rate increase on January 1, 2016) is the correct thing to do to sustain a very important Bay Area utility/amenity!
22	161	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Rate increase is okay by us.
23	166	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	I endorse the fare increase. The system needs to be maintained at a high level.
24	11	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	No, it's a reasonable increase for the items listed.
25	112	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Yes.
26	13	Email				Subject: BART's Inflation Based Fare Increase 2016 As someone who will be riding Bart regularly when the Milpitas and Berryessa stations are open to the public, I am very willing to deal with slightly more expensive rates for an increase in the quality of b as rt transportation. My vote goes to support the increase
27	14	Email		N/A	N/A	Subject: BART INCREASE HI, I vote for 10 cent increase. ride daily from SFO to concord.
28	38	Family Bridges (meeting)	Print	Minority	Low-Income	BART Fares should be increase, but poor people's family income should be increase before that we are struggling every day.
29	111	Lao Family	Print	Minority	Low-Income	When the fare increase occurs then there should be options to accommodate them.
30	180	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Non-Low-Income	The increase is not a burden for me but there are other people who will be effected by the increase especially low income families.
31	186	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Non-Low-Income	No one like increase. But it depends on how it is being used
32	206	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Non-Low-Income	As long as trains will be better and less crowded increase is fine.
33	241	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Non-Low-Income	I sadly understand
34	254	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Non-Minority	Low-Income	Guess it is needed
35	1	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	I would feel better about increases if I saw more evidence of their value. The trains are more crowded and the stations are dirty.
36	5	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	I don't like fare increase, but I think it's necessary.
37	10	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	I won't mind for the small increase of the fares as long as BART is able to let us know what and where the funds are going to be used for, i.e. building new trains, maintaining stations, expending rails toward West/East HWY80, replacing the disgust plastic seats with stainless steel seats (without cushions are ok), the current plastic seats retains body moist and heats after the person got up, and takes very long time to cool down. Build racks on last car of each train for bikers.
38	37	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	I would only approve the increase if fee if it went to the capital improvements mentioned and not employee salaries....
39	38	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	ok only if you make service better
40	44	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	I think the fare should be increased more for those who make longer trips, e.g. Walnut Creek to Embarcadero. Those who commute from the far suburbs tend to be wealthier and contribute more to the costs of operating BART because they overwhelmingly travel during the peak.

Count	Re-sponse ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
41	50	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Raising fares is only ok if actual tangible improvements are made to BART, making it worth the exorbitant amount of money. I've been taking AC Transit Transbay -- and let me tell you, it's clean, on time, and there's always a seat. It's actually a joy to ride! And it costs the same as BART, which is dirty, often delayed, and there is never a seat (or enough space to even stand comfortably). Raising BART even more, without immediate marked improvements, is pretty sleazy. A lot of people don't have the much nicer AC transit option.
42	56	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	I commute Monday through Friday from Pleasant Hill station to Civic Center station and can easily afford this planned increase. However, lower-income riders may find it difficult. I would be willing to help subsidize their fare.
43	61	Online		No Response	No Response	I really have no problem with the \$.15 increase, what I do have a major problem with is the filth that BART seems to ignore throughout its stations. I can only speak for the Civic Center and 16th street stations as those are the two that I mostly use. It smells like PEE, PEE, PEE. There are homeless always sleeping in the stairwells, top and bottom. At the Civic Center station, where the escalators take you up to the Whitcomb Hotel, there is ALWAYS homeless sleeping in their cardboard boxes, blankets with urine, trash and the horrid smell. Every now and then you will see a BART police office asking them to leave, but not nearly often enough. I have written to BART many times regarding these issues and it goes unanswered. One time my wife and witnessed 2 people having sex at the back of the station (Whitcomb side) where there is absolutely no supervision on that side. They smoke cigarettes, weed and who knows what else. The place is just filthy and my next move is going to the health dept. It is unkempt and not fit for people to travel thru.
44	66	Online		No Response	Non-Low-Income	I would like to make sure this fare increase actually goes to system improvements rather than salaries.
45	83	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	I have no problem with fare increases, but it would be nice to see a larger security presence on the trains and in the stations. More cleaning staff would be a plus-those trains get really filthy...
46	87	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Although I would prefer if BART raised money in a different way, if my fare increase leads to expanded and more reliable service, then I will happily pay 30 extra cents a day. Can't wait for the new trains.
47	91	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Nobody wants daily expenses to rise, but BART is still the fastest, easiest way to get to SFO, SF, Oakland, etc. We need to keep it in good working order and improve/increase service. It is a bargain any way you look at it.
48	101	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	Fare pegged to inflation is not ideal, but a reasonable practice. However, effort should be made to avoid disruption to service. Union strike should be banned and protesters who shut down service should be taken away by police force.
49	102	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	I have no problem with a fare increase. However, I think Bart is continually late and trains are overcrowded to the point that I feel it is a safety issue. I typically ride from San Bruno to Montgomery at 7:30am and from Montgomery to San Bruno at 6:30pm. It is frequently SRO into the City but almost

Count	Re-sponse ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
						always SRO Montgomery to San Bruno. There used to be trash receptacles on the platform.
50	109	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	increase ok if it will improve service
51	110	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	Ensure the 3.4% fare increase goes exclusively to preventive maintenance and/or capital projects.
52	111	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	I understand a fare increase, but then there is also parking fee increases on top of that. For some riding a bike is NOT AN OPTION and so driving your car to a station is the only way. I hope an increase in fares means an increase in trains on the system. Sending 8 - 9 cars during commute hours is unacceptable.
53	130	Online		Minority	No Response	I guess an approx. \$4 increase a month in fares isn't the worst. But at some point, I'm going to weigh the pros of purchasing and driving my own car to work instead of relying on BART and its often spotty service.
54	132	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Not a fan of increased fares, but the work needs to be done.
55	145	Online		No Response	No Response	Include 2nd transbay tube in future capital plans. Larger fare increase to help fund would be acceptable.
56	167	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Please consider offering discounts to low-income riders. I do not object to increases for those that can afford it, but many people cannot.
57	177	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	I hope the service (broken down trains, disruptions, etc.) gets better with the fare raise as well as with the parking fee raise that just occurred. It seems like we are paying more money for crappier service.
58	179	Online		Non-Minority	Low-Income	That is definitely a bummer, but I understand the necessity.
59	181	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	I understand that the rates will increase, but is there any way to provide a monthly pass for everyday BART riders?
60	5	Email		N/A	N/A	Subject: please let fare increases = service increases I don't mind modest fare increases if the "capital improvements" it funds result in longer trains running more frequently. Currently, BART is chronically overcrowded because there are too many 3- and 5-car trains running at 15-20 minute intervals. Please please PLEASE use the funds from your fare increases to increase the length of most trains, and decrease the time between trains on all lines at all hours. THANK YOU! (Daily BART commuter from Downtown Berkeley to Powell).
61	44	Email		N/A	N/A	I take Bart daily to work and exit at Civic Center station. I would not mind a 10 cent raise on my fare if you would keep the station cleaner. I take the escalator up by where the Burger King is. At the bottom of the escalator it is just filthy. I understand that it is an inner city location but that is no excuse for you to keep your stations dirty. Have you thought about a partnership with a job training program to hire folks from the community to keep your stations clean? People would learn to respect it if it was constantly cleaned. Since Muni runs underground there, maybe consider splitting the cost with Muni.

Count	Re-spon se ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
Comments Not In Support						
62	58	Family Bridges	Print	Minority	Non-Low-Income	I hope keep it in the same price.
63	73	Lao Family ESL Class	Print	Minority	Low-Income	no increase
64	107	Lao Family	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Lower BART fare and more security professionals on BART and Platform for safety issues and concerns
65	108	Lao Family	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Safety, please have a security on the platform all the time. Not rise for rider.
66	109	Lao Family	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Please don't go up on the fair.
67	113	Lao Family	Print	Minority	Low-Income	I believe funds should stay how they area. This is getting ridiculous
68	114	Lao Family	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Do not raise BART fare for the poor people (low income) poverty
69	147	Lao Family	Print	Minority	Low-Income	I think BART fare should not go up
70	163	Lao Family	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Not in favor for fair ride increase. Thank you
71	178	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Increase fair can impact low income riders that are struggling to make it financially in these cities that are raising the rent and kicking low income and people of color out of cities like San Francisco
72	184	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Non-Minority	No Response	Does the increase affect the senior ticket? \$9.00 for 24 perhaps. More than \$24 is needed to offset projected increase.
73	208	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Low-Income	No more increase to fare we are low income families
74	226	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Non-Low-Income	That's a lot of \$! BART already is a lot
75	231	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Non-Low-Income	For my parents that one senior it might affect them a little
76	232	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Non-Low-Income	Please don't raise fare as it will effect my monthly savings. Thanks
77	41	Family Bridges	Print	Minority	No Response	[I] wish no fare increase
78	42	Family Bridges	Print	Minority	Low-Income	[I] wish no fare increase
79	174	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Don't increase the fares
80	270	African Advocacy Network	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Totally against any increase
81	273	African Advocacy Network	Print	Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	BART is already too expensive. Public transit needs to be affordable for all users. How will the increase impact low income riders?
82	274	African Advocacy Network	Print	Non-Minority	No Response	Please no fare increase
83	276	African Advocacy Network	Print	Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	BART should stay affordable to all. I ride my bike mostly but it would be detrimental to low-income riders if the fare was raised.
84	278	African Advocacy Network	Print	Minority	Non-Low-Income	Raising the fare will have a terrible impact on people. It will force people to make really hard choices.
85	2	Online		Non Minority	Non-Low-Income	NO more fare increases! We are getting poorer service, same dirty stations, and jaded station agents since the last increase. Why there is a constant increase always for more capital improvements and everything stays the same. Why are you on a hiring binge? How many additional to the bloated BART salaries/benefits is adding. Are you appeasing the unions by adding staff? BART is run so poorly: your focus should be keep trains operating, have enough cars, and keep to your schedule. All other issues like transit villages, spending money on EARTH DAY contests, partnering with other Manilia Police services (see this in a BART email alert), etc should stop. You

