

REGIONAL TRANSIT ISSUE PAPER

Agenda Item No.	Board Meeting Date	Open/Closed Session	Information/Action Item	Issue Date
7	02/25/19	Open	Action	02/20/19

Subject: Adopting Major Service Changes Including the SacRT Forward Project

ISSUE

Whether to adopt the SacRT Forward New Network, weekend light rail frequency improvements, and an associated Title VI service change equity analysis.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

- A. Adopt Resolution No. 19-02-____, Approving a Title VI Service Change Equity Analysis for Weekend Light Rail Frequency Improvements and the SacRT Forward Plan; and
- B. Adopt Resolution No. 19-02-____, Approving Weekend Light Rail Frequency Improvements That Took Effect Temporarily on January 6, 2019; and
- C. Adopt Resolution No. 19-02-____, Approving the SacRT Forward New Network Plan

FISCAL IMPACT

Weekend light rail frequency improvements took effect on January 6, 2019 on a temporary basis, pending approval of a Title VI equity analysis and the SacRT Board of Directors at a cost of \$954,216 gross of fares.

The SacRT Forward plan was originally cost-neutral; however, the revised version would increase service levels at a cost of \$2.1 million gross of fares. This is due to the addition of new peak hour only service or other service to achieve project goals. The increased level of service would be paid for with gas tax revenues from Senate Bill-1.

DISCUSSION

SacRT like many other transit agencies across the country has been seeing a steady decline in transit ridership. Staff, with the input of the Board, recognized that it was time for a wholesale, blank slate approach to redesigning the bus network to better meet today's transit needs for the greater Sacramento community. In an effort to address this complicated issue, SacRT engaged Jarrett Walker + Associates (JWA), an internationally known leader in transit planning, to assist with the effort.

In an effort that has taken approximately one and half years, staff has engaged in a comprehensive network analysis, while engaging our riders, internal and external stakeholders and the public in general.

Approved:

Presented:

Final 02/20/19

General Manager/CEO

Director, Planning

Agenda Item No.	Board Meeting Date	Open/Closed Session	Information/Action Item	Issue Date
7	02/25/19	Open	Action	02/20/19

Subject: SacRT Forward New Network Adoption and Title VI Approval

The project’s major milestones so far include:

August 2017 – January 2018	Customer Satisfaction Surveys and Consultant Selection
February - March 2018	Independent assessment of SacRT’s service and market
March 2018	Operator Focus Groups
April 2018	Choices Report Published
April 4, 2018	1st Stakeholder Resources Group Meeting
April 2018	Board Workshop with JWA
April – May 2018	Public Outreach #1
June 4 – 8, 2018	Core Design Retreat
June – September 2018	Development of Alternatives Report, peer reviews, and technical analysis.
September 2018	Alternatives Report published
September – November 2018	Public Outreach #2
September 27, 2018	2nd Stakeholder Resources Group Meeting
November 2018	Board presentation on Alternatives Report and Community Open House
December 10, 2018	Board presentation on the draft Network and release for 45 day public comment period.
December 12, 2018	Open House SacRT Auditorium
December 13, 2018	Open House Mather Mills Station, Rancho Cordova
December 18, 2018	Open House Citrus Heights Community Center
December 20, 2019	Open House Pannell Center, South Sacramento
January 29, 2019	Board presentation on public outreach efforts and updates to the proposed draft network

Public Outreach Summary

The SacRT Forward public involvement began in August 2017. It started with engaging key stakeholders and the community in an ongoing discussion that would support the planning and design of a future bus network for the Sacramento region. This first phase also included development of a request for proposals, proposal review and consultant selection.

Phase 1 (August 2017 – September 2018): Customer satisfaction surveys were conducted as an early precursor the overall project. The process continued to build community awareness about the SacRT Forward project and discuss perspectives with stakeholders and the community about SacRT’s existing bus network. Discussed choices and trade-offs in transit service to guide the development of a proposed draft bus network. A series of 12 pop-up workshops were held from April 21 to May 19 to encourage community members to provide input on four interactive board displays that consider different travel options.

Phase 2 (October 2018 – December 2018): SacRT Forward team held a series of 16 pop-up workshops at community gathering destinations, key activity centers and local community events in the SacRT service area to engage community members, transit riders , businesses and local residents to get input on two transit alternatives, a higher coverage network and a higher

Agenda Item No.	Board Meeting Date	Open/Closed Session	Information/Action Item	Issue Date
7	02/25/19	Open	Action	02/20/19

Subject: SacRT Forward New Network Adoption and Title VI Approval

frequency network. The information obtained through these workshops helped the SacRT Forward project team make informed recommendations on creating a new bus network.

Phase 3 (December 10, 2018 – February 20, 2018): SacRT Forward team presented a proposed draft network to the Board of Directors on December 10, 2018, which began the public comment period on the draft proposal.

The SacRT Forward draft network was released on December 10, 2018, almost one year from the kickoff of the project. The draft network was first presented to the SacRT Board of Directors for initial feedback and to show how it reflected the input and guidance the community and stakeholders provided as well as trends and ridership statistics.

The draft proposal was then presented at more than 70 events from community meetings, neighborhood associations, stakeholder meetings, transit center and buses, and an online website where all the detailed plan information was available.

On January 28, 2019, the SacRT Forward team released some proposed updates to the draft network during the SacRT Board of Directors meeting.

On February 18, 2019, a new bus network proposal for the SacRT Forward project was released on the website and shared with stakeholders and community members who signed up to receive information on the project.

SacRT Forward Outreach Materials on the Proposed Network

A series of materials were developed to communicate the network proposals, including:

- System wide maps showing weekdays, Saturdays, and Sundays
- Summary sheet explaining changes/updates to all routes
- Three different area specific flyers
- Project Fact Sheet
- Mini-posters for buses and light rail trains
- Rack cards
- YouTube video explaining the proposed plan route by route
- Email blasts
- Social media posts
- Dedicated project webpage

The information on the project was made available at meetings, presentations on bus routes and on the SacRT website.

Public workshops were held to communicate the proposed bus network to riders and the general public. SacRT staff made presentations to community groups throughout the SacRT service area. SacRT staff rode bus routes, handed out information at major transit stops and at our Customer Service Center.

Agenda Item No.	Board Meeting Date	Open/Closed Session	Information/Action Item	Issue Date
7	02/25/19	Open	Action	02/20/19

Subject: SacRT Forward New Network Adoption and Title VI Approval

Staff also set up a display for the Bus Operators and met with Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) leadership to review and provide their comments and feedback.

A complete summary of all public outreach activities can be found in Attachment 1. A complete set of public comments can be found in Attachment 2.

The Draft Network:

The new network, as shown in Attachment 3, consists of 27 regular bus routes, plus 10 additional peak-only routes. The project scope excludes contract service (e.g., Rancho CordoVan) and recently annexed Folsom Stage Line service, which would be unchanged by the project. SacRT Forward would also add one specific SmarT Ride zone in the Gerber Road area. SacRT Forward would not change any other plans with respect to other SmarT Ride zones that were planned for as part of SacRT’s grant funding from the Sacramento Transportation Authority (STA); however, zones may be modified in the next phase to meet any service gaps.

With respect to the regular and peak-only bus routes that were within the scope of SacRT Forward, service levels would increase 2.9 percent over current network, measured in vehicle revenue hours. This reflects an additional \$2.1 million of gas tax money allocated to new service, such as added SmarT Ride zones, additional peak hour only service (including service to schools), and other added trips in the network.

Of the 27 regular routes in the new network, all but one would have seven-day service. The focus of the new network has been on building a solid network of core routes on major corridors. Specifically, this includes a focus on (1) adding morning or evening trips to certain routes that lack sufficient coverage of the day and to create better uniformity in end-of-service times from key terminals, (2) adding trips to many hourly routes to achieve at least 45 minute frequency, and preferably 30 minute frequency, especially on weekdays, and (3) combining parallel or partially redundant routes with one another to achieve one strong route with robust service levels rather than two competing routes both with inadequate service levels.

As stated early on in this project, one goal is to speed up SacRT service through an evaluation of routes, schedules and stop spacing. In the first phase of the project we look at major transit hubs and transfer points. As the project continues to advance a more detailed analysis will be conducted on bus stops and bus stop spacing. Our route design in the new network will provide a more direct path between destinations overall, and we will examine our stop and station spacing criteria for all routes in the next phase. There will be an immediate stop reduction as a direct result of route changes and discontinued service. As staff builds new schedules for the new routes and improvements to existing routes there will be a more detailed review of stops and we will continue to review the consolidation of bus stops throughout our system. Currently, in some cases, stops are closer together than our current standards dictate. Optimizing the number of stops will speed trips for riders, and reduce maintenance costs.

The initial draft plan released on December 10 entailed a substantial reallocation of service hours from weekdays to weekends, to address the fact that weekend service on the SacRT network is

Agenda Item No.	Board Meeting Date	Open/Closed Session	Information/Action Item	Issue Date
7	02/25/19	Open	Action	02/20/19

Subject: SacRT Forward New Network Adoption and Title VI Approval

very deficient. This has been scaled back in the revised plan presented in Attachment 3 and in Exhibit C to strike a compromise. The revised plan still entails a significant increase in weekend service, but not as substantial as in the initial draft. This combined with the infusion of gas tax funds allows weekday service levels to remain close to existing conditions while still effecting a major improvement to weekend service.

With respect to design philosophy, early conceptual work on the project, e.g., in Summer/Fall 2018, took an aggressive approach to the tradeoff between coverage and frequency, and presented the public with a conceptual network that was very oriented toward high-frequency service, at the expense of geographic coverage. The draft plan released on December 10 reflected a more moderate approach, striking more of a balance between the existing network design, but retaining some fairly major changes to network design. Over the past two months, the public feedback process has been extraordinarily helpful in vetting the December plan. The revised plan being put forward for consideration reflects substantial adjustments, based on customer feedback, and follow-up examination by staff.

Updated maps, descriptions, and an in-depth YouTube video were posted to sacrt.com on Monday, February 18 (and are available in Attachment 3, except for the video). Staff will provide a detailed discussion of the updated plan during the Board meeting.

Title VI

In accordance with Federal requirements under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as well as SacRT policy, a Title VI service change equity analysis must be conducted and made available for public review for a minimum of 30 days, with public comments taken into consideration by staff and the SacRT Board. An equity analysis of the proposed SacRT Forward changes was published on sacrt.com on January 28, 2019. The report also included an analysis of the weekend light rail headway improvements. Both changes were found to be favorable to minority and low-income populations. The final Title VI report is included as Exhibit A for adoption.

Next Steps

Staff recommends adopting the attached Title VI service equity analysis, the weekend light rail frequency improvements (which are already in effect), and the SacRT Forward plan. If adopted at this Board meeting, the SacRT Forward changes would take effect as early as June 2019. Staff would immediately proceed with work that has already begun preliminarily including schedule writing, operator bidding, staff training, updated public materials, construction of new bus stops and installation of related amenities, and preparation for Launch Day, including extensive recruitment and training of transit ambassadors and outreach to customers, employers, schools, and other major destinations along new or altered routes.



Attachment 1

**OUTREACH & COMMUNICATIONS
SUMMARY**



Rethink the **PURPOSE AND DESIGN** of
Sacramento Regional Transit's Network



SacRT Forward Outreach Events	
Phase I:	13 Events
Phase II:	32 Events
Phase III:	18 Events
Total:	63 Presentations or Pop-Ups

The SacRT Forward public involvement began in January 2018. It started with engaging key stakeholders and the community in an ongoing discussion that would support the planning and design of a future bus network for the Sacramento region.



Phase 1 (January 2018 – September 2018): Built community awareness about the SacRT Forward project and discussed perspectives with stakeholders and the community about SacRT’s existing bus network. Discussed choices and trade-offs in transit service to guide the development of a proposed draft bus network. A series of 12 pop-up workshops were held from April 21 to May 19 to encourage community members to provide input on four interactive board displays that consider different travel options.

Phase 2 (October 2018 – December 2018): SacRT Forward team held a series of 16 pop-up workshops at community gathering destinations, key activity centers and local community events in the SacRT service area to engage community members, transit riders, businesses and local residents to get input on two transit alternatives, a higher coverage network and a higher frequency network. The information obtained through these workshops helped the SacRT Forward project team make informed recommendations on creating a new bus network.

Phase 3 (December 10, 2018 – February 20, 2018): SacRT Forward team presented a proposed draft network to the Board of Directors on December 10, 2018, which began the public comment period on the draft proposal.

Proposed Draft Network

The SacRT Forward draft network was released on December 10, 2018, almost one year from the kickoff of the project. The draft network was first presented to the SacRT Board of Directors for initial feedback and to show how it reflected the input and guidance the community and stakeholders provided as well as trends and ridership statistics.

The draft proposal was then presented at more than 70 events from community meetings, neighborhood associations, stakeholder meetings, transit centers and on buses, and an online website where all the detailed plan information was available.

On January 28, 2019, the SacRT Forward team released some proposed updates to the draft network during the SacRT Board of Directors meeting.

On February 18, 2019, a new bus network proposal for the SacRT Forward project was released on the website and shared with stakeholders and community members who signed up to receive information on the project.

SacRT Forward Outreach Materials on the Proposed Network

A series of materials were developed to communicate the network proposals, including:


- ▶ System wide maps showing weekdays, Saturdays, and Sundays
- ▶ Summary sheet explaining changes/updates to all routes
- ▶ Three different area specific flyers
- ▶ Project Fact Sheet
- ▶ Mini-posters for buses and light rail trains
- ▶ Rack cards
- ▶ YouTube video explaining the proposed plan route by route
- ▶ Email blasts
- ▶ Social media posts
- ▶ Dedicated project webpage

The information on the project was made available at meetings, presentations on bus routes and on the SacRT website.

Public workshops were held to communicate the proposed bus network to riders and the general public.

SacRT staff made presentations to community groups throughout the SacRT service area. SacRT staff rode bus routes, handed out information at major transit stops and at our Customer Service Center.





SacRT Forward Presentations

12/12/2018	North Natomas Community Coalition	North Natomas
12/19/2018	Meadowview Neighborhood Association	South Sac
12/19/2018	Fruitridge Manor Neighborhood Association	South Sac
1/2/2019	Rio Linda-Elverta Chamber of Commerce	Rio Linda
1/3/2019	ECOS TAQCC	Downtown
1/8/2019	Pocket/Greenhaven Association	Pocket
1/9/2019	Avondale/Glen Elder Neighborhood Association	South Sac
1/10/2019	Gardenland Northgate Neighborhood Association	South Natomas
1/16/2019	Lemon Hill Mutual Housing	South Sac
1/22/2019	County EJ workshop	South Sac
1/28/2019	C.K. McClatchy High School PTSA	Midtown
2/5/2019	Anatolia HOA Community Center	Rancho Cordova
2/6/2019	Sacramento TMA	Downtown
2/6/2019	Arden/Arcade Community	Arden/Arcade
2/7/2019	State Capitol	Downtown
2/7/2019	ECOS TAQCC	Downtown
2/11/2019	Hollywood Park Neighborhood Association	Hollywood Park
2/13/2019	Resources for Independent Living	Downtown
2/19/2019	Pocket/Greenhaven Association	Pocket/Greenhaven
2/20/2019	North Laguna Creek Neighborhood Association	South Sac
2/21/2019	YPT (Young Professionals in Transportation)	Downtown
2/25/2019	Neighborhood Association 10 Meeting	Citrus Heights

SacRT staff reached out to dozens of other community groups and neighborhood associations to hold SacRT Forward project presentations. Many did not show interest or did not return calls.

District 1 – Angelique Ashby

Creekside Natomas Neighborhood Association
Natomas Chamber of Commerce
Natomas Creek Community Watch Group
Natomas Park Master Association
North Natomas Community Association
Regency Park Neighborhood Association
Valley View Acres Community Association
Valley View Acres Neighbors Working Together
Westlake Master Association
Westlake Villas Community Association
Witter Ranch Community Alliance

District 2 – Allen Warren

Benito Juarez Neighborhood Association
Del Paso Heights Community Association
Harmon Johnson Neighborhood Association
Neighbors In Action
North-Sacramento-Chamber-of-Commerce
Robla Park Community Association
Strawberry Manor Neighborhood Association
Swanston Estates Neighborhood Association
Woodlake Neighborhood Association
Woodlake Neighbors Creating Transparency

District 3 – Jeff Harris

Dreher Tract Neighborhood Association
East Sac Give Back
East Sacramento Chamber Of Commerce
Natomas Community Association
River Park Neighborhood Association
River-City-Commons
Sonora Springs Neighborhood Watch

District 4 – Steve Hansen

Alkali And Mansion Flats Historic Neighborhood Association
Beverly Way Neighborhood Association
Chinatown Mall Committee
College Plaza Neighborhood Association
Friends Of Grant Park
Land Park Community Association
Little Pocket Neighborhood Association
Marshall New Era Neighborhood Association
Newton Booth Neighborhood Association
Old Sacramento Waterfront District
Preservation Sacramento
Richmond Grove Neighborhood Association
River Oaks Community Association
Sacramento Riverfront Association
Sierra Vista Neighborhood Watch
Upper Land Park Neighbors
Winn Park Historic District Association

District 5 – Jay Schenirer

Fullertown Homeowners Association
Hollywood Park Neighborhood Association
Lawrence Park Neighborhood Association
North City Farms Neighborhood Association
Oak Park Business Association
Oak Park Neighborhood Association
Sierra Curtis Neighborhood Association
South Oak Park Community Association
Woodbine Neighborhood Association

District 6 – Eric Guerra

Campus Commons Homeowners Association
College Glen Neighborhood Association
Colonial Manor Neighborhood Association
Colonial Village Neighborhood Association
Friends of West Tahoe Park
Nepenthe Homeowners Association
Sierra Oaks Neighborhood Association
Southeast Village Neighborhood Association
Tahoe Park Neighborhood Association
Tallac Village Neighborhood Association

District 7 – Rick Jennings

Charter Pointe Neighborhood Association
Lake Greenhaven Homeowners Association
Marina Oaks Homeowners Association
North Laguna Creek Valley Hi Community Association
Park River Oak Estates Homeowners Association
Pocket-Greenhaven-Riverfront-Association
Reith Park Neighborhood Association
River Grove Homeowners Association
Riverlake Community Association
Riverwind Place Owners Association
Sacramento Roundtree Homeowners Association
South Pocket Homeowners Association
Valley Hi Neighborhood Association

District 8 – Larry Carr

Brookfield Homeowners Association
Cabrillo Parks Neighborhood Association
Detroit Community Association
Hampton Station Neighborhood Association
Henrietta Drive Neighborhood Association
Morrison Creek Estates
North Laguna Creek Valley Hi Community Association
Phoenix Park
Regency Place Homeowners Association
Southgate Gardens Homeowners Association
Wildwood Homeowners Association

Feedback from Presentations

Overall the feedback during the SacRT Forward presentations has been positive. Community members were appreciative of the information and understood the goal of redesigning the SacRT bus network to be more streamlined, easier to understand, and increase weekend service.

Feedback in some neighborhoods was challenging as residents felt strong connections to historical bus routes and wanted to see service increase, even in locations where service would not be warranted based on ridership patterns and data analysis. These communities pushed for changes, and SacRT staff revised several routes in response. Many have expressed gratitude for staff activity listening and making changes.

Participants were encouraged to comment on route proposals via comment cards, email, calling or writing to SacRT. At each event, SacRT staff gathered input on the SacRT Forward proposal as well as individual changes.

Public Comments on SacRT Forward Project

As of February 18, 2019, SacRT has received more than 500 comments on the SacRT Forward project. 400 of those comments have been received specifically since the draft networks went public on December 10, 2018. Comments were received in multiple ways, including, but not limited to phone calls, e-mails, and written letters. Comments were also collected during all SacRT Forward outreach events, meetings, presentations and activities.

One of the primary goals for the SacRT Forward project was to hear the public voice. Staff understands that in order to make a network into one that people find useful, convenient, and reliable, we had to listen to what the public was saying. All comments received on this project have been reviewed by at least one Planning staff member (if not more), which resulted as a critical piece in the route design decision-making process. A lot of commenters felt that their voice would not be heard, and many were afraid that SacRT would not be concerned about their needs; however, members of the public have most definitely been heard throughout this process. Planning staff decided to make many of its revisions and updates to the original draft proposal based on the comments received.

All SacRT Forward comments received are included in Attachment 2.

SacRT Forward
The new bus network

Comment Card

Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

Name: _____

Email: _____

How did you hear about this event? _____

You can submit your comments to staff today or directly to sacforward@sacrt.com


Regional Transit



SacTru meeting

SacRT Forward Outreach and Communications

Top Five Comments by Bus Routes




Riding the Routes

Staff discovered that one of the most effective ways to collect feedback from riders was to position themselves out in the field, and at stations and on routes throughout the current network. Staff not only wanted to build project awareness, but they also wanted to obtain input directly from the riders while riding the system. Between December 10, 2018 and February 18, 2019, SacRT staff conducted nearly 50 assigned outreach shifts on approximately 45 different bus routes. In addition to riding bus routes, Staff also conducted outreach at light rail stations and transit centers that serve as transfer points.



Riding the Routes

12/17/2018	Route 15	Rio Linda Blvd - O Street
12/18/2018	Route 25	Marconi
12/19/2018	Route 19	Rio Linda
12/20/2018	Route 15	Rio Linda Blvd - O Street
12/20/2018	Route 23	El Camino
12/20/2018	Routes 54, 56, 5	Center Pkwy, Pocket, Meadowview
12/21/2018	Route 61	Fruitridge
12/21/2018	Route 80	Watt Avenue
12/26/2018	Route 67/68	Franklin Blvd., 44th, MLK
12/27/2018	Route 65	Franklin, 65th Street, Franklin station
12/28/2018	Routes 93, 103, 95, Watt/I-80	Hillsdale, CH, Auburn Blvd.
12/28/2018	Routes 62,11	Freeport, Natomas
12/31/2018	Route 65	Franklin, 65th Street
12/31/2018	Route 2 and 6	Riverside, Land Park
12/31/2018	Route 13	Northgate
1/2/2019	Route 55	South area, Los Rios CRC campus, CRC station
1/3/2019	Routes 22, 23, 67, 68	Arden area, south area, @ Arden
1/3/2019	Route 81	Florin/Riverside, Florin Town Centre
1/3/2019	Routes 33, 47	Dos Rios, Phoenix Park
1/4/2019	Routes 1, 21, 23, 24, 25, 28	CH, Carmichael, Fair Oaks, etc., @ Sunrise Mall
1/4/2019	Route 22	Arden area routes, Arden DP station
1/7/2019	Route 24	Orangevale
1/7/2019	Route 34	McKinley
1/8/2019	Route 3	Riverside Express
1/8/2019	Route 56, 6	Pocket, Land Park
1/8/2019	Routes 33, 47	Dos Rios, Phoenix Park
1/9/2019	Routes 74, 75	International, Mather
1/10/2019	Routes 7, 82	Pocket Express, Howe
1/10/2019	Route 22	Arden area routes, Arden DP Station
1/11/2019	Route 81	Florin/Riverside, Florin station
1/14/2019	Routes 86, 88	San Juan, W. El Camino
1/15/2019	Route 87	Howe
1/15/2019	Routes 56, 6	Pocket, Land Park
1/15/2019	Route 34	McKinley
1/22/2019	Route 38	P/Q Street
1/22/2019	Routes 2, 3, 6 and 7	7th Street @ O Street
1/23/2019	Routes 26, 38, 61, 65, 81, 82, 87	65th Street light rail station
1/23/2019	Routes 1, 82	students @ American River College
1/24/2019	Route 62	Freeport
1/28/2019	Routes 26, 38, 61, 65, 81, 82, 87	65th Street station
1/29/2019	Route 13	Northgate
1/30/2019	Route 22	Arden
1/31/2019	Route 13	Arden Del Paso Station
1/31/2019	Route 80	Watt Avenue
1/31/2019	Route 80	Watt Avenue
2/5/2019	Route 30	CSUS bus loop
2/5/2019	Routes 86, 88	Downtown - L/4th Street
2/6/2019	Route 28	Fair Oaks
2/6/2019	Route 30	J Street



12 Pop-Up Workshops (April 2018 – May 2018)

- April 21 Citrus Heights Farmer’s Market
- April 22 Sacramento Earth Day, Southside Park
- April 24 Cosumnes River College
- April 26 16th Street Station
- April 28 Kids Day in the Park, Hagan Park
- May 1 Mather Field/Mills Station
- May 3 Florin Road Transfer Station
- May 4 Arden Fair Mall
- May 8 Watt/I-80 Station
- May 10 Breathe Fest, California Museum
- May 12 Healthy Kids Day, Golden 1 Center
- May 19 Community Carnival, Jefferson School Park



Pop-Up Events (October 2018 – November 2018)

- October 13 Spooktacular, Citrus Heights
- October 16 Sacramento State University Union Lunch Hour
- October 17 Arcadia Transit Center, Citrus Heights
- October 18 Cosumnes River College
- October 20 Del Paso Boulevard Fall Street Festival
- October 21 Creekside Community Fair, Natomas
- October 22 Unmet Transit Needs Hearing
- October 23 Mather Mills Station
- October 24 University and 65th Transit Station
- October 25 Florin Transit Center
- October 27 Mutual Assistance Network Harvest Festival
- October 30 R Street Customer Service Center
- November 1 Arden Fair Mall Food Court
- November 2 Watt / I-80 Transit Center
- November 7 Pocket Transit Center
- November 8 Louis Orlando Transit Center



Community Open House

A community open house and virtual workshop was held on November 13, 2018 on the SacRT Forward network plan.

News Releases:

SacRT Holds Open Houses to get Feedback on New Bus Network

<http://www.sacrt.com/apps/sacrt-holds-open-houses-to-get-feedback-on-new-bus-network/>

SacRT Holds Open House to Discuss Future Transit Network for the Sacramento Region

<http://www.sacrt.com/apps/sacrt-holds-open-house-to-discuss-future-transit-network-for-the-sacramento-region/>

SacRT Seeks Public Input for World-Class Transit System

<http://www.sacrt.com/apps/sacrt-seeks-public-input-for-world-class-transit-system/>

SacRT Awards a Contract for Route Optimization Study

<http://www.sacrt.com/apps/sacrt-awards-contract-for-route-optimization-study/>

SacRT Forward Media Coverage:

January 21, 2019: Capital Public Radio

SacRT New Bus Route Plan: More Weekend Routes And Restoration Of Proposed Cuts

<http://www.caprado.org/articles/2019/01/21/sacrt-new-bus-route-plan-more-weekend-routes-and-restoration-of-proposed-cuts/>

January 2, 2019: Rio Linda Online

Sacramento County Bus Route Redesign Workshop

<https://www.riolindaonline.com/sacramento-county-bus-route-redesign-workshop/>

December 12, 2018: California StreetsBlog

Sacramento Is Reworking its Bus Network

<https://cal.streetsblog.org/2018/12/12/sacramento-is-reworking-its-bus-network/>

December 11: Sacramento Observer

SacRT Holds Open Houses to get Feedback on New Bus Network

<http://sacobserver.com/2018/12/sacrt-holds-open-houses-to-get-feedback-on-new-bus-network/>

May 9, 2018: Carmichael Times

SacRT Forward Workshops End May 15! Share Your Thoughts!

<http://www.carmichaeltimes.com/articles/2018/0509-SacRT-Forward-Workshops-End-May-15-Share-Your-Thoughts/index.php?ID=4802>

April 23, 2018: KCRA (NBC)

Sacramento Regional Transit looking to re-design system

<http://www.kcra.com/article/sacramento-regional-transit-looking-to-re-design-system/19975325>

April 18, 2018: Citrus Heights News

SacRT Forward! Citrus Heights public workshop on April 21!

<http://www.citrusheights.net/civicalerts.aspx?AID=374>

January 16, 2019: Pocket News


SacRT Proposes cutbacks on local bus service

<https://issuu.com/valcomnews/docs/pn1902>

Facebook:

Sacramento Regional Transit District
Published by Katie Nichols [?] · November 5, 2018 · 🌐

Give your input to help us plan for the future of SacRT's transit network! Participate in the online virtual workshop at www.SacRTForward.com



SacRT Forward - Bus Network Redesign
SacRT is embarking on a major redesign of its transit network....

[Learn More](#)

4,267 People Reached **210** Engagements [Boost Again](#)

Boosted on Nov 5, 2018 By Katie Nichols Completed

People Reached	3.1K	Link Clicks	78
----------------	-------------	-------------	-----------

[View Results](#)

👍 Like 💬 Comment ➦ Share 📌

Performance for Your Post

4,267 People Reached

57 Reactions, Comments & Shares

23 Like	19 On Post	4 On Shares
1 Haha	0 On Post	1 On Shares
1 Wow	0 On Post	1 On Shares
1 Angry	1 On Post	0 On Shares
18 Comments	13 On Post	5 On Shares
13 Shares	12 On Post	1 On Shares

153 Post Clicks

0 Photo Views	110 Link Clicks	43 Other Clicks
----------------------	------------------------	------------------------

NEGATIVE FEEDBACK

3 Hide Post	0 Hide All Posts
0 Report as Spam	0 Unlike Page

Insights activity is reported in the Pacific time zone. Ads activity is reported in the time zone of your ad account.

Sacramento Regional Transit District
Published by Katie Nichols [?] · November 6, 2018 · 🌐

SacRT is redesigning its bus network to better serve the needs of the Sacramento region. Based on community feedback, the SacRT Forward team has developed two draft Alternative transit networks – the high coverage alternative, and the high frequency alternative. Join us at an open house on Tuesday, November 13, to learn more about these alternatives and share your feedback! www.SacRTForward.com.



We want to hear from you!

COMMUNITY OPEN HOUSE
Tuesday, November 13, 2018
5 p.m. to 7 p.m.
SacRT Auditorium, 1400 29th Street

SacRTForward.com

1,806 People Reached **136** Engagements [Boost Again](#)

Boosted on Nov 7, 2018 By Katie Nichols Completed

People Reached	1.2K	Post Engagement	73
----------------	-------------	-----------------	-----------

Performance for Your Post

1,806 People Reached

70 Likes, Comments & Shares

39 Likes	37 On Post	2 On Shares
24 Comments	20 On Post	4 On Shares
7 Shares	7 On Post	0 On Shares

66 Post Clicks

17 Photo Views	12 Link Clicks	37 Other Clicks
-----------------------	-----------------------	------------------------

NEGATIVE FEEDBACK

3 Hide Post	0 Hide All Posts
0 Report as Spam	0 Unlike Page

Insights activity is reported in the Pacific time zone. Ads activity is reported in the time zone of your ad account.

Instagram:



ridesact
Kokomo Park

ridesact SacRT is at the Creekside Community Fair in Natomas discussing the SacRT Forward alternatives with the community. Learn more about the bus route redesign project by visiting SacRTForward.com.

17w

Liked by [visitranchocordovaca](#) and 20 others

OCTOBER 21, 2018

Add a comment... Post



ridesact

ridesact SacRT is rethinking the purpose and design of the transit network. Based on your input from spring 2018, two draft alternative transit networks have been developed for the SacRT service area. We want to hear from you! Participate in our virtual workshop between now and November 16, to share your feedback at SacRTForward.com

15w

[_dwise](#) 🤔

15w Reply

Liked by [sacgonzo](#) and 20 others

NOVEMBER 2, 2018

Add a comment... Post



ridesact

ridesact The SacRT Forward open house is about to begin, and we have tons of great information about the proposed new transit network!

9w

[psychora_the pup](#) Yay!!!

9w Reply

135 views

DECEMBER 12, 2018

Add a comment... Post

Social Media Outreach

Twitter:

Regional Transit @RideSacRT

SacRT Forward project team members are at the Watt I-80 light rail station this afternoon getting your feedback on creating an updated transit network! Be sure to stop by until 5 p.m. Or, participate in our virtual workshop online at sacrtforward.com/sacrt-forward-...

3:17 PM - 8 May 2018

1 Retweet 1 Like

Regional Transit @RideSacRT

SacRT is at the Natomas Community Carnival listening to rider's feedback on the SacRT Forward bus route redesign project [#natomas](https://twitter.com/natomas) [#sacrtforward](https://twitter.com/sacrtforward) [#trytransit](https://twitter.com/trytransit)

11:04 AM - 19 May 2018

1 Retweet 2 Likes

Regional Transit @RideSacRT

SacRT is redesigning its bus network to better serve the needs of the region. Join us at an open house on Tuesday, November 13, to learn about two proposed alternatives and share your feedback! SacRTForward.com.

COMMUNITY OPEN HOUSE
Tuesday, November 13, 2018
5 p.m. to 7 p.m.
SacRT Auditorium, 1400 29th Street

2:30 PM - 6 Nov 2018

5 Retweets 2 Likes

You Retweeted

Ride Downtown 916 @RideDowntown916 - Feb 5

Happening Tonight: @RideSacRT is @ the Anatolia Clubhouse on Chrysanthy Boulevard in the @CityofRCordova. Participate in a community conversation about the #SacRTForward New Bus Network. See what "The New Generation Network" is all about & how it'll fit into all of @SacCountyCA.

1 Retweet 3 Likes

Regional Transit @RideSacRT - 4h

Based on feedback from the community, SacRT has revised the proposed service changes for the SacRT Forward project: sacrt.com/sacrtforward. The revised plan will be presented at the SacRT Board of Directors meeting on Mon, Feb 25, 5:30 p.m. in the SacRT Auditorium, 1400 29th St

2 Retweets 3 Likes

Regional Transit @RideSacRT

SacRT Forward will rethink the purpose and design of SacRT's entire network by exploring wholesale changes to the network, including a "blank slate" look at how to position transit competitively long-term in the Sacramento region. Sign up for updates: sacrt.com/apps/sacrtforw...

5:00 PM - 12 Apr 2018

3 Retweets 3 Likes

SacRT Forward

The new generation network



Rethink the **PURPOSE AND DESIGN** of
Sacramento Regional Transit's Network

sacrtforward.com

Attachment 2 – Outreach Summary

Public Comments on SacRT Forward Project

The following is a summary of comments, organized by route. The commenter's name, method in which they communicated their comment to SacRT, and the feedback tracking number assigned to their comment(s) is also listed for the record. Comments that include multiple routes will be listed in one section, and footnoted in other applicable sections, so that we can reflect an accurate number of comments collected per route. For example, if a patron sent one e-mail message about the project, that contains comments about more than one route, that comment will be noted in each applicable section.

Each commenter received a standard acknowledgement that their comment(s) was received. The standard message stated not only that the comment(s) was received, but that it had been, or would be, reviewed by SacRT staff, and included in the official 'Public Comment' document to be presented to the SacRT Board of Directors. Comments requiring detailed responses, and more dialogue with the patron, were personally addressed by SacRT Planning staff. Follow-up communications are also included in the summary of comments.

Route 2 – Riverside

Customer requesting no changes be made to route 2. (*Anthony, phone, #65766*)

Patron lives in the Pocket area Hidden Lake Condominiums (7551 Greenhaven Dr, Sacramento), is elderly and uses a cane. If bus services are eliminated, patron stated he can't get to light rail, grocery store and will have to walk to closest bus stop @ Greenhaven & Florin which is a long walk for him. There are a lot of seniors living in senior facilities in this area. If transit services are eliminated, he would have to pay for Uber rides and he can't afford it. He moved to the Pocket area because it is a safe area with good bus service. It would be an extreme hardship for him to pack up and move elsewhere and he wanted the Pocket area to be his last move. (*Michael Beckman, phone, #64414*)

Patron inquired about attending the BOD meeting and he also wanted to submit his comments and concerns over the phone. Patron would like a follow up call to discuss issues further with someone in the Planning Dept. He is not just one voice but the voice of those elderly/low income/students who may not know how to fight for transportation in the Pocket/Greenhaven area. If patron has to move out of the Pocket area, he will be faced with new/higher rent and there's no telling (down the road) that transportation will be eliminated then he'll be faced with same situation when he'll be much older and unable to pack up and move again. There are lots of elderly/senior apartments housing in the Pocket area who relies on public transportation. RT system needs to accommodate all areas to promote ridership. Patron gave up his car to be a good citizen by having one less car off the road. Now that he relies on public transportation, RT may eliminate his mode of transportation. He can't afford to pay Uber (round trip), in addition, RT pass to get to and from his destinations and he speaks on behalf of others in his community who lives on a fixed income. Patron stated there was inadequate advertisement about the Service Changes. He is considering contacting KCRA to get it out on the 6pm news. It is extremely important to keep service as it is in the Pocket area. Don't ignore his request to save transportation in the Pocket area. (*Michael Beckman, phone, #64526*)

Response: Planning staff spoke with Mr. Beckman the day prior to the public meeting at Robbie Waters library, which he also attended and provided similar comments. I advised that the proposed changes and comments we are receiving are all carefully reviewed and considered during this extensive public outreach period. He thinks that although a route may have low ridership now, we (SacRT) should continue to operate bus routes that cover any and all areas because it is our duty to provide transportation services, even if not many people ride it, because more people may want to ride it some day in the future. Copying these notes for the record.

Lives on Riverside & near 25th Ave, disabled & blind. If you stop my bus and that means that I will be stuck at home. Can't use paratransit for every trip. Wont' be able to go out to doctors appt as such. Other people needs this bus as well and will hinder them getting out of the house. (*Trudy, e-mail, #65070*)

Could you please study or consider running the #2 or #6 routes twice per hour during rush hour? I believe there would be enough ridership to justify more frequent routes. Thank you. *(Eugene Kalinsky, e-mail, #64503)*

I am writing because I am concerned about the SacRT changes that specifically effect Bus #2 and #3. These routes run in the Pocket Area. As you are aware Bus #3 has only four runs during peak hours to downtown in the a.m. and four runs from downtown to the Pocket Area in the p.m.. Bus #2 runs every hour on the 1/2 hour and runs regularly during the day to and from downtown. Needless to say these bus routes provide Pocket residents transportation to and from downtown. When #3 is not available I rely on #2; I appreciate the service and having that option. I'm sure you are also aware that Bus #2 services were cut a few years ago from running every 1/2 hour to the current one hour run. I been riding the bus for years and rely on the service. It amazes me however, that we talk about pollutants given off by cars, the number cars on the road, traffic, etc. and encourage public transportation but we continue to cut the service. Why? We cut the routes to those who utilizes the service. Why? I am a Pocket Area resident and have relied on Bus #2 and #3 for years. Is it assumed that individuals living in this area do not need public transportation? That everyone has vehicles and public transportation is not important or necessary? Let's not assume! There are many people like myself who utilize public transportation, especially to and from work (state, federal, city, and county employees); and we cannot forget about the senior citizens and elderly who rely on these bus routes as well. I ask that you reconsider your planning routes, especially for routes #2 and #3 and other routes that effect Pocket Area residents (Bus #81 connection from Florin Road/Riverside to light rail on Florin Road). *(Myrtle Jones, e-mail, #64886)*

Customer would like to suggest in the off peak hours, have the 2 and 6 run every other hour. *(Dennis Murphy, phone, #65178)*

I live on Piedmont Drive off Seamas Avenue and Riverside Boulevard in the Little Pocket area of Sacramento. I am a senior citizens who no longer drives. For the past three years, I have utilized the Route 2 line and connecting buses to get to medical and business appointments. With the elimination of this route, I will be stranded in an area that will not have access to public transportation. How can this happen in a progressive city? How are 75+ individuals going to maintain their independence and safety without public transportation? It seems like this new plan is being driven by dollars and cents without much consideration for the most vulnerable of society. *(Jean Puente, e-mail, #66031)*

I am writing to urge you to reconsider restructuring bus routes 2 and 6. I alternately take these two routes to and from Downtown during the day, outside peak hours. Should the frequencies of these two lines be reduced to only three trips each in the morning and afternoon, it would severely limit my ability to travel to and from Downtown. I understand that it may be cost-effective to further reduce the already limited services of the 2 and 6 routes, but such a move would pose significant challenges to people like myself who utilize RT services to travel between the Pocket area and Downtown outside peak hours. I hope you will seriously reconsider reducing coverage of the 2 and 6 lines, instead allowing them to continue running at least once an hour as they currently do. In addition, I hope that you will allow the terminus of route 62 to remain at Rush River, and the 81 at Riverside/Florin. Thank you for your time and consideration. *(Crystal Yu, e-mail, #65688)*

Response: Depending on where you are located in the Pocket area, there may be another alternative for you to get downtown during the midday period. Where exactly are you starting your transit trips from? We are proposing to have Route 61 run on a segment of Riverside, and the 56 running along a segment of Greenhaven. Additionally, the Route 62 is proposed to run on South Land Park Drive, which may cover some of the area that the existing Route 6 does.

I recently reviewed the new bus system routes and, to my dismay, discovered that you are eliminating all non-commute service from the Pocket/Greenhaven area south of Florin Road and west of Greenhaven. This is completely unacceptable. For years I've heard residents of the Riverside area complain that they don't have weekend service because the #2 doesn't run on weekends and now you are eliminating the #81 from that area as well. I live in the area of Rush River/Windbridge and regularly catch the busses that

run from the Promenade. So the only option you are leaving me and other people who depend upon RT for weekend or evening travel is to walk to Greenhaven/Florin or use some other method of travel (such as Uber). I am fortunate enough to be able to utilize Uber, but others in the area in which you are stranding may not have that choice. There are also people who work late or whose work hours are outside the traditional commute hours. These people will be forced to walk longer distances, sometimes after dark, to reach home if they live in the areas you are abandoning. The Florin/Greenhaven area of town is safer than some other areas, but it no way comfortable to walk alone after dark. When the RT service first came to the Promenade area of the Pocket, I was very enthusiastic. However over the years, I've seen that service erode until we are again faced with no service outside the commute hours. It's not acceptable to abandon this area. *(Elaine Steidley, e-mail, #65152)*

I strongly object to the proposed service changes affecting the Pocket-Greenhaven area, notably the service reduction on the number 2 and 6 lines, and the relocation of the western terminus of the 56, 62 and 81 lines to Florin and Greenhaven (Lakecrest Shopping Center intersection). In our view, this would eviscerate service to the southwest part of the Pocket-Greenhaven community. There are a number of problems with this plan. One, it leaves a regional library (Robbie Waters Pocket-Greenhaven Branch) without transit access during its operating hours, both by cutting no. 2 and by stopping no. 81 at Lakecrest. Two, it leaves the SES and Kernedy High Schools with inadequate bus service by cutting no. 2 and ending no. 81 at Lakecrest. Three, using the Florin/Greenhaven intersection (Lakecrest) as a transit hub presents many problems because the intersection is extremely busy, especially at peak hours, and there are frequent accidents there. It is dangerous for large numbers of RT riders to embark and disembark there. Four, cutting off no. 56 from the Promenade hub cuts off access to Kaiser, Methodist Hospital, and other facilities used by retirees in the south and west Pocket area. The proposed plan would present hardships for me and my family. I am a State retiree and use no. 2 to go downtown to volunteer as a docent at the California Museum, but I do not use it at peak hours. Driving and parking downtown is cost-prohibitive, so I would have to rethink my volunteer activities if this proposed plan is approved. My son has a developmental disability (autism), and cannot drive, but works part-time Monday through Friday in supported employment. He relies on RT to commute to work. However, the proposed reduction in service to the no. 2 and/or stopping the no. 81 west of Greenhaven Drive would make it difficult, if not impossible, for him to continue his current employment without other transportation options. Some possible mitigations were suggested at the Pocket-Greenhaven Community Association meeting on January 8. They included re-routing the proposed no. 61 to the existing Promenade transit hub, extending the no. 81 to its existing western terminus at Riverside Blvd, and offering Smart Ride in the Pocket-Greenhaven area. I also strongly urge you to reconsider reducing service on the no. 2. Instead, consider straightening and shortening the line, for example, by cutting out the U from Havenside to Gloria to Greenhaven and vice-versa. Just do one straight line down Havenside or Greenhaven to Riverside. *(Steve Koyasako, e-mail, #64719)*

Yesterday one of your staff approached me on the bus to give me a leaflet about proposed changes to many of the bus routes. I'd like to thank you for putting this information out to your customers, and offering the opportunity for feedback! I live in the Pocket and work downtown, so the two routes that I use are 2 and 3. As you know, 3 is a rush-hour express route. It's also the one I usually use. It operates only in the morning inbound and the afternoon outbound, which is fine the majority of the time. You propose no changes for route 3, so that's fine too. 2 is my back-up route, for those times when there is something unusual about my schedule, like working late, or going home mid-day for an appointment or an emergency. You propose eliminating route 2 except in the morning and afternoon. My problem with the proposed changes to route 2 is that it leaves in place the trips that are at roughly the same time as route 3, while eliminating the trips that route 2 uniquely covers today. If you truly must trim route 2, my proposal would be exactly the opposite of yours: eliminate runs at times when route 3 provides coverage, and keep the ones at other hours. At a time when Sacramento is trying to reduce car traffic and its associated climate-changing emissions, eliminating public transit options for a major neighborhood for the bulk of the day is counter-productive. I hope you will rethink the proposed changes to route 2. I live at 302 Rivertree Way and work at 400 R Street. Route 3 is very convenient at both ends, and I'm glad you're not changing that. Route 2 is a bit more of a walk at both ends, but still reasonable. Aside from my personal convenience, there are the larger social and environmental implications of a city with comprehensive public transit connections between its downtown and where people live. Eliminating large portions of

transit routes seems at odds with Sacramento's goal to become carbon neutral. I'd value your thoughts on such issues. *(Charley Cross, e-mail, #64659)*

Response: The proposed changes to the midday service on Route 2 is primarily due to low productivity on the route during this time of day; however, we are still collecting comments and reviewing feedback from the community in order to evaluate the draft network further. Social and environmental issues are always important, and will be considered along with many other factors throughout this process. Your feedback will be included in the information presented to the Board of Directors for their consideration, as well.

I live in South Land Park and take the #2 bus route to work. It is the only bus route that is near my house. Please keep this route just the way it is now! There are a lot of people who depend on the #2 bus route and would be highly inconvenienced by it's discontinuance. Please, please, please keep this route intact. If anything, there needs to be more frequent buses on this route. Thank you for your kind consideration. *(Cortney Staford, e-mail, #64078)*

When the Planning Department met with the Board Members on December 10, 2018, I couldn't believe what was put under "Issue" in the memo. Whether or not to release the Sac RT Forward draft networks to the public for review and comment. Why wouldn't the Planning Department release the draft for the public to review and comment on? Since, the changes will affect the public. I couldn't attend any of the open house meetings because the meetings weren't over until 7:00p.m. The last #2 bus arrives at Riverside Blvd. and Florin Road at 5:35pm, going toward 43rd Avenue. I don't drive do to a medical condition. What is the purpose of moving the bus terminal from Florin Road and Riverside Blvd. to Florin Road and Greenhaven? Saving money? How much money can SacRT save by moving a bus terminal one mile? If the Bus 2 continues to drop passengers at Florin Road and Riverside Blvd. – and the terminal moves to Florin Road and Greenhaven, individuals will have to walk 1.7 miles from Florin Road and Riverside Blvd to get to Florin Road and Greenhaven to take Bus 81. And on the return trip, bus riders will have to walk 1.7 miles again with or without packages, from Florin Road and Greenhaven to Florin Road and Riverside Blvd. No matter what the weather i.e., raining with wind blow, just raining; cold weather with wind blowing; or just cold weather; mothers with their children in strollers, with or without packages, senior citizens, individuals using walkers; temperatures 105 and higher. If the bus terminal is moved to Florin Road and Greenhaven, it will be a tremendous hardship for bus riders. Regarding Bus 2, three buses in the AM. Three buses in the PM. This is a joke. Right? You've got to be kidding me. Will Bus 2 be scheduled hourly? Why does SacRT Planning have to have four express etc. *(Gilda Fusilier, e-mail, #64143)*

Response: Thank you for sending us your feedback regarding the proposed changes to the SacRT bus network. Your comments are valuable to our redesign process. Many factors were considered for this system design. One of the main issues with designing our new bus network (using the same amount of resources) was the trade-off between providing more frequency and span of service, and providing more coverage. Some of the areas with low ridership did lose some coverage, with those resources being applied elsewhere where ridership does well and provides more connectivity, which is the case with Route 2 and the decision to move the terminal from Florin/Riverside to Florin/Greenhaven. The proposed terminal would connect with more routes, allowing for more east-west, and north-south travel patterns. The proposed changes to Route 2 (AM and PM trips only) do not have scheduled trip times yet. Changes would need to be approved and made final before scheduling trips could occur. We are aware that some of the proposed changes may cause difficulty to some riders, and we attempt to provide alternatives in some cases, such as paratransit service, and/or on-demand service (SmaRT Ride) in certain locations. Please remember that these changes are still only proposed, and all comments will be shared with our Board of Directors before they make a final decision on the bus network. Thank you again for sending your feedback. We value your patronage.

When the Planning Department met with the Board Members on December 10, 2018, I couldn't believe what was put under "Issue" in the memo. Whether or not to release the Sac RT Forward draft networks to the public for review and comment. Why wouldn't the Planning Department release the draft for the public

to review and comment on? Since, the changes will affect the public. I couldn't attend any of the open house meetings because the meetings weren't over until 7:00p.m. The last #2 bus arrives at Riverside Blvd. and Florin Road at 5:35pm, going toward 43rd Avenue. I don't drive do to a medical condition. What is the purpose of moving the bus terminal from Florin Road and Riverside Blvd. to Florin Road and Greenhaven? Saving money? How much money can SacRT save by moving a bus terminal one mile? If the Bus 2 continues to drop passengers at Florin Road and Riverside Blvd. – and the terminal moves to Florin Road and Greenhaven, individuals will have to walk 1.7 miles from Florin Road and Riverside Blvd to get to Florin Road and Greenhaven to take Bus 81. And on the return trip, bus riders will have to walk 1.7 miles again with or without packages, from Florin Road and Greenhaven to Florin Road and Riverside Blvd. No matter what the weather i.e., raining with wind blow, just raining; cold weather with wind blowing; or just cold weather; mothers with their children in strollers, with or without packages, senior citizens, individuals using walkers; temperatures 105 and higher. If the bus terminal is moved to Florin Road and Greenhaven, it will be a tremendous hardship for bus riders. Regarding Bus 2 Three buses in the AM. Three buses in the PM. This is a joke. Right? You've got to be kidding me. Will Bus 2 be scheduled hourly? Why does SacRT Planning have to have four express buses? (2, 3, 6 and 7) What about six (6) buses in the AM and six buses in the PM? What time will the first bus 2 leave downtown in the AM? What time will the last Bus 2 leave from downtown in the AM? What time will the first bus 2 leave downtown in the PM? What time will the last bus 2 leave downtown in the PM? I understand Bus 2 doesn't have a high ridership at certain hours of the day. But there are a lot of seniors, like myself that depend on Bus 2. Seniors who no longer drive, do to slow reflexes are medical issues. We use Bus 2, to get to downtown, Walmart, Walgreens, Lake Crest Shopping Center, doctor appointments, shopping at Bel Air at Rush River and Windbridge. Individuals use Bus 2 to get to school, go to work, doctor appointments, don't have a car. Cover ALL riders and potential riders, without putting other riders in extreme and tremendous hardship. Like one hour each way to get to Florin Road and Greenhaven from Florin Road and Riverside Blvd. and back again. Individuals shouldn't have to have a car, or use Uber/Lyft to get around Sacramento. Has SacRT Planning given a thought to the Neighborhood Ride Bus? To fill in for the limited schedule of Bus 2? Fares Increase the fares. I would rather have increased fares than less coverage and tremendous inconvenience. Does anyone in SacRT Planning depend upon the bus/light rail system? SacRT will have fifteen minute weekend light rail service starting January 2019. But at 5:35p.m., during the week the last Bus 2 has left Florin Road and Riverside Blvd. for downtown. And I can't get to my home on 43rd Avenue. I live in the capital of California. California has the fifth economy in the world and California could be its' own country. But I don't have weekend bus service. I have to walk to Riverside Blvd and Florin Road (1.7 miles) to get a bus (currently) then walk back again, from where I came from. There is a bus stop going toward South Land Park (4 blocks), but the 61 doesn't operate on the weekends. Currently, RT has twenty-three (23) buses that don't operate on the weekend. Why? And this is the capital of California. (*Gilda Fusilier, e-mail, #64143, additional comment*)

I need the 56 to go to Rush River to catch the 62 bus to SAC CITY COLLEGE. I also use bus to the light rail to the Meadowview station, I need 56 to keep running and the 62 to Rush river to the don't stop on where I catch the bus 2 , Yes I do need that bus too! I don't drive and I relay on those buses to get me around town. I have a disability and I don't need to break down on not having transportation where I live in front of Meadowview that needs to keep all the stops, so I can be able to catch my bus or light rail , it depends on the time I go to school. So please don't get rid of bus 2, 56,62 thank you. (*April King, e-mail, #64502*)

Response: Thank you for sending us your comments. Just to clarify, the Routes 2, 56 and 62 are not proposed for elimination. Route 2 is proposed to operate morning and afternoon peak trips only, due to the very low ridership during the midday period. Routes 56 and 62 are also not proposed for elimination; however, the alignment of both routes would change, if approved. The 62 is still serving City College, but it sounds like you may experience some different connections, depending on where your trip originates. Additionally, the frequency and span of service on both Routes 56 and 62 are proposed to be increased; weekend service on 56 will go to 45 minutes, and weekend service on 62 would go to 40 minutes, with NEW Sunday/Holiday service. The draft bus network certainly does come with trade-offs; more service and frequency at the cost of some coverage. That is why it is important for us to obtain comments such as yours during the public outreach period. Thank you

again for sending us your feedback. Your comments will be included in the information presented to the Board of Directors for their review and consideration.

The proposed plan eliminating #38 and #2 will make getting around more inconvenient for me on the whole. I am 72 years old and not a speedy walker. 1. I am sorry that the #38 will be eliminated since the #38 bus stop is in my immediate neighborhood on Muir Way at Vallejo. I have been taking #38 for 40 years, and it takes me only 7 minutes to walk there. I use the #38 to go downtown and to the Sacramento Natural Foods Co-op at 28th St. and R, the Fort Sutter Post Office, and to connect with the #67/68 buses. With the new plan, I will always have to go downtown on other routes and then transfer to Light Rail to get to 28th St. and R. 2. To get downtown on the new plan, it seems that I could take either #51 or new #11. For #51, I could walk for 20 minutes to the bus stop on 8th St. at Broadway-a somewhat sketchier location. However, it seems that the new #11 might be coming to my stop on Riverside Blvd. at 3rd Ave., which is just a 5-minute walk away. 3. It will be much more inconvenient for me to get to Riverside Blvd. and Florin Road with the new set up since I will have to make transfers. Currently I just get on the #2 at Riverside Blvd. and 3rd Ave. and get off at Riverside Blvd. and Florin Rd. With the new set up it seems that I would take the new #11, then #62, and finally the new #61. Or I might have to walk to Freeport (30 minutes away) and then get the #62 and transfer to #61. 4. With the new plan eliminating #2, I think that I will have to give up going to the nice Bel Air Market at Rush River and Windbridge. I'll have to find another supermarket that is near a bus or light rail route, but I will have to transfer. 5. Now that the #38 will be eliminated, how will my friend go from her apartment at 701 Fairgrounds Dr. to Food Source at 4401 Broadway? How will she get from 701 Fairgrounds Dr. to downtown? She is one of many living in seniors. (*Jamie Abe, e-mail, #64437*)

Response: Thank you for sending in your comments regarding Routes 38 and 2. The proposed plan does not eliminate Route 2 completely; it will continue to operate three morning trips and three afternoon trips. The proposed Route 11 will travel from North Natomas, through downtown, and onto City College via Riverside Blvd. Additionally, the proposed Route 11 will run 7 days a week, with 30-minute frequency on weekdays, and 45 minute frequency on weekends, to make transfers with other bus routes more convenient. Your friend who lives on Fairground Drive will not be able to catch a bus route within the same proximity as the existing Route 38; however, the Route 51 is may be an option. If your friend is not able to walk to the nearest Route 51 bus stop (at Broadway and Stockton Blvd.) due to a disability or health-related condition, then he/she may be eligible for paratransit service. Thank you again for sending your feedback. Your comments will be included in the information presented to the Board of Directors.

Customer called concerning routes 2 & 38. Customer stated that she believed that both routes are still needed because they serve the upper land park area. (*Terri, phone, #64023*)

Response: Unable to contact patron; no contact information provided.

I would like to comment on the proposed SAC RT bus route and schedule changes affecting the Greenhaven/Pocket area. I have been a regular SAC RT bus rider for over 30 years; since 1986. I am a State of CA employee who prefers to travel to/from work by bus. I normally take Bus #7. I occasionally ride Bus #2 and Bus #6 during the day and (early) evenings. My son takes Bus #62 to Sacramento City College. His classes normally start after 9am. He returns home about 1pm. We both pickup SAC RT bus service at the Pocket Bel Air Shopping Center located on Rush River Drive. Bus #2 - Proposed change - Eliminate service except 3 mornings and 3 afternoon trips. Bus #6 - Proposed change - Eliminate service except 3 mornings and 3 afternoon trips. Weekend bus service was eliminated during the 2008/2009 recession. Service interval changed from 30/45 minutes to 1 hour to accommodate driver rest. SAC RT is now proposing to eliminate mid-day bus service. State employees will have no mid-day bus service to/from downtown. Not having ALL day bus service is wrong, especially for elderly persons and students. Bus #3 - No changes. Service times are 6:15am, 6:45am, 7:00am, and 7:15am. It would be great to have bus service after 7:15am. Not everyone starts work at 7:30am. Very few State employees work earlier than 8am. Bus service should not accommodate the "early-birds" but rather the general working and student population. Bus service should not necessarily accommodate the 9/80/80 employees. Eliminate the 6:15am route. Add 7:30am route Bus #7 - No changes. Service times 6:09am,

6:39am, and 7:09am. It would be great to have bus service after 7:09am. Not everyone starts work at 7:30am. Very few State employees work earlier than 8am. Bus service should not accommodate the "early-birds" but rather the general working and student population. Bus service should not necessarily accommodate the 9/80/80 employees. Eliminate the 6:09am route. Add 7:39am route. Bus #56- Proposed change - Change terminal from Pocket Bel Air to Greenhaven Drive and Florin Road. This change is okay. Very few riders from Pocket/Greenhaven take the bus to Meadowview and Consumnes River College (CRC). How many students attend CRC versus Sacramento City College (SCC)? The volume of SAC RT bus and light rail service to CRC seems excessive compared to other Los Rios community colleges. Bus #62 - Proposed change - Change terminal from Pocket Bel Air to Greenhaven Drive and Florin Road. My son and many of his classmates takes the bus to Sacramento City College (SCC) from the Pocket Bel Air shopping center. With the extra time required to transfer, he would no longer be able to take the bus to SCC. This change would affect Community College and McClatchy students living in the Pocket/Greenhaven area. Bus #81- Proposed change - Change terminal from Pocket Bel Air to Greenhaven Drive and Florin Road. Terminating bus service at Greenhaven Drive and Florin Road is short sighted. I would imagine that some J.F.K. high school students take Bus #81 to/from school in the morning, afternoon, and other times during the day. Stopping bus service at Greenhaven Drive and Florin Road would not be helping anyone. Traveling to the end of Florin Road to Riverside Blvd benefits many young high school students and riders trying to get to a different bus line, such as Bus #6, #7, #56, or #62. *(Lance Morris, e-mail, #64781)*

I'm writing with concern regarding the plans to eliminate routes 2 and 6 except for three peak trips. These routes supplement 3 and 7, and many downtown commuters take one route downtown and another home. Cutting these could impact ridership on routes 3 and 7. Additionally, during the day these routes serve students at California Middle School, Brannan Middle School, and the school of Engineering and Sciences. The new proposal leaves the western pocket area with peak-only coverage. How are you planning to address these issues? *(Laura Gerber, e-mail, #65964)*

I am a resident of South Land Park Terrace, and I would really be upset if Sacramento Regional Transit had these two buses - 2 and 6 - only running during peak times and not all day. I consider having these buses as a plus to our neighborhood and only lament that they no longer serve our area during the weekend. Please reconsider. *(Hiliry Harvey, e-mail, #65992)*

Number 2 and number 6 routes: Please keep them running all day as they currently run. People need them to get downtown to locations where parking is difficult...eg the State Archives building that is on a light rail stop. *(Steve Kamp, e-mail, #66023)*

Please keep at least the #2 or #6 bus during mid-day hours! I am retired, live between those routes and occasionally ride either the #2 or #6 bus during mid-day hours to go downtown, and choose the bus depending on when I need to arrive and my destination. I have been trying to leave my car in the garage at least some of the time to do my part for clean air and reducing pollution. I've wondered why there hasn't been more marketing promoting transit use, especially in closer-in neighborhoods like Land Park and Curtis Park. If there were more frequent service not less, that would be an important factor for choice riders like me. Have you considered shortening the route during the mid-day hours (rather than completely eliminating them) to go only as far south as 35th Ave to the South Hills shopping center and making it loop between Riverside and S Land Park Drive? With the SF Market, post office, restaurants and other shops, plus the library and community center at South Land Park Drive and Fruitridge Rd, those are destinations of interest to many. Hourly service, however, makes riding the bus less desirable than if it were more frequent. Having no service means even more car trips! Please keep some service on the #2 or #6 for mid-day riders! *(Sue Teranishi, e-mail, #66066)*

(Terri Yee, e-mail, #64851) *FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES*

Route 3 – Riverside Express

(Myrtle Jones, e-mail, #64886) *FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES*
(Charley Cross, e-mail, #64659) *FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES*

Route 5 – Meadowview/Valley Hi

As a student who goes to Florin High School and takes the number 5 bus to school nearly every morning, changing the route would greatly affect me as well as many other students who take the bus along with me in getting to school. I speak for everyone when I say please do not change the bus 5 route. (Scott Lee, e-mail, #65007)

Response: Thank you for sending your comment about proposed changes to Route 5. Although this route is facing some changes, we have prepared to continue providing service to/from Florin High School in the morning and afternoon, so students can get to school, and home from school. The ridership on this route during the midday period is very low, and unproductive when it comes to our service standards. Thank you again for your interest in SacRT Forward. Your input is valuable to this process, and will be included in the public record, and presented to the Board of Directors for their review and consideration.

I would eliminate Routes 5 and 65 altogether. Have recommended a route that goes from Cosumnes River College to 65th Street Station or CSUS. The route would go through Cosumnes River Blvd, Power Inn Road, Auberry Drive, Cutler Way, Cottonwood Lane with a stop at Florin High School, Elsie Lane, back to Power Inn Road, turn at Florin Road, Briggs Drive, Lawneod Drive, 75th Street, Elder Creek Road, Power Inn Road, Turn at Fruitridge Road, 65th Street, and stop at University 65th Street Station or CSUS. (Aubrey Cannon, e-mail, #65253)

Route 6 – Land Park

Hello, I attended the Pocket/Greenhaven meeting last night and appreciate your employees taking time to come out and discuss this proposed project with us. My main concern in learning more about it was my youngest son who rides the #6 every afternoon from Cal Middle to Windbridge. School is out at 2:09 M, T, W, F and at 1:09 on Thursdays. Having to wait until a "commute" time bus ran would mean he and many other teenagers would be left hanging around Land Park for an hour or more. After seeing the proposed changes, I now have additional concerns. One is the traffic impact to the intersection of Lorin/Greenhaven if you create a bus hub there. That is already an absolutely horrible intersection with impacted traffic and a high number of accidents. I fear the impact to normal congestion would be extreme if you move forward with this plan. In addition, I am concerned about the number of middle and high school students that will be impacted. I know several families outside of the neighborhood whose children take RT to/from Kennedy. The proposed changes would greatly impact their daily commute, and create another traffic impact at an already busy intersection if they are being forced to change buses to make the last half mile or so of their journey to school. I hope the RT Board will look at the concerns I and other members of the neighborhood have presented and take them into consideration. Of course we are just one small corner of the world, but these changes would be a large impact on our small corner. (Amy Cleveland, e-mail, #64686)

Hi there! I feel so sad that I wasn't alert enough to notice this effort underway and the first I learned of it was yesterday, while riding my normal bus home. My concern isn't for me as a commuter though - I am worried about my daughter who uses the Bus to get to and from school. From what I can gather, her normal bus route will cease under this plan and I want to know what options are being considered not just for her, but for all of the kids in Sacramento City Unified School District who rely on bus transport to get to and from school. Hope to hear back from someone on this! (SallieAnne Maliguine, e-mail, #65096)

Response: SacRT operates many routes that serve as "school trippers" throughout the service area. Can you tell me what school your daughter attends, and where it is located? There may be other options for her, considering our existing school trippers, and/or other services we are proposing.

To whom it may concern- I watched the presentation and read information about the proposed change to Route 6 (proposed rename to 106), for this route to run only during "peak" hours. First, I cannot determine what "peak" hours are considered. My concern over the proposed, greater limited run of this route of for riders to/from California Middle School. While I recognize that before-school ridership would not be affected since it would fall during morning "peak" (commute) time. However, for the afternoons, the school is dismissed at 2:09 p.m. on Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Fridays; and on 1:09 p.m. on Thursdays. I fear that these hours do fall into "peak" afternoon hours, and this will impact the student riders who travel this route (whose destinations are not on the route to to the "special" routes/buses which run from the school). Please provide clarification or specific times for the proposed route run times, so we can better understand the impact to student commuters (conversely, to the students of Sam Brannan Middle School impacted by proposed Route 2 changes). Thank you in advance for your consideration. (Michelle Mahon, e-mail, #66063)

This is in response to your proposal to limit trips on this route to three in the morning and three in the afternoon. I would be very sad to see these reductions take place. It was bad enough to watch Route 5 shift from my South Land Park neighborhood years ago along with the loss of evening and weekend service on Route 6. I work irregular hours now and the No. 6's hourly buses allow me to commute easily during the day. I particularly valued its availability these past months when I've been ill. I don't have a solution to low ridership outside peak commute hours, but these proposed reductions make me doubt SacRT's commitment to offering an alternative to Sacramento's overwhelming car culture. The changes would also erase the possibility of my retiring in place here, since midday bus service and easy connections to the 16th St. Light Rail station will have evaporated. Please reconsider this plan and let us keep the current No. 6 route! (Carole Ludlum, e-mail, #66113)

I vehemently oppose the proposed plans to change the RT routes to the Pocket Area. My children ride the 6 bus to and from Cal Middle School. I allow this primarily because of their fabulous driver (I believe her name is Ms. Wilson). She looks out for the school kids and makes sure they are safe on and off the bus until they reach Cal Middle in the morning. If she is removed from this route, I most likely will drive my kids to school and RT will lose two passengers two times a day. I am also displeased with eliminating most of the bus 6 runs every day. Again, my kids ride this bus to and from school. Many children who ride the 6 bus to Cal Middle and Sam Brannan School will not have an alternative way to get to school. Pocket parents, like myself, choose to send their kids to great schools a distance away because RT provides a means for Pocket kids to get to and from these schools. Changing the bus schedules and eliminating routes will cause hardships for many families here in the Pocket. This includes eliminating the 62 route from the Pocket to McClatchy High School. My older 3 children all took this bus to and from McClatchy and I anticipated my youngest 2 taking the 62 bus to and from McClatchy. Another potential hardship for many families in the Pocket. I kindly ask that you reconsider the proposed changes to the Pocket Area, especially to the 6 and 62 routes. We need these buses to help our children feel independent and learn to manage their world as they get themselves to and from their schools. Thank you. (Michelle Fetros, e-mail, #64618)

Thank you for sending your comments regarding the proposed changes to Route 6 and other routes in the Pocket area. We have been conducting a lot of public outreach, and have been in direct contact with school administration, especially at schools that will be impacted by the proposed changes. We understand that some of the proposed alternatives may not work for all riders. With that said, all of the proposed changes are being carefully reviewed, considering the feedback we have received, and continue to receive. Public outreach and comments will continue into February, at which time, we will present them to our Board of Directors for their consideration. Thank you again for providing your feedback to this important process.

(Eugene Kalinsky, e-mail, #64503) **FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES**
(Dennis Murphy, phone, #65178) **FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES**

(Crystal Yu, e-mail, #65688) *FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES*
(Steve Koyasako, e-mail, #64719) *FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES*
(Carol Nelson, e-mail, #64993) *FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES*
(Lance Morris, e-mail, #64781) *FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES*
(Laura Gerber, e-mail, #65964) *FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES*
(Hiliry Harvey, e-mail, #65992) *FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES*
(Steve Kamp, e-mail, #66023) *FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES*
(Sue Teranishi, e-mail, #66066) *FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES*

Route 11 – Truxel Rd.