Count	Re-sponse ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
						need to again : focus on train maintenance, keep those train on a schedule, keeping passengers safe
86	3	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	For all the improvements and the fare increases, I see nothing budgeted for repair and maintenance of the escalators and elevators. As a disabled individual, the loss of the Sansome Street escalator, combined with the Montgomery Street elevator, means I cannot get down from the street to the trains. The Sansome Street escalator is the only escalator at that end of the Montgomery station that goes down in the late afternoon for commuters. All other escalators go up, regardless of time of day.
87	6	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Longer Bart trips are expensive enough and would become more expensive than others with a percentage based increase. Instead increase fare on shorter trips more than longer trips.
88	8	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	It's us horrific the level of mismanagement of your money. Constantly increasing rates for Bart and parking while doing frivolous paint jobs etc. to Powell stations. Get those maintenance ppl to work at night instead of laying around doing nothing.
89	9	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Stop asking for fare increases until you make the system: A- run more trains and more frequently B- operate LONGER hours!!! You cannot even use BART for an early flight as often trains do not get started until 8am. I am sick of getting on PACKED trains at 10 at night because you run such short trains too infrequently. Get up to speed the system is WAY too expensive and not nearly efficient enough.
90	12	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	For all increases have seen nothing that is concrete as to clean cars, escalators that WORK, windows one can see out of.
91	13	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	Pittsburg line is already high. Please consider a lower fare increase for the fares that are highest.
92	15	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	BART must take care that the cost of using the system is nowhere near the cost of taking a SOV. BART should always be cheaper. The total cost of using the system should always be taken in consideration when weighing the use of BART compared to taking one's own car.
93	17	Online		Minority	No Response	The calculation should be given.....i thought we had no inflation!!
94	18	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	Our jobs do not have automatic increases every two years, yet BART constantly raises its fares. Parking has been going up every six months. The fares and parking fee are becoming unbearable.
95	22	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	BART is already too expensive for terrible service.
96	31	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	BART has not improved with previous fare increases. Riders should not have to pay any more for an inferior experience. We have been asked to gradually pay more for a poorer quality of service. A new increase will just perpetuate the higher cost/lower quality cycle.

Count	Response ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
97	32	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	I have been riding BART since I was a little girl in the 80's and I always considered it a pleasant ride. Even up until a few years ago, it wasn't too bad. Granted, there were occasional delays, but it happened so seldom that I never gave it much thought. Fast forward to today - there is a delay almost every single day. The trains are dirty and disgusting and I don't want to touch anything. The trains are overcrowded and smell bad. We need new trains, more trains operating during peak hours in the mornings and evenings, and proper cleaning of the BART trains. It feels very much like BART knows people have no other choice when it comes to commuting into the city so you do the bare minimum to keep things (sort of) operating. It is ridiculous and something drastic needs to be done. Perhaps new management? Perhaps a group of people who care more about the ridership? What happened to the new trains which were supposed to be replacing the current outdated fleet? Where are the funds going? Certainly not towards the current system.
98	33	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Oh yes. Tired of the fare increases with marginal service. I sent a letter to the General Mgr. with my complaints. You have much to do to improve and you raise the fares and you do nothing. You have become an agency that provides jobs and NOT the service you were originally meant to provide to the S.F. Bay Area. You need to slash your budget, folks. Stop making the commuters pay for the salaries because we sure don't pay for any improvements. And your questions are racist, shameful and disgusting. Will you discount comments from people who don't have a good command of the English language or are of Latino origin? What is the point of these questions? I will be sure to bring this up in my letter to the Contra Costa Times. UGH
99	40	Online		Minority	Low-Income	I'm a BART rider, and I oppose the fare increase. Money should instead come from taxes on cars.
100	41	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	Against an increase. It's already really expensive for crappy service where you have to wait 20 minutes if you miss a train.
101	47	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Disapprove, at this rate, I rather drive my car for the same price and enjoy not smelling someone else's BO and feeling cramped (and hot)
102	48	Online		Minority	No Response	Raise in fares is unfair. They are already among the highest in whole country. Parking was also raised quickly from \$1 to 2 to 3. Do not raise the fares. Bicycles on BART are a hazard. They always force their way inside crowded morning and evening commute times even though the written rules say they should not board crowded trains. Nobody cares about written rules. The operators never stop them. They block the doorways, aisles etc.
103	55	Online		Non-Minority	Low-Income	With parking fees plus rate hikes, it's going to get cheaper to drive to work. Make the gates taller so you don't have people jumping over the toll gates/fences to get a free ride. Also put a lock on the "emergency gate" I see people walk through it all the time. Hikes will hurt more than help. Still the trains have no air going through them, interior of trains are filthy and cars are still getting broken into. Where's the patrolling and why don't you hire more BART PD?

Count	Re-sponse ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
104	58	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	ANOTHER fare hike? Ridership is at historical levels, service and reliability are poor, commuters have to deal with dirty trains and homeless people sprawled across seats. Station agents are few and far between and less than helpful. You are also getting \$\$ from parking. The convenience of BART is long gone.
105	60	Online		No Response	Non-Low-Income	I strongly disagree with the proposed fare increase. You have continuously increased the fare at a rate that is not consistent with the general public's wellbeing. In comparison, the New York, Washington DC and Atlanta and other metropolitan cities across the US, BART's rates are ridiculously expensive especially for working middle class. This transportation system is no longer considered public transportation when the rates are so high that citizens can no longer afford to travel on your trains.
106	64	Online		Minority	Low-Income	As usual the proposed ticket increases negatively and disproportionately affect short distance riders, many of whom are low income or minorities. For example, you propose to increase the fare from Berkeley to MacArthur, a trip of 2 stops, by \$.10 while you propose to increase the fare from Walnut Creek to SF, a trip of more than twice as many stops, by only \$.15. There is no way that is fair. At most the first trip should be increased by no more than \$.05. And I really don't think it should be increased at all. You should increase fares more proportionate to the length of trips and number of their stops. Something BART has never done. BART has always given bargains to those who least need them and "screwed" or to put it more politely disadvantaged those who can least afford it, and it just "ain't" fair. Do the right thing. Be equitable and fair.
107	65	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	I disagree with the fare increase in 2016. A fare increase was just instituted in 2014 and there have not been any improvements that I can see. The Embarcadero escalators are continuously breaking down as well as various elevators throughout the system. The escalator at Embarcadero was broken for the whole month of December. This is not acceptable for people with physical disabilities. If the escalators keep breaking down, you should replace them completely. BART makes it very difficult for people with physical disabilities to get around when the escalators and elevators are not working. For all the money commuters spend taking BART, the money doesn't seem to be used to improve BART at all. All the trains are crowded during the morning and evening commutes. There are medical emergencies almost every day because the trains are way too crowded. You will get just as much money if you put some extra trains in service so people are not packed like sardines in the cars and passing out. Bikes are still allowed at commute hours. You indicate these increases are for new rail cars - I haven't seen a new rail car yet and you certainly don't clean the ones you already have in service. Use the money you currently get from the fares and parking and replace the escalators and update the elevator systems and put some more trains in service. On another note, you lost about 3 fares on Monday at the Bayfair stations because three teenagers jumped the fence instead of

Count	Re-sponse ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
						going through the fare gates. I told the station agent lady but she was too busy on the phone to care. Whenever you ask a station agent a question, they act as if you are interrupting them and annoying them. Yes, we probably are but that is their job to answer questions and help people who don't know how to use the machines. After all, we are paying all of your paychecks - just remember that.
108	69	Online		Minority	Low-Income	Well publicized strike a year ago and now a fare increase? You can't milk or squeeze more juice from your employees now you turn your head towards commuters/customers even though bart is earning millions every year. its "unfair"
109	70	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Fares shouldn't be increasing as trains get more and more crowded and shorter due to maintenance. People don't want to pay more for a miserable commute.
110	71	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	It is really difficult to justify your fare increases when the quality of our travel has so diminished. There are never any seats in the morning even though there is just one station before I get on (Castro Valley) and I have to go back three stations to get a seat after work.
111	72	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	It is very hard to justify a fare increase when BART's service has continually gone down. Dirty, crowded trains, people on the Dublin line forced to go to work an hour earlier just to get a seat because we never have more than 8 cars. There has to be some justification. BART keeps advertising for more riders, but when they get them, they can't accommodate them.
112	73	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	I don't think it's fair that we keep having price increase i commute from Millbrae to 24th Monday thru Friday. A 10 to 15 cent price increase makes a big difference especially since there have been hike fares for the past couple of years including parking fee increases.
113	74	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	Pricing seems to keep going up yet there isn't any improvement to the service or cars we ride in.
114	75	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Pay more to ride BART? No way! They need to better manage the money they already have. I've ridden on rapid transit in different cities around the world and BART is by far, the worst! BART does not run on time, something is always going wrong or breaking down. The cars are smelly, dirty and disgusting. The car's track system is far too noisy for health standards (I've had to get noise canceling headphones just for the commute). The air conditioning is often broken; leaving us standing there packed together in the car, sweating and barely able to breathe above the stench. I'm usually in support of unions, but the strikes by BART employees are just absolutely ridiculous. I don't understand how they get away with it, who do they think they are? In this economy they do not deserve raises and we do not deserve to pay more for such unacceptable facilities and service!
115	81	Online		Minority	No Response	Right now we DO NOT HAVE INFLATION! Wages have not increased. Riders CANNOT AFFORD a so-called "inflation-based fare increase!!"

Count	Response ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
116	84	Online		Non-Minority	Low-Income	BART is already unaffordable. I put off or cancel trips to important community events to save money sometimes. Even though I strongly believe in public transit & think it's the best option environmentally & to not sit in traffic, I try to get rides across the bay instead of taking BART purely for cost reasons. It's cheaper for me & a friend to drive and split the gas/tolls cost than take BART, even if we can't fill up the car with more people and it's just the 2 of us! This is NOT his public transit is supposed to work. The cost issue should incentivize public transit not abandoning public transit to drive because it's more affordable even when you'd prefer public transit!!
117	90	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	I believe in public transit and rely on it daily. I think we need to do a lot to make it a more viable and connected network, but I think BART fares are already way too high and raising them more is a bad move. The BART boards salaries are outrageous, the workers are also overpaid (though far less so), and the riders have to deal with the highest fares in the country. I know you will continue to raise fares on the people that rely on transit, which are the people that have no other options. It will reach a breaking point. I beg you to stop the fare increases. Find other sources of funding, because you are sucking people dry. I will be moving away temporarily in the next year and I am debating about returning to the bay area (even though I love it) because it's just too expensive and on top of housing it's hard to justify paying \$200+ a month to stand on a packed BART train to get to work. Chicago, NYC, DC, Boston, even Seattle all have better or at least comparable public transit to BART but cost FAR LESS on a monthly basis. Keep milking your riders and giving yourselves absurd raises and it will become the rich commuter service that you've always wanted it to be.
118	93	Online		Non-Minority	No Response	We can't afford another increase in fares. Next will be parking and you KNOW IT! For what, parking lots with no safety; trains so overcrowded you can't breathe. No heat on trains when cold; no air when it's hot and overcrowded (this is a major problem). Station staff that are only friendly to their friends and spend most of their time preoccupied with something other than their jobs. Ask station attendants a question and you would think the wrath of Khan just occurred. Don't get me started with the stupid new rules on bike riders during heavy commute time. What am I thinking, I've forgotten, "They own the place!!" Have you looked at your parking lots? Have you seen the drivers particularly in San Leandro drive in the wrong direction to beat street traffic? You park in that lot at your own risks and it can be dangerous. The front end of my car barely missed being slammed not once not twice but too many times to count and I can't count how many times I've been just missed by crazy drivers while I'm walking to the station. Your ridiculous answer to the problems is to create a new fleet of trains with less seating! REALLY??! So we pay increases for more punishment. Wonderful. Perhaps your high paying salaries should take some cuts and live on less income like most of us. Trust me riders realized just how much your staff makes during the

Count	Re-sponse ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
						strike and it's pretty insulting to most of us. If anything you should be ashamed of yourself to even think about raising rates. BART is an embarrassment to modern rail system of any kind and so is their staff.
119	94	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Increased fares, delayed service almost every day, dirty trains & stations and richer BART board. That's the way to do it. I don't buy this "inflation based" increase for a second. And what's up with question 3? Why does Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin matter?
120	99	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Cut your employment costs instead of raising fares, BART is already ridiculously expensive and barely affordable as it is. It shouldn't cost \$180 a month to get from Oakland to SF on public transit.
121	100	Online		Non-Minority	No Response	How can you justify a fare increase when the trains are beyond crowded? The cars are garbage. The stations are disgusting. BART IS DOING NOTHING to add more cars during high peak times. In fact, BART took cars off the Richmond line during morning commute times. What the hell? Even the conductors I spoke with thought it was insane. I've ridden trams the word over, Bart is by far the worst. Get your shit together, and then ask for a fare increase.
122	104	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	Bart is already an expensive choice for me. I cannot afford another fare increase.
123	105	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Yes. Fare increases for San Leandro folks are a slap in the face. Parking rates increased, 300 parking spaces taken away, BART bus through Aug on Sunday's between Coliseum and Fruitvale - we've had enough increases, losses and inconveniences!!!!
124	106	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Please stop raising the fares every year! It already costs me \$10.20 to get to and from work every day. My husband also rides BART, so that's another \$10.20 EVERY WEEK DAY. Plus, we park at the Pleasant Hill BART parking lot, which is another \$3. Just to get to and from work every day, my husband and I currently spend \$23.40. EVERY DAY. That's \$117 a week! \$2,340 a month! \$28,080 a year! That is an exorbitant amount of money. Our industries are located in the city, so we must commute in. We can't afford to live in the city, so we must commute in. Why do you keep punishing us for living in an affordable suburb? Please stop raising the fares. I already can't believe we spend almost \$30 a day just to get to and from work. If we could save all our commuting money, we could have paid down more of our student loans or have a nice nest egg to help ourselves buy a house!
125	107	Online		Non-Minority	Low-Income	I feel BART customers already pay too much for the lousy service and no restrooms available or too many homeless that camp out on BART property-very much not for the public just for the BART employees and management.
126	113	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	I do not agree with the increased fare. Parking costs just increased by double.
127	114	Online		Non-Minority	No Response	Please stop raising fares so soon and so much.

Count	Re-sponse ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
128	115	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	According to the KTVU Fox News ticker Bart is considering a 3.4 % fare hike next year. ☹ Of course that means the parking costs at every Bart station will go up too. ☹ Smh after the horrendous four day Bart strike that crippled the entire Bay Area, the continued suicides that disrupt service, the dirty stations with dirty needles everywhere and drug use going on in the stations, broken fare gates and ticket machines and absent station agents, broken escalators and elevators. Give me a break! They need to use all that reserve money they've been hoarding instead of increasing fares! Smh!
129	119	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	Am a daily rider. It is already very expensive. Deal with your labor contracts more effectively before you continue to raise fares. Deal with your pension issue. We need a dependable, affordable and clean public transportation system. The stations, particularly in SF, are filthy. Stepping over or in poop every day. Bart leadership needs to see what they really provide before raising rates.
130	126	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	This fee increase is too high. BART service has significantly decreased in value. Many days of the week there are delays, the trains are overcrowded. The BART employees go on strike and leave passengers stranded. BART does not manage funds well. I highly disapprove and disagree with this fee increase. Reduce other costs. Be more efficient. Set priorities. Stop passing on wasteful costs to the passengers (and then periodically shutting down the system).
131	131	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Factor in the urine, feces, vomit, severe overcrowding, angry cyclists packed onto trains and escalators and the occasional assault, and I think a fare increase is a great idea! (SARCASM) BART is HORRIBLE and getting worse. Perhaps if you hadn't caved to your drivers repeatedly and had invested money in the system, it wouldn't now look like some third-world deathtrap. Your past fare increases have resulted in no upgrade in service, and my barely being able to economically justify riding with you. According to my math, any increase will now mean driving is more cost-effective for me (not to mention healthier and less prone to assault), so I will finally be free of BART (and no longer using you).

Count	Re-sponse ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
132	133	Online		Minority	No Response	<p>The proposed fare increase is beyond preposterous. Given the deteriorating state of the trains, increase in delays, constant mechanical issues, high parking fees in select stations, stations with no access to restrooms (Powell), excessive overcrowding, excrement/urine found in most stations and their stairwells- having the passengers subsidize issues that BART should be responsible for, is ridiculous. BART has become very uncomfortable to ride. And this is not said lightly- seeing the amount of medical emergencies increase because the trains are so hot and stuffy, is a liability. The seats, floors and rails are filthy. The smells of bodily fluids on the platforms, stairwells and surrounding areas are retched. On top of the huge increase in passengers, allowing bikes during all hours has not helped to address the overcrowding. I believe that BART takes advantage of the fact that they are the only high-speed transportation system in the area. As passengers, we have dealt with not only all the items noted above, but the unending strike that disrupted the entire Bay Area in 2013. BART did nothing to appease its passengers during this time, but rather filed the pockets of a negotiator whose personal business benefited financially because of the strike (i.e. "chartered buses".) Along with that, the executive members also rewarded themselves with high wages after the strike. BART has made no significant improvements to address all these issues and when they propose to do so, always look at the passengers to pay for them. I have ridden BART on an everyday basis for the past 10 years, and it is getting to the point where I am considering another means of transportation. I refuse to continue to pay for a system that does not value its passengers and puts them at risk on a regular basis.</p>
133	135	Online		Minority	Low-Income	Raising fares would impede my everyday commute and effect my cost of living. It is hard enough as it is trying to make it paycheck by paycheck on minimum wage. Please don't raise the fares!! Thank you
134	137	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	Please do not increase the BART fare; it will affect me badly.
135	138	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	You're making BART unaffordable. I was shocked at how expensive it was when I moved from NYC. No unlimited pass & an unpleasant experience with overcrowding... I'll start driving to work instead. You're making it difficult to justify riding BART to the people that can afford other transportation methods & unaffordable for the people that can't. RIDICULOUS!
136	140	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	I think it a crime to continue to raise fares. Those of us who ride daily are paying a premium price for transit, to STAND most of the distance (i.e. from SF to Concord). The crowding is becoming intolerable and the extra 30 cents/day will add up so that BART is no longer the cheaper option to driving and parking. When will it end? Personally, I have not seen a raise in my income since 2008. These fare increases are beginning to hurt us!
137	149	Online		Minority	Low-Income	BART fare increases have reached outrageous levels. And instead of going towards maintenance, the elevated rates are to pay for the HUGE pay increases. Please provide a line chart of BART fare/parking increases in the last 5 years. Riders will revolt.

Count	Re-sponse ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
138	153	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	BART is inefficient and I am constantly trying other modes of transportation in order to get to work in the morning. Until there are more trains during rush hour so I don't have to stand with my face in someone else's armpit, I don't want to see fares increase one cent. Why should I pay more money for service that keeps getting worse and worse??
139	154	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Stop spending money on hugely expensive parking garages then passing the expense along to all the non-driving BART riders via fare hikes. The cost to park at BART stations needs to go way up to reflect the true cost of those facilities. People who cannot afford the parking fee will find other ways to get to the station, just like the rest of us already have.
140	155	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Please do not raise the fare!
141	157	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	It's my understanding that BART has had a surplus for the last several years, which makes sense with the increased ridership. Why increase fares AGAIN if you have more people riding and a surplus? Take bonuses and pay away from the people at the top who sabotaged the system during recent strikes.
142	178	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	It is absurd that BART rates keep rising every couple of years. Along with increases in BART parking rates, it makes no sense to take BART to my work.
143	185	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	BART fares are already far too high. BART should install surveillance cameras at every fare gate and actually enforce the law against fare evasion. I see dozens of teenagers riding BART from Downtown Berkeley for free because they illegally use the emergency exit to reach the platform. Station agents ask people to pay their fares, but until BART Police actually begin citing people for fare evasion, this practice will continue--and those of us who spend hundreds of dollars a month on BART fares will continue to subsidize those who choose not to pay to ride.
144	192	Online		Non-Minority	Low-Income	BART needs to have a program to help people who make a wage at or below the poverty limit to ride for a reduced rate, I already can't afford to Bart but have to take it and now the prices are going to increase more.
145	193	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	I don't mind paying for functional, dependable service. However I do expect that along with the \$10 a day I spend on BART there to be accessible trash cans, working and open bathrooms in stations, working escalators consistently, and cleaner, quieter transport. Presently, BART meets none of these expectations. Step up your game when you step up your fares.