I write in support of the change of the No. 11 route to extend to City College as proposed. As for changing the timing of the No. 2 and No. 6 routes, since they follow somewhat similar paths, I suggest staggering them so that they run about 30 minutes apart from each other (currently, the routes are about 15 minutes or 45 minutes apart from each other, depending on how you look at it). Thank you. (*Eugene Kalinsky, e-mail, #64503*)

This is the only bus (11) that really comes out all the way to North Natomas (there's the JIBE but that doesn't stop for anyone) Bus 11 doesn't come out here on Sundays and I'm not sure about Holidays and the time for the last stop from downtown on Saturday to North Natomas is 6 pm and during the week I think its the same?? Please see about adding longer hours to this route and adding on it to run 7 days a week. Please contact me if you need additional information. (*Theresa Slaughter, e-mail, #65898*)

Response: Thank you for your comments about the SacRT Forward project, specifically your suggestions for Route 11. Fortunately, we are proposing to do some of what you have requested; the route is proposed to extend south to City College, and have improved frequency with additional Sunday/Holiday service. For more information on all of the proposed changes, please visit our page with the most recent revisions: <http://www.sacrt.com/apps/wp-content/uploads/Summary-Revised-190218.pdf>.

My name is Angela E. Herring-Jackson and I am a Sacramento Resident. I am (and my son) also a patron of the Sacramento Regional Transit system. I utilize both the bus and or train if I am able to access it. My son, Glenn Jackson Jr., an 11 year old sixth grader, also utilizes the Sacramento Regional Transit bus system. Currently, my son, has to commute to school. He is currently a student at a charter school in North Natomas. My son's Charter school along with the Natomas Unified School District does not provide a bus to and or from school. We reside in North Natomas off of Arena Blvd where there is currently NO public transportation available. My son uses a manual scooter to get to the nearest bus stop (Truxel Road & Arena Blvd.) bus stop. My son waits for the bus, gets on, gets off and has to use his scooter for another four miles to get to school. My son does this twice a day, everyday there is school. There has been numerous times that the bus has come late. When the bus comes late, my son (and his classmates) along with other riders are late (for school). The bus that my son takes is (Northbound) Sac RT #11. When he boards the bus in the morning it is standing room only. It is usually over capacity (except for Wednesday mornings) because it is serving mostly students in the morning hours. The current path that bus 11 takes serves bus riders that attend Natomas Middle School, Natomas High School, Inderkum High School, American River College satellite school, and Westlake Charter School. On January 14, 2019, SAC RT bus #11 was cancelled (Block #6204062). That crucial 7am run left many students waiting for the next bus to come. The next bus is scheduled to come within a half hour, but due to the over capacity of students and patrons, the bus came in a hour. In this day it was storming. Most of the bus stops do. To have canopies to protect patrons from the weather. This happens quite often and nothing happens to correct or improve this problem. On January 31, 2019, my son was hit by a car (Sacramento Police Report # 19-29900) on his attempt coming home off of the SAC RT bus #11. My son has been trained by myself to follow the rules of the road as a pedestrian and cyclist and by NNTMA (North Natomas Transportation Management Transportation). It is dangerous for my son to travel down Arena Blvd to catch the nearest bus on Truxel Blvd. Not having adequate access to any type of public transportation is

a disservice to the minority, elderly as well as low income residents of North Natomas. From the project update on YouTube, it still does not seriously address or consider North Natomas as disadvantaged population and it is. Sac RT bus #11 is used quite frequently especially during high peak business hours and needs to run every half hour, not 45 mins or 60 mins. If I have to use transportation I access ride sharing companies such as Lyft, which can be a financial burden after awhile. I am requesting that this request be part of your presentation to the Board of Directors. I am requesting that the bus route 11 for North Natomas runs every 30 minutes. I am also requesting that the bus route travel further/deeper into the heavily populated residential areas of North Natomas. I hope this statement is taken into serious consideration. *(Angela Herring-Jackson, e-mail, #66114)*

Response: Thank you for your comments about the SacRT Forward project, specifically your suggestions for Route 11. For revised information on all of the proposed changes, please visit our page with the most recent revisions: <http://www.sacrt.com/apps/wp-content/uploads/Summary-Revised-190218.pdf>.

Route 13 – Northgate

Please do not cut bus 13 on North Market Blvd. Please keep the 6:23 and 7:23 and the 8:23. I work in the old kings arena by the coke company. I take bus 6 to 16th lit rail then lit rail to Arden Del Paso then take 13 to work. Please keep the bus 6 also. I do not drive I leave by the Zoo. *(Carol Nelson, e-mail, #64993)*

You have not only make it more difficult for many non students to get to work, but have changed the other routes that affect our lives. ARC students aren't the only ones who need the bus to get where they need to go and rerouting the bus routes and sending them to ARC was unnecessary. I know our comments are only a formality, since you intend to do what you're going to do regardless of them. *(Natalie Loreda, e-mail, #65396)*

I urge you not to reduce service on the 6 bus line to peak only. I am blind and we the 6 bus to get downtown for many meetings and activities. Reducing service on the 6 line would impose a significant hardship on me. *(Ralph Black, e-mail, #66030)*

My husband and I both have disabilities and are senior citizens as well. The number 6 bus is the closest to our home and the one we need to go to downtown. We are both involved in numerous Committees and Boards which meet during the day for part of the day. Having the #6 only be peak times would pose a significant safety problem for us. It also would make it very hard to get downtown for these meetings, for other business, or to transfer to other busses during the day. Please do NOT reduce the #6 to peak times only. *(Catherine Campisi, e-mail, #66026)*

I really do not understand why RT would discontinue the Bus 13 route when so many people use it in the morning. Every morning the bus is completely full, there are no empty seats. Most of the riders that I know work at Department of Consumer Affairs and the Department of Fish and Wildlife. If you discontinue the Bus 13 route, it will be a hardship for many. When I leave the office and take the Bus 13 to Del Paso/Arden, again it's full. For people trying to do the right thing and take public transportation, by taking away the route would be a disservice for many. I avoid the bumper to bumper commute and park my car at the RT station, take the lightrail in, then the bus. Using the bus / lightrail is environmentally the correct thing to do. With discontinuing the Bus 13 route, it's like setting us for failure and I will be back driving into work. I hope you listen to reason and you don't already have your mind made up. Please continue the Bus 13 route. *(Paul Roberts, e-mail, #65754)*

I currently take the 6:57 am bus 13 from Truxel & Gateway Park and get off at the corner of National Drive. Will the bus stop on National Drive be discontinued with the new proposed changes? *(Tammy Hackman, e-mail, #64878)*

Response: Thank you for your interest in the SacRT Forward bus network redesign project. The proposed change to Route 13 would eliminate the existing service on Northgate Blvd., between San

Juan Rd. and N. Market Blvd., and would also eliminate service on N. Market Blvd. and National Drive, which is a largely industrial service area. Instead, the route will operate on San Juan Blvd. to Truxel Road, and extend north to Del Paso Road, providing service to two high schools (Natomas HS and Inderkum HS), a library (Natomas library), and a junior college (ARC). This change would move the nearest Route 13 bus stop from National Drive to Truxel and Arena Blvd (approximately 0.5 mile), and essentially moves the existing service from a low-density area to a higher-density area. The advantage of this proposed change will not only provide access to more destinations, but it will also improve the frequency from every 60 minutes, to every 45 minutes, and will add Saturday and Sunday service, as well.

Just recently I happen to look at the Draft Networks and it looks like it gonna impact me very negatively. I have been using RT Route #13 everyday for last 8 years to commute. I work in Natomas near National Dr and North Market. With the new purposed #13, I won't have RT service near me. I have no idea why new #13 is getting routed for most of the route already going to be serviced by #86 and #11. I would like to see #13 continue to go straight on Northgate Blvd all the way to Del Paso road and then to the purposed new area. It does make sense to me. If you look at the new draft network there is large area in Natomas not serviced by RT. Will SmartRide RT coming up in Natomas area anytime sooner? (*Ajay Tandukar, e-mail, #64918*)

Response: Thank you for your interest in the SacRT Forward project. We appreciate you taking the time to review the proposed changes, and we value your input. The proposed change to Route 13 on Northgate between San Juan and N. Market is primarily due to that segment of the route being in a largely industrial area with low density. Moving the route over to Truxel allows us to serve a corridor with higher density, extending to two high schools, a library, and a junior college. Although the Route 13 may not run directly in front of where you work, the N. Market and National Drive area will continue to be served by not only one route, but two bus routes (the 11 and the 13) at the Truxel/Arena bus stop approximately 1/2 mile away. The proposed change to Route 13 also includes improvements to frequency from every 60 minutes to every 45 minutes, as well as having new service on the weekends. Thank you again for sending your feedback. Your comments will be included in the public record, and presented to the Board of Directors for their review and consideration.

Please do not change this route!!! With this new route coming soon, too many people will lose their main stream of transportation to get to work. I cannot afford using Lyft \$20 morning and another \$20 in afternoon to get from home to work and vice versa. That is too expensive and cannot afford Lyft on daily basis. I live in Carmichael. This changes will force me to no longer be able to take Bus 13 route (that is currently running), if this new route takes place. It will make me super late to work. My shift is 6:45am - 4PM. It is my only means of transportation. This route is the reason I took a promotional position, because I was guaranteed to make it to work on time. Being late is not acceptable! Having no other means of transportation is hard. My legs are what gets me to work right now. Changing my only way to get to work is stressing me out !!! This new route does not make sense??? It will force me to rush getting a car, and not use RT services at all!!! Walking from Arena & Truxel will make me at least 40 minutes to 1 hour late to work everyday. I cannot afford to get fired because I can no longer be at work on time. Our late/absent policy will not allow me to use this route if I want to be on time to work. Please note that other people who use this current route to get to work will be greatly affected in a negative way, because they also use same time & route as I do to get to work by 7AM (Monday - Friday). Now, I can at least make it to work by 7AM with current route. New route will force me to get a car & stop buying monthly Sac RT pass. Possibly relocate to a new job closer to home. If I get a bike, what will happen when the bike racks get full on bus (on new route)? Because I'm sure a lot of current riders will be forced to get one to make it to work on time that early in the morning. Is there a possibility to provide a smaller bus (like Paratransit uses)? (*Kiki Soqui, e-mail, #64923*)

Response: Thank you for sending us your comments about the proposed changes to Route 13. The changes to this route are primarily due to the segment along Northgate between San Juan and N. Market being in a largely industrial area with low density. Moving the route over to Truxel allows us to serve a corridor with higher density, and allows us to extend the route to two high schools, a library, and a junior college. If you currently work along N. Market, the closest bus stop will be at Truxel and

Arena, which is approximately 1/2 mile from N. Market and National Drive. This may create a longer walk than you are used to, but it does provide you with more service on a more frequent basis; Route 13 will operate every 45 minutes instead of every 60 minutes, and the Route 11 will also serve that stop. Additionally, this change will allow us to add weekend service to the Route 13. Paratransit service may be an option for you if you are currently unable to walk to/from the bus stop because of a disability or health-related condition. Thank you again for your comments. They will be included in the public record, and presented to the Board of Directors for their review and consideration.

I have been one of your loyal riders since my department relocated to Natomas from S and Alhambra! The State of California supports and encourages employees to ride public transportation, and those of us who have chosen to Park and Ride, are now being faced with the #13 being cut from our well needed routes. I travel among County workers, privately owned business employees, State workers from my Department, and Consumer Affairs employees etc. that will be left without a connection from the #11 to the #13. There also are some that transfer from the light rail, at Del Paso and Florin which the proposed #13 cuts would leave them out of the loop completely. I begin my travels along with others, at Southland Park and Florin Rd at #62 5:50 to Downtown J & 3rd to transfer to # 11 at 6:36, to Natomas-transfer to the #13 at 6:57 to my job 1740 N. Market. I can't imagine why you would even consider cutting the #13 route down Truxel to Arena -N. Market when it's Home to State agencies, County Agencies, Natomas School District and many Commercial and private agencies? You have some riders that out of their dismay are considering using Lyft's new offer of 30 rides for a set amount per month! While a few have car payments and may find Lyft's price unreasonable, there are those that will have no other options. Although riding RT can be a challenge at times- trying to make connections, and sometimes the cleanliness of the bus (which has improved greatly), all in all -riding RT can be an enjoyable experience by meeting others - (Bus Buddies) and what would be a stressful drive can be left in the hands of your very Professional Operators. I truly hope that you will re-consider this change, because it will create a hardship for many of your loyal riders. Thank you. *(Sally J. Howard, e-mail, #64946)*

Response: Thank you for sending us your comments about the proposed changes to Route 13. The changes to this route are primarily due to the segment along Northgate between San Juan and N. Market being in a largely industrial area with low density. Moving the route over to Truxel allows us to serve a corridor with higher density, and allows us to extend the route north to two high schools, a library, and a junior college. Although the Route 13 is proposed not to run along N. Market, the closest bus stop at Truxel and Arena (1/2 mile from National Drive) will be served by both Route 11 and Route 13, which could potentially eliminate the need to transfer. This may create a longer walk than you are used to, but it does provide more service on a more frequent basis, with both routes operating every 45 minutes instead of every 60 minutes. Additionally, this change will allow us to add weekend service to Route 13, and Sunday/Holiday service to Route 11. If you are not able to walk the distance to/from a bus stop due to a disability or health-related condition, you may be eligible for paratransit service. Thank you again for your comments. They will be included in the public record, and presented to the Board of Directors for their review and consideration.

I have recently been informed of the proposed changes to the 13 line. I'd like to submit for consideration my thoughts. As a state worker who has been riding this line for the past 3-4 years to the Department of Consumer Affairs, located at 1625 North Market Blvd., the bus stops right in front of our building at present. We have several employees who depend on this bus to get to and from work, at least two (2) are disabled, to re-route this line close to a mile away from our office would be very disheartening. Additionally, on this route there are at least 25 passengers that depend on the North Market route to get to and from work daily. May I suggest considering a peak run for the morning and evening runs, ie 623am/723am/823am departures from Arden Del Paso, respectively on the afternoon departures from Truxel Road 356pm/456pm/556pm. With this schedule, workers would still be able to get to their employers without too much stress. I understand since the departure of the Pride facility, ridership is down on this route, but the North Market Blvd. route is still very much needed. Thank you for your consideration. *(Deborah Wells, e-mail, #64977)*

I was informed this morning that the bus route for the #13 is being rerouted so it will not run on N. Market Blvd any longer. I really hope this is not true. There are a number of state employees and others that

work in the area along the #13 route around N. Market Blvd/National Blvd. The buses are full on the 6:23 am and 7:23 am #13 routes for N. Market Blvd due to the number of state employees that work in the area. It would be very inconvenient to many people to have the bus rerouted to Truxel Ave. and having to walk a distance to get to their office buildings. Currently, the bus stops right in front of the state buildings. It is VERY dark in the early morning and dangerous for those that would have to walk such a long distance. I would have to walk alone early in the morning, which is not safe considering that the state office buildings are located in an industrial area. Please consider, if there must be a change in routing for the #13, making the bus route a direct route along N. Market Blvd. Maybe making that route between 6 am to 9 am and 3 pm to 6 pm an express bus specifically for commuters to the North Natomas/N. Market Blvd area. Otherwise, this change will have a huge impact on several state workers and may cause you to loose ridership because we will have no other choice but to find other alternatives. A response from you would be greatly appreciated. It would also be greatly appreciated if someone from Sac RT could reach out to the State departments that are on or near North Market Blvd to get a response from us or better yet have a representative come ride the bus with all of us at 6:23 and 7:23 am/evening routes, so you can see that we do utilize the #13 North Market a significantly. Rerouting the #13 North Market would be majorly inconvenient to an already inconvenient area (there are not enough buses that service South Natomas to get to North Natomas). Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter. *(Tamika L. Byrd, e-mail, #65001)*

I take bus 13 and my stop is north market this is my only means to getting to work if im unable to take the bus to work i will not be able to keep my house or provide for my family.This will be a very a very bad idea for those of us that use the bus to get to our jobs. *(Rodney Vargas, e-mail, #65002)*

I am writing because I have some questions about the proposed changes to route 13. I work for the Department of Fish and Wildlife and my office is on this route. As it currently stands, this is the only route that goes down N. Market Blvd and stops close enough to my office where I can walk and get to work on time in a reasonable fashion. My current commute consists of taking the 1 from Auburn to the light rail at Watt/I-80 to Arden/Del Paso where I catch the 13. The proposed changes would have me either having to catch the 88 to the 11 and walking an extra 15 minutes to my office or taking the light rail to catch the 11 downtown which could potentially add an extra 30 minutes to my commute. Several of my coworkers in my office and in the other state offices in the area also utilize route 13 to commute to work and in my opinion the impact of having this bus rerouted will incur a loss of ridership. Would it be possible for an express route between 6:30-7:30 am and again from 4-5 pm? Or perhaps a representative could ride with us to see that this route is utilized by and that the proposed changes do have the potential to be devastating to commuters. *(Anntrenia Threatt, e-mail, #65017)*

Is it true that you are rerouting bus 13 to Truxel and not having it run on N. Market Blvd? The reason I am asking is because you have more than several state employees and other employees that ride this bus and really utilize N. Market Blvd on what is currently your 6:23 am and 7:23 am bus. Is there a way that for these 2 bus times you could have the bus go down North Market Blvd? With you stopping the bus from going down North Market you may lose several riders me being one of them. It will be a great inconvenience if I have to change the route I take currently (Bus 13 which drops me right in front of the job) to take Bus 88 from Arden to transfer to Bus 11 to take it to Truxel (By Wal Mart) and then have to walk 15 minutes to my job. There are many that ride the 13 at the two times mentioned above. Can you make an express route to go down N. Market at 6:23 am and 7:23 am and then at 4 and 5 in the evening? This change will have a huge impact on several state workers and may cause you to loose ridership because we will have no other choice but to drive ourselves in, for those of us who have vehicles or can drive. I currently use Bus 13, and 93 and the light rail. A response from you would be greatly appreciated. You could reach out to the State departments that are on or near North Market Blvd to get a response from us or better yet have a representative come ride the bus with all of us at 6:23 and 7:23 am so you can see that we do utilize North Market a lot and by you cutting North Market out of this route would be devastating. *(Michelle R. Diaz, e-mail, #65031)*

Please I beg you not to change the route 13 buss, that is only my way to work and I don't drive this route is very important to at least 20 people that ride this buss the rout buss #13 starts At Arden and DI Paso to Truxel and dropping off few us right on North Market Blvd were our State building is, even if we took #11

buss we will still have to walk two blocks and we will late to work every day. So please we are begging you do not change buss 13 or take it out. We need transportation to work and from that's were Rt comes in to help us get to work and from if you take or cancel routes what's the use ridding Rt. Please reconsider. Also if we can't to work and we won't need connect cards and you will just lose more money. *(Maria Chavez, e-mail, #65049)*

Please reconsider altering the current route of Bus 13. RT should strongly consider the fact that there are many people who work along the current route of Bus 13 and they rely heavily on it's reliability in getting to work and returning home at the end of each business day. Perhaps making Bus 13 just an Express Route for Bus 13 to go onto North Market Blvd. at 6:23 am and 7:23 am and at 4 and 5 on the way home. You guys have a lot of people that use this route at that time to get to work on North Market. I know this route is slowing during the day and that is why I am asking kindly that you guys consider an express bus for us. Many state workers use this bus to get to work at the Department of Consumer Affairs Headquarters. Us state workers use it to get to work. Please really consider an express bus for Bus 13. *(David Jones, e-mail, #65051)*

There are many early morning workers including myself that ride this bus t and from work. Please don't mess with it. *(Craig Clement, e-mail, #65052)*

Good afternoon, It is my understanding that bus 13 is going to be re-routed and will no longer be traveling to North Market. Why is that? Do you know how many people will be affected by this change? What are people suppose to do that rely on this bus route to get to work? Lots of people rely on this route to support their families and this is their livelihood! These people may not have any other means of transportation and you are taking that away from them. Some of these people are unable to get any kind of assistance from welfare or any other government agencies. What do you expect them to do? *(Kristina Vargas, e-mail, #65056)*

This email serves as public comment relative to the published proposed changes for Bus Route 13. Specifically, I use this route to connect from Light Rail at Arden Del Paso to my place of employment located at 1747 North Market Blvd, Sacramento CA 95834, which is the State of California/Department of Consumer Affairs. My residence is located near Florin & Freeport in Sacramento CA 95834. My average commute time is one hour, forty minutes each way. So on a daily basis, I spend three hours and twenty minutes commuting to work. This adds up to 16 hours and forty minutes each week. SO YOUR PROPOSED CHANGES WILL IMPACT MY LIFE SIGNIFICANTLY. Two Bus, One train (Route 81 to Blue Line to Route 13). Route 13 has enabled me to have the most direct commute using RT services. When RT eliminated the 6:53 AM run from the 13, I was forced to start earlier to meet my 7AM start time. Route 11 as the solution - There are occasions that I rely on Bus Route 11 to take me to Natomas, where I exit at Truxel and Arena, then walk the remaining way to Gateway Park and North Market. I do this primarily in the morning (when the weather is nice) since the Route 11 tends to be more stable than during the evening commute. While this may be an option for me to get my exercise, those along North Market and down to Northgate, don't have that luxury. I have been utilizing RT for over three years now and the Route 11 is almost never on time. You certainly can't set your watch to it and I have had previous complaints where the morning driver would leave 3rd & J before he was supposed to, making a connection from the light rail at 9th & K, a marathon sprint. I like to have a back-up plan on getting to work. RT reliability has affected my commuting plans and back-up plans over the past three years. Options to Consider - State of California and other Natomas employees need to have service that will take them to North Market between Arena & Northgate. An option would be to run the 13 from 6-9 AM and 3-6 PM. Another option would be to utilize Jibe Express from the connection points to the Market Blvd corridor for the AM and PM commutes. The Department of Consumer Affairs is planning to move to a new state facility in 2024-2025. That leaves five years that its employees need to get to work. Please take this into consideration, outside of the business model, when determining the best routes for the Natomas area. *(Dean Fairbanks, e-mail, #65077)*

I would really like to take the time to stress to you all how much changing Bus Route 13 to not go onto North Market will not only affect my way to get to work but several other people. At least 20 or more. If you stop the bus from going down North Market many of us will have no choice but to stop riding

RT. We will have no choice but to find other ways to get to work. If I take the bus to Truxel I will have to walk 15 minutes to work regardless of the weather or find another way to get to work besides using SACRT. Using SACRT has been a great experience and I really would like to continue to ride it. I wish instead of cutting bus 13 and stopping me from getting to work, cut some of the route such as stop it from turning down National and making a loop back around to North Market. Have the route go straight down North Market. That will still allow us all to get to work and possibly free up some time for you to go another direction after the bus turns off of North Market. If this is not a solution you could also make bus 13 an express route that leaves Arden/Del Paso at 6:23 and 7:23 am and then an express route headed towards Arden/Del Paso at 4 and 5 pm. I am asking you to kindly reconsider cutting our route. Take the time to ask the current bus drivers about our route especially at 6:23 and 7:23 am. They will tell you. We are a great group of people honestly just trying to make an honest dollar and get to work utilizing SacRT. (*John A. Hicks, e-mail, #65097*)

Please do not stop the bus route through North market in Natomas Sacramento area!!!! many state workers need that route in order to get to their work place !!! stopping at Truxel only will make them walk for another 20-25 minutes which is so inconvenient and not safe especially during winter time when it gets dark!!! please do not stop THE BUS route!! Keep it the same!!! (*Tania Bordei, e-mail, #65181*)

I am one of the many employees at the California department of Consumer affairs headquarters that rides the bus to commute. I would propose that the changes would maintain the current route 723am 823 a.m. leave times from light rail in the 356 and 456 leave times from gateway Park. I understand that the bus is empty during the afternoon times because this is an industrial area but not during these two inbound and outbound times from arden light rail station. (*Kenneth Cooke, e-mail, #65212*)

I really do not understand why RT would discontinue the Bus 13 route when so many people use it in the morning. Every morning the bus is completely full, there are no empty seats. Most of the riders that I know work at Department of Consumer Affairs and the Department of Fish and Wildlife. If you discontinue the Bus 13 route, it will be a hardship for many. When I leave the office and take the Bus 13 to Del Paso/Arden, again it's full. For people trying to do the right thing and take public transportation, by taking away the route would be a disservice for many. I avoid the bumper to bumper commute and park my car at the RT station, take the lightrail in, then the bus. Using the bus / lightrail is environmentally the correct thing to do. With discontinuing the Bus 13 route, it's like setting us for failure and I will be back driving into work. I hope you listen to reason and you don't already have your mind made up. Please continue the Bus 13 route. (*Paul Roberts, e-mail, #65754*)

Response: We are still looking at the proposed change for Route 13, and the ridership along segments that are proposed for elimination. None of the proposed changes have been presented to the Board for their approval yet, we are still working on the route design, and are considering comments from our riders throughout the process. Thank you very much for your input on this project. We value all of the feedback we are getting, and will be presenting all of the public comments to our Board of Directors prior to any decision being made.

There are rumors that they will be eliminating the route for Bus #13 in the Summertime. This should not happen, there are many employees of the Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Department of Consumer Affairs that ride that bus and take that route. The bus is always full in the morning and when I go home. This will bring plenty of hardship for many state workers. Please continue the Bus 13 route. I enjoy taking public transportation and it eliminates commuting to work. I would have to drive from Elk Grove to Natomas to get to work and the commute is horrendous, that is why I enjoy taking the light rail and bus. Please do not stop the Bus 13 route, otherwise I will be driving to work again, every day. (*Paul Roberts, e-mail, #64974*)

My name is Veronica Williams and I have been riding the bus since I was 17 years old. I am now 27 years and I am still here riding the bus. The 13 bus shouldn't be cut the way it is proposed. If you cut the bus route at San Juan Road, then I would have to walk 15 minutes from San Juan Road to and from northgate and Rosin Court every day. Where I work there is a school called Hazel Mahone College Prep

and there are parents who take the 13 bus every day to drop and pick up their children. If you stop the 13 from going through this route, then parents would have to walk their children 15 minutes back and forth from school every day (even in the rain) to make sure that their kids get to school every day. Please consider these things when changing the bus schedule and route for the 13. This is the only bus that gets me to and from work every day along with working with those students that their parents drop them off at school. *(Veronica Williams, e-mail, #65454)*

Do not cancel #13 to Northgate & Market. Many of us catch the bus to get to work and we will not be able to get to work without that bus line. I'm begging you not to cancel down to Northgate & Market. *(Polly Hubbard, e-mail, #65781)*

I don't see any consideration of the impact on riders with disabilities and mobility issues. My sister is developmentally disabled and does not drive, so public transportation is her only option. Currently it takes over an hour to get from our home (Bus 6) to her workplace on N. Market Blvd. (Bus 13). She has to take light rail in between the buses. The only positive is that she has minimal walking. She has physical limitations and walks very slowly. I'm sure the other route cuts will have similar impacts on other people like my sister. Your proposed changes eliminate bus service to her building would require her to walk a half mile on a busy street. This would take her at least 30 minutes and isn't safe. Sacramento is trying to become a world class city. We will never make until we have a world class transportation system for ALL citizens. We need a reliable and safe public transportation system that covers all of Sacramento. We should be embarrassed by our current public transportation system, and you're proposing to make it worse. If SacRT is trying to make sure they are the transportation system for only those who have no other option, you're doing a great job. *(Sharon Nelson, e-mail, #65936)*

Route 15 – Rio Linda/O St.

There are ppl who work on this route (Richards) and you have ppl who go to greyhound. I don't like to ride light rail and this route to downtown is convenient and there are a lot of workers in morn and eve who utilize 15 bus. *(Tania Burke, e-mail, #65093)*

Patron stated lots of people use Route #15 and it will create an inconvenience if eliminate route south of Arden Del Paso Station. Patron suggests to run it during morning and afternoon peak periods. *(Jeffrey Jemmott, phone, #64512)*

I know a lot of people who use this line to get to Richards blvd as well as downtown. This suggested change to shorten the route just adds more trouble for the riders and would be appreciated if you kept the line as it is. The bus shows up on time and makes it to its destination at a consistent pace and I see no reason to change it otherwise. *(Kunal Prasad, e-mail, #65812)*

The existing route is used by a number of people who are not used to transferring from bus to light rail and back, and will need assistance and education in order to use the new route that terminates at Arden/Del Paso light rail rather than downtown. *(Sacramento transit Advocates and Riders – STAR, e-mail, #66068)*

Route 19 – Rio Linda

When will the new bus route start and what hours will it still come to watt I-80 going north how close will I be able to get him close to elverta elementary school at 7900 Eloise ave. *(Bertha Owens, e-mail, #64963)*

Response: Thank you for contacting Regional Transit. No decisions or adoption of changes has occurred for route 19. RT will be gathering public and rider feedback through mid-February. The Board will receive the revised network design at their regular board meeting on February 25th. Any changes would take effect minimum 90 days after approval.

I have heard the disturbing news that you are planning on discontinuing Route 19 that goes to the Rio Linda area. This route is essential to this area for all...including our youth. I know many high schoolers and jr high students that rely on this route. I also know some adults that need this route to get to and from work. Please reconsider this plan. *(Melissa Saldivar, e-mail, #65823)*

Response: Sent updated draft network information with revisions to proposed changes for Route 19.

My name Cecilia Gonzales. I am a senior class officer at Rio Linda High School. It has been brought to my attention by concerned members of my community that there is voting for bus 19 (to Rio Linda and Elverta Area) to be discontinued. I am a witness to many of my classmates and peers getting on that bus everyday after school. Every day as I walk to my practices, I see students waiting for the bus to pick them up. Discontinuing this bus could have a negative impact on more than just the students on my campus but people in my community. I hope that you will reconsider discontinuing this bus. Thank you for your time. *(Celia Gonzales, e-mail, #65856)*

Response: Sent updated draft network information with revisions to proposed changes for Route 19.

I am writing about the proposed discontinuation of the rio linda/elverta route by bus #19. I am against this discontinuation of the route that serves my community as it is a major source of transportation for some kids to get to school including my own and for many other people I know. This route has been around well before I used it myself as a student and it should remain in place otherwise it would leave hundreds of people without transportation. I hope sac rt reconsiders this. *(Jessica Prater, e-mail, #65859)*

Response: Sent updated draft network information with revisions to proposed changes for Route 19.

I ask that you please reconsider discontinuing bus #19 to the Rio Linda/Elverta area. There are so many students and working adults that would be affected by the decision to stop this route. Before I learned how to drive, everyday I depended on this route to make it to work to support my family. There are students who depend on it to go to school and I have an aunt who is 53 years old and to this day does not know how to drive so she depends on #19 to make it to work also, as well as many other members of this community. Whether it's to go to work, school, doctor's appointment or even do some grocery shopping there are so many of us in this community who depend on bus #19 so please find it in your heart to reconsider this and do not discontinue bus 19. Thank You so much for your time , have a blessed day. *(Veronica Rosas, e-mail, #66002)*

Response: Sent updated draft network information with revisions to proposed changes for Route 19.

I would like to express my deep concern in the discontinuation of bus 19. My Mother rides this bus to and from work every day. She does not and cannot drive. She highly depends on this bus and so do many others. Please do not discontinue this bus route. There are so many people in the Rio Linda and Elverta area including the elderly, disabled, and school children that depend on this bus to get around. Thank you Sac RT for everything you do for our community and thank you so much for your consideration. *(Christina Sazo, e-mail, #66004)*

Response: Sent updated draft network information with revisions to proposed changes for Route 19.

Please do not discontinue bus #19 in Rio Linda/Elverta. This would negatively effect young people, students and the working class in this community, as this is the best mode of transport for many. This group struggles enough to keep food on the table and bellies full. Taking a mode of transport away would add to their daily struggle. Please reconsider. Thank you. *(Samantha Keyes, e-mail, #65861)*

Response: Sent updated draft network information with revisions to proposed changes for Route 19.

I've learned that bus #19 Rio Linda route is going to be up for a vote to be discontinued. I would like to Express there is a great need for this bus route to continue and hope you'll vote to keep in going. It is

essential for many high school students as well as many others. It is also very beneficial to our local businesses. I myself have used it several times. *(Tammy Corbus, e-mail, #65863)*

Response: Sent updated draft network information with revisions to proposed changes for Route 19.

Please don't take Bus route 19 away. That is the only bus route that really goes into the city of Rio Linda. Many parents & kids will be impacted by this if SacRT takes the route away. Many ppl depend on that bus route. Please reconsider. *(Linda Lor, e-mail, #65993)*

Response: Sent updated draft network information with revisions to proposed changes for Route 19.

As a senior in high school, I am supportive of adding bus stops near Rio Americano high school and surrounding neighborhoods. I think that increasing the use of public transportation would leave a lasting impact on the way students view fuel and the environment. Making public transportation more accessible and safe for students would definitely help to reduce traffic and increase attendance in schools. *(Meg Snyder, e-mail, #66085)*

Response: Sent updated draft network information with revisions to proposed changes for Route 19.

I drive this route every day, why taking it off of Elverta Rd... you are saying screw you to a Wheelchair Veteran, and some students I pick up on Elverta.....I'm disappointed.... Why can't you just leave it the way it is, just take Watt Avenue off of this route???? That would make MORE sense! And a lot of people will be upset and disappointed... SMH.... So determined to change this route... *(Scott Whittlesey, e-mail, #66089)*

Please vote on keeping Bus 19! This Bus is really needed by the community. We have students that use it to get to school and people who use it to get to work daily. This would impact our community in a negative way. It's a safe clean way for us to get to Light rail, down town and home again. Please re-evaluate the impact it will have on our community if you discontinue Bus # 19. For a lot of us it's our only way of transportation in the community. Please reconsider. *(Tammy M. Gonzales, e-mail, #66036)*

Response: Sent updated draft network information with revisions to proposed changes for Route 19.

I would like you to please reconsider discontinuing bus 19. I use bus 19 to get to work being that I do not have a vehicle at the moment. If the bus 19 is to be discontinued it would put a lot of residents out of transportation that live in Rio Linda. They would no longer be able to get to work or to any other activities that they may have going on in their lives. I hope that you can reconsider it. *(Karina Richardson, e-mail, #66029)*

Response: Sent updated draft network information with revisions to proposed changes for Route 19.