Count	Re-sponse ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
146	194	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	I'm extremely frustrated and angry at the fact that BART is going to raise fares. The Board of Directors allows the BART unions to hold riders hostage during a strike. The Board then allows the unions to stay in the driver's seat in a new contract. You charge parking at extremely high rates, knowing that in a high economy more people will need to commute to get to work. Knowing this, you raise parking fees, continuing to fleece the riders for every dollar in their pockets. Trains are consistently filthy. BART has no commitment to keeping the trains clean or preventing riders that don't pay fares from boarding trains. Personnel are overpaid and underworked, from top to bottom. Maintenance to the system happen at a snail's pace. It's only a matter of time until more trains derail due to deteriorating tracks and cars. BART has no commitment to keeping the system safe. Finally, you have the audacity to try to hide the scheduled fare hikes under the third category on Level 1 of your website, all the way at the bottom, with an obscure page heading, "Title VI". You owe your riders more transparency with something this important. More fare hikes are abhorrent, and categorize BART's ineffective use of revenue and overall funding. Your lack of overall care for rider safety and satisfaction is repulsive, and your actions show that you care nothing more than to increase revenue while monopolizing the Bay Area. Clearly, I must not be the only person who feels this way, let alone take the time to fill out this survey. If you truly do care about ridership opinion, then you will consider improving the system in many ways so that it may be recognized as one of the premier mass transit systems in the world.
147	195	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	BART constantly raises fare and parking. There aren't enough trains and trains during rush hour are stuffy. Money should be better spent on improvements, not on salary!
148	197	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	Yes I have comments. You provide an awful commuter experience. Trains are more than 5 minutes late many times throughout the week. Even worse is when trains are 10 minutes late (like this morning arriving at 16th St. Mission 10 minutes late). And, service ends at midnight! Come on! We know the real reason is because you don't want to deal with the hassle of the "late night crowd". That you have to clean the tracks is bologna! Why are other large metro cities around the world able to extend late night service at least once a night?! Oh, and you don't have enough parking for bicycles. Here's to your rate increases: Go fuck yourself BART. Eat elephant poo!
149	198	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	BART delay is horrible when there is incident (such as people jumping or falling onto tracks) - please install platform screen doors similar to the underground transit system in Hong Kong and Korea.
150	199	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	The BART is already too expensive. The cars are jam packed every day. This is unacceptable. Please add more cars, and do not charge more.
151	200	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	A fare increase when the service is ABOMINABLE is beyond the pale. Also given not one, but TWO strikes, this is ridiculous. Cut upper management pay.

Count	Re-sponse ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
152	201	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	BART charges enough now. The Board wasted hundreds of thousands of dollars on the negotiators and union--why do the riders have to pay for your ineptness. We paid plenty for the strike the Board caused. Protesters did not have to pay. It is time to give the riders a break. No increase in fares. Parking keeps going up. Where does it end? The Board gets raises and what do you do to earn it? Nothing. No increase. Thank you.
153	49	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	Price hikes every other year seems to be getting too much for middle to lower class families. I know at some point its necessity but have some other plans in place where both commuters and bart org could benefit. I have been pushing for monthly passes for years now. If majority of bart commuters buy monthly pass but are not commuting BART still gets to keep the money regardless, the pricing plan needs to be worked out of course but I still believe it's doable. Add parking combo to it too. Right now I am spending approx \$4K a year on BART that's 5.5% per year of our total income.
154	54	Online		Non-Minority	No Response	Soon - you will price yourself too high for commuters and it will be cheaper to carpool to SF.
155	59	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	No unfair tax burden on the poor and working class. Transit fares are regressive taxes. Increase the cost of parking, increase taxes for transit & do mixed-use development on BART sites.
156	63	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	The increase in fares for commuters equates to an increase tax and an added burden to workers in the Bay Area who already have to deal with the unaffordability of the area. I would like to see BART make public the cuts they are making in projects and salaries to accommodate the "increased budget needs" that require this increase!
157	134	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	I ride BART during the standard commute hours, mainly because i do not have a choice. Despite the age, deplorable quality, and lack of accommodating the increased ridership, BART is still the most convenient way for me to travel from Walnut Creek to San Francisco for work or SFO. I find that increasing the fare whether every even-numbered year or every 5 years based on national and local inflation a deplorable business tactic no matter how small the increase is. Wages and increases thereof, whether merit or annual, do not typically reflect inflation or the continual increase to the cost of living. Though, i do understand the need for BART to reevaluate and possibly increase the fare to account for the cost of operation and maintenance, i feel that there is a better system that can be used to accommodate the ever increasing cost of living in the Bay Area and prevent BART from becoming something that only the more affluent can afford. BART needs to be an organization that works for the people it serves.
158	97	Online		Minority	No Response	RIDICULOUS! What about all that money from Bart parking? Use that money. I don't see improvements or maintenance in or around the parking lot. If there's an increase I see maybe \$.05

Count	Re-sponse ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
159	159	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	I think between the parking fees, the ridiculous tickets you give out for parking in a space 5 minutes before you are allowed when there are DOZENS of spaces available and the filthy condition of the trains, you should be giving us a DECREASE! The Fremont line which I use routinely has shorter trains than Pittsburgh Bay Point resulting in standing room only by the second stop in Union City! I have been growing more and more disgusted with the entire system in the last several years. All fare increases, no improvements! And the people at the entrances are lazy.
160	203	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Janet Yellen fed res board says inflation is less than 2%. Read the papers
161	204	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	I think the current rates are high. You should be able to do what needs to be done with what you have. You already don't do enough. Number One obviously is Safety, by the way, you never have drills... what are the plans in an emergency?? Share with us. Fix the speakers, you can't hear whatever the driver is saying. Except the crapping elevator updates; hear those loud and clear. Enough already do we really need to hear those, put them on the app, people can check them there or a central board. No More elevator updates!! Next CLEAN CLEAN CLEAN... BART is the most disgusting thing on earth. Filthy Dirty everywhere, cars in and out, stations are filthy, NO EXCUSE. There should be a team cleaning all day not just a night... with as many people as you have going thru besides the transients. A cleaning crew needs to be on hand all the time... and cleaning, not just standing there.
162	1	Voice Message		N/A	N/A	I am calling about the proposed increase. I am really against it. I can't afford to keep paying higher and higher prices for BART. The parking in Daly City where I take it has already gone up \$3 dollars a day and now you guys want to increase the fare. I just wanted to voice my opinion and say that I do not favor the fare increase and pretty soon I will have to start driving into work because it will be cheaper than taking BART. Thank you.
163	2	Voice Message		N/A	N/A	Hi I'm calling in regards to the input for your next fare increase. Well I'm just saying, you guys are looking for fares every year or every six months the fare goes up but you're BART, the rides, the seats, the filthiness, the smells. Should consider staying open longer on weekends. Need more people to clean up you guys want to raise the fares and then pocket the money but you need all these other things going on. You're asking for more money but cars are not clean. Not enough people cleaning. The elevators are always down and escalators. Need more services over night and weekends. You guys need a big town hall meeting not just a call on the phone or the website. Need to hear people's input personally because the people working for BART don't give a damn about people riding it. Now if people working there was riding it, it would probably be a better transportation. Have a good day

Count	Re-spon se ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
164	4	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: Against BART fare increase in 2016 I am highly against the bart fare increase in year 2016. Now we are paying \$3 a day for a parking. My trip from San Leandro to 12th Oakland is \$2.40, which will be \$2.50 next year. The round trip + parking is \$8.00. The gas I drive around is less than 1 gallon, which is \$3 now. If the fee keeps increasing, I will quit taking bart and drive instead. I know you don't care since I am just one out of 400k passengers in a day. The fee hurts all low income families and poor.</p>
165	6	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: BART's Inflation Based Fare Increase 2016 If you would pay your employees a fare wage and NOT the highest in the country, then perhaps you wouldn't have to frequently increase fares to the riders.</p>
166	7	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: BART Fare Increase BART fares are already too high for the service you provide. I pay in excess of \$240 per month with an additional \$60 for parking for massively overcrowded trains that were last cleaned in 1978. If you want to charge the best, you have to be the best and you aren't even in the ballpark.</p>
167	8	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: Really You are really going to increase fares for bad service, stinky garage that never gets cleaned (and I am in Dublin, a so called NICE Station). I told the usually quite rude station agents several times that the buttons on the elevators are burnt out, nothing has been done. You say you are increasing fares for cost of maintenance and improvements and it is for lining your pockets and giving raises for folks that sit there and read their paper barely looking up. They can't get fired even if the embezzle and plead guilty to that. Wow, just wow. I so wish there was a Ferry close to me. Or anything quite frankly. Pretty soon it will be cheaper to drive.</p>
168	11	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: Don't raise BART fares Don't raise fares. For the last few years, BART has not gotten any cleaner or safer. I rarely see BART police working. Spend the existing money on cleaning the carpet (or remove them all together). Get the homeless and beggars out of the BART locations. Have more patrols in SF and Oakland/Hayward area at night.</p>
169	12	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: Fare increase You must be kidding. Fares are high already and the trains are so crowded and sometimes delayed or just so slow, get real, be fair about this, everything is going up in this city except for peoples wages. I won't ride.</p>
170	21	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: Fare increase 2016 Please don't increase fares again on top of parking fee hikes....our salaries can't sustain it and it's almost crossing the line to drive...it's making a trip to SF very unattractive.</p>
171	22	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: No fare increases! I oppose any fare increases. Fares are already sky high, and they should be rolled back, not increased.</p>