Regarding Route #19 We support continuing service with a route that would include Rio Linda High School and continue on to connect with the Watt Ave Bus route, and return to the start of the route. *(Ridership for the Masses – RFTM, e-mail, #66078)*

I recollect hearing something about taking the 19 out of service. My disabled son uses it every day so I'm quite concerned about it. Can I get some information about that? *(Robin Gates, e-mail, #66152)*

Response: Sent updated draft network information.

Route 21 – Sunrise/Citrus Heights

#21, proposed change to cut out the first three runs in the morning. She uses the #21 at Old Fair Oaks in the morning. *(Cindy Nugent, e-mail, #65124)*

(Bonnie Lindemann, phone, #64746) FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES

Route 22 – Arden

Please keep buses 22, 23, 25, 67, 68; on the 22 from Arden Del Paso need to get to Arden and Morse Ave. hearing aid doctor. On the 23 need to get to Arden mall to catch buses 67 and 68 to Kaiser point west doctors. And also need to get to Madison and San Juan for an appointment. On the 25 need to get from Marconi Arcade light rail to Marconi and Watt and on the other side is eye doctors. And need to get to Madison and Dewey for an appointment. *(Carol Nelson, e-mail, #65060)*

Response: Thank you for your comments. From Arden/Del Paso to Arden & Morse, under the new system, you would have to take Route 23 to Arden Fair Mall and transfer to Route 68, but the new Route 68 will be every half hour; whereas Route 22 is only once an hour today, so in some cases, you may find this faster. For reaching doctor offices around Kaiser Point West, you will still want the #67/68 from Arden Fair Mall, same as today. The new Route 25 will still go from Marconi/Arcade directly to Marconi and Watt every 30 minutes, same as today as well.

Route 23 – El Camino

I am greatly affected by the proposed change of route 23. Looking at the plan, I don't see the reason why eliminating Ethan way route would make the trip shorter, slightly as you even describe it. Howe avenue is more congested than Ethan way and still #87 will be running that way so i don't see the need of number 23 going through Howe also. In my observation as I always take route number 23, a lot of residents along Ethan way and neighboring Swanston and students from Leo Palmiter high school take this bus route. You will require them to walk all the way to Howe Ave? Another reason is that it has been so convenient for a number of senior citizens riding this bus along Ethan way to take number 23 from Ethan way. It would really make it difficult for them to walk all the way to Howe ave from Ethan just to get a bus ride. I hope you consider this and thank you. *(Joseph Anthony Otayza, e-mail, #65991)*

Please do not reroute the existing route 23 schedule! Only just learned about the proposed changes from another upset commuter on my route. I live up the street on Fair Oaks Blvd. up from Manzanita and need easy, continued access on Fair Oaks Blvd. I depend on to get me to work and back home. There are no covered bus stops as it is and would not be convenient during Sacramento's two seasons of hot, humid summers and cold, wet winters to walk several blocks up and down the hill just to get to work daily. The other issue is I really need the transport in the other direction to access stores on the way on San Juan and to frequent Citrus Heights Shopping Mall. The SmartRide would be ridiculous as the area is too large, and if anything like Dial-A-Ride you can forget it. Not convenient at all. Are you trying to force folks back into cars or serve the public needs as not everyone needs to head to American River College? I'm sure many people that dependent on this route are unaware of this proposed change? Why do we pay so much fare for lack of service? Concerned commuter who depends on reliable transportation service. *(Patricia Sanano, e-mail, #64857)*

I am a 61 year old woman that cannot afford a vehicle to get around. I have some minor health issues which require me to go to one doctor monthly and another quarterly. I live one street off of San Juan Avenue in Fair Oaks and I need the 23 bus to connect to 21 to Roseville for one and the 28 to Rancho Cordova for the other. If needed I can walk up the hill to catch the 25 to get to my labs and onto my connections but it's becoming a problem as I now have pulmonary issues. If you take the Fair Oaks and Sunrise stops out of these routes I will be cut off from my doctors, any part time work I can get, dining and shopping. The 25 goes past a major hospital and many medical offices and the 23 goes past a popular high school. I know many people that ride the 23 to get to work between Carmichael and Citrus Heights that will be greatly affected by the closing of the Sunrise transfer station. I was under the impression that when Mr. Li was elected he wanted to fix what was wrong with RT but this is going to make it worse for many of us. This will harm more than help the system. Maybe if you hired more competent operators (you have some that are real pieces of work) and cleaned the buses once in a blue moon more people would ride. I would even go for fares going back up. I have heard from one operator that the new hires are being trained to drive the SmartRide and that it is a door to door system. Too bad I can't get a pick up at my home. We've been told we have to walk to the grocery store down the street for that (even though I see SmartRide buses drive past our house often). I see them becoming like Paratransit where you are on the

schedule of other riders and don't have a timetable so you aren't really sure when you will get to your destination. I used to ride with my disabled mother to her many appointments and the amount of times we sat for hours waiting to be picked up was ridiculous and the price was too. I have been riding buses since the 1980's and I feel this is the worst decision you could make. You are cutting us off at the knees. I also don't want to lose the best operator ever #2459 Levi. Who of the four of you would like to get me to my appointments and such? Also it would have been nice if you would have posted that changes like this were being considered. Maybe if you had postings on the buses about the meetings instead of just the downtown ice rink more people like me could attend them since you have been working on this for a year and a half. But then you really aren't thinking about the people who actually ride the bus, now are you. I hope this makes you stop and think again about this mistake you are about to make. *(Katherine Brothers, e-mail, #65864)*

Response: Sent updated draft network information with revisions to proposed changes for Route 23.

PLEASE do not change bus 23! There are MANY people living and using RT along Ethan way. For me, I am nearly disabled and depend solely on RT for travel. Google maps says I live 4 minutes from my bus stop, it takes me 9, but I gladly do it to continue working. Moving the nearest bus stop to Howe Avenue will cause an extreme hardship for myself and many others, and make travel entirely impossible when it is windy and/or rainy, which it does every now and then in Sacramento! Howe Avenue already has a bus line, please don't make it much tougher for many workers to continue with their jobs in an already very economically depressed area. Howe Avenue will continue on just fine without a little extra bus traffic, but a lot of the dollars currently being spent there will leave along with the employed status of people no longer able to go to work. *(Fergie, e-mail, #65860)*

Response: Sent updated draft network information with revisions to proposed changes for Route 23.

Just on the surface this will totally change my activities. It may mean I'm back behind the wheel. Can't see how waiting an hour for a SmartRide pickup to get to a transfer will ever be an improvement. Will wait for the final plans. *(Cheryl Jones, e-mail, #65790 & 65796)*

I saw that you had posted a list of bus routes on various numbers of bus stop cover /overhangs with the list of bus route cut backs, eliminations. I can say from taking the bus as much as I have since living in Sacramento County many people within the general public within both the city, County of Sacramento - The public, visitors that live, visit city, County will always & have always depended on the reliability of RT & - Its buses to get them where they want to, need to get to at different hours of each, every day both while working, looking for work/ employment, meeting friends, family, going out with friends, family to many different places for birthday celebrations, hanging out, going out to dinner or lunch, more. Cutting back, eliminating routes like 23 cutting back 25 cutting back 80 eliminating) -To start you will be overwhelmed with many of the riders that take those bus lines to the mall, and many other places. For example 23& 25 Del Paso Light rail to Sunrise Mall - Those are two routes equal to bus 01 & 21 are depended upon, reliable to many of the riders that take the bus routes to get to many places even the final stops going both directions to even meet up/ connect with other bus routes, more so cutting them back from going to the mall, on the way to the mall the way that they have done it, to the Del Paso light rail station, to many of the other areas that also connect to other bus lines on the way, at the end of the line of the two bus lines is most effective & logical. Its better to keep them the way the buses are going to, from the mall, to, from the light rail station the way that they have done it, are still doing it. On the case of bus line 80 - If it is rerouted, or eliminated from would force the ridership wait way more longer than they intended to both the 80 & 84. *(Dave Gomez, e-mail, #64920)*

I meet with my Viet Nam Veterans brothers and sisters monthly at Arden Fair Mall. If you cancel Route #23 which goes up and down San Juan Ave to areas of Carmichael and Arden Arcade how is that portion of Citrus Heights going to be served? Thank You. *(Leon Barrow, e-mail, #65248)*

Response: Most of San Juan Ave and that portion of Citrus Heights is covered by Smart Ride. If there are specific addresses, or locations that are in questions, please feel free to forward that information.

Please do not make any changes on route 23 schedule because that would leave people with no transportation from Manzanita and Fair Oaks all the way down Fair Oaks to San Juan to Greenback to Sunrise with no transportation. *(Cindy McKinley, phone, #65382)*

Your proposed changes for the line #23 will impact my son as he uses that line to get to work. We live on Birdcage and that's where he picks it up. Your changes would leave him without access. As for the #24 that is the line that I take to work. I realize that SmartRide is available and I use it often. The problem is that it is a RideShare program and you cannot count on it to get to you at a specific time and you cannot depend on it to get you to your destination at a specific time. *(Tracy, e-mail, #64593)*

Response: Thank you for commenting on the SacRT Forward project, and for being a SacRT customer. All of the comments we receive are carefully reviewed and considered throughout the network design process. Your comments pertaining to the potential service changes on Routes 23 and 24, are noted for the record, and will be shared with the Board of Directors for their review and consideration, as well. Fortunately, on-demand services, such as Smart Ride, may continue to be a coverage option for low-ridership areas that do not currently have enough demand for a fixed-route bus. It is SacRT's goal to promote and improve access in the Sacramento region by providing safe, reliable, and fiscally responsible transit service, which includes fixed-route bus and light rail service, as well as on-demand Transit service. Thank you again for your feedback on the project, and for your continued patronage.

I am writing because I am very distraught after seeing your plans for the Route 23 line. I noticed that San Juan Ave to Fair Oaks Blvd section has been eliminated. I have also noticed there is no replacement for that section. I live in that section (Fair Oaks & San Juan) and take the 23 bus to and from work every day. I actually moved there for that very reason. Please reconsider this elimination. There are plenty of people who ride this part of the ride as well. Please advise me on what I can do to get to work and back. *(Christine Hobbs, e-mail, #64400)*

Response: Thank you for sending your feedback regarding the proposed changes to Route 23. The proposed elimination of service east of Fair Oaks Blvd. up to Sunrise Mall (including service on San Juan Ave.) is currently covered by our on-demand service, called Smart Ride.

Thank you for your quick response to my question regarding the proposed elimination of the service east of Fair Oaks Blvd up to Sunrise Mall. Since I live on Fair Oaks Blvd & Hollister Ave I do not see that area covered by the attached Smart Ride map. I also read the information about Smart Ride on the SACRT site and it does not seem like it would be a good option for me to rely on getting back and forth to work every day on a daily basis. There must be some other solution for working individuals like myself who do not drive and are employed on a full time basis and rely on SACRT to get to work and back. In the meantime I have to sit here anxious and distraught wondering what I am going to do in 6 months if this is approved. This is not fair. That section is too large of an area to only have a ride sharing dial a ride to cover it. Please reconsider this decision or at least come up with a better solution than this. *(Christine Hobbs, e-mail, #64400)*

I see that you are asking for input on proposed draft. You are removing bus 23 from San Juan between Madison and Fair Oaks and Fair oaks between San Juan and Manzanita. This impact so many with no alternative. I have ridden the bus at San Juan and Sunset for many years and I am rarely at the stop alone. There are many special needs people, handicap, elderly as well as students. I hope you consider the impact this route change has on so many who depend on this bus for their livelihood, shopping and school. Thanks for considering this. *(Homer Black, e-mail, #64880)*

It appears as if you wish to eliminate Fair Oaks and parts of Citrus Heights, Roseville and Carmichael from RT routes. Can I ask which one of you will taking me to work or family members to dr appts? If it were not for one of my regular bus drivers, I never would have known what you were up to!!!! I am specifically referring to the 23 route whose end at the Sunrise terminal is disappearing. I would like to know when I will need to start walking to work as I do not drive and can't afford a car. I have ridden RT

since the 1970's as a youth and now rely on the service as previously mentioned. I would thank you for lowering the fare, but if this is what it gets me raise it back up. I also see your ongoing interest in the city of Folsom and more frequent weekend light rail times, again forsaking the needs of others. I am so disappointed. Please give me some hope of your attention and response. I vote NO to any changes. (*Liz King, e-mail, #65682*)

I was informed that the route for bus 23 was going to be changed. I wanted to inform someone that my job depends on this route, it is the only line which runs late enough to get me from my job near the Arden Mall to my home near the Sunrise Mall. Any changes to this route would be detrimental to not only myself but several other that use this line on a daily basis. (*Greg Rand, e-mail, #65524*)

I use Route 23 to get from Sunrise Mall to Blumenfeld Dr. 6 days a week. I always get off work at 8pm and the 23 is the only bus I can take to get home. Rerouting of this Route will add an additional 30-40min to an already hour long ride to my job and will require me to also leave my home an hour earlier than I already do. Furthermore with the bus no longer going to Sunrise Mall I am also now stranded at work with no way to get home, all of my coworkers live in different directions than I do and typically leave work up to an hour before me. The cost of using Uber or Lyft is a minimum of \$20 one way, this means using it just to get from work to home would cost me \$120 a week! I don't have the funds to do this hence why I'm sending this email, I formally request that bus Route 23 remain as is. Not only for myself but for the countless other people who use it from Sunrise on who will also be left stranded with no way to get to their jobs, doctor's appointments, or other important stops along the way that are being removed. (*Greg Rand, e-mail, #66027*)

Response: Sent updated draft network information with revisions to proposed changes for Route 23.

I was recently informed by a patient that we see on a regular basis that the bus route (23) connecting crucial medical and pharmacy services with local residents from the Fair Oaks area may soon be cancelled. I wanted to provide feedback that this cancellation will have a potentially catastrophic impact on the health and wellness of an undetermined number of patients, many Seniors and children, that use the route to access life-saving medical attention and medications in the Sunrise and Antelope corridor. Most of these individuals are on some form of government assistance such as Medi-Cal that dictates WHERE a patient can be seen and SacRT is the only access that they have to this. I fully understand the need to balance cost of operations and pruning ineffective practices however, I would strongly urge the committee assigned to streamlining the operation to reconsider cancelling Route 23. (*Ralph Velasquez, e-mail, #65794*)

Response: Sent updated draft network information with revisions to proposed changes for Route 23.

I want to tell you please do not take Bus 23 out San Juan to Sunrise. I take this route to my family house. I am disabled. (*Kelli Morgan, letter, #65877*)

Hello, I am e-mailing in regards to a proposed route change for route #23. I have been using Sacramento Regional Transit almost my whole life and it is a service I count on to get around town to take care of necessities as well as leisure activities. When I choose where I live, I do so with bus service in mind. I moved to an area that the #23 bus service currently services and, for the most part, I am very happy with the service. I live beyond the Fair Oaks/Manzanita junction and the route allows me to traverse town. If the #23 is re-routed, I will have to walk a mile in either direction to take the bus, which is inconvenient for me as someone who has chronic pain. When I use this route, there is often plenty of other people using it as it is on a busy commute with lots of neighborhoods and particularly many multi-family homes. As an alumna to American River College, and a native to Carmichael, I understand the need to have bus service towards to college as well as re-establishing bus service in the city of Carmichael, however, I do not believe re-routing #23 will be of good service. Even though I am considering re-enrolling to American River College, this route change would drastically affect the amount of time it takes to get to the college and how long it takes me to get pretty much anywhere. And now that transfers are being offered again, I will be able to transfer to another line with convenience that I was not afforded these past years without transfers (in which I almost never used the bus as I could not afford to transfer lines). As someone with a

very limited income and someone who chose their home based on the existing route, I would be greatly dissatisfied with your service and I would honestly use it less. And let's be honest, I depend on it and greatly appreciate the existing service. Also, this would greatly reduce the coverage of service throughout Carmichael and Citrus Heights where I see no reason to have redundant streamlining along Manzanita such as Watt Ave. Fair Oaks Blvd is one of the busiest streets in the county and current service accesses San Juan Ave, Winding Way, is within walking distance to a river access, and provides access to the new SmaRTride service in Fair Oaks/Citrus Heights (which I would otherwise not have access to). All of this access would be lost in the proposed re-route. Some suggestions I have are to loop the #25 around ARC and the Mercy San Juan. There is often the same amount of people or less on the #25 along Fair Oaks. Another option, which is already being implemented, would be to lessen the amount of trips to every 45 minutes, although I find this inconvenient, it is better than have next to no service available at all. Even when I did not live along route #23, I still used the line extensively past the Fair Oaks/Manzanita junction. I really feel that the #25 is better suited for re-routing to American River College, as the route is already close to the college. While I understand money and revenue is always a factor, you may very well altogether lose many customers who are residents in these areas from which SacRT would be re-routing lines. Using public transit already costs a lot in regards to time and walking 2 miles round trip for possibly a 10 minutes or so bus ride would be so much out of line that I very well may not use the service altogether and find other transportation services. Thank you so much for your time and consideration regarding this invaluable service. (*Arielle Noel, e-mail, #66025*)

Response: Sent updated draft network information with revisions to proposed changes for Route 23.

(*Carol Nelson, e-mail, #65060*) **FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES**
(*Bonnie Lindemann, phone, #64746*) **FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES**

Route 24 – Madison/Greenback

Customer requesting route 24 not be canceled, this route is his only means of transportation. (*Stanley Brewster, phone, #64667*)

Actually, Friday before this last weekend the male bus driver informed his riders that the #24 bus line is up for a cut of service come June 2019. I am therefore completing this complaint form so as to let Regional Transit know that this #24 bus line is absolutely vital for people most especially students to American River College and Folsom Lake College; and then people that work in Folsom. I believe trying to cut this #24 bus line would say to me that I myself would be directly affected as a student to American River College and that this is very insulting to have Regional Transit now come into Folsom as uniformed drivers to the local bus service of Folsom known as the Folsom Stage Line; and then want to cut this #24 bus line. To me the #24 bus line is the lifeline for people to get in and out of Folsom. And people just may not be able to continue with their education at both colleges if this #24 bus line is cut. Please think about the riders of this #24 bus line and not outside influences. And if you're thinking I could take light rail to Watt/I-80 and then the bus to American River College; I cannot as I have arthritis in both knees and cannot climb the stairs at Watt/I-80, and have no intention of using the unclean elevator. (*Joyce Williamson, e-mail, #65745*)

About 3 weeks ago the male bus driver of the #24 bus line informed his bus riders that the #24 bus line is rumored to stop running come June 2019. I am a American River College student in the Gerontology Dept. that of which only ARC College offers the program(s) towards certificates or degrees in Gerontology. Folsom Lake College only has work experience in the Gerontology Dept. thus far. I am a student that benefits from the grant between Los Rios Community College District and Regional Transit in riding the Regional Transit bus and Folsom Stage Line bus system. I talk from experience in that I know first hand that the #24 bus line with Regional Transit has been in route for probably 30 years, and there is absolutely no reason to end the #24 bus line service that gets people to the Folsom Stage Line so as to go to and from Folsom. I am almost 60 years old and will be turning 59 in March 2019, and have arthritis in both knees and have no intention of taking the Regional Transit Lightrail train as I cannot climb the stairs and would never use the dirty elevators. Please listen to me in that I know there is no reason for Regional Transit to now take over Folsom's bus system and be rumored to end the #24 bus line that

connects people to and from Sacramento and Folsom. My being a student is my pursuit and I do not have to have revealed in this length how ending the #24 bus line will affect me, but I have. This #24 bus line with Regional Transit should be regarded as vital to ARC College students as I know it is for me. (Joyce Williamson, e-mail, #65953)

(Tracy, e-mail, #64593) **FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES**
(Bonnie Lindemann, phone, #64746) **FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES**

Route 25 – Marconi

On the 25 bus you told me it would still go to Marconi watt . Is it still going also to Madison and Dewey that my dentist. And Madison and San Juan Blvd . Is it still going to be the 23 and 25 bus. Also let me know about the 13 bus . I work at 1625 North Market Blvd in the old kings arena the last stop on North Market Blvd .Please give us 3 am peak hour 6:23 7:23 8:23 and 3 pm peak hours 3:00 4:00 5:00 on North Market Blvd. WE have a lot of State worker and other offices around 1625 North Market Blvd that also rid the 13. Please at least keep the peak hour on North Market Blvd. I leave on the 6 route at South land Park cross street Sutterville Rd. I start out on the 6 every day. Thanks for your help. (Carol Nelson, e-mail, #65060)

If bus line 25 does not go sunrise mall I have to two different bus lines instead one. I also bus line 25 to get to the Carmichael library with a new 25 design I have to find new library to go. (Rachel Schnautzer, e-mail, #66071)

Please do not change bus 25 route. It goes a block from where i stay off coyle ave and drops me off at work on sunrise and greenback. (Josh Mihal, e-mail, #65866)

Response: Sent updated draft network information with revisions to proposed changes for Route 25.

(Carol Nelson, e-mail, #65060) **FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES**
(CherylN Jones, e-mail, #65790 & 65796) **FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES**
(Bonnie Lindemann, phone, #64746) **FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES**

Route 26 – Fulton

Hello my name is Toni White and I have heard that you want to cancel bus route #26 all together. I think that would be a bad decision because #1- it is the only bus route from the Arden area to McClellan where veterans go everyday for health care #2 it is the only bus from Arden to the Wal-Mart they closed the one at El Camino & Watt so many of us bus riders have started to go to the new one on Watt using bus #26. I live on Northrop & Fulton and I use the bus #26 daily and I am a veteran and disabled. I have been using the bus system for over 30 years. Please don't take #26 out because that I need and many others need. Thank you. (Toni White, e-mail, #63755)

Response: Thank you for your comments regarding Route 26. At this time, all changes to existing routes are proposed, and we are reviewing and considering all of the comments we are receiving. In this specific case, riders using the stops in McClellan Park would walk to the stops along Watt Avenue. If riders are unable to walk the distance to a bus stop because of a disability or health-related condition, then paratransit service may be an option. Additionally, the proposed route would give riders access to the Wal-Mart. Thank you again for contacting SacRT. Your comments will be included in the information presented to our Board of Directors.

Route 28 – Fair Oaks

I learned from one of the #28 drivers that the #28 route will be phased out soon. I hope not. But if that happened, I wish that your will build a ramp/terminal where trains can pick up passengers, just like the ones at Zinfandel & Cordova Town Center preferable at the Paseo Rio & Folsom Blvd Library is located.

The RC Library opens at 10am (most of the time). I tried to call the Sac Public Library if I could make a reservation for a computer. They said they don't do that anymore. So I need to be at the RC Library by 10am, otherwise, I may wait from 2-3 hours before a computer will be available. I go to the library 1 or 2x a month to pay bills and read my emails. I use the #74 route comes every hour, wait 50 minutes for the #28 bus arrives at the MF Mills Station. I can't even go Sunday weekend mass or holiday - No #74 service. I am 70 1/2 years old using either a walker or cane and don't drive. The Fair Oaks Library is a long walk from the #21 bus stop. It will be a big strain to my weak knees. The RC Library is located at Folsom & Paseo Rio in comparison. Also if you could install a bench at the #74 bus stop either along International & Zinfandel or Data Dr & Zinfandel. The disabled, elderly, and those with weak knees will completely be thankful. *(Angelita Pelegrino, PSR, #64421)*

Customer stated no buses between library and Mather LRS; no buses between Sunrise and Folsom. You have a residential area and schools. Quite a walk to crossover to Coloma and Zinfandel. No way to get to the library or medical office. People use route 28, always full. Customer wants RT to keep route 28. *(Nicole, phone, #64729)*

Response: Thank you for sending your comments about the SacRT Forward project. We are still reviewing comments as we continue to work on the new bus network. Although we are proposing to eliminate service on Route 28, some of the existing route will be covered by portions of Route 21 and the new Route 74. Specifically, the new Route 74 will provide coverage on Folsom Blvd. between the Rancho Cordova library and the Mather light rail station; service between Sunrise Blvd. and Folsom Blvd. is covered by the light rail (Gold line). Thank you again for providing input to this important process.

One of the reasons I purchased my home was its proximity to public transportation. The bus stop within a half block of my home insured that when I could no longer drive I would still be able to get around town. Elimination of Route 28 means I will now have to walk a half mile to catch a bus. During inclement weather this would be untenable. A short distance off Zinfandel on Vehicle Drive is a retirement home whose transportation options would also be greatly impacted. Elimination of Route 28 leaves only one bus route through Rancho Cordova north of Highway 50. Smart Ride is not available in Rancho Cordova. Please reconsider eliminating this route. I am currently 70 years old and still able to drive, but in ten to fifteen years I may need to rely on public transportation. The bus stop in on Zinfandel between Vehicle Drive and Cobblestone. I live off Cobblestone. *(Bobbi Smith, e-mail, #64754)*

Response: Unfortunately, the new Route 74 will not serve the area where you live (Cobblestone); however, the Route 21 will still operate on Coloma, and it is proposed for service improvements, changing from 60-minute frequency to 45minute frequency on The weekends. It looks like the closest Route 21 bus stop is just under 1/2 mile away from Cobblestone. Hope this information helps. Thanks again for your interest in SacRT Forward.

I am a 5 day a week rider on the 28 line. The driver said you guys were maybe canceling the route. I rely on the 28 it would be devastating to many. Please don't cancel this route. *(Maria Santos, Facebook, #64856)*

Please don't discontinue the 28 line. Myself and my son use it to get to work and school. The 21 line is not compatible to our apartment, on Fair Oaks Blvd. Bela Vista high school has no other bus that could work. It would have a very bad impact for our community. *(Maria Santos, e-mail, #65937)*

Response: Hello, the route is proposed to be eliminated due to proximity to #21 Sunrise and new #74 Rancho Cordova, both of which have (or are proposed to have) 7-day service with later evening hours. However, please keep in mind these are all proposed changes at this time and no final decisions have been made. We are currently collecting public feedback.

I have ridden public transportation for many decades. I overheard that Bus Route 28 may be changed by the SacBoard of Directors. I ride this bus almost every weekday afternoon at 5-25 PM from Butterfield Station to Bradshaw Rd. Please do not eliminate this route. *(Michael Kunda, e-mail, #65133)*

I am a full time student with Folsom lake college and I rely on the 28 line to get to and from the library and i rely on the 24 to get to and from orangevale to connect to get to school in folsom. i also rely on the 23 and the 25 lines and the 80 and the 82 lines. im sure there is a lot of los rios students who use those buses to transfer to get out to rancho cordova to get to school and work. Its not feesable to take out the buses that the passengers rely on. also it is a good idea to extend train services at night time for those students trying to get back to rancho cordova from campus. *(Rachelle Coleman, e-mail, #65713)*

Response: Although the Route 28 is proposed for elimination, we are also proposing to have the new Route 74 serve the library (assuming you are referring to the Rancho Cordova Community Library). Also, the Route 24 area is currently covered by SmaRT Ride, the on-demand service you can request from a smartphone. SmaRT Ride operates with the City of Citrus Heights, Antelope and Orangevale, and does provide a connection to Folsom at the Historic Folsom light rail station.

Customer called about routes 28 and 74. She rides the 28 on Folsom Blvd to Mather Field LRS then catches the 74 towards Sunrise to work. She does this same routine in reserve e to get back home. Caller is requesting no changes to the routes. *(Revonda Uveges, phone, #64720, #64661, & 64832)*

Customer called and requested that route 28 stay as it is and not be replaced. Customer stated that he uses this route to go to his doctors appointments. *(Charles Bellairs, phone, #64532)*

Customer lives in Sunrise / Arcadia area, and uses routes 28, 24, 23, 25, 95 and 21 and is concerned over routes being canceled as part of SacRT Forward. She is concerned that with the new fixed routes patrons only have the 24 to get from Greenback to Madison between Manzanita and Main. She stated that using the 21 route in place of the 28 will cause patrons to have to walk farther to destinations and increases wait time. She has a bad knee and she noted that a lot of patrons are elderly and/or disabled. Her concerns with supplementing microtransit is that it is an invasion of privacy with the driver coming to a customer's house, and also with neighbors being clearly aware that residents are leaving the home. She was also concerned with the increased wait time for microtransit and also that it may not take you close enough to the requested location, and this may be disorienting for disabled and/or elderly patrons dropped at unknown locations. This in turn would be discouraging for the community to take microtransit. *(Bonnie Lindemann, phone, #64746)*

Route 30 – J Street

My name is Yetlanezi Gomez-Chavez and I'm a frequent RT rider. I attend Sacramento State University and my means of transportation fro Monday to Friday is the bus and light rail. Most days of the week after I finish school I take the bus and light rail to work. The routes I frequently take are the 67,68,30, and the light rail from the University 65th station to the 59th street stop. My main concern with the changing schedule is the 30 route changing from every 15 minutes to every 30 minutes. I have been on both the 67 and 68 routes that on occasion have taken longer to reach my transfer stop to the 30 route. When this happens and I miss my bus I normally wait another 15 minutes to get to school This always seems to work out as I leave to intentionally get to school around 15 minutes early in case anything happens to delay me. However by changing the route to every 30 minutes, any delayed rides can result in me and other sac state students to arrive to classes late. I hope you take this into consideration and rethink the decision to change the 30 route from every 15 minutes to every 30 minutes. I look forward to see what changes are and are not made.

(Yetlanezi Gomez, e-mail, #65708)

Response:

If you currently take #67/68 to #30 to Sac State, under the new proposal, you will be able to take a #30 or a #38 bus to Sac State. Both the #30 and #38 will run on J and L Streets from Downtown to 29th/30th Street. The #38 will go to 65th Street light rail via Stockton and Broadway and the last stop will be at the 65th St light rail station. So if you take a #67/68 north to midtown, you can catch whichever route is coming first, #30 or #38, and take it to Sac State. The only difference will be that #30 will drop off at the north end of campus and #38 will drop off at 65th St station, near the south end. The only other difference will be that if you're catching #38, you will have to catch it on J Street at 28th St, because it will be turning onto 29th Street, whereas you would probably want to catch the #30 on J Street at #30th St, under the freeway. So it would be an extra block walk to the #38 stop. But on the other hand, if you are scheduled to transfer with the #38, you could actually catch it a little farther south, e.g., at 29th/R Street, at the light rail station, which would probably give you a better chance of making your connection if the #67 or #68 is running late.

I have heard that there is a proposed change to Route 30, though after much searching I cannot find it on your website. If the rumor is true that RT is abandoning any bus service to Sacramento Valley Station, that would be a step backwards and should be scrapped. To get people out of individual cars and on to public transportation, the entire trip from door-to-door must be considered. For people who live beyond the reach of the light rail system, "heavy rail" (Amtrak) and the freeways are the only choices. However, hardly anyone works at the station or within walking distance of it. So the choices (1) a multimode commute, or (2) drive a car. The Gold Line departs from Sacramento Valley Station, and for people who work within walking distance of a Gold Line stop, that is fine. For those who don't, the bus down J Street is an important alternative. Amtrak's Morning Express opened up a new commuting option for people from San Joaquin County. It provides a way to get to CSUS for students from the largest California metropolitan area without its own 4-year public university. But we still have to get from the station to school or work. The fact that this train (unlike the Capital Corridor) does not offer RT passes is a problem, and that may be one reason that ridership is slow in growing. But pulling the plug on the only bus that serves this station would deal a blow to commuters who really want to find an alternative to the crowded freeways. Please don't do it. *(Kent Scheidegger, e-mail, #65838)*

I would like to supplement my previous comment with a proposed alternative route. Let Route 30 begin and end at Sacramento Valley Station, as it does now. Outbound, proceed east on H Street and turn right on 6th, as at present, but continue on 6th to J Street and then turn left on J. Inbound turn right on 5th Street, the same as at present except the turn is from L Street instead of Capitol Mall. Adopting this routing, instead of the proposal, would preserve the intermodal connection to Amtrak at Central Valley Station at the cost of reduced frequency of service in the rectangle of 3rd-J-5th-L Streets. Passengers in this area would have only the half-hourly Route 38, not the combined 15-minute Routes 30 & 38, as in the proposal. I think that is a good trade-off, overall. Reduced frequency is better than cutting off service altogether, as the proposal would do to the Amtrak passengers. For those not willing to wait, 3rd to 5th or 6th Street is a shorter walk than L to H Street, which is the walk returning Amtrak passengers would have to make under the proposal. *(Kent Scheidegger, e-mail, #65838)*

Response: Sent updated draft network information with revisions to proposed changes for Route 30.