Count	Re-sponse ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
172	25	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: increase in BART fares</p> <p>I do not ride BART except on rare occasions, but I do believe that the rates are fairly high, and the pay given to people who are train operators who's job does not require a lot of skill or education, are making far too much money for what they do. I would rather see lower pay for these people, who make more than some college graduates, than to raise fares even further.</p>
173	29	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: BART's Inflation Based Fare Increase 2016</p> <p>Pay more to ride BART? No way! They need to better manage the money they already have. I've ridden on rapid transit in different cities around the world and BART is by far, the worst! BART does not run on time, something is always going wrong or breaking down. The cars are smelly, dirty and disgusting. The car's track system is far too noisy for health standards (I've had to get noise canceling headphones just for the commute). The air conditioning is often broken, leaving us standing there packed together in the car, sweating and barely able to breathe above the stench. I'm usually in support of unions, but the strikes by BART employees are just absolutely ridiculous. I don't understand how they get away with it, who do they think they are? In this economy they do not deserve raises, and we do not deserve to pay more for such unacceptable facilities and service!</p>
174	34	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: Fare Hike</p> <p>Bart:</p> <p>I protest against the proposed fare hike. Bart is already over-expensive, and poorly run. The directors give themselves too many perks and benefits. And they over-compensate and over-benefit the employees.</p> <p>Directors and their families should not get free passes. A 25% discount will be just fine. Nor should they get health and other benefits far in excess of what average workers (not Bart workers) get. Plus, their travel should be kept to a bare minimum. These same restrictions should apply to the workers. Health benefits should not be so highly subsidized. Nor should there be so much overtime and sick leave.</p> <p>Until Bart can control and reduce their expenses, there should be no fare increase. Should expenses be controlled, any increase should be wholly dedicated to maintenance and new equipment, both of which are currently lacking.</p>
175	35	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: PLEASE DO NOT RAISE BART FARES</p> <p>As a regular BART rider I think it's outrageous that BART burdens the riders with fare increases when the system is run so wastefully and excessively. Public transportation should be affordable to the public, many who do not own a car and who sacrifice and take on the inconvenience and discomfort of riding public transportation; it should NOT be used to enrich BART employees who are already amply paid.</p>

Count	Response ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
176	36	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: Fee hike- Negative Comment Dear Board:</p> <p>As an employee of the California state government and working for the Department of Public Health, I disapprove of this fee hike. It is understandable that Bart must continue operations, improve trains and account for inflation, however with every hike the affordability of taking alternative "friendlier" transportation becomes less practical.</p> <p>Here at CDPH, we are reimbursed \$65 at max for our 'local transportation' expenses. My ticket expenditure has almost always exceeded \$200 a month. At this rate, I may as well drive from my home in Pittsburg to work in Richmond. The price for gas is essentially the same, factoring in the recent increase in Bart delays, incidents and loss of compensation at work for arriving late. If this fee increase arrived at the time the new trains did, then I could understand, but with the cars being as they are, and the simply ridiculous crowd cramping condition during rush hour(s) I would rather spend an extra \$50 a month to be in my own car in traffic.</p>
177	37	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: Fare Increase To whom it may concern, Why would anyone support a BART fare increase? It's by far and away the most poorly managed public transportation system in the country. Strikes, constant delays, bitter employees, the complaint list is endless. If there was any other alternative, BART would be out of business in a second. You're only recourse is try and extort as much money out of the riders as possible</p>
178	38	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: Do Not Raise Fares Please do not raise bart fares!!! I ride bart to work and it is already expensive as it is! We can not afford the added cost of paying more for transportation with all our other expenses. Many people I talk to feel the same. SO PLEASE NO FARE INCREASES!!</p>
179	42	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Fares are already too high. The only ones who benefit are the employees and relatives, yes because they ride for free. And seniors who finally get a break.</p>
180	2	Townhall		N/A	N/A	<p>Why are they continuing to raise the parking and bus fares? Mothers and people on public assistance. Difficult to lower income people to get around. Why is it necessary?</p>
Comments on Other Subjects						
181	227	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Non-Low-Income	Yes please increase police presents in the BART trains
182	213	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Low-Income	I think the salary needs increase if the fare increases. Think.
183	70	Lao Family ESL Class	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Increase
184	71	Lao Family ESL Class	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Increase
185	72	Lao Family ESL Class	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Increase
186	10	La Clinica de La Raza	Print	Minority	Low-Income	I'm very happy to hear that BART Rides to both near airports
187	12	La Clinica de La Raza	Print	Minority	Non-Low-Income	Excellent both rides to airports
188	51	Family Bridges	Print	Minority	Low-Income	I hope that BART will be better and better

Count	Response ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
189	61	Lao Family ESL Class	Print	Minority	Low-Income	I'm feel very convenient because can a saving to time
190	62	Lao Family ESL Class	Print	Minority	Low-Income	I am happy because your help
191	63	Lao Family ESL Class	Print	Minority	Low-Income	I find it safer to ride the bart to travel in a car
192	64	Lao Family ESL Class	Print	Minority	Low-Income	I find it safer to ride the bart to travel in a car
193	74	Lao Family ESL Class	Print	Minority	No Response	I have good idea
194	75	Lao Family ESL Class	Print	Minority	Low-Income	I have good i
195	96	Lao Family	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Work at SF discount for low income?
196	103	Lao Family	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Some train stations look not safe to train riders
197	104	Lao Family	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Train look very unattrative color
198	115	Lao Family	Print	Minority	Non-Low-Income	Air conditioning on trains in afternoon would be great.
199	120	Lao Family	Print	Minority	Low-Income	I have a job in SF. So I used BART, everyday good and safe for me.
200	122	Lao Family	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Went to church and Bible Study
201	123	Lao Family	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Church and Bible Study. Good and Safe
202	155	Lao Family	Print	Minority	Low-Income	BART is very convenient
203	158	Lao Family	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Please put a clause or pass a bill to prevent future strikes. That was a disaster leaving thousands to find a way to work
204	170	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Non-Low-Income	Love BART!
205	176	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Low-Income	I like BART!
206	179	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Low-Income	love riding BART on long trips saves gas and gives me time to relax
207	181	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Non-Minority	No Response	Late night Please
208	183	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Non-Low-Income	Would love later service on Fri, Sat.
209	189	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Non-Minority	Low-Income	Thank you
210	191	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Non-Low-Income	Love BART!
211	204	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	cars are loud, need ventilation (open windows), plastic seats (so that can be hosed down)
212	207	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Low-Income	More supervision on BART trains. Security reasons people who ask for money or fight on trains
213	216	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Non-Minority	Low-Income	It's loud cheap so that I can move to East Bay. Can you always sell many pacquiau tee-shirts?
214	217	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Non-Minority	Low-Income	Please fix/grease/oil tracks so as to reduce extreme noise of screeching tracks now that there is so much money in SF let's see some improvements. Regulate vagrancy better. Fix squeaky tracks.
215	220	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	go to the south bay
216	222	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	very loud, new cars would be nice, clipper website is a disaster
217	229	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Would like to see more officers patrolling trains
218	235	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	I would love to have a monthly pass option for discount on frequent riders
219	236	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	A monthly pass, or consideration for people commuting daily would be a plus
220	237	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Non-Low-Income	Need escalators been fixed. More clean
221	239	Cinco de Mayo Festival	Print	Minority	Low-Income	cleanliness of public transportation

Count	Re-spon se ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
		(SF)				
222	243	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	BART need face lift please
223	247	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Security, more police more supervisors for homeless, dirty on BART, stairs dirty, too much smoking, need to clean. Clean for people. Powel street station homeless asking for money
224	249	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Low-Income	BART is convenient too my destination. I try too catch more often. But depends on my update on traffic control.
225	253	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Low-Income	To have more safe at the station BART and clean
226	256	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Non-Low-Income	We love BART
227	258	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	No Response	Good transportation and rider better
228	260	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Low-Income	I like BART!
229	262	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	No Response	Non-Low-Income	Beautiful people but expensive
230	201	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Low-Income	N/A
231	5	La Clinica de La Raza	Print	Minority	Low-Income	All the services are very good
232	3	La Clinica de La Raza	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Put a station in Pittsburg
233	7	La Clinica de La Raza	Print	Minority	No Response	Please clean the bathrooms so that they can be used with plenty of confidence
234	8	La Clinica de La Raza	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Why isn't there more security at the stations?
235	9	La Clinica de La Raza	Print	Minority	No Response	I'd like more security
236	177	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Everything is fine
237	182	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Low-Income	I think that the cost of living in San Francisco is very high and what we make is no longer enough to live on
238	187	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Have more surveillance inside the BART
239	198	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Low-Income	I'd like more direct service on weekends, without train transfers
240	214	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	No Response	More maintenance to the trains, more reliable service, cleanliness outside at the train station entrance
241	48	Family Bridges	Print	Minority	Low-Income	[I] suggest senior should have more discount or free of charge (similar to the free of charge method San Francisco public transit adapted)
242	218	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Yes, sometimes there's no elevator service for strollers.
243	223	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Everything is perfect
244	230	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Low-Income	More security service
245	240	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Low-Income	To have more sanitation in the elevators and more warning signs and BART notices
246	257	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Low-Income	Yes. Service should be cleaner, safer and the trains should not stop so much for up to 20 minutes. A better AC system is important and service [should be given] in Spanish. And when broadcasting instructions both in and out of the train cars, do it in Spanish too.
247	259	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	No Response	It's a very good service.
248	264	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Low-Income	It's a very fast mode of transportation
249	265	Cinco de Mayo Festival (SF)	Print	Minority	Low-Income	When broadcasting over the PA system, do it in different languages