My feedback is about proposed change to eliminate the Route 30 trips beginning at CSUS at 5:36 am and 5:51 am. Please keep this main route heading inbound to Downtown Sacramento for workers who need start earlier than the usual 8 am to 5 pm workers. Some of us need to be downtown to work that early! Eliminating these earliest times on Route 30 will mean driving becomes the alternative. Please consider keeping the service at these times with smaller buses. Please give the same consideration to use smaller buses for the midday service being eliminated for Route 34. I have voluntarily not had a car for many years while living in Midtown. It is becoming a necessity to buy a car and I will when these Route changes occur. I am fortunate to be able to do so. However, there are other people who will just have less or no options at the "non-peak" times when RT eliminates service. These are the same people who also have the least ability to get on-demand bus services on-line that I was told would replace the earliest routes on Route 30 or to use the JumpBikes and electric scooters. *(Jeanne Ekstrom, e-mail)*

I met you at the information meeting Wed Feb 13 at the RIL office with Russell Rawlings and my other advocate friends who speak up for responsible changes to the RT network as changes are pondered and made. I am Rosalie. I am 80 years old. I have used RT exclusively to do all my life work e.g. errands, medical appointments, visits to friends, trips, evening concerts at the various theatres and churches. What I am saying RT has and is my only wheels. I have made a system that isn't everything to everyone.... well, I have made it work for me for some 13 years. I proudly use RT as it has been. I am having grave concerns about the changes suggested to the Route 30. Please I beg of you do not make changes to Route 30. It is a clear example of a route that works and should be an example of an efficient line to the professional people consultants who have been hired to put RT on the drawing board for change. Bus route 30 is truly like a traveling bus hub. Let me explain, I pick it up at the corner of 26th and L Streets, at the corner of Sutter's Fort. My apartment is right there, I come out the door every 15 minutes M-F and begin my trek for the day. Going West on L, I can transfer to Route 62 at 19th and L. I have taken classes at SCC for some 10 years and this connection takes me south to Freeport Blvd and to the college. It is perfect, or staying on Route 30 and continuing down L. I can easily make connections with Route 51 that takes me to the Tower Theatre and beyond down Broadway to the delicious Real Pie Co, a new and favorite place of mine, over to Oak Park or to South Sacramento or Staying on route 30 continuing down town, to the Bank of America on 5th, to Macy's or the wonderful final destination of Sacramento Valley Station, where I can transfer to the Gold Line and go East to countless places which are part of my life network, or board Amtrak for train rides to S.F. and beyond. Now going East on Route 30, please note the following: Above all do not make part of the route 1/2 hr and part every 15 min. as proposed. Please don't accept that as a doable plan. The portion between 29th/30th to the college, must be kept at every 15 minutes as it is now. You must understand, there is Safeway at Alhambra and Sutter Medical Buildings, Mercy Hospital at 40th St., at 48th there is the Post Office, Rite Aide, Cleaners etc. Fed Ex and at the end is State College. Route 30 every 15 minutes serves us who use it daily to life. Also all the students at California State University, Sacramento must be considered in all these plans. Now I have suggestions for the weekends on Route 30: I have made the Saturday 1/2 hr. work for me. It is difficult but I make it work, if I have to get out. Every 15 minutes on Saturday would be best. In truth I try to do all my run about errands etc. M-F when Route 30 runs every 15 minutes. The only horrendous backlash to Route 30 is the every 1 hr stops on Sunday. I very rarely use it on Sundays...every hr. is a waste of time, energy monies for RT and for its riders. Sunday service does need change. James, let us look at another issue: It is a huge concern. I have brought it to the advocacy department for attention. Nothing has changed. I am speaking of the 19th and L St intersection of Route 30 and Route 62. Bus 62 needs to wait at 19th and L, not at 19th and Capitol. It is logical that the change be made to 19th and L Streets. You, see when 62 arrives early, it is sitting there at 19th and Capitol. I get off of 30 and miss what could be a perfect connection...because sure enough, I see it down at the next block. I and other riders cannot run to Capitol Ave to get Bus 62. Then we wait for 1/2 hr. for the next Bus 62. At one time there was a Bus 36 or 37? that had its route down Capitol Avenue and into Folsom Blvd. With the recession that Route was discontinued. Yes, when that route was in operation it made sense to have the transfer point at Capitol Avenue. This is an easy quick change that I suggest be made. Thank you for listening to my concerns. *(Rosalie Rashid, e-mail, #66032)*

Route 30 and Sacramento Valley Station: While the efficiency and simplicity of the new route 30 is appreciated, it will add about 2-1/2 blocks to the walk from the bus route to the Sacramento Valley Station platforms, which is unacceptable. Sacramento Valley Station is a major trip generator, and needs regular bus service. Though light rail serves the station, it has a limited span of service and insufficient weekend service. *(Sacramento Transit Advocates and Riders – STAR, e-mail, #66068)*

Regarding Route #30. We do not support route #30 no longer going into the Sacramento Valley Station. We support Route #30 entering the Sacramento Valley Station. *(Ridership for the Masses – RFTM, e-mail, #66078)*

Route 33 – Dos Rios

I am the Executive Director at Loaves & Fishes, one of the largest non-profits in the area providing survival services to people experiencing homelessness. I am also an Advisory Board Member of the River

District PBID and Advisory Board Member of the Sacramento Continuum of Care. It was shared with me last night at the River District Meeting that SacRT has intentions of discontinuing the Route 33 bus route. I am requesting a meeting to discuss the impact of eliminating the bus route to the community, and to the men, women, and children served by Loaves & Fishes that specifically rely on public transportation to access the services offered within our community. A great number of people with mobility issues that are unable to travel further than a couple of blocks rely on public transportation. I believe that this bus route was previously created in collaboration with one of my predecessors some time ago to ensure that people would be able to access services in our community. Please let me know when you have time to chat, as I would like to know a bit more about the SacRT plan and what steps are being taken to address the needs of the most vulnerable members of our community. It sounds like the decision on whether to keep or discontinue Route 33 is to be made next month, so I know that time may be of the essence to have this conversation. *(Noel Kammermann, e-mail, #64701)*

Response: Contact information was forwarded to SacRT Planning Director for follow-up.

Route 34 – McKinley

Hi, Three Points: 1) What is the proposed new route? Route 34/134 has no documentation on "New Network" maps provided on "SacRT Forward Draft Networks" website: <http://www.sacrt.com/apps/sacrt-forward-draft-networks/>. These maps show the route having been fully eliminated. Under the "Summary of Route Changes" for Route 34 it states: "Upon completion of new road construction at former Sutter Hospital site on F Street, realign bus route off of Coloma Way and Pala Way to use more direct routing. See map for details." 2) Please add a trip in the 2 pm hour. Elementary and middle school students use this route daily. Eliminating this trip would require these students to find alternative transportation. 3) Consider increasing route frequency during operating hours to at least every 30 minutes. The 34 McKinley Route is heavily used during the commuting hours, and serves as a critical public transit link for River Park, East Sac, and Midtown to each other and to downtown. There are three professionals, plus two children, who regularly access this line from the Pala Way stop alone. I frequently travel with two children to daycare and work, and eventually will be traveling to elementary school and work. Hourly travel is already restrictive. Increasing this route to every 30 minutes would make drop-offs at the local elementary schools, and then taking the next bus the rest of the way downtown, a possibility. *(Adam Weinberg, e-mail, #64688)*

Response: Thank you for your interest in the SacRT Forward project. Just to clarify, we are not proposing to eliminate the Route 34 entirely; however, we are proposing to only operate three morning trips, and three afternoon/evening trips, and re-number as Route 134. As you mentioned in your comments, this route has high ridership during the morning and afternoon peak times. Unfortunately, ridership is very low during the midday period, which is primarily why it is being proposed as a peak-only route. The description for this proposed change, and other proposed bus network changes, are up-to-date on our website at <http://www.sacrt.com/apps/wp-content/uploads/PocketSummary-8.5x14-180123.pdf>. Thank you again for sending us your comments. They will be included in the public record, and presented to the Board of Directors for their review and consideration.

Hello, I take the 34 bus in the morning and evening when it rains. I would appreciate the bus being kept in operation at 9am and 6pm during the rainy season. Thank you. *(Melissa Ramirez, e-mail, #64881)*

I appreciate the map you sent, but it shows the existing route, not the new one. The summary of route changes says "Upon completion of new road construction at former Sutter Hospital site on F Street, realign bus route off of Coloma Way and Pala Way to use more direct routing." The map you sent shows the route on Coloma and Pala. I would like to see the proposed new routing. *(Maureen Pascoe, e-mail, #65296)*

Response: Maps sent to patron upon request.

I rely on the 34 bus to commute from East Sacramento to downtown for work Monday - Friday. I would like SacRT to consider keeping the 6:20 pm trip outbound to CSUS. Although I am able to catch the 5:20 bus more often than not, I often need to stay at work a little later and need to take the 6:20. Please keep the 6:20 trip. *(Michael Burdick, e-mail, #64919)*

I ride the Route 34 to downtown from East Sacramento about 4-5 days a week. I would request the 6:20pm downtown departure bus not be eliminated. As someone who works past 5:30 about 2 days a week, I would have no other option than to take the Route 30 home and walk approximately 10 blocks to get home. The other proposed Route 34 changes make sense to me. *(Jerome Parra, e-mail, #65455)*

I have studied the proposed changes to bus service. Sacramento already has quite unacceptable bus service: in the capital city of California, one cannot take public transit to an evening event and get home. Even though I live in the central area, I cannot go out at night except by bicycle (not being able to afford taxis, etc.). I can see the planning that has gone into the drafted changes, and I realize that Sac RT has to figure out how to operate within its financial means. Unfortunately, the effect is to continue the slide into a commuter-based transit system, when the ideal would be to encourage people to ride buses and not use cars so much. One of the reasons I choose to live in the central area of a city is to have good transportation. When I moved into my midtown neighborhood thirty years ago, the #34 ran on weekends. Then the schedule was reduced and for many years now, it has operated only about twelve hours per day, once per hour, and not on weekends. The proposed changes will turn the #34 into a commuter route, so that even midday trips will be eliminated. When the #34 is not operating, the nearest bus for residents of the northern part of midtown is the #30, on J Street going out and on L Street going in. The latter is a seven-block walk for me, more for people living north of me. One thing I truly do not comprehend is the elimination of Route 38. The information states that with the elimination of the #38, people can take the #51 to the UCD Medical Center. However, the #51 stops about half a mile from the hospital, and no route changes are mentioned. Do you intend for every worker, patient, visitor to walk this distance? *(Jillian Stanley, e-mail, #66022)*

I have heard a rumor that the 34 bus line will soon be discontinued completely. Before taking this step I urge you to check in with the administration and families at Theodore Judah Elementary. Quite a few families rely on this bus line to get kids home from school, and more families would use it if the timing of the morning bus did not make it impossible. (The eastbound 34 stops at Theodore Judah before children can be dropped off on campus, and the next bus does not arrive in time for the morning bell.) Moreover, this is the ONLY bus line within walking distance of the new McKinley Village development. In 1998 we bought our house on D Street in midtown in part because of its proximity to the 34 bus line, which we used all the time to get to and from work downtown and to and from classes at CSUS. Unfortunately the drastic reduction in hours and reliability made it impossible for our family to use this bus line regularly. We are lucky to be able to walk the much longer distance to the 30 line, but many of our elderly neighbors cannot do that and will be hit hard by the loss of the 34. *(Elizabeth Campbell, e-mail, #66073)*

I take the number 34 bus daily, often at different times. While I agree it is not necessary to keep the mid day routes, I feel an added route at peak commuter times, both morning and evening would be beneficial to both rider and RT. For example, a route added between the 7:00 and 8:00 am. bus; and a route added between the 4:20 and 5:20 pm. bus. This would add riders for those who cannot make the earlier bus but do not want to wait an hour for the later bus. For those in between times, usual riders such as myself will use Lyft or Uber. Those routes are the busiest of all routes and in the heat of summer or cold of winter, the bus is often standing room only. The majority of these riders work downtown and I do not often see riders on these routes that are going to or coming from Sac State. Maybe shortening these added routes to River Park or even East Sac and back to downtown would work. *(Staci Shell, e-mail, #64922)*

I am reaching out to provide my feedback regarding the proposed service changes to Regional Transit Route 34. I have ridden Route 34 nearly every day for over a year and usually take the 8:30am bus to work and the 5:20pm or 6:20pm bus home in the evening. I often take the 6:20pm bus home on evenings I stay late (roughly 1-3 nights a week) and occasionally take the 9:30am bus to work. I mostly use ZipPass to pay for my rides and worry that my regular use of the bus may not be captured in the same way as a monthly bus pass or Connect Card might. My primary request is that you keep the 6:20pm bus -

at least in the winter, as it is the only safe option in the evenings in the winter for some (whereas folks like myself might be able to walk or ride a bike home in the spring/summer/fall months when the days are longer and there is still light out). Living near 22 and F, the next transit option for me would be Route 30, and while I appreciate that it comes every 15 minutes, it is not ideal during the winter months when it is dark out after 6:00pm and the weather is often not ideal for the 6-7 block walk home. Thank you for your consideration and please let me know if you have questions. (*Diana Stantz, e-mail, #64962*)

I'm a monthly pass holder and I would like to vehemently OPPOSE the cutbacks proposed for the #34 bus. This bus already only comes once an hour, and if anything I would prefer MORE frequency on the route, not less. I take this bus at varying times throughout the day on the weekdays, returning home earlier on some days due to my work schedule. I regularly use the 1:20 and 2:20 pm buses in the evening, as well as the 3:30, 4:20, and 5:20 pm buses. If I have to arrange for additional transportation because this bus no longer runs before 3 pm, then riding the bus is no longer cost effective. I do have the availability to use the #30 bus, however I would have to walk over a mile and a half to my house in River Park from Sac State, which then becomes ineffective in both time and money. I have the option of a parking space downtown for \$100/month, which comes with the ability to come and go as I please with a quicker commute time. I enjoy taking public transportation and I like to support a smaller carbon footprint, but I will DEFINITELY discontinue riding the bus if these proposed changes are made. Additionally, it's rather alarming to think that these changes were proposed without consideration of the dozens of middle schoolers I see get on the 1:20 and 2:20 pm buses. This gives working parents an option for transportation where school buses aren't available, and this would effectively eliminate that option. The children provide consistent ridership and are always well behaved. I wonder if their parents have even been made aware of these changes since pamphlets are only being given out to riders and it's extremely difficult to find this info on the website. I am deeply disappointed that these changes are being proposed and I OPPOSE. If raising the monthly fare back to \$110 would alleviate the issue I vote reinstating the previous rates. PLEASE don't reduce this route as it will cause me to discontinue my monthly ridership. (*Erika Feyereisen, e-mail, #64981*)

I understand that my comments may be too late, but I only recently learned that there has been discussion about removing the 34 line. Please do not take the 34 line out of commission. Nothing else serves a very large residential community (Meister Terrace/East Sac) that both uses it for the work commute and that uses it for the Sac State commute. The J Street line is not sufficient for the community that uses the 34 line. Thank you so much for your consideration. (*Jordan Traverso, e-mail, #64523*)

Response: Thank you for sending your comment regarding proposed changes to Route 34. Your comment is not too late, we are still in the process of soliciting comments from the public. All of the changes in our draft network are still just proposed, and are being carefully reviewed, considering all of the feedback we are receiving. Your comment will also be included in the information presented to our Board of Directors for their consideration. Thank you again for providing your feedback to this important process.

Please consider this a public comment urging you to keep route 34 in proposed changes to SacRT. Route 34 serves several neighborhoods and for some people is the only public transit option. While some of those who regularly use the route 34 service have the option of using route 30 (with a significant increase in walking time to a bus stop), it is not feasible for all current riders of route 34. Elderly, disabled, and those riding with children may not be able to make the switch to route 30, and I see many of these riders on bus 34 everyday. Additionally, increasing the distance of the nearest bus stop will discourage use of public transit by the neighborhoods serviced by route 34, and impact the good that public transit does: positive environmental impact, decreased stress from driving, money savings, and the positive impact of SacRT on Sacramentans. The SacRTForward materials on the website are inconsistent, some show proposed elimination of route 34, some show reduction in service to peak hours only. (*Gina Ferguson, e-mail, #64476*)

Response: Thank you for sending your feedback regarding Route 34. Just to clarify, the Route 34 is not proposed to be eliminated completely; the proposed route would continue to operate three

morning trips and three afternoon trips, which are high ridership trips. The existing ridership on this route is very low during the midday period; however, we do understand that there are still riders that use it. For the elderly and disabled riders that are unable to use the alternative (Route 30) due to a disability or health-related condition, they may be eligible for paratransit service. The information about this route, and others, can be found here on our website: <http://www.sacrt.com/apps/sacrt-forward-draft-networks/> Thank you again for your comments; they will be recorded and included in the information presented to our Board of Directors.

I write regarding the proposed changes to bus route 34, of which I was made aware during my commute this morning. As a recent transplant to Sacramento, I was thrilled to have the opportunity to use public transportation to commute to and from downtown from my home in East Sacramento. And I'm disappointed to learn that Regional Transit is considering eliminating the 6:20 PM evening trip from route 34. I regularly take this later trip home and I know that its elimination would cause me, and I presume the many other riders that also seem to take this trip, to resort to driving to work more often, or perhaps everyday. This would result in increased payments for parking by riders, additional traffic, unnecessary wear and tear on local roads, and an increase in automotive pollution in our community I hope that you will reconsider eliminating the 6:20 PM trip from route 34. *(Brent Westcott, e-mail, #64558)*

Response: Thank you for sending us your comment about Route 34. As you know, this route is proposed to only operate three morning trips, and three afternoon/evening trips, with the elimination of midday service. The proposed change does include specific trip times, although nothing has been approved yet by the Board. I will include your comment about operating a later PM trip with the information presented to the Board, for their review and consideration. Thank you again for providing your feedback to this important process.

I agree with most of the proposed changes, except that I suggest making the last three departure times 4:20, 5:20 and 6:20. Drivers in the morning too often have left early, got lost, or otherwise made taking the early buses unreliable. If the route becomes mostly for commuters, make it reliable enough for people to count on it to get to work or school on time in the morning. Rain or shine. *(Jennifer Madrid, e-mail, #65699)*

Response:

Thanks for your comment. We are planning on keeping the 4:20 and 5:20 pm trips but not the 6:20 pm trip. The 6:20 pm trip averages only about 6 riders per day, which we felt was difficult to justify. For peak-only commuter service, it is normal to have a last trip of the day that is not as well-used but that provides all the regular riders a backup plan, in case they miss their normal bus; however, in the case of Route 34, we felt that with Route 30 running every 30 minutes through East Sacramento, if regular commuters on Route 34 miss their bus, they can take Route 30, in which case it would be a longer walk home, but since it is more of a backup plan than an everyday routine, we felt that was an appropriate level of service. As I'm sure you can understand, SacRT has limited resources, and we are trying to make the most out of those resources and use them where there is the greatest need or ridership potential. I appreciate you taking the time to write, and if you have any follow-up questions, please let me know.

(Jeanne Ekstrom, e-mail) FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES

Route 38 – P/Q Streets

Please don't eliminate SacRT Bus 38. Don't always use the bus though Bus 38 is the bus I use when needed. Was born to Tahoe Park in 1947 and have lived here for a total of 45 years. Used to use SacRT Bus and LightRail when I worked downtown for 31 years. Many of our neighbors currently use and depend on SacRT for work and personal transportation. A major concern of mine is getting older, surrendering my drivers license, becoming dependent on public transportation and not having reasonable choices. In the past this would not have been a concern of mine. Eliminating Bus 38 adds concern. " Please Don't Eliminate Bus 38 " Thank you. *(Anonymous, e-mail)*

I use Bus 38 for my transportation to and from work, Monday - Friday. I would really urge you not to eliminate this important route for my daily commute. It is quite difficult for it being only a one hour service, but that is what we have. If there is any way to increase service to at least every half hour, that would be an improvement. From my morning and evening commute observation, ridership is fairly decent on this route. I'm sure I wouldn't be the only one that would be effected if this important route was eliminated. Please don't eliminate bus 38! *(Tracy Frost, e-mail)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 38.

PLEASE do not discontinue Route 38. There are numerous patrons residing in Land Park Woods Apts, 5th & Vallejo, who ride the bus, as it is our only means of transportation. I am a disabled senior citizen who has no other way to go to medical appointments, shopping, or visiting friends. Please, please, continue Route 38. *(Barbara Hightower, e-mail, #64849)*

What happens to the people that live on 5th and Vallejo? need transportation too. What about a small shuttle or extend the 51? There's a lot of seniors. *(Richard Boyd, e-mail, #66072)*

I am a frequent rider of this route in the evening after work. It's convenient and quiet. I am asking, do not stop this route #38. *(Vernice Hodges, e-mail, #64699)*

Thanks for putting the new route 38 proposal out on the street for public review and, hopefully, support. A minor request: Can you have someone resend it with a new map image? The map in yesterday's email is not showing up properly.

Also, is it possible to calculate how much longer the new route 38 would take to travel down L/J street rather than P/Q at commute hours? I assume it's only a couple minutes, but I'd like to be able to say so with confidence.

Again, great job coming up with a creative and flexible solution. This may be a win-win for Route 38 riders and RT's frequent-service goals.

(Zach Miller, e-mail)

Response:

Thanks for your feedback. Copying Jamie Poole Canevari on the issue with the image quality on the email. With respect to running time into downtown, I'm anticipating trips will be about 5 minutes slower from 65th St to a common point downtown, (e.g., L/9th) due to higher ridership and more traffic.

I will say that at this stage of design, there is some margin of error in our running time estimates. All that is necessary at this stage of planning is to approximate the running times close enough to determine the vehicle requirement to run the route on the desired headways. Every round trip is scheduled to have some break time, so there can be a little margin of error in our running times estimates without having a budget impact. If we overestimate running time, then the schedule ends up easier, with more break time for the driver. If we underestimate running time, then break time ends up less than we planned, but as long as we budget a sufficient level, it will still be adequate.

As a resident of Tahoe Park and a state worker who commutes daily to downtown, I would like to ask you to please not cancel route 38. I am a daily user of bus route 38, and I have to say that I am very disappointed that despite using transit and the SacRT transit app daily, I did not find out about this project until a stranger posted a flyer on the bus stops. I would have very much loved to participate. Route 38 is important to my fellow riders and me. Especially those of us who work downtown. Eliminating routes like 38 prevents people further in the suburbs from taking transit because its too far to access a bus route or light rail station. The suggested alternates of light rail or route 51 does not help anyone in the neighborhood south of Broadway and East of 53rd street. Not to mention safety issues for women walking home from work at night through Oak Park in the dark. If the goal of Sacramento was to promote more

people taking transit and reducing the amount of cars on the road, this is not the way to do it. Please, please, reconsider. (*Kiana Samadzadeh, e-mail, #64597*)

Response: Thank you for sending your comment regarding the proposed change to Route 38. We have been conducting our second phase of public outreach since October 2018, with many staff members going out in the community, making presentations to different groups, and reaching our riders by distributing materials at stations and on bus routes. We have been successful in receiving many comments, and we appreciate you writing in to provide your feedback, as well. We understand that some of the proposed alternatives may not work for all riders. With that said, all of the proposed changes are being carefully reviewed, considering the feedback we have received, and continue to receive. Public outreach and comments will continue into February, at which time, we will present them to our Board of Directors for their consideration. Thank you again for providing your feedback to this important process.

I wanted to thank you for taking the time to listen to rider feedback on Bus 38. I am delighted to hear that should this plan move forward, I will still be able to commute to work via Bus 38. I am also equally delighted on behalf of all of the people in my neighborhood who will retain the option to take the bus, especially the senior citizens who live along the Broadway corridor and who depend on this bus to grocery shop, attend medical appointments and more. I confess that I don't find this new option perfect. I can already foresee that I will be getting home later due to the higher volume of traffic on J street and I do know a few other riders who take or board the bus along 3rd and 5th streets. Losing this portion of the route will mean longer walking distances for these riders as there are no other bus routes in the immediate area. I am sure that these riders will forward their comments and concerns along to you. I cannot speak for them. However, I do appreciate the proposed increased frequency of the buses and, again, I very much appreciate the fact that you listened and preserved the most important portion of the route for the commuting residents of Tahoe Park, seniors who depend on the bus for independent living, visitors to several state and federal agencies as well as 3 major hospitals. Though I cannot attend the meeting on Monday, I will be following continued announcements surrounding this plan. Thank you again for listening to community concerns. (*Brendle Wells, e-mail, #64635*)

I attended an RT open house on November 14 at 1400 29th Street, where RT et al. presented the two SacRT Forward options for bus service: high frequency or high coverage, the latter being similar to what the current bus system is like. I expressed my views on which option I preferred on the RT website. I was shocked and very disappointed to learn recently that the high frequency option was chosen. Though the SacRT Forward website says that "SacRT will be developing a new network of bus routes based on community input and data analysis," I really wonder if there was enough "community input," enough effort to get such input, and whether RT listened or responded enough to community opinions. I suspect that "data analysis" was valued more heavily. I live in Tahoe Park and work downtown. I am 61 and do not drive. I can take buses 51, 38, or the light rail. Sometimes, the 38 is extremely helpful, particularly when I'm carrying, e.g., heavy grocery bags or am rather tired after a long day, as it is the closest to my house. It also can take me to the University/65th St. transit Center. The 38 is one of the buses that would be eliminated with the new bus plan. This would certainly inconvenience me sometimes and some trips would take longer. But since I am healthy, can easily walk, and have other transportation options, it wouldn't be a disaster for me. I fear more for the many Sacramentans who are not as able to walk long distances and who, if the bus route their lives depend on is one of those to be eliminated, will face disastrous situations. Eleven routes will be eliminated: buses 22, 24, 28, 33, 38, 47, 54, 65, 75, 80, and 95. Not all such people would qualify for ADA para transit services, or live in one of the SmART ride neighborhoods. They'd be in a grey zone with no transportation options. Many may not even know about the proposed new bus networks, which could greatly affect their lives. It seems unfair and unwise for SacRT to cut off services for existing riders, while seeking to add new riders who already have other options (I assume, since they don't use RT). SacRT may not have considered the extent to which some city residents may have chosen where they live because of proximity to nearby bus stops. Ideally, there would be enough funding for both high frequency and high coverage, but since that's not the case currently, I urge SacRT to reconsider its choice of the high frequency option and choose either the high coverage option instead or make just a few lines higher frequency, while maintaining quite high

coverage. I do hope RT will soon get the increased funding it deserves so that all Sacramentans would be well-served. *(Julia Scher, e-mail, #64646)*

Response: Thank you for sending all of your comments about our project, SacRT Forward, and the proposed change to Route 38. I would like to clarify that the open house on November 14 was not intended to propose one option over another (referring to high-coverage versus high-frequency). SacRT has not chosen to draft a potential bus network with only high-frequency routes; the result was actually a combination of the two ideas. The open house was simply an opportunity to explain what the trade-offs would be considering the same amount of resources. With that said, the draft network that has been designed and put out for public comment is a proposal; there will likely be revisions and changes. All comments are reviewed and considered in this process, and will be shared with the Board of Directors for their consideration, as well. Thank you again for your feedback.

I am extremely gratified that bus 38 is being preserved in response to rider concerns. Regarding the part of the route that switches to J and L rather than P and Q, it will likely make the bus travel more slowly since those streets are busier, but with the increased frequency combined with route 30, this may be helpful for people who only need to travel to or from points west of 30th street. If they need to travel east of 30th, they'll need to transfer, which won't necessarily make their options more frequent. Still, it may be good if there are more people in general getting on or off on J and L versus P and Q. Personally, I've sometimes found the 38 running on Q helpful, as it is near some grocery stores, etc., though for some places I go, L would be closer. Either way, I can walk as needed. 30 minute frequency is great. Overall, it is very good news that the 38 is being preserved, as I depend on this bus usually once or twice a week, as it is the closest to my house and it is close to the coop. It's a very quick way to get home. *(Julia Scher, e-mail, #64676)*

I am a bus commuter and enjoy riding the bus every day for my work. The bus is very close walking distance from my work and home. I live in West Tahoe Park and therefore the light rail is not close enough for me to walk to. Earlier in the year, I have tried using the 51 route but feel unsafe riding it. One time, I waited for the 51 bus by the light rail and almost got mugged on my way home. Also, many times the route is overcrowded and late. Please reconsider canceling the 38 route and instead make it a commuter bus. It would be great even to only have the route running during early am and evening hours for workers only. I enjoy my quiet and safe ride home and to work. *(Tuyet Tran, e-mail, #64808)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 38.

Please don't eliminate bus 38. It's an integral part of our neighborhood and the fantastic public transportation in Sacramento *(Anna Lisa Storey, e-mail, #64813)*.

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 38.

Please do not eliminate Bus route 38! I have taken this route for almost 20 yrs. since the route 15 was discontinued. This route is very convenient and allows me to catch the bus from my home neighborhood in Tahoe Park. The light rail is a 15-minute distance walk compared to just a few minutes taking the route 38. During the Higher and lower temperatures of the season this makes a big difference with convenience. This route also allows many elderly riders in my community to ride with an easier commute. The route 50 is not a desirable route and is much further and out of the way for many regular commuters that ride the route 38 to work etc. Consider continuing to provide the route 38 for peak hours as an alternative decision if necessary but please do not eliminate bus route 38 completely.

(Marcus Ruiz, e-mail, #64845)

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 38.

Thank you for your January 16 email response to my feedback on the SacRT Forward Plan for **Route 38**. Here are comments on the revised plan for Route 38.

It's good that the new proposal would preserve part of the Route 38. However, it doesn't ultimately address my main concern in that it eliminates service from the River Oaks section of the current route (the area bordered by Broadway, I-5, Riverside Blvd.). I'm a regular Route 38 customer traveling from that area to downtown for work, to midtown/other areas, and to connect to the other buses/light rail. I see many other regular riders from the River Oaks area, so service is still needed there. For many, the Route 51 might not be convenient/too far. Route 2 is also up for elimination.

From my read of the rest of your plan, it appears that the proposed change to Route 11 would have it run on the northern portion of Riverside Blvd. That would provide needed service to the River Oaks area. If you do go forth with eliminating Route 38 service to River Oaks, I hope you implement adding Riverside Blvd. to Route 11 to provide the area with access to downtown and to other major transit connections.

For future mass e-mails, is it possible for you to address all recipients as a "bcc" so our e-mail addresses aren't shared with all recipients?

(Terri Yee, e-mail, #64851)

Tahoe Park needs Route 38. I am a senior citizen with a student bus pass. Unfortunately, so far this semester I have a Mon night class, and, 1/21 being a holiday, 1/28 is the 1st day of the class, which must be attended. *(Laurie V. Jones, e-mail, #64882)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 38.

I am writing to please encourage you not to permanently terminate route 38. Route 38 is a critical means for me, and many workers, to get to and from work. If route 38 is terminated, it will make it impossible for many people to get to work via public transportation. *(Ann Percha, e-mail, #64885)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 38.

I am writing to urge you not to eliminate Bus 38. I have lived in a fourplex at 2512 P Street for close to 25 years. I like the convenience of Bus 38 since it comes down my street and has stops all along P Street. For almost the past six years I have worked downtown. I can catch it across the street from my apartment, and sometimes I walk to the bus stop closer to 29th Street and pick it up as it first arrives to the grid. There is another bus on that route, I believe it's Bus 109, however that bus seems to be inconsistent, arriving early some days and late other days. Bus 38 is more reliable. I also like getting Bus 38 to go home. It is timely and drops me near my home. It's closer than light-rail which is important to me now since I have a dog and need to get home quickly. Please consider keeping Bus 38. I would love to see MORE transit, instead of less. *(Melanie Turner, e-mail, #64901)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 38.

Please keep route 38! I live in Tahoe Park and have a monthly RT pass. This is a valuable route not only for me and my neighbors, but for elderly people throughout the route's area. Please reconsider. Thank you. *(Tonja Edelman, e-mail, #64913)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 38.

I heard you are considering increasing the frequency of Bus 38 in Tahoe Park. I am writing to let you know I support this action. It could be very helpful for public transit for our neighborhood. *(Angie Noorda, e-mail, #65190)*

I am writing this email to express my concern about the plan to eliminate the bus route 38. This is the bus that I use to commute to and from work daily from the Med Center neighborhood to the East End Complex on Capitol Mall. I do not have a car, nor the budget to buy one or pay the parking fees for a space downtown. I also cannot ride a bike. The bus is truly my only option to get to work, and in fact the reason I recently chose to move to the Med Center neighborhood. I will be attending the community meeting on Monday to discuss RT Forward and the City's plan regarding bus 38. I hope that you consider my situation and that of other riders with similar concerns before deciding to eliminate Bus Route 38. *(Christina Espergren, e-mail, #65206)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 38.

I heard you are considering increasing the frequency of Bus 38 in Tahoe Park. I am writing to let you know I support this action. It could be very helpful for public transit for our neighborhood.

(Angie Noorda, e-mail, #65190)

I'm a longtime resident of Tahoe Park, and I support the the new proposal to not only keep the Route 38 bus but also increase its frequency of stops. Thanks. *(Tim Wilbur, e-mail, #65288)*

Thanks for considering public input to the decision on whether or not to keep Route 38 that serves part of the Tahoe Park neighborhood. Very good to hear that the route will be preserved in a modified form with an increased frequency. I believe this will increase its usefulness to the area. *(Laura Leonelli, e-mail, #65297)*

Customer requesting no changes to route 38. She's a senior and has no other way to get to her destinations. *(Gaye Tobey, phone, #64464)*

I was unable to attend last nights RT meeting. I am writing in support of keeping bus 38 in service. I'm not a frequent bus rider, but as a senior citizen, my driving days may eventually come to an end. I frequently see people at the bus stops along Broadway; so I know the service is used. It's a nice sense of security knowing there is a bus line in my neighborhood, and if it only runs every hour, so be it. We riders can adjust. At least the service is there. Thank you very much for your consideration.

(Judy Weber, e-mail, #65339)

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 38.

We implore you to reconsider. Please do not eliminate Bus 38. My family and I use bus 38 to commute to and from downtown. We need this route. *(Dominic Tonei, e-mail, #65298)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 38.

I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed elimination of route 38. We need more mass transit that is accessible and serves the needs of our community. We have seen massive growth in Tahoe Park and immediate surrounding areas. There is additional growth planned. However, the existing roadways are already congested. Please increase access to mass transit and encourage reduction of personal vehicle use. Thank you. *(Daniel Steinhart, e-mail, #64883)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 38.

I heard this route may be eliminated. I love this route and would take it more often if it ran more often-at the very least back to every half hour. This is the perfect bus to take downtown and midtown for any event as it takes you down a lot of major streets and attractions. It is so close to many bars and restaurants. I'm guessing a lot of people don't know about it or there'd be more riders. There are a lot of new residents in our area, young ones as well, that can save money taking the bus downtown for nights on the town rather than taking Uber, Lyft or Taxi. The problem is that it doesn't run often enough.

I truly hope this route stays. Perhaps more advertising? What if you get the restaurants and bars to post information about the bus and include nearest bus stops and schedule? *(Lucia Ruiz, e-mail, #64211)*

Thank you for your January 16 email response to my feedback on the SacRT Forward Plan for Route 38. Here are comments on the revised plan for Route 38. It's good that the new proposal would preserve part of the Route 38. However, it doesn't ultimately address my main concern in that it eliminates service from the River Oaks section of the current route (the area bordered by Broadway, I-5, Riverside Blvd.). I'm a regular Route 38 customer traveling from that area to downtown for work, to midtown/other areas, and to connect to the other buses/light rail. I see many other regular riders from the River Oaks area, so service is still needed there. For many, the Route 51 might not be convenient/too far. Route 2 is also up for elimination. From my read of the rest of your plan, it appears that the proposed change to Route 11 would have it run on the northern portion of Riverside Blvd. That would provide needed service to the River Oaks area. If you do go forth with eliminating Route 38 service to River Oaks, I hope you implement adding Riverside Blvd. to Route 11 to provide the area with access to downtown and to other major transit connections. For future mass e-mails, is it possible for you to address all recipients as a "bcc" so our e-mail addresses aren't shared with all recipients? *(Terri Yee, e-mail, #64851)*

According to the information of "SacRT Forward" in the Next Stop News De 2018, it indicates that the ultimate goal of SacRT Forward is to provide transit service to destinations where people want to. It sounds good! However, RT proposed to "take away" Rte 38 and close the bus stop in front of Bel Air supermarket at Rush River & Windbridge. These cancellations will cause a lot of inconvenience to the customers in our area; (especially us elderly people). We have to walk all the way to Broadway #51 bus stops; we will not be able to go to as many destinations as now having #38. It will take forever for going to many destinations such as Airport, Arden Fair, Cal-Expo, Kaiser, Co-Op, Downtown, Historic Folsom, North Natomas, West Sacramento, etc. In other words, without #38 and the bus stop in front of Bel Air Supermarket will greatly affect our daily life. It causes us mentally and physically stress out! Please do not cancel Route 38 and said bus stop. *(Mei Fong, e-mail, #64793)*

According to the new proposal of Route 38, it doesn't benefit us living in this area. It will cause more inconvenience. My regular Bus Stop is at Muir way and Vallejo Way (Bus Stop # 1766). We will have to walk about one mile to Broadway #51 bus stops. Please help us elders ...keeping the route 38 and the Bus Stop #1766. Save the long trip walking to Broadway. Thanks! *(Mei Fong, e-mail, #64943)*

According to your new proposal Route 38, there will be NO bus coming River Oaks. We have to walk all the way to Broadway to catch Route 51. It will be too far for us elderly walking there. It will be very inconvenient for us. The "Future Forward" project is supposed to have better service, but there will be NO bus coming our area. Yes, the project may be better for the people in other areas; it is worse for us. I feel so left out and stress out because of No bus will come here ! Please re-consider the proposal Route 38 to let us have the bus coming her River Oak. Most important for me is having the same bus stop #1766 where I catch #38. Thanks for your attention to this matter. PS This is my 4th letters mailing to you. Hoping you will reconsider your proposal Route 38, so I will be able to catch #38 at the same bus stop as now. *(Mei Fong, e-mail, #65200)*

Customer requesting bus stops not be moved from Rush River, she's a senior and it would be too far to walk. Customer also does not want to see route 38 canceled. She cannot afford to take a taxi or uber. *(Mae, phone, #64435)*

Customer requesting route 38 not be eliminated. No way to get to the hospital from her home. *(Marcia Johnston, phone, #64230)*

Customer takes RT 38 to downtown from Land Park or takes RT 2, RT plans on cutting both routes. RT 38 gives her more flexibility to travel downtown and other places, would like RT to keep route 38. *(June, phone, #64285)*

I'm a long time user of Route 38 River Oaks part of the route. I hope future plans include continuing service through the River Oaks/Upper Land Park area. Transit has been available through that area for over 30+ years and there is a continued need there. You sometimes seem to have too much emphasis on the light rail system. The buses are needed too, to connect the light rail hubs or to other buses. I use Route #38 River Oaks to connect downtown and other buses and light rail. Please continue service to River Oaks/Upper Land Park. *(Mareus Vang, letter, #64422)*

I recently became aware that RT is planning to eliminate route #38. As, a UC Davis Med Center employee who rides 38 every day for my work commute I would like to request that the 38 not be eliminated. I do understand there are alternate routes such as the light rail and route 51, but these alternatives would add 30min to 1hr to my commute. Also, because I do not work in the main hospital neither the 51 or light are located near me, the 38 gets me closest to my office building. Thank you. *(Tony Hernandez, e-mail, #64473)*

To whom it may concern, It is my understanding that there are talks of eliminating route 38 soon. Eliminating this route would cause serious problems for several people that I know who use this route to and from daily. Please reconsider. *(Danette Howard, e-mail, #64487)*

This is a letter to ask the the route 38 NOT be eliminated from service. It is the main source of transportation for 3 senior living community and for people living from 65th st. To Stockton blvd. I personally been using it every day for the past 20 years as my main means of transportation to work. I was mad when it got cut from every 30 min. To every hr but said to myself these people must know what they are doing. Now you are pushing us to the light rail that is long walk for us to get to work. The train is constantly full with little help on keeping the foul smelling homeless off the train. If you talk to any state employee they will tell you, that is the main reason they don't take the train to work. Smelling filthy people puts you in a bad mood. Doesn't take a college degree to figure that out. Now the ride home is a frustrating experience in its own right. The train is more times than not cut by one car so again over crowding and why not mix in the covered up windows with advertising. Now you have to stare at the floor or attempt to look out the blurred out window's adding to the eye strain that comes from working on a computer all day. Why NOT! I hope that you can now see why the 38 is a welcoming and quite ride to and from work. Sure every now and then we get a wino or two, a soiled smelling wheelchair but what can we do? Thank god that you get that bus driver who has a can of Febreze and kills the stench from lingering on the bus. So for the sake of all the grandpa's and grandma's who are holding on to what little independence they may have, to all the state workers who like to get to work in a good mood and not answer the phones with a sour tone, I'm asking please do not cancel the route. You would think that the city planner would have taken this into consideration before allowing more housing development in the area. Adding traffic lights don't help but add to the congestion of traffic. It seems that the city is growing and more student living is increasing in our area. Traffic is a constant head ache to us living in the area and we do what we can to help by taking public transportation. New eateries bring no corporate hipsters out in flocks mixed with the college kids to the park. PLEASE DO NOT KILL THE 38 ROUTE. *(Fa Ibarra, e-mail, #64506)*

Please do not eliminate Route 38. This route is relied on to get to and from work and other locations. *(Kally LaFrance, e-mail, #64518)*

Eliminating the 38 route will severely affect senior citizens who live on Broadway between Stockton and 65th light rail. I see you expect these passengers to walk to the 51...most cannot. Bad move RT. *(Elizabeth Rodriguez, e-mail, #64596)*

Customer requesting RT keep route 38. You have senior housing on Broadway that uses the bus to get to hospital and downtown. Most who are unable to drive. *(Toni, phone, #64621)*

I recently sent the email below to SacRT in response to a portion of the SacRTForward plan, namely the elimination of Bus Route 38. I wanted to share it with each of you as Board Members who serve the areas along the route because this proposed elimination deeply concerns me. In addition to ending a route I use to commute downtown 5 days a week, it would cut off bus service to an entire neighborhood and place

public transportation options more than a mile away in some cases. This reduces the options for independent living for seniors (many of whom live along this route on Broadway), for regular commuters, and for those traveling to destinations such as the UCD medical center, the DMV and the EDD among others. I sincerely urge you to reconsider this portion of the plan. If RT truly wants to look forward, eliminating service to an entire city neighborhood should not be on the table. In June of this year I began a new job. This meant that for the first time in my working life (some 30 years) I was able to take public transportation from my home to my job. I ride Bus 38 from the Tahoe Park area to 9th & L every Monday through Friday morning and take it home again in the evening. Despite some challenges this has proven to be a fantastic part of my new work life. It saves me money, reduces my carbon footprint, and is incredibly convenient. If you were to discontinue this bus line as in your recent proposal, all of that goes away for me. Another car would be back on the road as light rail and Bus 51 are not viable options for a regular commute from my home. Both would significantly increase my walking distance and travel time. But enough about me. Every day I see a variety of other people use this bus line. They ride it to the DMV on Broadway and the UC Davis Medical center from the Light Rail Station at 65th street. I see senior citizens catch the bus on Broadway and get off at the intersection of Stockton and Broadway so they may do their grocery shopping. They have no other regular or reliable transportation options. I see families use bus 38 to visit the Sacramento County Health Center. I see students on the bus, working on homework, going in both directions. I also see other regular commuters from the Tahoe Park and Med Center neighborhoods ride this bus to various points in midtown and downtown. To take it away would cut off a significant section of a city neighborhood, and thus a significant number of residents, from any sort of easily accessible public transportation. This bus route is a convenience for me, but to others it is a life line. I do understand the argument that once an hour service is not effective. I agree. *(Brendle Wells, e-mail, #64635)*

To whom it concern: Supervisors Serna and Kennedy, We have a huge concern over the discontinued Bus line#38 since it will effect a big community of seniors who live nearby at the Senior complexes along Broadway near Stockton Blvd Many of these seniors do not have drive and rely on Regional transit to get to the grocery store, social security office or medical appointments. These are not want to go appointments, but need to attend offices or stores for food supplies or medical appointments for the week. Here are some suggested options: The alternative bus route that will replace bus line #38, which is 51X is a far walking distance from the apartment complex. Some of the seniors have medical heart illnesses and cannot make this distance. They use walkers or wheel chairs and this would be a great inconvenience for them. We are suggesting that a smaller bus being placed on bus line #38, just like the smaller buses that are presently being used to bus children who have disabilities. Why can't this same option be voted upon to help seniors, who are the next most important population in the Sacramento area? Thanks for your time and assistance to help with these suggestions. Otherwise, most seniors will have no other option but to rely on taxis or some other expensive mode of transportation. *(Kathy Cushing, e-mail, #64636)*

As a resident of Tahoe Park and a state worker who commutes daily to downtown, I would like to ask you to please not cancel route 38. I am a daily user of bus route 38, and I have to say that I am very disappointed that despite using transit and the SacRT transit app daily, I did not find out about this project until a stranger posted a flyer on the bus stops. I would have very much loved to participate. Route 38 is important to my fellow riders and me. Especially those of us who work downtown. Eliminating routes like 38 prevents people further in the suburbs from taking transit because its too far to access a bus route or light rail station. The suggested alternates of light rail or route 51 does not help anyone in the neighborhood south of Broadway and East of 53rd street. Not to mention safety issues for women walking home from work at night through Oak Park in the dark. If the goal of Sacramento was to promote more people taking transit and reducing the amount of cars on the road, this is not the way to do it. Please, please, reconsider. *(Kiana Samadzadeh, e-mail, #64597)*

Please please im asking not too discontinue the bus line 38. Im a resident in the area of Muir Way & Vallejo Street. I read this bus 38 every other day and alot on the weekends. It gets me too the Safeway at 19th & p street when their isnt a bus that goes near their on sunday. It is too far too be walking towards Broadway. And think thus line should still be used who rides that bus 38. You may lose a lot of people who ride the Bus 38. *(Anonymous, e-mail, #64674)*

I attended an RT open house on November 14 at 1400 29th Street, where RT et al. presented the two SacRT Forward options for bus service: high frequency or high coverage, the latter being similar to what the current bus system is like. I expressed my views on which option I preferred on the RT website. I was shocked and very disappointed to learn recently that the high frequency option was chosen. Though the SacRT Forward website says that "SacRT will be developing a new network of bus routes based on community input and data analysis," I really wonder if there was enough "community input," enough effort to get such input, and whether RT listened or responded enough to community opinions. I suspect that "data analysis" was valued more heavily. I live in Tahoe Park and work downtown. I am 61 and do not drive. I can take buses 51, 38, or the light rail. Sometimes, the 38 is extremely helpful, particularly when I'm carrying, e.g., heavy grocery bags or am rather tired after a long day, as it is the closest to my house. It also can take me to the University/65th St. transit Center. The 38 is one of the buses that would be eliminated with the new bus plan. This would certainly inconvenience me sometimes and some trips would take longer. But since I am healthy, can easily walk, and have other transportation options, it wouldn't be a disaster for me. I fear more for the many Sacramentans who are not as able to walk long distances and who, if the bus route their lives depend on is one of those to be eliminated, will face disastrous situations. Eleven routes will be eliminated: buses 22, 24, 28, 33, 38, 47, 54, 65, 75, 80, and 95. Not all such people would qualify for ADA para transit services, or live in one of the Smart Ride neighborhoods. They'd be in a grey zone with no transportation options. Many may not even know about the proposed new bus networks, which could greatly affect their lives. It seems unfair and unwise for SacRT to cut off services for existing riders, while seeking to add new riders who already have other options (I assume, since they don't use RT). SacRT may not have considered the extent to which some city residents may have chosen where they live because of proximity to nearby bus stops. Ideally, there would be enough funding for both high frequency and high coverage, but since that's not the case currently, I urge SacRT to reconsider its choice of the high frequency option and choose either the high coverage option instead, or make just a few lines higher frequency, while maintaining quite high coverage. I do hope RT will soon get the increased funding it deserves so that all Sacramentans would be well-served. *(Julia Scher, e-mail, #64676)*

I wanted to send an email asking not to eliminate bus 38. I catch this bus during peak hours along with many people who are seniors and/or have a disability and can not walk to light rail or bus 51. Please consider a different alternative. *(Andrea Burrell, e-mail, #64700)*

(Terri, phone, #64023) FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES

Route 47 – Phoenix Park

Customer called and stated that she does not want this route to be changed or removed. Customer stated that she is disabled and the bus comes into her apartment complex. This bus makes getting around easy for me. *(Doris Spinks, phone, #64536)*

Caller uses a wheelchair and calling regarding Rte 47. I live on Mack, Meadowview & Florin and I use bus every day. Keep weekdays, otherwise, can't go grocery shopping. *(Charles, phone, #64611)*

Charles is requesting that no changes to route 47 occur due to this is the only bus that allows him to go to doctor's appointments and grocery shopping. *(Charles Gochanour, phone, #64666)*

Caller is requesting no changes for route 47. Caller says she typically rides from Restoration Court towards Florin Towne and the Meadowview LRS to go shopping and the changes would alter how she travels. *(Adrian Givens, phone, #64722)*

Route 51 – Broadway/Stockton

I'm in favor of the changes to route 51. I work downtown on weekends, so it would help to have busses more often. *(Paul Mullinger, e-mail, #65302)*

This electronic communication is a follow-up to a phone call I successfully had with James Boyle on Tuesday 29 January 2019. Since timing of our communications is now of the essence in getting to a final issue paper for the SacRT Forward Project to the Board for their February 25th Board Meeting, I wanted to send to you a draft route alignment for Route 51 that would describe the route within the downtown grid, and allow it to serve the Sacramento Valley Station. This would replace Route 30 at the Sacramento Valley Station for the reasons staff has previously presented so that the original staff recommendation to remove Route 30 would remain intact going into perhaps the most important Board of Directors Meeting in the history of the public transit agency. Without further hesitation, here is the downtown grid route alignment for Route 51 to be presented to the Board of Directors on February 25th: Route 51- Broadway/Stockton: Within the Downtown Sacramento Grid, inbound routing from Broadway would travel via 8th Street, I Street, 5th Street to Sacramento Valley Station. Outbound from Sacramento Valley Station Roadway, Route 51 would travel H Street, 9th Street, to Broadway. Existing outbound service along 7th Street would be shifted east over to 9th Street from H Street so as to avoid 7th Street closures that occur before, during, and after Golden 1 Center events at DOCOSacramento. For inbound service, as an alternative to 8th Street, Route 51 could operate inbound from Broadway via 5th Street, directly to the Sacramento Valley Station Roadway, should staff feel more comfortable with this option. What are the reasons behind doing this for Route 51, rather than keeping the downtown grid route alignment as it is today? Throughout several months of observations as well as conversations with bus operators of existing Route 51, it has been noted that the existing turnaround in and around 8th Street, F Street, 7th Street and G Street that operators have no accessible restroom or food facilities to go to when they go on their layover/break. Currently, operators of existing Route 51 are going "off-route" into the Sacramento Valley Station to use restrooms and buy food either from station vending machines or at the Starbucks located at the east end of the Sacramento Valley Station parking lot - near the 5th Street entrance for automobiles, including but not limited to Uber and Lyft ride hailing services. For the convenience of Route 51 Bus Operators, and for the reasons noted in the previous paragraph that they are doing this anyway in the existing route, making the downtown grid route alignment changes more of a formal formality by the Board of Directors on February 25th will no longer make it appear that there is any "wrongdoing" by the bus operators, plus, for riders, it would generally preserve bus service to and from Sacramento Valley Station by the Sacramento Regional Transit District for months and years into the future. With this change, riders would be able to board the Gold Line in an east-west routing, while riders would board Route 51 to travel in a north-south route alignment. If I could be of any further assistance, please let me know at your convenience. *(Mike Barnbaum, e-mail, #65346)*

Route 56 – Pocket/CRC

(Steve Koyasako, e-mail, #64719) FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES
(April King, e-mail, #64502) FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES
(Lance Morris, e-mail, #64781) FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES

Route 61 – Fruitridge

We are writing you today to express our collective concerns about the proposed Services Changes impacting Bus 61 and 65. We are requesting the Bus Routes for Bus 61 and 65 not be reduce or eliminate for the following reasons: 1.Regional Transit Bus--Public Transportation provides access to job opportunities, as well as a transportation options to schools and colleges, visit friends, go shopping, or going to a doctor's office. 2.Regional Transit Bus-- Public Transportation Fosters More Livable Communities. 3.Regional Transit Bus-Contacts and engagement with neighbors tends to increase, ultimately helping to bring a community together and increase social capital. Finally, we are urging the Sacramento Regional Transit District not to reduce or eliminate Bus 61 or 65 from the Sacramento Regional Transit District's route because they are vital community's asset. *(Faye Wilson and Avondale/Glen Elder Neighborhood Association, e-mail, #64842)*

(Janet Lewis, e-mail, #65795 & 65810) FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES

Route 62 – Freeport

It was brought to my attention that a stop in front of my school is scheduled to be removed from the 62 route. I believe this choice poses a safety concern for my students who rely on this bus for transportation to and from school. I am the principal of Alice Birney Public Waldorf School and we serve students from Early Kinder to 8th grade. Younger siblings often ride with older students. To walk to the next nearest stop beyond the one in front of Birney on 13th street would require students to walk along 43rd Avenue. This is a considerable busy street and out of the view of school staff. I am requesting that you reconsider this option and keep the stop on 13th on the route. Thank you. (*Mechelle Horning, e-mail, #65095*)

We have made a revision to the proposal, and are now planning to keep the route on Freeport, to 43rd Avenue, to South Land Park, which will continue to serve the bus stop at Alice Birney K-8 school (see attachment).

I take the bus #62 at 6:41AM from Rush River & Windbridge transit center to Capitol Mall to work M-F. I am not agree to eliminate this on the SacRT forward draft network. It will cause a lot of problem for me and others if RT eliminate this. If this service got eliminated, I will have to drive my car to work because timing issue for me to do other things in the morning before getting to work, like drop kids off at school, etc. (*Steve Wong, e-mail, #64879*)

I am writing to you to ask that you do not make this change to the existing bus route for #62 route. I have two students that attend the local school Alice Birney that is currently on this route. The proposed route change would have them walking farther to get to school. And on the return trip home, they would have to walk the rest of the way. That would be crossing the very busy and scary Florin Rd/Greenhaven intersection where drivers are notorious in not waiting for pedestrians to use the crosswalk. Please consider the parents and students that depend on this route and do not make this change. Thank you for your consideration. (*Sharon Cordell, e-mail, #65519*)

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

Hello, I am concerned about the proposed changes to Route 62 in South Land Park. Currently Route 62 provides service to a K-8 school (Alice Birney), with many 6th, 7th, and 8th graders utilizing the bus to and from school and taking younger siblings with them. The bus stops are within visual sight of school currently. The proposed change would make the closest stop several blocks away, on busy South Land Park Dr which is not a place we want students spending 30 minutes waiting for the bus. And it would not be a reasonable idea for older siblings to escort their younger siblings on that walk and to wait in that location. Please reconsider these changes to Route 62. SCUSD does not provide bus service to schools for the majority of students so SacRT is the only bus service available to these families. Thank you for your time and consideration. (*Tracy Mistry, e-mail, #64897*)

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

I am writing to oppose a proposed route change.

Proposed RT Route Change: Regional Transit is proposing a route change to the #62 bus that runs in front of Alice Birney School. This would end this stop for bus #62 starting in June. After that the closest stop for the #62 bus would be South Land Park & 43rd. This is a good .5 mile for elementary school and junior high students to have to walk from the school if they want to take the bus. This is less safe for the kids at Alice Birney. Please do not implement this route change.

(*Randy Olson, e-mail, #65004*)

Response:

Thank you for your comment on Route 62. We are actually considering keeping Route 62 on 43rd Ave (as it runs today). We are still considering rerouting it from 13th St to South Land Park, for better connections with Route 61, the post office, apartments, and neighborhood retail. We would prefer to discontinue service on 13th St, south of 43rd Ave, due to the primarily residential character of the neighborhood. If we kept Route 62 on 43rd Ave, the closest stop to Alice Birney would be on 43rd Ave at 14th St, which would be about a 1,500 foot walk to the front door of the school, which would be entirely within line of sight of the school, and with a safe crossing at 43rd/13th St. We will be looking into locating stops at 43rd Ave and 13th St, to shorten that walk, although installation of new stops at that intersection may not be feasible, without taking property from the school and restriping one or more crosswalks into the intersection. For busy school trips, we could theoretically detour Route 62 down 13th St to stop in front of the school, at its current stop, however, we currently average only 2-3 customers per day at 13th St and Norfolk (i.e., at Alice Birney) so it does not appear that it is being well-used for school transportation.

Hi, I'd like to comment on the proposed change to the #62 route. I have one son that goes to school at Alice Birney K-8 and another son that goes to school at CK McClatchy HS. I know from walking with my son to school at Birney that the bus stop at the school is heavily used by the students there. I oppose the plan to remove that bus stop because it would make it more difficult for many students to get to and from school. My older son rides the bus to McClatchy High School and the bus stop being right at the school is a blessing and convenience for him because it is so close to home. I respectfully urge you to please keep the bus stop at Alice Birney school. Thank you for your consideration. *(Eric Janssen, e-mail, #65008)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed rerouting of Bus 62. I am a parent at Alice Birney Public K-8 and believe that giving families and students safe and easy access to public transit is incredibly important. One of RT's greatest features is connecting the public to public institutions and our public schools should be very high on that list. My children have been riding the #62 bus line home from school every day for 3 years and they will continue to do so for several more years if the route does not change. They ride with a group of other students and it has been a wonderful way for them to gain independence and responsibility, as well as learn the importance of a public transit system that works. Reducing individual car trips is also good for the environment, our carbon footprint, and our pocket-book. In addition, it helps working parents with much-needed transportation to get their children safely home during the work day. The proposed map shows the Bus 62 route shifting away from our campus, where it currently has a stop in front of the school. Children and families use this resource. If the route changes to head north on Land Park Drive or east on 35th Street, our children will have to walk nearly 0.5 mile to a bus stop on the new route. This exposes the children to a variety of situations, especially if the bus is delayed. Currently if the bus is late, there are other parents and teachers around the school. If they are waiting at a new stop away from the school, they would not be in a safe and trusted environment with other known adults nearby. The safety-net of being able to return to the school's office to make a call or borrow bus fare would be diminished. I request that RT consider keeping the current route or, alternatively, having the new route go down 43rd St (instead of 35th) with a stop on the north side of the Alice Birney campus. The latter option may keep access to Alice Birney while also meet RT's other needs for the overall route. *(Linda Leeman, e-mail, #65010)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

I was shocked to see the proposal for route 62 that eliminates stops in front of Alice Birney K-8 in the proposed route changes. I am a parent of kids that attend the school. Because the school is not a "neighborhood" school, most of the students that attend do not live within walking distance. Many of them depend on the bus to get home from school. Our 6-8th grade track team depends on the bus to get to practice at Kennedy HS, as our school does not have a track, and both our track and basketball team members use it to get to games. Frankly, if this proposal goes through, I believe that could end the track program at the school, which would be pretty disappointing to the older kids; and some kids would have to leave the school. Please keep service to this bus stop. *(Rosie Yacoub, e-mail, #65011)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

I am writing in response to the proposed rerouting of Bus 62. I am a parent at Alice Birney Public K-8 and believe that giving families and students safe and easy access to public transit is incredibly important. One of RT's greatest features is connecting the public to public institutions and our public schools should be very high on that list. The proposed map shows the Bus 62 route shifting away from our campus, where it currently has a stop in front of the school. I request that RT consider keeping the current route or, alternatively, having the new route go down 43rd St (instead of 35th) with a stop on the north side of the AB campus. The latter option may keep access to AB while also meet RT's other needs for the overall route. Please let me know if you have any questions. (*Michael Hearn, e-mail, #65013*)

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

I was recently informed that bus 62 route may change. This route picks up on 13th Street at 43rd Ave very near Alice Birney K-8th school. My 2 daughters, 5th and 7th graders, take the bus home from school to 4th Ave and Freeport. The proposed change would cause our children to walk farther and wait longer, to South Land Park Drive to catch the bus home from school. This is a safety concern for our children. The life's would need to walk on 43rd Ave which is a considerably busy street and out of the view of school staff. I am requesting that you reconsider our family needs and safety. Please keep the stop on 13th Street and 43rd Ave on the 62 route. (*Karen Combrink, e-mail, #65251*)

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

My name is Megan Trifiro. I am a Sacramento South Land Park resident with three children that attend Alice Birney Elementary EK-8th grade School. I was recently made aware of proposed plans to change line 62's route away from the school. As you know line 62 currently stops right outside of Alice Birney's school gate. There are many children who ride this bus to school and home from school each day. In fact some depend on this bus route as their primary mode of transportation to and from school. Moving this bus stop to South Land Park Drive and 43rd St would have a negative impact on these children's commute to and from school. There are several reasons why this change is strongly objected. One reason is that it would lengthen students time to get to school and home because they will have to walk significantly farther. The second, and perhaps most importantly, the walk along 43rd to South Land Park Dr is a busy street that students would have to cross unaided putting them in potential harms way. I myself allow my children to ride this bus line because I want them to feel like they can engage with public transportation in a safe and comfortable way. Getting on the bus right at school feels secure to them. This cultivates a sense of independence and even community participation. If they are forced to walk so far to get on the bus those advantages will dissipate. This school serves children in all grades from Kindergarten to 8th grade with a total population of over 560 students and approximately 50 faculty and staff; I find it hard to believe that the Sacramento Regional Transit would intentionally move a bus stop and restrict access to a student and faculty population of that size. Why is this being proposed? What is the benefit of restricting student and faculty access and in turn restricting access to students whose socio-economic circumstances force them to be dependent on the public transit, i.e. their parents work and can't get them school, their families only have one car or none at all, and many other reasons?? I am baffled that this particular stop on 13th St would be removed from the line's route. I hope you will consider this and change your proposed plans. I know I am not the first and I won't be the last member of this school community to object. (*Megan Trifiro, e-mail, #65014*)

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

My name is Andrea Thom. My family lives in the neighborhood off South Land Park in between Florin road and Greenhaven drive. My family and I are extremely concerned with the cuts to the 62 route. With the proposed changes the bus would not pass our neighborhood. The stop we use is near Golden Oak on South Land Park. This stop is a short walk to our home. However, if the 62 turns onto Florin road, instead of continuing down South Land Park to Greenhaven drive, it would be nearly a 20 minute walk to the bus stop. A 20 minute walk is something I can handle, but my mother has trouble walking and cannot make this walk. My parents are also blind. The current stop is a route they both know. However, if the 62

does not go to this stop, they would have to find someone to teach them the new route. And for someone like my father who has trouble with mental mapping and spatial concepts, learning a new route is not easy. Changing the 62 route to the new proposal also cuts my family off from going to the shopping center at Rushriver and Windbridge. This shopping center has lots to offer for us including our bank, CVS, Bel Air, and food options. Sure there is the 6 route, but my mother, with her limited mobility, is unable to walk over the overpass on South Land Park to reach this stop. If the route needs to be cut, I would suggest the 62 continues down South Land Park, past Florin road and makes its final stop at Greenhaven drive and South Land Park. This way my family will still have access to a bus that takes us downtown. If you have any questions for myself, please feel free to contact me at [REDACTED] or by email andrea.thom916@gmail.com. (Andrea Thom, e-mail, #65072)

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

I'm a resident of the South Land Park neighborhood and my children attend school at Alice Birney elementary school. I'm writing to oppose the plan to eliminate the bus stop on 13th St in front of the school. This bus stop serves a vital purpose to our children and families, allowing working parents to have safe and reliable transportation for Middle School students and helping those students gain important skills. Young transit riders become older transit supporters. And they become voters who support smart public transportation. (Nicole Oehmke, e-mail, #65092)

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

I understand that you are the Director of Planning for Sacramento Regional Transit. I saw your video presentation on the SacRT Forward Draft Networks. My question is about the proposed changes to route 62. In your presentation, it was stated "this route has a minor change at the south end of the route." What I am hearing from the neighborhood association is that the bus would no longer stop in front of Alice Birney Ek-8 public school. My sons take that bus every day. I would not want elementary and middle school aged children to have to walk great distances alone to catch the bus home. As you know, many students in the Sacramento City Unified School District rely upon regional transit to get to and from school. Can I please get your assurance in writing that the bus route will not be moved away from Alice Birney school? (Nina Collins, e-mail, #65113)

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

Changing the southern terminal of Route 62 will impose a hardship to numerous bus riders. A significant number of riders board and disembark the bus in the area of Rush River Drive and Windbridge Drive. Asking riders to walk at least an additional 1 ½ miles to the proposed nearest stop is unjust. A good number of riders reside in the numerous apartment and condo complexes located south of the existing southernmost stop. There are riders with disabilities, and seniors that should also be considered, that would be unable to endure this very long walk. The Pocket Community would be better served with the route continuing to its existing southernmost stop. To compensate for the minimal additional drive time to the bus route, another 10 to 15 minutes could be added to the proposed intervals between buses. It is so much easier to wait an extra 10 to 15 minutes for the bus than to attempt a 30 minute walk. This would eliminate a hardship to the southernmost bus riders. Again, asking riders to walk at least an extra 1 ½ is unreasonable. Thank you in advance for your consideration. ("robsac", e-mail, #65154)

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

Good Morning, It was brought to my attention that a stop in front of my school is scheduled to be removed from the 62 route. I believe this choice poses a safety concern for my student who relies on this bus for transportation to and from school. To walk to the next nearest stop beyond the one in front of Birney on 13th street would require my student to walk along 43rd Avenue. This is a considerably busy street and out of the view of school staff. I am requesting that you reconsider this option and keep the stop on 13th on the route. Thank you. (Tiffanie Simpson, e-mail, #65157)

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

I just found out that the stop in front of my children's school is going to be removed from the 62 route. I'm very concerned about this decision, as my children rely on this bus for daily transportation from school. They are elementary-aged children, and the nearest stop beyond this is out of sight of the school staff and on a very busy street. I implore you to reconsider this decision, for the safety of my children and the many others at Alice Birney who rely upon your services. *(Sarah Barnes, e-mail, #65158)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

It was brought to my attention that a stop in front of my school is scheduled to be removed from the 62 route. I believe this choice poses a safety concern for my student who relies on this bus for transportation to and from school. To walk to the next nearest stop beyond the one in front of Birney on 13th street would require my student to walk along 43rd Avenue. This is a considerable busy street and out of the view of school staff. I am requesting that you reconsider this option and keep the stop on 13th on the route. *(Emily Webb, e-mail, #65159)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

It was brought to my attention that a stop in front of my child's school on 13th Street is scheduled to be removed from the 62 bus route. This choice poses a safety concern for my child who relies on this bus for transportation to and from school. To walk to the next nearest stop beyond the one in front of Alice Birney Elementary School on 13th street would require my child to walk along 43rd Avenue. This is a very busy street and out of the view of school staff. I am requesting that you reconsider this option and keep the stop on 13th on the route. Thank you. *(Murray Clayton, e-mail, #65160)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

I'm writing to express my objection to the proposed removal of the 13th street stop for the #62 bus. This bus is a lifeline to many families at Alice Birney Elementary School. The bus stop's current location adjacent to the school makes the #62 bus viable and safe for the many young students who currently use this city service. Working parents rely on public transport for a safe and affordable transport home. The new proposed site at the corner of South Land Park Drive and 43rd Ave is a high-traffic area and it is out of sight of the school. The removal of this stop is not a question of ease, but of safety. Alice Birney families already contend with many challenges when it comes to getting their children to and from school because there is no school bus service. Our fourth and sixth graders rely on this service to get to and from school every day. Thank you for considering our community's concerns. *(Stefani Danch, e-mail, #65161)*

Same comment as above. *(Sylvia Romo, e-mail, #65163)*

Same comment as above. *(Adan Romo, e-mail, #65164)*

Same comment as above. *(Rosalva Willow, e-mail, #65165)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

I strongly urge you to reconsider the route change to the 62 line. The public bus system is a public service, and changing the route from the promenade to lakecrest would greatly disservice not only the riders of all stages of life in the greenhaven-pocket area, but also the drivers who would have to deal with more cars on the road, not to mention the effect this would have on the environment and global warming. The promenade is an excellent central location for the 62 to start, and as it also runs through the center of the pocket area, it picks up many passengers. I'd say you'd be missing many regulars just on the bus that I ride by changing the route from this prime location. There are often people in each seat by the time I get on and I will have to sit all the way in the back to get a seat just to myself. The change would highly inconvenience many people. I've been taking the 62 for many years. I first started as a college student, taking the bus from the Greenhaven-Pocket area to Sacramento City College. As I did not yet have my driver's license, the bus was essential for me to get to classes, and having it run every 30 minutes was

convenient to get to class and back without having to wait a super long time before or after class. As a student with a different schedule each day, I appreciated the bus running consistently throughout the day. When I started working, I began to take the bus downtown. Again taking the bus and avoiding parking and traffic has been highly convenient for me. I can imagine that I would need to take the bus to get anywhere in my later, retired years when I am unable to drive. I have seen many older and elderly riders on the 62 over the many years. Sometimes I see my grandmother on the bus. She has knee problems and making her walk farther to catch the bus would be a slow arduous process. (*Joseph Fong, e-mail, #65857*)

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

I am writing these comments not in my position as the Mobility Advisory Council vice-chair, but as a blind citizen of Sacramento. I would first like to make some general comments about the SAC RT Forward plan and then discuss my specific concerns. Your mantra has always been that the customer comes first, and you have shown that by many of your actions in administering RT. However, it appears that the SAC RT Forward plan is the converse of that view. It is helpful for commuters and those with transit options, while disenfranchising many transit dependent low-income persons, including those who are seniors or have disabilities. Route change proposals in the east and south areas of the city of Sacramento are just two examples of this point. I now turn to my own issue, which I have also commented upon to Supervisor Kennedy's staff. My wife, who is also blind, and I live near Southland Park and Greenhaven, but on the east side of the freeway. We are in a part of the 62 line proposed to be eliminated. Our closest stop would be Southland Park Drive and Florin Road, about a 20-minute walk from our home. For my wife and others like her with physical limitations, this is not walkable and thus her bus service would be completely taken away. Essentially, I am in the same position, as although I could walk to the stop on Florin, coming home on the bus would require crossing Florin Road at Southland Park, a task that has grown almost impossible with the ever-increasing traffic on that corner. For both of us, paratransit would be our only public option. Thus, the plan promotes exactly the type of behavior that policymakers have long sought to avoid, specifically making riders more dependent on paratransit. Moreover, the proposal would remove coverage to Rush River Drive, thus harming the businesses on Rush River and Windbridge and taking away an option for many seniors and persons with disabilities who, like myself, find it far easier to use that shopping center with its easy bus access. If the goal of this plan is primarily to save RT money, at the cost of those most dependent upon the service, then this plan meets that goal. However, if the plan is truly one that is intended to make RT a model transit service, then it is a step backward and needs extensive modification. (*Jeff Thom, e-mail*)