Count	Re-sponse ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
250	11	La Clinica de La Raza	Print	Minority	Low-Income	All the services are excellent
251	271	African Advocacy Network	Print	Non-Minority	Low-Income	Keep BART affordable
252	277	African Advocacy Network	Print	Non-Minority	Low-Income	BART is already a bit too far outside of my transportations as is.
253	279	African Advocacy Network	Print	Non-Minority	Low-Income	Mass Fare strike/refusal Free transit! (Or at least sliding scale, not and low-income, monthly/day cards.
254	281	African Advocacy Network	Print	Minority	Non-Low-Income	BART is expensive. Living wages and rent have pushed residents out of SF. Commute is expensive for basic wages.
255	14	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	How does this figure in with the raises that were just given to Union employees? From my perspective they are paid too much-taking monies away from fixing an aging system that is handling increased traffic. Bet there are folks willing to work for less.
256	16	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	<p>As a commuter on BART since 1980 I feel there should be some type of additional benefits or cost savings. I purchase the high value BART Ticket at \$60 for a \$64 Value Ticket. This has been the only cost savings benefit I know of for years now. Do you know how much money I have paid BART over the last 35 years and BART gives me a \$4 discount on a high value ticket of which doesn't even last through a 5 day work week since I travel from Pittsburg/bay point to Powell street station, Monday thru Friday, twice daily. Again long time commuters are hit with a minimal fare increase but what is also hurting my budget is the continual increase in the parking fares. Since paid parking was enforced several years ago it increased from .50 cents and now will be \$2.50. When will the parking fees stop because I do not see any improvements in parking or adding additional parking at the Pittsburg/bay point station. I only see garages going up in walnut creek, pleasant hill, and Oakland west, etc.... It is almost too costly to consider commuting to work in the city anymore or in the near future. My job does not give me yearly pay increases and I'm lucky to get a cost of living increase which does no good when fares are increased, rent is increased, food prices are increased, etc..... You keep increasing fare prices and the neighborhoods BART serves will not consider a family adventure or sport event by taking BART because by the time you pay for a family of 5 or 10 to ride BART you're broke. It is cheaper to put the family in a Van, pay for gas, drive to the destination with no hassles of using other public transportation to get to your ultimate destination and pay to park or pay an entry fee at that destination and be able to enjoy the day with money still in my pocket. Take the family on BART and be broke all day with no enjoyment. When will the increases stop to your regular paying customers? When we can't afford to commute anymore! Find alternatives to filling the funding gap. Eliminate some of the high paying jobs in the BART administration. Cut back on station attendants which are standing around in groups of 4 to 5 agents doing absolutely nothing to help the passenger (your customers). Find other methods--fundraisers--quit milking your commuter "customers" or you will not have enough of them someday to have a BART system. Thank you for taking the time to read my comments even though they will not change a thing or stop the</p>

Count	Re-sponse ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
						increases and taking my hard earned money. P.S. As a "white" person, I feel discriminated against with all the minority questions below. The "white" person is now the minority especially in California. Thank you.
257	19	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	FIX BART!
258	20	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	BART needs more frequent service to SFO airport and Millbrae. Also, stop sending out of service trains to Daly City station platform 3
259	26	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Trains need to run overnight, `and` still service all stops.
260	28	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	Yeah, how much of the improvements are tax funded and how much of profits actually go to maintenance and repairs? My pay has not gone up. My daily commute costs have. It's getting ridiculous.
261	29	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Is this really necessary so soon and upgrading the system is necessary.
262	34	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	Given the current level of Bart service (constant bart delays, crowded trains, dirty stations) I would hope that all funds from this proposed increase in fare will go towards fixing these issues and not towards increasing bart employees' already inflated salaries and benefits.
263	35	Online		Minority	Low-Income	A system designed like MTR in Hong Kong would be much more efficient, clean, and have more options for revenue recovery with stores in stations.
264	39	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	Last week I saw one of your janitorial workers take a bottle of water and empty it onto the tracks at Lake Merritt so he could toss the recyclable bottle into the garbage. How is increasing my fares on BART going to compensate for one of your employees combining water and electricity to maintain the cleanliness of the BART system??
265	45	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	I don't see any relevance to how the following questions help BART determine whether they are reaching the communities they serve. It is nothing more than a demographic survey. If you want to truly serve the communities of the Bay Area, you should be creating faster routes (express) where possible and if the single track system does not allow for this, then investing in multi-track systems. BART also needs more efficient connections to other transit connections, including Caltrain, hence faster routes given a number of people in the north bay work on the Peninsula. If there were more efficient routes I would surely ride BART on a more consistent or even daily basis. I'd also like to see more lobbying of federal officials for public transit subsidies to make riding public transit more affordable than driving. With the cost of public transit more expensive than driving, the future of Bay Area transit is in a dire situation.
266	51	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	I've travelled between Pleasant Hill and Montgomery stations daily for work for the past decade. Cleanliness in both the stations as well as the trains has suffered greatly during this time. New seats and flooring on the trains has helped, but I hope that this fee increase is used to improve the riding experience for those of us who are on the train for extended amounts of time each day. The 'Fleet of Future' is several years away, we need improvement on what we currently have to ride.

Count	Re-spon se ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
267	53	Online		No Response	Non-Low-Income	I take every chance I get to say this: Longer trains in the morning from Richmond to SF !! 8 cars at 720AM and 735AM ??? Ridiculous! Is it your plan to make sure riders can only get a seat if they get on at Richmond or El Cerrito Del Norte ?? Come on now I get on at N Berkeley I am 56 yrs old, I am not disabled but I have some painful arthritis so standing is not easy
268	57	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	You're going to do it anyway no matter what the public says, so at least if you're going to increase the fares on the Richmond line can you also increase the evening and weekend service on the Richmond line? It is so difficult to ride Bart after rush hour to get to Richmond/EC/Berkeley. Also: you need to put garbage cans in your stations
269	62	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	If BART is going to continue increasing its already expensive prices (compared to many other cities around the globe), it could at least run until 2 a.m. on Friday and Saturday nights, to provide better transit options and encourage public transit over drinking and driving. Even just every 30 minutes or every hour would make a huge difference for a lot of people.
270	68	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	This is the question you ask first?
271	79	Online		Minority	Low-Income	I believe that Bart should have more late night services and have weekend fares
272	80	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Would love to see the 24 hour BART program serve San Mateo county and SFO. Living in SSF and working at SFO it would allow me to use the service to have a late night out as well as get to work at 0500 which currently with the schedule is not possible.
273	85	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	Are we raising these fees for the improvement of bart or more to cover the raises and benefits that were pass down to the drivers of bart? I have been riding bart for close to 4 years and have not seen much change in the trains as well at some of the stations. I have not seen any changes by some of the drivers either. I assume you get paid more if you start doing more things but what I see is them doing the same thing over and over and wanting more. I will be honest the good change was the bart transportation to the airport.
274	86	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	Why are we being charged more for sub-par service, filthy, dangerous trains that the homeless use as a hotel? CLEAN UP YOUR ACT.
275	89	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	I have a couple comments. The Dublin/Pleasanton line needs more frequent trains during rush hour. Also, the trains are always incredibly hot. Please manage the temperatures better so that when we are riding a packed train, we are not also sweating on each other.
276	116	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	if you are going to make these fare increases can you please make sure your train operators can give announcements loud and clear. I have been on the same train (train #) several times with different drivers one driver gives announcements so that everybody can hear them other drivers you can barely hear. If they can't make an announcement maybe they need a different job. Also when you have delays you guys need to make a better effort to let your passengers know what is going, give them updates. Some riders may have other ways of getting to their destination. I

Count	Re-sponse ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
						am sure you like to have updates when traveling on public transportation
277	118	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Would have liked a web site to see increases for all trips.
278	122	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Why is it more effective to consult Google Maps than the platform signs for train times?
279	124	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	You're station agents are nasty to riders. I cringe when something goes wrong with my card and I have to go talk to them because they are ALWAYS so hateful. You have crowded trains, lousy weekend service and refuse to do anything about it and you feel we should pay 3.4% MORE. FOR WHAT? To increase your administrator salaries?
280	125	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	What are you doing about overcrowded trains during commute hours? Are we expected to pay more for the same or less (given the bay area's population growth)? My train is delayed in both directions nearly every single day, will this increase fix that? How much is going toward payroll?
281	128	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	As fares are raised, the community should have more say in how Bart funds are spent. The money set aside for the extension to Warm Springs, for example, might be better spent on making sure that there are longer trains for rush hour and for making more key services (bathrooms) available to riders.
282	129	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	It seems like BART fares are increasing each year and the value of the system decreases. Meaning, the trains are always late, broken, or people keep jumping on the tracks. The stations are dirty and so are the trains. I am tired of paying more for a service that keeps falling apart. And let us not forget the BART employees who are overpaid! If you are going to keep raising the prices, then start fixing the system.
283	136	Online		Minority	Low-Income	I take the first Dublin/Pleasanton train M-F, and several times the station agent at 16th St. Mission did not arrive in time to open the station. Completely unacceptable. Weekend closure between Fruitvale and Coliseum stations, with minimal bus bridge, is a phenomenal example of poor planning. Increase late night service and invest in track redundancy. No more strikes.
284	142	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	Yes, why is it that no monies from the increase are being directed towards parking. We are not only charged for parking, but we are lucky if we can even get parking at the West Pleasanton Station. This is a new station and the planning for sufficient parking was done poorly. I could accept an increase if there was a plan to eventually increase or find additional options for parking.

Count	Response ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
285	143	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Note that it is the shortest trips, on the most efficient, most heavily used, and cheapest to operate parts of the BART system in and between San Francisco, Oakland and Berkeley, etc. — i.e. the only parts of BART that ought to even exist — that see the highest proportional fare increases, and those riders were already paying the highest relative fares. In contrast, long-distance riders from Dublin and Concord and the like pay far less per mile to ride trains that cost far more to operate (because they're empty most of the day, unlike in the urban core), and serve stations that cost as much to maintain despite minor numbers of passengers, on tracks that never should have been built as urban subway (i.e. BART) lines anyway. The exurbs salute you, brave BART Board of Directors, and thank you, urban suckers, for underwriting the worst sprawl. Next up for BART: the San Jose Flea Market! Oh, and \$1.85 (the shortest trips, including those within SF) plus 3.4% "rounded to the nearest nickel" is \$1.90, not the \$1.95 quoted by BART. \$1.95 is a 5.4% increase for you urbanites. But amazingly enough they do get exurb arithmetic right. Walnut Creek-Powell \$5.10 plus 3.5% does indeed round (DOWN, this time) to \$5.25, giving them a 2.9% increase.
286	146	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Fares between and within Oakland and SF are MUCH MORE EXPENSIVE per-mile than long-distance fares. Long-distance riders are more expensive to serve. Urban riders are cheaper to serve: far more riders per train, far more riders per station, 24 hour demand. So why does BART subsidize the longest rides by the most affluent homeowners in the most distant parts of the bay area? Why does BART's fare system discriminate against downtown Oakland to downtown San Francisco trips while rewarding Dublin to SF or Pittsburg to Millbrae? Reset the fare basis to be fairer, and to reflect the costs of running empty trains to then ends of the lines while trains are jammed within Oakland and SF.
287	147	Online		Non-Minority	Low-Income	Please include a low income payment option!
288	148	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	Quit paying your board and unions so much and spend that money on the system.
289	151	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Bart is already expensive -- whatever the increase is going to be, we need to ensure that taking public transportation does not cost more than commuting by car if we want our local infrastructure to support sustainable growth.
290	152	Online		Non-Minority	No Response	Your proposed fare increase for short journeys is over the 3.4% number that you're claiming! \$1.85 -> \$1.95 is over 5%. Please consider honoring your stated percentage of 3.4% to avoid misleading the public.
291	187	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	BART needs to spend money on cleaning its cars. The seats and carpeting on trains are filthy. Some stations are littered with pee and homeless people left and right. Trains are overcrowded especially during rush hour.
292	96	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	Need more space here for list of bart improvements. A few are: 1)less delays, 2 lines running every 15 minutes to Dublin/Fremont but delays almost daily 2) redundancy plan? So often a train stalls in the tube, leaving all other trains immobile? 3) Want to promote more ridership but can't accommodate riders during rush hour?

Count	Response ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
293	158	Online		Non-Minority	Low-Income	So irritating all the problems and things working on bart ie elevators, rude staff, lack of safety for bike parking, recent strikes for more benefits just costing me more. . .
294	160	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Will this increase keep the station cleaner?
295	163	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	My income isn't increasing at the same rate as my already expensive BART fare. Also the federal max of \$120 tax-free per month does not come close to covering my commute.
296	164	Online		Non-Minority	Low-Income	Bart needs an affordable option for families and individuals who rely on bart but lack an abundance of resources.
297	165	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	Yes, I have been riding the train from Pittsburg's; on the 5:32am the train is filled with homeless riders. They take up numerous seats, and when you call and complain it that's forever before the police arrive. Will this increase fund more police or staff? It appears to the general public no matter how much the system receives the issues continue. That goes for the cleanliest of the trains to the rude station agents that just yell at patrons. If I didn't want to deal with the drive I would drive to work since I have free parking in the city.
298	168	Online		No Response	No Response	Bart employees pay is outrageous, benefits are sweet and they should pay to use Bart.
299	169	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	1st you want to keep increasing parking fares, next you want to increase transit fares. I've seen cars going to Richmond where the seats look it was never cleaned and this is at 5:50 am. What are you doing with all this money?
300	171	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	You should improve the gate system before you increase the fare, so that everyone pays fare. There are so many cheaters who sneak out gates. The cheaters come out from elevators, so that they do not have to go through gates, or they go through gates before the gates close, or sometimes they jump over the gates. They also use red or green tickets. It is unfair to keep charging to the honest riders while more and more cheaters riding BART without paying fare. The station agent is not even watching the gates. You do not have to increase the fare, because you can easily increase your revenue if everyone pays the fare. Each time you increase the fare, you have more cheaters.
301	173	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	run more Fremont to Richmond & vice versa during commute hours
302	174	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	How will you stay transparent to ensure that money raised from these fare increases will go to capital improvements only?
303	175	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Why isn't the in-city SF fare increase spelled out on your web page? Just a small oversight...
304	176	Online		Non-Minority	Low-Income	yes
305	183	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	Bloated administrative and worker salaries are the problem
306	184	Online		Non-Minority	Non-Low-Income	I used BART to commute 5 days a week for almost 30 years. When i had the opportunity to move my office and avoid BART i jumped at the chance. I now avoid it as much as possible as the experience has become unbearable -- crowded, no seats, noisy, and too costly.

Count	Re-sponse ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
307	188	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	BART should improve its services such as cleaner trains, longer trains, and more frequent trains before any fare increase as BART is already expensive relative to the services it provides.
308	190	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	BART is a rip-off, Parking is a monopoly and it sucks when people have no choice but to pay exorbitant fares and parking fees for the worst possible service you can give.
309	191	Online		Minority	Non-Low-Income	Bart trains continue to be overcrowded to the point of insanity, very dirty, and the fleet is rather aged. While inflation can inform Fare increases- as a daily Bart rider- I have not seen the quality of my ride experience improve over the past years.
310	3	Email		N/A	N/A	At some point, you will price yourself out of the market.
311	9	Email		N/A	N/A	Subject: BART's Inflation Based Fare Increase 2016 BART should create a low income discount fare recognizing that while San Francisco is a job rich area many low income workers and students cannot afford to live there and commute from lower housing cost communities such as Richmond and East Oakland. Seattle is a model to examine. Presently the MUNI low income discount program is restricted to residents and is a low bar for BART to meet.
312	10	Email		N/A	N/A	Subject: Increased fares. Again!!!! Since San Francisco is the only city that has a monthly Bart Pass. What happened to Bart's plan to do the same in other cities? I host students that use BART every day, in fact 7'days a week, they have to pay a huge fare over the course of one month. Why don't you introduce a monthly discounted pass for riders that actually use the BART system daily? This is done in Switzerland, Germany and the United States. It is time that BART is rider friendly and makes it more affordable for everyone.
313	15	Email		N/A	N/A	Subject: Fare Increase 2016 Hi, I'm a daily BART rider and I understand the need to increase fares in 2016. I also understand how vital it is that BART run and not be subjected to strikes that shut the system down. That is not fair and is highly unethical. There are many parts of my job that I don't think are fair but I still have to go to work and so should Union workers.
314	16	Email		N/A	N/A	Subject: Fare Increase MUNI recently began allowing seniors to ride free. Is BART giving any consideration to a similar move?
315	17	Email		N/A	N/A	Subject: Fare Increase I fully expected this after the recent strike but at the same time I want to be clear that the importance of a reliable BART system for a growing Bay Area economy cannot be understated. The BART Board cannot allow future BART strikes, I know that the public will have a long memory on the impact and the way the negotiations were handled. It is not place to question what BART workers should be paid, I just want to make sure that there is adequate planning to avoid any future strikes and to improve the system to avoid the recent many service impacts Thanks

Count	Re-sponse ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
316	18	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: BART's Inflation Based Fare Increase 2016 To whom it may concern: I am very concerned about the increase in Bart fares. What is the point of public transportation if it prohibitively expensive? If I have to travel on Bart to SF, I only take it if I will be alone. If I am going in with my two children, it is cheaper to pay for gas, toll, and parking than to take Bart. And it is often more convenient to drive, especially on weekends, when Bart is less frequent and the cars (I travel on the Pittsburgh/Bay Point line) are overflowing with people - often because there are less than 10 car trains. Bart should be much more heavily subsidized for all riders - perhaps funded with higher bridge tolls for cars - and children and college students should ride for free. Please feel free to share these views with the legislature. If you provide me with the appropriate addresses, I would be happy to reiterate these funding thoughts with them as well. If we are looking to reduce traffic congestion, we must provide more tax funding for Bart to incentivize people to take Bart with lower fares and more frequent trains with increased capacity. And ultimately, we need to create new lines - especially along the I-680 corridor. Thank you for your consideration of my views. Regards,</p>
317	19	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: fare increase Let's be honest. No matter how you attempt to spin it, these fare increases are because you gave the already overpaid bart unions another huge raise they don't need or deserve. I am against the fare increase and any further raises for bart workers. Some of this should be taken out of the compensation of the people who screwed up the negotiations instead of the poor riders and taxpayers</p>

Count	Re-sponse ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
318	20	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: Fare increases for 2016 To Bart Members, This letter is in regards to the likely increase of 10-15 cents next January. The local new sources state it will raise \$15 million dollars for system upgrades, cars, maintenance, and so on. All those areas are important for the safety of Bart riders and I am willing to contribute to my share to help.</p> <p>That said I also want to remind you the Bart connector to the airport cost hundreds of millions and it was an INEFFICIENT use of funds that we paid. The cost to ride is \$6 each way in addition to the regular fare that must be paid from whatever station you begin, the total cost is absorbent and the connector is underutilized. The public can pay less to go to SFO in most cases or take a car share ride for less. That project was a waste of BART's time and money.</p> <p>I do not want to continue to contribute to BART's fare hikes if the money is spent inefficiently and the system is not actually upgraded properly. Every time you increase the fares it effects BART riders monetarily and forces us to consider the cost of commuting and what is most cost effective transport for us. I currently pay \$6.20 per day round trip to ride BART, with the increase it would be up to 30 cents more per day which would cost me over \$70 per year to continue to ride. Though it may sound minimal to some it isn't for me. I am a preschool teacher and also have to pay for a MUNI pass monthly as well so the cost of my commute per year is over \$2300. I am certain I am not alone in this situation as most people use another transit agency besides BART to get to work.</p> <p>BART only offers reduced fares to youths and seniors but many people in other situations also are on tight budgets and every fare increase effects our income. If the cost to ride BART continues to increase (which is certain) people will consider driving or carpooling instead if the costs deem it more feasible. I ask you consider the frequency of your fare hikes and how much as many people in the Bay Area are struggling financially.</p> <p>Regards,</p>
319	23	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: BART Fare Increases: Impact on SENIORS I sincerely ask that the design of your fare increases EXEMPT SENIORS from any increase.</p>