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

I am writing to voice an objection to the proposed change in route for the 62 bus. The bus currently has stops in front of Alice Birney Elementary school on 13th street and 43rd Ave, and I understand the proposal will move the route a distance away from the school. My son currently takes the bus home from school and it is a godsend. I feel very secure in the fact that it is in front of the school, if there are any problems or the bus is missed, he can always go into the school office to ask for help or wait for a ride if it is needed. This has brought me peace of mind, knowing that he can do this, if the stop is moved, this would no longer be a very realistic option. One of the reasons we picked this school for our son was knowing that when he was old enough, he would be able to get home by himself. He is now finally at an age he can ride the bus, he likes it, it gives him a sense of responsibility, not to mention being good for the environment. Next school year he was going to start taking it to school in the mornings too. I believe public transportation should be readily available to get students to and from school, it is serving a very deserving need. Please do not change the route away from Alice Birney Elementary School, it would be depriving a lot of students of transportation to their school. (*Teresa Zepeda, e-mail, #65174*)

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

We have been informed that an RT stop in front of my son's school is scheduled to be removed from the 62 route. Our son is in 7th grade at Alice Birney school and at times heavily relies on taking RT after school to our home over 7 miles away in Curtis Park. The potential removal of the stop on 13th Street,

which is currently within view of school staff, highly concerns me especially if our son and other students must travel along the very busy 43rd Avenue where automobiles often drive above the speed limit. We ask that the decision to remove the stop on 13th Street be reconsidered for the safety of the students who attend the school. *(Sheila B. Enos, e-mail, #65176)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

I have a child that currently attends Alice Birney Waldorf School w/SCUSD. I would like to express concern about the 62 Freeport line, specifically the bus stop @ 13th Street and Norfolk Way. I'm a concerned because it will leave some of the children at risk of being unsupervised while waiting for the bus home or walking to school from the closest bus stop if the line is rerouted away from Alice Birney School. In rerouting it can open up for liability if children are injured by oncoming traffic on the walk from Land Park to Alice Birney or unsupervised at the bus stop on Land Park during the fall when it becomes darker earlier in the day. I work with the homeless population and additionally that could potentially decrease accessibility for those children as a main mode of transportation for these children and their parents. I would like to request that the 62 Freeport still make it's stop on 13th Street and Norfolk Way for our children. *(Aileen Guerrero, e-mail, #65179)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

I have been a teacher at Alice Birney since 2011, and have learned about the importance of our bus stop for our community. In fact, it is an integral part of the development of independence of children, so important to middle school students, in preparation for their further high school independence. The service is reliable and indispensable to many families out of our community of about 550 students. Another important aspect of our relationship to your excellent public transportation service is our commitment to sustainability, not only in riding your buses, but in the fact that our school provides food waste from the cafeteria to be transformed by the bio-digester into natural gas, the very clean fuel your buses run on. Our symbiotic relationship is vital to our community, and we hope that you will consider the continuation of service at our school bus stop. *(Luiz Felipe Ferraz, e-mail, #65195)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

To Whom It May Concern I'm writing to express my objection to the proposed removal of the 13th street Stop for the #62 bus. This bus is a lifeline to many families at Alice Birney K-8 School. The bus stop's current location adjacent to the school makes the #62 bus viable and safe for the many young students who currently use this city service. Working parents rely on public transport for safe and affordable transport for their children to get home. The proposed replacement site at the corner of South Land Park Drive and 43rd Ave is a high-traffic area and it's out of sight of the school. The removal of the 13th Street stop would present a risk to school children's safety. Because Alice Birney is an Open Enrollment campus within SCUSD, students' families live all around Sacramento, not just in the neighborhood around the school. Parents already contend with transportation challenges because there is no public school bus service offered for students who live in more distant neighborhoods. Our sixth, seventh and eighth graders rely on the #62 RT bus service to get home from school every afternoon, September thru mid-June. Thank you for considering our community's concerns. *(Julia Mitri, e-mail, #65246)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

I am writing in response to the proposed rerouting of Bus 62. I am a parent at Alice Birney Public K-8 and I've been waiting for my child to be old enough to ride the 62 from school to her after school activities. Students need safe and easy access to public transit. Preparing the next generation of active citizens and public transit users is vital for our region and so connecting our public schools to other public institutions should be a high priority. The proposed map shows the Bus 62 route shifting away from our campus, where it currently has a stop in front of the school. I request that RT consider keeping the current route or, alternatively, having the new route go down 43rd St (instead of 35th) with a stop on the north side of the

AB campus. The latter option may keep access to AB while also meet RT's other needs for the overall route. *(Jennifer Zoffel, e-mail, #65252)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

It was brought to my attention that a stop in front of my child's school Alice Birney Waldorf on 13th St. is scheduled to be removed from the 62 route. I believe this choice poses a safety concern for my student who relies on this bus for transportation to and from school. To walk to the next nearest stop beyond the one in front of Birney on 13th street would require my student to walk along 43rd Avenue. This is a considerable busy street and out of the view of school staff. I am requesting that you reconsider this option and keep the stop on 13th on the route. *(Rucha Powers, e-mail, #65283 and #66175)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

I ride bus #62 at 6:41am from Rush River and Windbridge transit center to downtown to work Monday through Friday. I am against to take out this bus service route and schedule time. If so I will have to driveto work. Please consider. It is no good since it doesn't go to Pocket Transit Center like the existing/current service. So most likely I am going to ski RT and drive my car if RT take out the service on #62 bus to Pocket Transit Center. It will be a big miss since my coworkers and I have been riding the 7:41AM #62 bus at Pocket transit Center to Capitol Mall for almost 10 yrs. *(J. Smith, e-mail, #65299)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

It was brought to my attention that a stop in front of my school is scheduled to be removed from the 62 route. I believe this choice poses a safety concern for my student who relies on this bus for transportation to and from school. To walk to the next nearest stop beyond the one in front of Birney on 13th street would require my student to walk along 43rd Avenue. This is a considerable busy street and out of the view of school staff. I am requesting that you reconsider this option and keep the stop on 13th on the route. *(David Colegrove, e-mail, #65315)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

Our family opposes the changes to bus 62 in Pocket because it would negatively impact my two elementary school kids. Although they do not currently ride the bus to school, it is our plan to have them ride the bus to school starting next school year (August 2019). They go to school at Alice Birney (43rd and 13th) and we live in Pocket. The bus stop on Rush River near Greenhaven is one block from our house, so they can easily get on in the morning, and the bus (given the current route) will take them directly to school. Then after school, the return trip would be just as easy for them. If proposed changes are implemented, the 62 will no longer come to Pocket on Rush River, so they will not be able to ride the bus to and from school. The nearest stop would be at Florin/Greenhaven, which is too far of a walk for my 11 and 9 year old. I feel comfortable have them walk a block to Rush River to ride the bus, but I am not comfortable having them walk the 1.3 mile, 29 minute walk from our house to Lake Crest at Florin/Greenhaven. We understand that changes may be needed, but eliminating service to our entire Pocket neighborhood seems like a disservice to all of those people in our community. Please reconsider, given that Pocket residents need convenient access to public transportation, and having to walk 1 mile to the nearest bus stop would not be convenient or safe for my school-aged children. *(Stephanie Silva, e-mail, #65967)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

Customer stated he takes the bus at Freeport and Kitchner Rd. at Airway Market. Proposal would make it difficult for him to walk to 35th. He would like the bus to continue on 43rd. *(Bryan Haynes, phone, #65935)*

We catch #62 to go to work in Downtown every day from the Southern terminal. Shorten the route will cause us inconvenience.

(Domina Yee, e-mail, #65325)

My friend told me today, that in June, the #62 could change the south terminal, from Rush River Drive and Windbridge, to Florin and Greenhaven.

That way, me, an elderly, residing on an apartment at Rush River Drive, depend on public transportation to Sac City College for memory improvement, to all the Chinese restaurants and Chinese stores, to all the banks, to connect to all the other bus routes, can no longer lead an active life.

The bus frequency is not as important to me as much as the availability of service.

I can speak for my self only, of course, but I know that some of my neighbors would have similar problems if the services to Rush River Drive stop.

Now that most #62 riders already get used to the current route, we know our way to get around. If the proposed new Florin Road terminal plan is implemented, would there be a backup plan for us to get around town? Something like a shuttle to connect Florin and Pocket Road?

Please take into consideration of my situation, and of my neighbors', and my neighbors' workers'.

(Joanna Mar, e-mail, #65338)

I am very concerned because I have been told that there is a possibility that the bus stop in front of the K-8 school, Alice Birney, will be moved.

My daughter uses the bus stop, along with other students of working parents. They rely on this safe, convenient stop for access to/from school daily.

The proposed new stop location is far away and is not safe for my child to walk to and she is currently one of the oldest in the group that uses the bus.

I cannot imagine the younger kids walking along busy 43rd Avenue and is definitely not safe for my daughter.

I know of a specific story of a girl who was ran over & killed after school walking/crossing the street in the rain. This tragedy did not happen at Alice Birney but at a Sacramento school.

I ask you to please leave the bus stop in its historic, accessible, safe location.

(Pia Estrada, e-mail, #65351)

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed rerouting of Bus 62. I am a parent at Alice Birney Public K-8. Many children ride the #62 bus line home from school, including mine.

The proposed map shows the Bus 62 route shifting away from our campus, where it currently has a stop in front of the school. Children and families use this resource. If the route changes to head north on Land Park Drive or east on 35th Street, our children will have to walk nearly 0.5 mile to a bus stop on the new route. This exposes the children to a variety of situations, especially if the bus is delayed. Currently if the bus is late, there are other parents and teachers around the school. If they are waiting at a new stop away from the school, they would not be in a safe and trusted environment with other known adults nearby.

I request that RT keep the current route or, alternatively, having the new route go down 43rd St (instead of 35th) with a stop on the north side of the Alice Birney campus. The latter option may keep access to Alice Birney while also meet RT's other needs for the overall route.

(Land Park, e-mail, #65362)

I am writing to oppose the closing of the route 62 bus stop at 43rd Avenue and 13th street. This bus stop is right in front of Alice Birney K-8 School and is used by my son as well as many other students. This bus stop is convenient for students to use coming to and leaving school and provides a safe place in view of parents for children to wait for a ride together. If this bus stop is removed, my son is unlikely to continue taking the bus. Please reconsider your proposal for the benefit of children and parents who rely on this bus stop for school transportation.

(Marijke Melman, e-mail, #65363)

Eliminating Route 62 stop at the Promenade Shopping Center would mean that residents (including the elderly, students, or the disabled) along Rush River and nearby areas would not have access to public transportation to school, medical, and work facilities, supermarkets, and shopping center access. Walking to Greenhaven/Florin is not an option especially in 100+ degree summer weather or pouring rain (similar to what is currently happening) during the winter months.

I would urge Regional Transit to consider the proposal offered by the Pocket Greenhaven Community Association to assure bus service for all residents.

(Celia Ing, e-mail, #65689)

I am a teacher at Alice Birney Waldorf School on 13th Street. I just found out that RT is planning to move the 62 bus stop route from 13th all the way down to South Land Park and 43rd. We have a lot of students that take the bus and for the younger students, this is a safety issue. There are many intersections between our school and the proposed new stop. It also is much further from a sense of safety. Please reconsider the move. It will seriously affect our community.

(Nathaniel Melman, e-mail, #64910)

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

I have been a regular customer of Sacramento Regional Transit for years and have been pleased with this safe, reliable, friendly service. This is a valuable travel option that reduces environmental impacts and traffic congestion, and it grants many riders a freedom and independence they might otherwise not have.

After reviewing the proposed service changes to the existing Transit Network, I would like to encourage you to reconsider the rerouting of the 62 bus line. I catch the 62 before it crosses Florin Road northbound, which is early in the in-bound Downtown course. The bus is often half full before I board, so it is clear to me that cutting off the southern end of this route will eliminate service for many riders, myself included. The 62 is well-utilized by students, families, the workforce, and members of our elderly community. If the proposed Draft Transit Network is implemented, I would need to catch the 62 several blocks away from my current stop, which I am able and may be willing to do. However, we have young and elderly riders who might not be able to do this safely. Rather than decreasing service to the Pocket/Z'berg Park area, I personally would prefer to wait longer for service or take a reasonably longer bus ride so that more citizens can have convenient access to RT and be able to commute to school, work, daycare, and medical appointments. It is more important to increase access than to shorten routes and wait times. Time is a trade-off for RT service, so we riders must plan accordingly and prepare to be flexible. I am glad to see no proposed changes to the 7 Express line, but if the 62 were to be rerouted per the SacRT Forward Draft, then I would recommend increasing the 7 Express in frequency and/or service time as it would be the only bus that comes through our area, and it is already quite impacted without the addition of displaced 62 riders. *(Laurie Fong, e-mail, #65858)*

Response: Resent updated information about revision to proposed changes for Route 62.

I am writing to say—please do not re-route the #62 bus! We love that bus! My son goes to Alice Birney on 13th Street, and he rides the 62 every day. That bus has been an important step for him in finding independence in the world. He feels confident there--and grown up. He is also learning to be a life-long user of public transportation, which is important for the planet and for him personally. I also think it's important that "destination schools" like Alice Birney be available to all kids--not just the kids whose families who are rich enough to drive them there and back every day. The 62 bus plays an important role in making this school available to all families. Many thanks for all you do. *(Kate Johnston, e-mail, #65250)*

I just learned of the proposed route change for bus #62 which currently runs in front of my sons school (Alice Birney). The change as I understand ends the stop nearest the school requiring a walk to South Land Park and 43rd for the nearest stop. I'm hoping this change is not set as this would impact more than a handful of AB families. Please let me know if this route change can be revised to keep running in front of the school (we have 7th & 8th graders who take the bus regularly). *(Mary Bradsberry, e-mail, #64952)*

My name is NiYondashay Wright, I am 22 and I have lived in Greenhaven/Pocket area for most of my life. I have taken the 62 and 81 to Sacramento City College for the last 4 years and just recently heard that both of my bus routes will be discontinued soon. Now, as a college student and not having a steady income or financial assistance, it's hard for me to go and buy a car even a used one at that. If you take away the bus routes that get me to school, so that I can further my education and get a degree and become successful it would be also hurting a lot of future students who want to go to Sacramento City College and try to get an education. I will be hurt to know that I won't be able to take a bus because in all honesty it is the most convenient and I have been doing this route for awhile I know when it comes and when it goes. So, please do not discontinue both of these routes. I know you are thinking we are not taking advantage of the bus but most of take the bus instead of driving and because financially things are not adding up to be able to afford a car. If someone can get back to me at a reasonable time, that would be great. *(NiYondashay Wright, e-mail, #64887)*

Hi. The 62, 6, and 81 are key buses I need throughout the week. The changes being proposed aren't beneficial at all. The 62 proposed changes are a major inconvenience for me. In order for me to catch it, I'd have to walk from my apartment on south land park drive to sac city college. That walk is a very far travel. I depend on the 62 to get me to and from work. I depends on it to get me to downtown. There are many elderly people in my neighborhood who depend on this 62. There are other hard working people who work downtown like me that depend on the 62 to come down from Rush River and Riverside. Please, I beg of you please reconsider these proposed changes. Please revise it to where it doesn't hurt people like me from getting to their jobs, doctor appointments family, and shopping outlets. *(Kenneth Sanders, e-mail, #65280)*

(Crystal Yu, e-mail, #65688) *FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES*
(Steve Koyasako, e-mail, #64719) *FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES*
(April King, e-mail, #64502) *FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES*
(Lance Morris, e-mail, #64781) *FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES*

Route 65 – Franklin-Univ/65th

Customer requesting no changes be made to route 65. It's the only bus that will take her to work.
(Andrina, phone, #64449)

I work in a County office at Granite Regional Park, near the Power Inn Light Rail station. With the planned elimination of Routes 61 & 65, the Power Inn and Florin-Perkins corridors will become drastically underserved by public transit. This would be really unfortunate to do away with linkages south of Folsom Blvd's Light Rail stations. I strongly urge that Regional Transit extend SmaRT Ride On-Demand Transit service in the Power Inn and Florin Perkins corridors, between Folsom Blvd and Fruitridge Road, as advocated by the Power Inn Alliance. Your consideration is much appreciated. (Janet Lewis, e-mail, #65795 & 65810)

Caller stated that she would like route 65 to remain the same. Caller reported that this is the only bus that comes in the area and is her only way to work. "Without it I have no way to work other than to walk".
(Andrea Henry, phone, #64241)

I am one of many individuals that will be vastly affected by the proposed Sac RT route changes. While I appreciate & support the idea of overhauling the routes to better match Sacramento's needs & growth, once again the area I live in is being left behind. I live in the Glen Elder area currently served by bus #65, which is proposed to be eliminated because of low ridership. I understand the reasons for this, but what are those that live here to do? It states on the proposal that this area is "mostly" within walking distance of the new 55 and 81 routes, but walking is not something that is just simple. Heat, rain, cold and other elements can make that half mile to mile walk terrible for those that might be elderly or sickly or just any of us really. Years ago when RT axed routes they took the previous route that was here, the #8, and left us with signs that stated the end was "temporary" but then we went around five years with no bus service, making it difficult on so many of us, only for it to finally be brought back a few years ago and now you're taking it away again. This move is going to leave so many that work or live in the area that will now be unserved in a lurch to figure out how to get to work, school, errands and other things when they were so reliant on public transit. There must be some way to balance the need and the costs. Perhaps still axing the Delta Shores section and running the bus just from say the Power Inn Light Rail Station to Florin Towne Center transit center. Thus still giving people in this area a way to travel to transit hubs to get on the other buses. Rather than leaving us in such a lurch. What about one of those small neighborhood shuttles that RT used to run doing that sort of small run if there aren't that many riders? Have it go between transit centers just during some peak times, making sure that people are not left behind. (Scott Redmond, e-mail, #65569)

(Aubrey Cannon, e-mail, #65253) *FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES*
(Faye Wilson & Avondale/Glen Elder NA., e-mail, #64842) *FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES*

Route 67 – Franklin

Customer requesting route 67 service frequency be increased during peak time hours. Buses are full, and passengers are not able to board. (April, phone, #63352)

I love the idea of extending these routes 67/68 (if I'm understanding the video presentation) to provide a direct route from Arden to Midtown. I've lived in Sacramento for 11 years, in many different neighborhoods, but Arden is where I've most frequently lived and shopped. I'm happy to currently live in Midtown, but it's difficult to get to Arden, the area I'm most comfortable in and familiar with. I've always

wished that there were a way to go from Downtown/Midtown to Arden without needing to transfer or walk a long distance. Please go forward with this routing change! (S. Ferghus, e-mail, #65026)

I was thrilled to learn that the first draft of the new routing system extended this route to Howe Ave. I see in the re-draft that this proposed change has been redacted. Please reinstate this change! A direct route from Midtown or Downtown to the heart of Arden is sorely needed. (S. Ferghus, e-mail, #65026)

(Carol Nelson, e-mail, #65060) **FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES**

Route 68 – 44th St.

(Carol Nelson, e-mail, #65060) **FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES**

(S. Ferghus, e-mail, #65026) **FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES**

Route 74 – International

I understand that you are considering getting rid of bus 74? You can't do that! It's my ONLY means of transportation to get to work AND to get to Kaiser. Not EVERYONE can afford to get a car, take Lyft or Uber on a daily basis and we can't ride share because our co-workers do not live close to us or they live in the opposite direction. PLEASE don't get rid of this route! State workers and ALOT of veterans rely on this route as well to get to the VA hospital because the bus that picks them up only comes twice a day and you will be disrupting SEVERAL people's lives if you go forward with this. SO PLEASE consider the lives that you will be disrupting before you make the devastating decision to alleviate this bus route PLEASE!!!!!!!!!!!!!! (Clara Beth Jones, e-mail, #65207)

Response: Thank you for your feedback pertaining to the proposed changes to Route 74. We are not proposing elimination of this route; however, we are proposing a change in the alignment. Please see below for new Route 74 description.

I am one of many individuals that use Bus #74 Monday through Friday to get work. We don't have cars; therefore we rely on public transportation to go to work and school. By changing and eliminating the #74 bus going to the Sunrise light rail station that means additional cost. We already pay \$120.00 for a monthly bus pass and now add at least another \$100.00 to use an Uber or Lyft is not feasible. Please don't stop the #74 from going to the Sunrise Light Rail Station. (Michelle Butler, e-mail, #65003)

Customer would like to see no changes made to route 74. She would have to get off at International and walk to work or take light rail to Sunrise and walk. Distance is too far to walk, she would end up having to take a Uber or Lyft to get to work. Cost would be too expensive plus her \$100 monthly pass. Customer stated she has been taking RT since 1996 and buys a monthly pass. (Kimberly Watts, phone, #64660)

Customer rides routes 28 & 74. Caller is requesting that the changes to these routes would alter how she goes to work. (Revonda Uvegef, phone, #64720, #64661, & 64832)

Route 80 – Watt Ave/Elkhorn

Caller reported that she uses route 80 to go back and forth to her doctor's appointments. She also stated that her grandson uses route 80 to go to work. (Cathleen Maine, phone, #64695)

I use these routes to connect to other buses to get to work in the TWUSD. Please keep these routes. I found out via 2 members on the committee for SAC RT. (Mish G, e-mail, #64302)

Response: Thank you for sending your feedback regarding the proposed changes to Routes 80 and 19. Where are you currently traveling to/from, and what other routes are you connecting to? I ask because service on Watt Avenue is proposed to be covered by Routes 84 and 26.

Customer would like to keep route 80 as is; her son is disabled and uses it about three times a week. If he doesn't have route 80, then he would have to take Paratransit, which would be more costly to RT. *(Diana, phone, #64563)*

Customer requesting no changes be made to route 80. Many people wouldn't be able to get to work. Its long way to light rail without a bus. *(Jenelle Christian, phone, #64491)*

Incident Details: Caller requesting that route 80 continues to run as is, due to the fact that cancelling would greatly affect how she travels around town.

(Eula Robertson, phone, #64090)

Do not take away Route 80 because that's the route I take from Watt & El Camino to get to Watt I80 to catch #93 and connect to Louis & Orlando. Keep the 80. *(Nick Bryant, e-mail, #65197)*

Response: Thank you for sending your feedback on the proposed changes to Route 80. Although this route is proposed for elimination, the Route 84 is proposed to continue serving Watt Avenue, with improved frequency of every 30 minutes. The Route 84 will travel from Watt/Manlove light rail station to Watt and Elverta, via Watt Avenue. It is our hope that the current Route 80 riders will be able to use the new Route 84 in its place. Thank you again for your comments. They will be included in the public record, and presented to the Board of Directors for their review and consideration.

Hello, I am writing because I am opposed to getting rid of route 80. I also have an alternative solution, if you are willing to hear it. My Issue: I live near the corner of La Riviera and Salmon Falls Drive. I currently take Route 80 to get to the light rail. Otherwise, I take route 80 to route 29, which I catch to come downtown. I do not have a car, since I cannot afford one. Route 80 is the only route that comes near my house. The closest bus besides that is route 84, which is over a quarter mile from my house. It would be difficult for me to walk to route 84 every morning, since I am a disabled veteran with arthritis in my right ankle. I am hoping that you will not get rid of route 80. Alternative Solution: If RT is determined to get rid of route 80, I would like to propose that Sac RT expand the route of bus 210 and expand the hours of operation. This bus already drives down La Riviera, but it stops before getting to Watt & La Riviera. This alternative would be more convenient for the people who live in our neighborhood. You could expand the service of Route 210 so that it goes all the way down La Riviera to Folsom Boulevard. Then, the bus would turn right and stop at the Starfire light rail station. The bus could then make a U-Turn and head back down La Riviera and up to J and Alhambra. If you were to expand this route, it would serve many people in my neighborhood who currently catch the bus to the light rail station in the morning. There are typically about 10 people on the bus in the morning. Many of them probably do not have cars, like myself. The expanded route 210 could run from 6 a.m. to 10 a.m. and from 2 p.m. to 6 p.m. This would allow low income people like myself to catch the bus for work in the morning, and again in the evening. *(Kenneth Miller, e-mail, #65196)*

Response: Thank you for providing your comments on the proposed changes to Route 80. We are reviewing and considering the feedback as we get them from riders, and we appreciate your interest and suggestions. You are correct; the Route 84 will now serve the area where you live (LaRiviera and Salmon Falls), and it is proposed to have better, 30-minute frequency. If you are not able to walk to the Route 84 bus stop because of a disability or health-related condition, then paratransit service may be an option. Your input is valuable to this process, and it will be included in the public record, as well as presented to the Board of Directors for their review and consideration. Thank you again for your participation in this important project.

I am writing on behalf of a dear friend that cannot drive and has limited funds to take a Lyft. "I rely on public transportation for a majority of my travels around my area, getting to and from stores, dr appts, etc. The 80 bus is the only bus which travels to & from the nearest lightrail station, Watt/Manlove, to my home, and which can take me to & from to dr appts and to the nearest grocery store. It also is the only easily

accessible bus within about a 2 mile walk of my home. Sacramento Regional Transit is planning on putting this line in June. I strongly request you reconsider this matter. (*Anna Cebrian, e-mail, #65562*)

(*Diane McKay, e-mail, #65801*) **FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES**

Route 81 – Florin/65th/Riverside

Customer requesting no changes be made to route 81. (*David Parra, phone, #64417*)

I received the handout concerning the proposed route changes for #81, effective June 2019. I have a son who attends School of Engineering and Science (SES) on Gloria Drive. We live on the other side of the I-5. My son rides #81 to get from home to school and back again. If this route terminates at Greenhaven Drive instead of Riverside Drive. My son will have to walk an additional eight city blocks along Florin Road to Gloria Road. Florin has a forty mile per hour speed limit and I personally witness that the majority of drives are going faster than 40mph. As this is a bus route that serves a public school, more than just my son uses bus route #81 to get to and from home to school. An increase of foot traffic by minors along a fast city street is not a good combination. (*Gena Harmonson, e-mail, #64698*)

As a longtime Pocket resident, I am very concerned about the proposed scope of service reductions to the Pocket area. In particular, reducing the frequency of the 81 bus and ending the route at Florin Road and Greenhaven Drive would make it inconvenient for some residents to commute to work and school. (*Gloria Eng, e-mail, #65005*)

I am writing to express grave concern about the cancellation of Route 80. When I look at the new maps I see a lack of service to the area south of 50 and east of 65th Avenue, such as along La Riviera Drive. The changes to the #26 and # 84 don't address continuing service in that area. How is that area going to be served? I know a community member who cannot drive due to health reasons who relies on Route 80 to get to the lightrail station at Manlove and to/from grocery store and medical appointments. What will her options be? (*Alison French-Tubo, e-mail, #65571*)

(*Myrtle Jones, e-mail, #64886*) **FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES**

(*Crystal Yu, e-mail, #65688*) **FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES**

(*Elaine Steidley, e-mail, #65152*) **FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES**

(*Steve Koyasako, e-mail, #64719*) **FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES**

(*Gilda Fusilier, e-mail, #64143*) **FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES**

(*NiYondashay Wright, e-mail, #64887*) **FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES**

(*Lance Morris, e-mail, #64781*) **FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES**

Route 82 – Howe

I plan to attend the 1:30 PM February 5 RT presentation at RIL. I was wondering if this presentation is open to the entire disability community, or is it limited to a small number of transit disability advocates? I am asking in order to determine the size of the audience and the number of questions which can be asked by me. I have gone through the hour plus length video, which was helpful but still had a lot of visual aspects which were not orally conveyed to a non-sighted person. For instance, James Drake gave an explanation that the #82 route would be changed to eliminate some turns between Whitney Avenue and American River College. However, he did not specify which turns were going to be eliminated along the route, or if the route change would eliminate service on Mission Ave to destination locations such as the Mission Oaks Recreation and Park District, Mission Carmichael HealthCare Center, etc. I do want to acknowledge the video was a major accessibility step forward in presenting visual information to people with visual impairments. Nevertheless, what would have helped is having a more detailed narrative for this route as well as other routes as to the streets the busses would be operating on. The more detailed description for each bus route would be equivalent to the route maps which were shown on the video for people with vision. I will have the following questions or requests for clarification: 1. What will be the actual route that is being proposed for the #82 bus line? 2. What busses will serve San Juan Mercy

Hospital? 3. What busses will serve American River College? 4. What busses will serve the Morse Ave Kaiser Hospital? 5. Will the #84 bus route continue to detour off Watt Ave to go up Morse Ave so to serve Kaiser before going back onto Watt Ave? 6. Why is it proposed for the #30 bus to no longer serve the Amtrak/Sacramento Valley Stations since this is a major gateway in and out of Sacramento? 7. Has it been decided that the Amtrak/Sacramento Valley Stations will not become the major transit hub for Sacramento? For years, it has been talked about that this location was to eventually become the major transit hub for multiple forms of public transportation such as: a. Light rail. b. RT busses and other transit company bus lines. c. Airport shuttles. d. Megabus. e. Others to be determined. 8. How will seniors and people with disabilities who do not have the endurance or physical ability attend events at McKinley Park/Shepard Garden and Arts Center if the #34 bus is reduced to a weekday peak time schedule only? It is unreasonable to expect this segment of the population to walk the distance from the #30 bus line on J Street to McKinley Park. Also, it will deny these individuals the opportunity to participate and enjoy activities offered at these two locations which will be available to the "able-bodied". 9. One of the premises for redoing the bus system is to better address the employment, health, social, and welfare issues of the socioeconomically disadvantaged communities within the Sacramento RT District with no increase of transportation funding resources. If this is correct, why is there the discontinuation of bus service to many of the industrial areas of Sacramento where there is employment for individuals with little or no skills, in other words, members of the socioeconomically disadvantaged community? These are some of my questions and concerns which arose after viewing the video. Some of the information may have been contained in the visual aids that were not fully given audio descriptions. Please feel free to share this email with James Boyle and James Drake, or anyone else who might have interest in hearing from the public on this matter. Perhaps, my questions/concerns can be considered for integration into the presentation so to save time. *(Gene Lozano, e-mail, #65277)*

The #82 and #80/84 times NEED TO BE STAGGERED. They only run every half-hour on weekdays, less often other times. Lots of people coming from Butano toward Sac State, and back, can take either 82 or 80/84, and yet these buses always arrive within minutes of each other. Then if you miss those, it's a half-hour wait. I live in Arden Arcade and am partially disabled. I always have to walk 1/3 mile to catch a bus. You REALLY need to begin the van pickup type of service you started in Citrus Heights, which I hear was a big success. Arden is so spread out, and there are a lot of older people in this area who need to get around. It's exhausting for me to walk 1/3 mile to catch first bus, then often wait up to a half-hour to catch the transfer bus. Then it's the same thing on the return trip. *(Diane McKay, e-mail, #65801)*

Route 95 –Citrus Heights/Antelope

(Bonnie Lindemann, phone, #64746) FEEDBACK RE: MULTIPLE ROUTES

General Comments

My name is Nish Krishnamurthy and I'm a transit enthusiast and am interested in SacRT's Forward plan. I was going through your December 10th presentation and was wondering what Measure A+ was about. I'm familiar with the original Measure A passed in 1989 and its extension passed in 2009 which helps fund transit in the Sacramento area, but I'm not sure what Measure A+ refers to. I can't find anything online about it either. I'm guessing it's a hypothetical ballot measure which would further help fund transit? Also, I'm interested in improving transit options to and from the airport. Has the Green Line plan, which was supposed to bring light rail out to the airport, been put on hold? If so, are there plans to perhaps increase frequency of Yolo (or SacRT) bus services to SMF? *(Nish Krishnamurthy, e-mail, #64638)*

This is in reference to your proposed route changes. Please consider adding access to Arena Blvd at Duckhorn. My neighborhood is not served by public transportation during non commute hours. Please add me to your email distribution. *(Beck With, e-mail, #64844)*

Congratulations on the video presentation. I watched the entire thing. I had looked at the maps, but the video made your thinking much clearer. It sounds like a good plan. Just for curiosity, Did Jared Walker Assoc. give you much help? I read his book and got a lot out of it. *(Mark Riley, e-mail, #64907)*

Response: Thank you for your interest in the SacRT Forward project. We agree that the video has been extremely successful in communicating the draft network changes to the public. And yes, JWA was very helpful in our system redesign project; they provided very talented staff to assist us with developing some initial draft scenarios for our future bus network. Thanks again for sending your compliments about the video presentation. We are pleased to hear that it has been such a useful tool for our riders.