Count	Re-sponse ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
320	24	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: Future Fare increase Greetings!</p> <p>First, I believe that this new fare increase has come too soon. I know that the three uses of the fare increase are really important but I believe there is another way to obtain money for the things BART needs most. I propose that the BART employees do their job more efficiently. I ride BART regularly and it is rare for me to see the BART employee in the booth actually watching people enter and exit the station. The number of people either entering behind another person in order to prevent paying fare or people jumping over the machine, could help BART to earn a lot of money. It really bothers me to see a BART employee looking at his or her cell phone or talking to one another person. I am very observant and conscious of the dishonesty of people and BART employee's not doing a good job of keeping people honest. I thought about this situation when BART went on strike. BART employees want more pay but yet they aren't doing a good job of making sure that people are paying their fares in order to bring more money in. So, in closing, BART fares are increasing so please be vigilant in collecting fare from all BART riders. It can't be that difficult to watch people enter and exit BART. It is not even time consuming, just boring.</p> <p>Thanks for all the good that BART does. I am grateful that we have the system.</p>
321	26	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: (N/A)</p> <p>With increased fares should come better service. Station workers are rude, and too many train operators don't even bother to announce stations.</p>
322	27	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: BART Fare increase</p> <p>Is it not possible to offer commuter passes at reduced rates, for loyal BART riders, on top of a fare increase? This is how other major world cities operate their public transportation. BART is increasingly unaffordable for families being displaced far out beyond BART stations, yet, they maintain social and economic ties in the city.</p>
323	28	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: Senior Exemption Requested for Bart / Clipper fares</p> <p>I am a Senior that has BART travel and a clipper card My income is fixed and I'd like your fares held down for seniors.</p>

Count	Re-spon se ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
324	30	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: BART's planned Fare Increase for January 2016 (Attachment Included)</p> <p>BART has cited the basis for its January 2016 fare increase as follows:</p> <p>"The increase amount is determined by averaging national and local inflation over a two-year period and then subtracting 0.5% to account for BART's productivity improvements." [From the BART web site http://www.bart.gov/guide/titlevi accessed 20150409]</p> <p>I want to know specifically which Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Indices were used. Was it CPI-U? or CPI-W or another, and the dates over which the two-year period was calculated.</p> <p>"Knowing specifically" means in the best case the Internet web address (URL) for both the national and the sources of local inflation data.</p> <p>The Bureau of Labor Statistics says "The San Francisco-Oakland-San Jose, CA. metropolitan area covered in this release is comprised of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, San Benito, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Sonoma, and Solano Counties in the State of California".</p> <p>http://www.bls.gov/regions/west/news-release/ConsumerPriceIndex_SanFrancisco.htm)</p> <p>The inflation data sources (national and local) are important. Here's why: the USA-wide inflation increase for Social Security recipients for the year 2015 was 1.7% - exactly HALF of BART's proposed January 1, 2016 fare increase. And the Social Security USA-wide CPI increase for 2014 was 0.0%. That's an average increase of 0.85% for the 2014 & 2015 years. Social Security uses CPI-W and it does not include an increase for living in the San Francisco Bay Area.</p> <p>I want to be sure I understand BART's data sources for inflation.</p> <p>If there is an introduction or overall explanation of the "Below-Inflation Fare Increase" program on BART's web site, please forward that URL also.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
325	31	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: Possible Increases</p> <p>I understand the need to increase fares from time to time. My problem is my income has not increased as fast as your fares have. It's not just the fare itself but in between is the increase in parking at Bart fare so my TOTAL daily cost is increasing more than my income. I'm a mother of four kids, do not make much hourly, I have great benefits but just getting to work has to be factored into my budget and I don't have a lot of wiggle room.</p> <p>Please consider people like me when increasing your fares.</p>
326	32	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: Increase in fares</p> <p>I do hope seniors will not have take on the increase as we are on limited incomes</p>
327	33	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Subject: TOO NOISEY TO RIDE - CANNOT HEAR STATION ANNOUNCEMENTS</p> <p>I HAD QUIT RIDING BART BECAUSE I CANNOT HEAR STATION ANNOUNCEMENTS OVER THE BART CAR TRAVEL NOISE.</p>
328	39	Email		N/A	N/A	Tuesday, April 14, 2015

Count	Re-sponse ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
						<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>I have to complaints to make about the present system.</p> <p>Firstly, in regards to raising the cost of using the Bart System, I not against a fare hike. But before you do so, I think you need to do something about the surroundings in which we passengers have to manipulate getting to and from the trains. The filth in our stations should be an embarrassment to the transit system. It is blight on our cities and not advantages to anyone including the street people. I don't know what the answer is except something should be done. Those of you in control should be looking at solutions to the problem and a way to pay for it.</p> <p>Secondly, you need to make sure that the elevators and the hallways are maintained so that disabled users have access. Many times I have tried to use the elevator with a handicapped friend and find it is not in working condition including some escalators. Recently I was downtown and no where on the platform nor over the loud speakers was anything mentioned about the elevator being unusable. My friend has a walker and we had to return to the other end of the building to us the escalator. Between the two of us she was able to use the escalator. But what about wheelchair users? Or parents with strollers and small children? Leaving the station we found one of the escalators not in use and so had to use the one that left us out across the street from where we were going. Then we had difficulty getting across Market Street as the lights changed before she could get across with her walker. By the time we did make it across she was in need of her inhaler as she also suffers from asthma.</p> <p>Thirdly, I would like to ask why anyone put elevators all the way at the other end of the station where it is isolated and not safe for handicapped or parents with small children? It is beyond my understanding.</p> <p>I know it is not easy running a transit system, but I hope some of the concerns I've mentioned above will be remedied by someone in your group.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to have my say.</p>
329	40	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>I never ride anymore because it already costs too much, the cars are gross and dirty and more times than not there is a lunatic in my car.</p> <p>Bart police are a joke...</p> <p>Go ahead raise the rates, pay the administration more money. Don't forget to make it louder for those (hundreds of thousands) of us unfortunate enough to live close to the tracks. I will not ride again anyway.</p>

Count	Response ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
330	41	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>Dear madams/sirs,</p> <p>I recently learned from a news article that BART is planning to raise the fare to fund the future network expansion. While supporting and welcoming the network expansion, I'm having hard time to understand the link of fare raise to this project. The reason of my confusion is rather simple, has BART ever tried to optimize the profitability by improving the efficiency of your resource utilization?</p> <p>As a person who came from Japan where vast majority of transportation capacity is supplied by rail way system, I'm seeing quite a bit of opportunities for improvement. The Japanese train system's punctuality and safety are unbeatable, and the cost effectiveness for dollar (Japanese yen actually) per mile is superior to any other mean of transportation. They continue to invest for improvement in many areas without giving fare raise quite some time, and this has become possible not only because of the technology but also their desperate survival effort by transforming from government entity to 7 regional private company. Please don't miss understand me, I'm not expecting BART to be the same with Japanese train system. There are many differences in historical background and the business dimension. However I really wanted to explain where I'm coming from before I make some suggestions to improve your profitability to avoid fare raise while you build your financial base for future expansion.</p> <p>First, I'm seeing fairly noticeable gap in fill rate (how much crowded) by lane segment on my commute hours. My train (Pits B/Bay Pt) is almost always over filled while other trains are fairly open. I think there is a room to analyze the fill rate and fine tune the train configuration (# of cars) by hour/segment. The better the train capacity is aligned to the needs the better customer perception goes hence you will gain more popularity.</p> <p>Second, I'm not seeing any service differentiation by demand and popularity, meaning all train stops at all stations. Is there any way to operate express or rapid trains between high demand stations skipping low demand stations in between? This way you can offer improved service (shorter commute hours) to such high demand station users. For such improved services, you can raise the fare easier, and possibly higher than you are currently planning. What if you could operate express trains from SFO to central downtown that link these high demand points in 10 minutes? No other transportation can beat you and you possibly can charge double or even triple!</p> <p>Third, I'm not seeing enough synergy between other transportation methods, mainly with bus. Before you consider to expand your rail way, why don't you operate bus service to those future destinations under the name of BART with perfect alignment with the train schedule? This will help you obtain additional customers, and those new customers are pure gain as</p>

Count	Re-sponse ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
						<p>they are coming from your competitors (private cars, car pool, etc.).</p> <p>All these methods were tried and proofed to be effective by your counterpart in Far East island country. If you have not explored these possibilities yet, I suggest you do so. If you have done so already, please let me know how the outcome was and the plan of implementation if you have.</p> <p>Lastly, I think there is a room to improve the work efficiency of your station officers. My coworkers and I are often seeing your officers in the booth reading magazines or chit-chatting. Probably many of your customers are seeing this. This is not a criticism, rather I think it's a great opportunity for improvement. As a Kaizen officer in my company (Kaizen is a Japanese term meaning continuous improvement, the biggest reason of Toyota's success), I suggest you review all of your officers work processes and find defective parts to make improvement. It is often effective to develop the officers to become cross functional through training and education, but the solution really depends on the analysis.</p> <p>Thank you for spending your time to read this long message. I'm hoping to see mutual benefit for years to come.</p>
331	43	Email		N/A	N/A	<p>I have read about the fare increases and the planned improvements BART plans to make to the system (more cars during rush hour, more paramedics on standby, etc.), but nowhere does BART address the constant breakdowns of the escalators (BART doesn't even alert passengers when escalators are out of service) and elevators at the stations, especially in San Francisco.</p> <p>I am disabled but am able to work. The only accessible down escalator in the evening is the one at Sansome Street when it is supposed to reverse direction from up to down (a very popular, high use escalator). When it is out of service, which seems to be more often than not, there is no other down escalator at that end of the station (the other entrances are either stairs or an up only escalator). If the Montgomery Street elevator were to be broken at the same time, the disabled would have no way to get to the trains. Although the Citibank building at 1 Sansome has access to BART, if you don't work in that building, you can't use the underground ramp to access the station. And the escalator at Montgomery requires that passengers walk down a flight of stairs before they get to the escalator, something I and most disabled cannot do.</p> <p>Being ADA compliant does not mean have disability access that doesn't work; it means having disability access that works. Please devote some money to making sure disability access is safe and working.</p>

Count	Re-sponse ID	Outreach Event	Type of Survey	Minority/Non-Minority	Low-Income/Non-Low-Income	Response
332	45	Email		N/A	N/A	Hi, I am a frequent rider of BART and use it as a primary source of commute to work. Could you please consider the introduction of Monthly Passes on BART?
333	46	Email		N/A	N/A	price of Bart tickets to the airport are so expensive it's cheaper to drive also unable to use the airport parking program. Filthy trains
334	3	Voice Message		N/A	N/A	Caller thought the fare increase % was calculated over one year.
335	1	Townhall		N/A	N/A	Why do they charge for parking when they raise the fair too? It's getting unaffordable.