Last week, during the Active Transportation meeting, we heard from Mr. Boyle who presented some background on the proposed network and the public input process thus far. At this meeting, I expressed my concerns about outreach in communities that do not have existing routes, for example, in North Natomas. Although Mr. Boyle shared that they attended 1 pop-up event in the area, I'm concerned that this may not have adequately reached the N. Natomas region. Currently, there are NO existing light rail lines in North Natomas, and very limited bus routes. The new network does propose one line on east, which is a great start, but it completely leaves out the west side. If you visit this area, you'll know that you can't get from the west to the east easily, unless you drive. This population has grown significantly, and is continuing to grow as more and more development is underway, since the building moratorium was lifted not too long ago. Not only are there more communities, but there are even more active living communities being developed. With such a large older adult population (nearly 20,000 in zip codes 95834 & 95835 combined according to AARP data), with several active living communities, and a number of families in the area, SacRT should seriously consider how people in this neighborhood will get around. It is a suburban neighborhood, meaning walkability to grocery, retail, schools, etc. is non-existent for most of the residents. Bike infrastructure is not great, so there isn't a strong culture of biking in the community yet. Older adults might not want to or might not be able to drive their cars forever, so many will become isolated from the community. Although the JIBE shuttles exist, they currently serve the commuter population to downtown and back, and only during peak hours. What about the other members of the community who just want to get around? I think it's extremely important to consider this growing community that is extremely underserved currently in terms of transportation options. SmaRT ride may be one option. If there is more time for public comment and outreach, I strongly encourage SacRT to reach out to other parts of the community that may not have had a voice thus far. Surveying JIBE riders is only one small portion of the population. I would also encourage walking tours or site visits before the close of this public comment period. Thanks for your consideration of these comments. Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns or would like to discuss further. (*Jennifer Berdugo, e-mail, #65171*)

Do you know how frightening it would be for octogenarian bus riders like our household to take a bus home after dark and then have to walk from the bus stop in darkness in Del Paso Manor-Arden Arcade? Just wish SacRT would have their afternoon meetings closer to this area once in a while...Just hoping some events get planned at noon or 1pm when lots of people are strolling around during lunch hour. There are many senior seniors in Arden Arcade and Del Paso Manor who do not drive and use public transportation. The only event planned on topics of interest to bus and light rail riders over age 77+ in this area happens at night. It would be wonderful if once in a while event meetings happen in Del Paso Manor (Watt and Marconi Ave area) at noon or 1 pm when it's safe for older bus riders to walk to meeting places in public areas near a bus stop. There are many libraries, Country Club Mall, and other buildings in this area available for meetings near a bus stop and/or walkable, but no meetings are ever planned in the daytime when senior pedestrians/transit riders are outside and can safely walk home in the early afternoon. Just a suggestion. Thank you. (*Mr. & Mrs. Hart, e-mail, #65247*)

Having thought about it for a bit, I'm still not sure about 45-minute frequencies for bus routes. I think I'd rather have predictability that doesn't require checking the schedule or an on-line app than a few more Route 11 runs on Saturdays and Sundays.

However, if 45-minute frequencies are necessary for more efficient system-wide travel that requires transfers, then it might be okay for general ridership. For me, though, if transfers are involved I'd use an on-line app to see if the trip is practical, anyway, so for those infrequent cases the 45-minute headway would be acceptable.

(Chris Holm, e-mail, #65276)

Have you been receiving a lot of questions or comments from the public about the SacRT Forward that would eliminate 13 bus routes? I see little info online about the timeline for when the board will vote on the proposed plan. *(Zach Miller, e-mail, #64726)*

Response: Thank you for sending your feedback about the SacRT Forward project. We have been receiving a lot of comments about the draft network, and will continue to receive comments into February. The changes are still only proposed, and it is likely that there will still be some revisions. All of the feedback we have received, and continue to receive, will be carefully reviewed and considered by staff and by the Board of Directors before a final decision is made. The draft network and comments from the community will be presented to the Board on February 25; however, approval of the plan and a time line for implementation has not yet been determined. The Board will provide more direction once they have been presented the information. Thank you again for providing your feedback to this important process.

The Power Inn corridor NEEDS to have Smart Ride in place by the time existing routes are eliminated. Please implement this program, this is vital to the community who live and work in the area. Under the proposal, stakeholders from the office of Vice Mayor Eric Guerra, Alliance area and surrounding neighborhoods are asking that SacRT's Smart Ride On-Demand Transit be implemented to make up for the lack of service to the Power Inn area and our 29,000 people that live and work here. *(Stacy Ladd, e-mail, #65761)*

Please continue to provide bus/shuttle service in our area. *(Kelly Compton, e-mail, #65789)*

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on your proposed new bus system. As a commercial broker for the Sacramento region, I understand the pros and cons of all of our commercial corridors. The Power Inn submarket has an uphill battle as it is with cannabis, homelessness and theft relative to nearby competitors like West Sacramento and Natomas. To have to tell potential businesses that there is also no public transit to service their employees is one more reason for them to choose to locate in other corridors. I ask that you include a service like Smart Ride to supplement the eliminated bus lines, so that the Power Inn submarket remains competitive as a place to locate a business. *(Mike Smith, e-mail, #65803)*

Customer requesting expand SmartRide service to Jackson St. and Madison Ave. (North Highlands area). *(Anjelica Belasco, phone, #65865)*

This change would leave many seniors out of luck. We do our shopping and business in midtown middays. Many businesses are not open that early. Many riders are seniors that do not have cell phones or computers and many do not speak English so they are not voicing their opinion. You are doing a great injustice to us seniors. Perhaps if you advertised about how convenient, cheap and easy it is to ride the bus you would increase ridership. *(Inez Kenison, e-mail, #65867)*

It has come to my attention that bus routes 61 and 65 servicing the Power Inn District may be eliminated based on the new bus route system being proposed by SacRT. As an employer in the District, it is highly important that my employees reach their place of employment safely and on-time. The more options for public/private transit is of great importance. SacRT's [Smart Ride On-Demand Transit](#) would make sense in our area due to the high number of employees commuting in and out on a daily basis. I would like to ask that SacRT consider this On-Demand service on a trial basis to determine its feasibility. *(Abel Pereira, e-mail, #65894)*

I'd like to see far better RT service from Antelope and North Highlands to American River College. I am a single retired grandmother raising a grandchild who will be going to ARC fall, 2020. Money for a vehicle and insurance for her on top of college expenses will make our budget super tight. *(Kathryn Zeka, e-mail, #65965)*

Airport: We remain concerned about bus service to the airport, and feel that a solution that increases frequency and span of service should be a part of the SacRT Forward network planning. (*Sacramento Transit Advocates and Riders- STAR, e-mail, #66068*)

When considering adding a route to the RT service please consider a route from East Sac to Rio Americano/Jesuit area. With Sac City unified not having a good comprehensive high school option several East Sac students head to Rio or Jesuit. At this point there is no public transportation to the Rio/Jesuit Area. Parent carpool, students drivers or Uber are the only current options. Thank you for your consideration. (*Susan Loomis, e-mail, #66074*)

While we like frequent service, we are concerned that the implementation of SacRT Forward will leave behind a lot of riders. We still maintain that as a public utility, SacRT should provide service to all, with no one left behind, or create areas devoid of service. We are concerned that SacRT is going to rely on SmaRT Ride Service to take the place of the created void/s. Currently there are only two service areas, Citrus Heights and Franklin-South Sacramento in place. They provide limited service hours and no weekend service. There will be serious voids if the other eight service areas are not going to be in place when SacRT Forward is implemented. (*Ridership for the Masses – RFTM, e-mail, #66078*)

Please consider adding a bus stop near Rio Americano High School-some of those busy streets are dangerous for bikers! (*Kristie Corcoran, e-mail, #66083*)

Hello – Currently Rio Americano high school students have very limited access to public transportation due to the distance between the school and active routes. Please consider a route along American River Drive that would provide students and other members of the general public access from Watt Avenue and East towards Arden Way/Fair Oaks Blvd. Maybe this addition could be used as a bridge route out to Carmichael? (*Karen McDougal, e-mail, #66090*)

There is a situation that is happening concerning ridership & Route changes, more. Starting with the bus route numbers 23- 25 -21-1 -84...The head branches of the city & county bus system is negatively effecting the communities that do not have other low cost affordable ways of transportation, those that are not legally able to drive an automobile, those that cannot easily afford the cost, expenses of automobiles along with repairs smog checks purchase aside from the fact that many are unable to operate an automobile, that's no one's fault not even the persons in question but aside from that the head brass of the transit system are ignoring that even when it comes to the physically and mentally & diagnosed disabled, handicapped, many if not the entire population of the senior citizens & many if not all of the state city & counties youth from getting to many places as they do outings like going to the mall & food shopping, medical appointments, and several other things, activities & the norm of getting around to do, take care of things even in the sense of what many have to do in each of their day to day life. The transit authority of Regional Transit claim to be better appropriating for other people, the other numbers of Sacramento's cities, counties population is not negatively affected. Yet by cutting & rerouting / directing is negatively effecting the other large percent of the cities, counties population a lot deeper then then (RT) - Will even if at all actually realize. RT - Already has bus route numbers 01 -82-To start that it is operating where many can with they do not need to add the 25 & 23 or even the 84 to accommodate that area. It is better the way that it is where the 25 & 23 are taking many to, from medical appointments, hangouts, other activities like going to the mall in Citrus Heights, food shopping, cloth, gift shopping even as they go out to dinner or lunch, dinner, even when many head to work & look for employment on the bus they can stop for breakfast out, where many can meetup with many of those that they know, are friends with, within their own families & even when many go out on dates even as they meet the person that they will be dating & for many that are looking for other apartment in other locations within, around the Sacramento cities, counties. If they want to better accommodate the other areas they do not need to cut short routes like bus routes numbers 25 & 23. If they want to better accommodate other area's with in the cities & counties of Sacramento- Just simply add other bus lines like a 53-A & etc. - Leave the bus route numbers of the 23 & 25 the way that they are, do not cut them sort its better to leave the bus lines as they are or Regional Transit will without getting large amounts of unhappy angry population of the ridership in each, every other cities, counties that are really effected even if RT - head brass is not truly looking at starting with in the Carmichael Citrus Heights & the deeper areas with in those cities, the Sacramento areas that

connect , cross with streets like Watt, El Camino , more. Each number of the ridership that we at C.R.P.H.A. -Have encountered are in more then hate , dismay angary about the shortening , eliminations of the bus rotes on the RT -Chopping block -...& the proposed changes that Regional Transit has in the works at current. Many of the many that we have encountered of upset , angered ridership were more then upset on , about the proposed changes concerning the 23 &25 -Even when it comes to the base that the two will no longer transport the public to the Sunrise Mall to start along with the many that need to go to Mercy San Juan Hospital , clinics , many other area's .So the head brass of Regional Transit better take this seriously , toss the plan that is in place that they have proposed here , now leave the 23 & 25 , 84 bus routes the way they are at current to start. And do not ignore the public on any level , in any reason ever again It should not be ignored that it is the citizens of Sacramento , cities, counties , the many cities, counties that surround Sacramento , its cities, counties pay taxes that pay the employees , the top brass of Regional Transit -Its not only the federal Government that does. (C.R.P.H.A., Facebook message, #66091)

SacRT Forward Letters

December 23, 2018

Attention: SacRT Planning Department

Subject: Moving Bus Terminal at Florin Road and Riverside Blvd. to Florin Road and Greenhaven

When the Planning Department met with the Board Members on December 10, 2018, I couldn't believe what was put under "Issue" in the memo. **Whether or not to release the Sac RT Forward draft networks to the public for review and comment.**

Why wouldn't the Planning Department release the draft for the public to review and comment on? Since, the changes will affect the public.

I couldn't attend any of the open house meetings because the meetings weren't over until 7:00p.m. The last #2 bus arrives at Riverside Blvd. and Florin Road at 5:35pm, going toward 43rd Avenue. I don't drive do to a medical condition.

What is the purpose of moving the bus terminal from Florin Road and Riverside Blvd. to Florin Road and Greenhaven?

Saving money? How much money can SacRT save by moving a bus terminal one mile?

If the Bus 2 continues to drop passengers at Florin Road and Riverside Blvd. – and the terminal moves to Florin Road and Greenhaven, individuals will have to walk 1.7 miles from Florin Road and Riverside Blvd to get to Florin Road and Greenhaven to take Bus 81.

And on the return trip, bus riders will have to walk 1.7 miles again with or without packages, from Florin Road and Greenhaven to Florin Road and Riverside Blvd.

No matter what the weather i.e., raining with wind blow, just raining; cold weather with wind blowing; or just cold weather; mothers with their children in strollers, with or without packages, senior citizens, individuals using walkers; temperatures 105 and higher. If the bus terminal is moved to Florin Road and Greenhaven, it will be a tremendous hardship for bus riders.

I live in the capital of California. California has the fifth economy in the world and California could be its' own country. But I don't have weekend bus service. I have to walk to Riverside Blvd and Florin Road (1.7 miles) to get a bus (currently) then walk back again from where I came from.

There is a bus stop going toward South Land Park (4 blocks), but the 61 doesn't operate on the weekends. Currently, RT has twenty-three (23) buses that don't operate on the weekend. Why? And this is the capital of California.

Cordially,

Gilda Fusilier
Gilda Fusilier

December 23,
2018

SacRT Planning Dept,
Dear Planning Dept.

This is to provide my
comments on your proposed
changes, specifically Routes
2 and 38 designated for
elimination. Please

reconsider and keep them.

By eliminating them,
you leave the ~~area~~
upper west edge with

no convenient service.

Why are we being neglected?

I use both buses
regularly and see others
that do so, too. I

live in the area ~~by~~
near ~~area~~ (Cove)

Broadway and Riverside.
The 51 you want to
keep is too far to
walk to. You have
many transit users
in the Seavy Circle,
Upper Land Park area
who use 38 and 2.
I see many commuters
who use 2 to work
downtown — the
proposed limited
commute times for 2
aren't enough. You
end up driving people
back to their cars.
Have you looked at
keeping the Upper Land
Park Service + add it to
51? Please

recommender. Thank you. Mar. 1983

December 2018

SacRT Planning Department:

To RT:

I reviewed your draft of changes for June 2019.

Please keep 38 and 2 for Upper Land Park area. Citizens there need connection to downtown.

Riverside Blvd is a major street needing transit.

The proposed 11 which includes Riverside Blvd in Upper Land Park is a good proposal if you proceed to eliminate the existing 38 and 2.

I hope you either keep existing 38 or 2 or institute the proposed 11. This will keep the Upper

Land Park area in the
RT System

Thank you for accepting
my comments.

Sac RT Planning Dept.

P.O. Box 2110

Sacramento, CA 95812-2110

Re: SacRT Forward Draft Networks (December 10 Board of Directors Presentation)

11-25-2019


Dear Sir/Madam:

Please consider the following as a protest to the proposed cuts to the RT Bus Route 19. As a longtime resident of both Rio Linda and then Elverta, I have long relied on the Bus 19 service to get everywhere I needed to go. It has literally made me independent despite the fact that I have not had a driver's license and car. In the early 2000's I took the bus to connect to the Route 1 service to American River College and also to McClellan Park to do access shopping and medical services with my Air Force retiree family. Now that I have my own family and we live off Elverta Road, I use the bus with my young children and we visit my elderly mother in Rio Linda who has dementia and we also can access shopping and the Light Rail service in North Highlands to get to medical appointments. My husband drives a car, but when he is at work during the week, we take the bus and it gets us to where we need to go.

Our elderly, Air Force veteran neighbor, Kenneth, lives down the street off Dominion Way and he takes the bus with his mobility scooter almost every day in order to go to the McClellan Park Commissary and the VA Clinic. He lives alone. Maybe he won't be able to stay in his home if the bus does not come anymore. It's hard for Kenneth to call you and email you and send you a letter, but there are hundreds of people like him who use this service and who don't have any real solution for discontinuation of the service in the future.

We never see our buses empty. It's not Grand Central Station out here but there are real people who are part of a community and they use this service to get to work and school and to be caregivers for their family. There is a reason it is called Rio Linda/Elverta in so many publications and on so many maps; we are connected. Yes, most people have a pickup or an SUV and they don't care about the bus, but I want my children growing up seeing their neighbors and able to use transit anywhere in the world because that's how Paris works, that's how London gets to the doctor--I know, I've seen that too, I've been there too. My boys don't fantasize about being 16 and getting a driver's license; right now they want to be bus drivers when they grow up, or they want to ride the subway in New York City. That's how it starts, with access out here in Elverta on the bus 19. That's how I gained the confidence to travel anywhere, that's part of why we moved out here. Please reconsider cutting our route. Thanks for your time,

Sincerely,



Crystal Fountain

7908 Bellingrath Dr.

Elverta, CA 95626

(916) 694-4303

SAC RT Planning Department

My name Reggie Purdy and I hear that bus twenty four is under consideration to be cancelled permanently in June of 2019. I'm writing a letter of support for you to consider your thoughts of cancelling the bus route 24. I ride the bus 24 everyday to connect to bus 21 so I can get to work when I ride bus 21 to bus-orlando. The bus 24 stop is a block from Will I live and is important enough to me to write a letter and mail the letter in to your planning department in hope that it will save bus route 24 from being cancelled and no longer offered to regional transit rider in Fair Oaks and Grandvale.

Sincerely

Reggie Purdy.

SacRT Planning Dept.
P.O. Box 2110
Sacramento, CA 95816-2110

Donnie Lindemann
8125 Deseret Ave.
Fair Oaks, Ca 95628

11/6/19 Dear Rt Planning -

The opposite of Love is not Hatred

The opposite of love is indifference.

I am sure you can pull up data on how much usage of 24 + 28 there is daily.

The elimination of these routes

suggests indifference / Plus disconnect from Orangevale

Smart Ride looks good on paper.

It will slow transportation to a crawl.

As a senior from Madison + Fair Oaks to Madison and Sunrise represents 20-25 minutes walk.

As a senior from Madison + Fair Oaks to Sunrise and Arcadia is 20-25 mins.

Add that to your commute times in heat + cold. Walk a mile in my shoes.

Sincerely,
Donnie Lindemann

Bonnie Lindemann

8125 Deseret Ave

Fair Oaks, Ca. 95628

January 11, 2019

SacRT Planning Dept.

P.O. Box 2110

Sacramento, CA 95816-2110

Dear Planning Department-

- This letter is to express how very essential Routes 24 and 28 are for me.
- I use Route 28 , most times I ride RT, upon leaving home, 90%.
- I use Route 24, most times I return home, 90%.
- 24 connects me to the Orangevale: Raleys: Post Office, \$ Treee, Bingo Hall, SuperWalmart, and Winco.
- Route 24, makes it possible to shop and return close to home, from Sprouts, Petsmart, Walmart, my bank on Sunrise, Trader Joes.
- RT is my only form of transportation. Without 28 &24, additional walking times, by 20 minutes, each way, adds stress, rain or shine, with carted groceries, on return trips.
- Smart Rides cannot provide the flexibility to come and go as needed, changing plans based on weather changes. The Smart Ride buses seem to work for Smart Phone customers, with predictable schedules. Flip phone users will be paying flip phone charges to contact the customer service line at RT.
- Smart Rides may have us stand a block or so away, meaning we will have to allow additional time to be there, 10-30 minutes, hanging out, with or without shelter from the weather.
- As a senior, the proposed changes do not accommodate for the extreme hot, cold or rainy weather or shelter/bench provision. Unpredictable schedules, waiting times that are extensive, expectation that the senior relocate to yet another spot to wait to ride share. (No GPS on flip phones.) As a senior I prefer to not use my phone, so I find no joy in being forced to pay for a Smart Phone so I can use your system.
- I was unable to visit your home page from the library computer, neither Jan. 10. nor Jan 11, to read all of the proposals.
- These many changes are not advertised on buses and need our input.

Bonnie Lindemann
8125 Deseret Ave
Fair Oaks, Ca. 95628

Jan. 14, 2019

SacRT Planning Dept.

P.O. Box 2110

Sacramento, CA 95816-2110

Dear Planning Department-

- This letter is to express how very essential Routes 24 and 28 are for me.
- I use Route 28 , most times I ride RT, upon leaving home, 90%.
- I use Route 24, most times I return home, 90%.
- 24 connects me to the Orangevale: Raleys: Post Office, \$ Treee, Bingo Hall, SuperWalmart, and Winco.
- Route 24, makes it possible to shop and return close to home, from Sprouts, Petsmart, Walmart, my bank on Sunrise, Trader Joes.
- RT is my only form of transportation. Without 28 &24, additional walking times, by 20 minutes, each way, adds stress, rain or shine, with carted groceries, on return trips.
- Smart Rides cannot provide the flexibility to come and go as needed, changing plans based on weather changes. The Smart Ride buses seem to work for Smart Phone customers, with predictable schedules. Flip phone users will be paying flip phone charges to contact the customer service line at RT.
- Smart Rides may have us stand a block or so away, meaning we will have to allow additional time to be there, 10-30 minutes, hanging out, with or without shelter from the weather.
- As a senior, the proposed changes do not accommodate for the extreme hot, cold or rainy weather or shelter/bench provision. Unpredictable schedules, waiting times that are extensive, expectation that the senior relocate to yet another spot to wait to ride share. (No GPS on flip phones.) As a senior I prefer to not use my phone, so I find no joy in being forced to pay for a Smart Phone so I can use your system.
- I was unable to visit your home page from the library computer, neither Jan. 10. nor Jan 11, to read all of the proposals.
- These many changes are not advertised on buses and need our input.

*Sincerely,
Bonnie Lindemann*

Bonnie Lindemann
8125 Deseret Ave.
Fair Oaks, Ca. 95628
January 23, 2019

Sac RT Planning Manager
PO Box 2110
Sacramento, Ca. 95810-2110

Dear SacRT Planning Manager,

- There has been very little time allowed for public input regarding the "New Bus Network". It was presented by your staff to the Board of Directors December 10, 2018.
- There were no posted bulletins on the buses nor on shelters, between Dec. 10-31st, 2018, related to open houses, said to have been going on, in December, 2018.
- I learned of these meetings, January 10, 2019, when I found the white pamphlet, called the Next Stop News, on the bus.
- I was unable to locate the RT home page website, with the proposals, on Jan. 10th and 11th, 2019.
- Attached you will find a copy of the letter I sent, by mail, January 14, 2019, with my objections, to the elimination of routes 24 and 28. (I had yet to see the proposals.)
- January 16, 2019 letter, attached, is my response to the proposals. Although handwritten, it depicts the impact these changes will make, in some way.
- The next meeting is Jan. 28, 2019, time and location, unknown to me. Bulletins on bus?
- Observations: Routes 28, 24, 95, 23, 25 all traveled through Sunrise/Arcadia. Route 21 no longer will travel early morning hours, from Sunrise. Will 21 be scheduled more frequently since 28 is to be eliminated?
- East of Sunrise will no longer have ANY scheduled transportation, linking Sunrise to Main, via Madison and Greenback; Fair Oaks to Orangevale- Route 24. RT Also disconnects Fair Oaks from Carmichael, completely, again avoiding Sunrise/Arcadia by reroute of 25 and eliminating 23. Perhaps the avoidance of Sunrise/Arcadia is reflecting the new multi-plex planned for the future.
- This proposal reflects at least a year's worth of brainstorming. There is an answer to every objection, and passenger's inconvenience. More Light Rail service, is offered (not important to me); nor Smart Rides, requiring a phone call, costing more, Inhibiting spontaneity, invading privacy, (unnecessary use of internet). The personal additional 40 minutes walking time, rain or shine, to reach and return from Sunrise rather than Fair Oaks, matters to me as a senior.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Lindemann

BONNIE LINDEMANN
8125 DESERET AVE
FAIR OAKS, CA. 95628

SAC RT PLANNING DEPT. MANAGER JANUARY 28, 2019
PO Box 2110
SACRAMENTO, CA. 95810-2110

DEAR SAC RT PLANNING DEPT. MANAGER-

- MY OWN TRANSPORTATION IS RT, DUE TO LOW INCOME; NOT BEING ABLE TO AFFORD A CAR.
- AS A SENIOR, I HESITATE TO GO OUT NIGHTS, FOR SAFETY REASONS. LIGHT RAIL FEELS UNSAFE.
- I AM UNABLE TO ATTEND THE BOARD MEETING, TONIGHT, JAN 28., 2019, AT 5:30 PM. RE: PROPOSALS.

• MY CONCERNS :

- ELIMINATION OF ROUTE 24 - NEED FOR CONTINUED CONNECTION OF: SUNRISE/ARCADIA TO: ORANGEVALE VIA SUNRISE/MADISON/MAIN/GREENBACK.
- CONNECTION OF SUNRISE/ARCADIA TO FAIROAKS
- ELIMINATION OF ROUTE 28 - NEED FOR CONTINUED CONNECTION OF: MADISON TO SUNRISE/ARCADIA VIA FAIROAKS BLVD
- ELIMINATION OF ROUTES 23 + 25 VIA SUNRISE CONNECTION OF SUNRISE TO FAIROAKS + MANZANITA CARMICHAEL
- SMART PHONES ARE RELIED ON TO CONNECT WITH SMART RIDES. LOW INCOME - NO SMART PHONE.

SINCERELY,
Bonnie Lindemann

1-7-19

sacRT planning dept
po box 2110
sacramento ca 95816-2110

subject: Proposed service changes

I think proposed changes should be publicized more-directly on impacted buses. I only recently found out my bus is proposed elimination.

<u>Route</u>	<u>My Comment</u>
38 to be eliminated	River Oaks area needs service. There is a riders base here. Please keep service to River Oaks to downtown.
2 to be eliminated except only limited commute trips	This also eliminates service to River Oaks - Upper Land Park. Please consider keep 2 to service Upper Land Park
11	This proposed 11 adds a portion of the 2 and continues

service to Upper
Land Park. This
is a good change,

30,68

The change is
O.K.

Benton Clark

12-31-18

SacRT Planning Dept.

P.O. Box 2110

Sacramento CA 95816-2110

Subject: Proposed
Transit Changes for
June 2019

Dear Planning Dept:

For your consideration are
my comments.

I ride 38 extensively.
I am upset it is possibly
eliminated. I live in
River Oaks area where
there are many transit
users. There are sufficient
riders in the area.

I respectfully request
you consider service
to this area whether
you continue 38 or
include this area on -1-

or as part of another
bus line.

I only found out about
the changes this week.

I hope my comments
are not too late for
you to consider.

Respectfully,
Carole Newlin

20, December 2018

SacRT Planning Dept.
Regional Transit

Dear Board Members about Route 38:

Please keep Route 38 in the River Oaks area. I am writing as a fellow passenger. tells me you will end Route 38 in your planning.

River Oaks has citizens who need the bus. You take away from them. Broadway Route 51 is too far some. You also take Route 2 away ~~that~~, ~~is~~ ~~A~~ You need bus on main streets.

A suggestion is keep 38. or
You can extension 51 into

River Oaks or extension
Route 2 into River Oaks.

I see many River Oaks
people use 38, all ages and
all income but many are
low income and elderly.

Please consideration of our
neighborhood. Please don't
neglect us.

Thank you I appreciate you
have my comments.

Respectfully,

Jane Fay,

@c: Mayor Sacramento

I have been a Bus rider since 1948 a 74yr SA citizen
I have seen this bus system go down hill for years from
a 5¢ Fare to \$3.50 The Buses are GARDEN CAN BUS 51
and Rush Hr LT rail. We don't need to go down town
Nothing there with subways. CANT AFFORD Golden 1 cent
Return to DOWNTOWN STREET CARS ARENT REALLY NEEDED
only HOVELY & TOURIST. & RALEY Field.

Need to Restore shuttle service 9^{am} - 7 pm on Folsom Blvd
and Line 38 CUT off River ~~only~~ or put on Renoute ST
PUT 38 & Folsom on Shuttle 29th LT (near) & 65th LT
Fix transfer connection to meet NOT SECONDS LATE
we wait 1/2 hr or more. Especially 38 to 51 just mill
at Stockton & Broadway.

More buses would be helpful? CANT AFFORD
SEATS NOT AVAILABLE take up 2-4 seats with BACKPACKS,
SHOPPING CARTS, wheel chairs, bikes. or Feet on other seats.
PLEASE TRY TO improve Bus Lines.

SACRT Forward

John Edwin Morgan

SORRY CANT ATTEND


open Houses & meeting.
don't drive or out at Night.

RIVER OAKS HOUSING @ PUT ON 51
 LT MAIL
 TO G-1000
 CUT MID TOWN
 STOP SIGNS

MAKE Folsom Blvd
 hourly 9-7
 Shuttle 65-29 11 AM

MAKE BUS 32
 hourly 9-6
 Shuttle 65th-29
 Eliminate down town
 & stop signs on SE

Remove river oaks on
 the route 51?



MASTER PLAN by
 JOHN EDWIN MORGAN
 5200 Broadway #6
 SACRAMENTO CA 95820
 E. MAIL
 SACCAT682 - MORGAN. JOHN 891
 @ G. mail.com

Former planner for Mayor's office
 Tahoe Park Assn.
 N.S.G.W.
 President N.S.G.W.
 Sacto Resident & RT rider since 1948

1-18-19

Regional Transit
Attention SACT Forward Planning

I am writing in regarding the Mass changes for June.

I recommend #38 remain with service in River Oaks since the changes eliminate convenient service for that portion of town. That area has had service for over 30 years because it is needed. We need bus service just as much as the other areas that you are retaining service for. We have talked and been writing and calling with our comments. Many residents are low income in that housing complex in River Oaks. There are others who are transit dependent. Others find the bus more convenient. Perhaps you could retain service at the current frequency or add our area to #51 which could loop through River Oaks and back to its current route. It is a small change with a big impact to provide us with service.

#2 is being removed too. I hope you will reconsider that change on a mainstreet.

#11 you want to add Riverside Blvd. by where I live in River Oaks which is a good change. Please do that. Otherwise, you leave the Western edge where I live with no service.

Please retain service for the Western part of where I live by River Oaks and Riverside Blvd and Vallejo Way in keeping with RT's mission. We need to connect to downtown to the other transit hubs for other RT buses and light rail.

The other proposed changes seem to leave areas with no service. I know it is difficult to provide frequency and coverage but I am happy with less frequency if it means having coverage in as many areas as possible.

You currently have it balanced with #38 and #2. They run within $\frac{1}{2}$ hr. of each other and service the area I live.

I hope you consider this seriously and retain #38 and/or #2. Or at least revise #11 to include Riverside Blvd.

I like your changes to light rail, #30, #67, #68,

Thank you for letting me comment.

Tom's Friends.

TO: SacRT Planning Dept.

Jan. 28. 2019

Subject: Proposal Route 38

TO Whom it may concern:

I have been sending comments regarding the proposal Route 38.

Please keep Route 38 coming River Oaks as now. My regular Bus stop is #1766 at Mur & Vallejo Way.

Thanks!

Sincerely,

Mei Fong



Phone #: (916) 442-0584

R.T. Customer Service &
SacRT planning Department,
1400- 29TH Street,
Sac. Ca 95816

December 27,2018

Attention: Mr. Henry Li & Mr. Mike Wiley

Subject: Proposed Route 38 P/Q changes for June 2019

To whom this may concern;

I have been your loyal customer since 1970s. Route 38P/Q has been my main transportations. I have been depending on this route for so many years. Are you going to get ride of it? I as many other elderly living in this area will face a lot of inconvenience. Moreover, it will cause inconvenience to some young people too.

Without #38, we have to walk to Broadway to catch bus #51. It takes me long time walking to #51 bus stops and transferring to other buses as needed. My hips sometimes hurt. I need a route as closer as possible. Route 38 has been the best!

We should have a system benefits us; not causing us inconvenience. Anyway, #51 bus stops are too far from my house! So many times transferring from one bus to another will cause us mentally and physically stress out! Please consider my request keeping this route 38; or at least having some morning and afternoon trips for us.

Thanks!

Your sincere customer,

Mei Fong



Phone number: (916) 442-0584

Email; mcfong2008@live.com

December 31, 2018

Attention: SacRT Planning Department
Regional Transit
PO Box 2110
Sacramento, CA 95816-2110

Dear SacRT Planning Department Representatives,


My letter is to provide my comments on the SacRT Forward Draft Plan - Proposed June Service Changes. I couldn't attend the public meetings on these changes. I hope it isn't too late to provide my comments.

- I'm a resident of the Upper Land Park – River Oaks area who uses the #38 Bus regularly at least 4 – 5 days a week primarily to connect to downtown, but frequently to midtown and to the end of the line #38.
- I disagree with eliminating #38 Bus. I think there is sufficient need in the Upper Land Park - River Oaks part of the #38 route to maintain bus service through that area. The bus serves residents of the low income housing in that area, students, middle class residents, and many public transit dependent residents who use that bus. Although you are maintaining #51 Bus, #51 Bus stop can be a far walk for many of the Upper Land Park – River Oaks residents. The #38 Bus also travels along its route by senior housing downtown and a major hospital UC Davis which is important.
- I also use the #2 Bus frequently that is proposed to be eliminated. But, IF my understanding is correct, the proposed service change for #11 Bus includes replacing part of the #2 Bus route by having #11 Bus travel by the Upper Land Park area on Riverside Boulevard between Broadway and Sutterville Road. IF that is the plan, I like that I'll still have access to a bus near me.

It's wonderful that RT wants to increase frequency of the buses and they are trying to keep fares down, but it seems that some of the changes will take service away from people forcing them to use cars or not be able to be as mobile. It is great that the Folsom bus is part of RT and it is great that you want to expand light rail, but sometimes it seems you don't put enough emphasis on the buses. Some of the proposed changes seem to sacrifice bus service.

Thank you for allowing me to provide comments.

Sincerely,



January 10, 2019

Regional Transit
SacForward Plan for Changes

Dear Board for RT,

I called with my comment for the proposed service changes but the RT rep wasn't sure if he was the one to take comments so I am sending this with my comments.

I live in the west end of Bus 38. We need the Bus there. There is low income population. Kids go to school on the bus. Workers go to the jobs.

You need service on the key streets.

Sincerely,

Tia

January 18, 2019

To - SacRT Forward Planning
Customer Advocacy

Dear RT Representatives -

I hope my comments by phone were provided to you.

Here are my comments for proposed changes South Area

① Route 38 - Please keep the route in River Oaks - 5th & Broadway - New Helvetia. That area needs service. There low income there. There are people who need public transportation. Route 51 is too far for many of them

② I use both route 38 and 2.

Please don't eliminate both routes. You would leave no service for that River Oaks, Land Park area.

③ If you eliminate route 2, please implement the route 11 change to include Riverside Blvd. - this would give some service to the north west Land Park

area to connect downtown and
to the south area

(4) I am in northwest Land
Park ~~adjacent~~ adjacent to
River Oaks - Sevey Circle. I
ride the 38 regularly to downtown,
to use other buses and light rail.
Please continue service for
northwest Land Park / River Oaks.

(5) I am glad you propose
stopping buses downtown on
Capitol Mall. It was too
confusing when they diverted
due to events on the Mall.

(6) I ride route 30 and the
proposed changes seem o.k.

(7) It seems you are eliminating
service from areas like East
See, River Oaks - leaving
them with no service

January 22, 2019

Dear :

Regional Transit

Board of Directors

SacRT forward Planning

My letter is for comments for the SacRT forward proposed changes:

Please keep continued service in River Oaks with the bus 38. With the removal of bus 38 and bus 2, RT leaves this area without public transportation and access to downtown to connect to other buses and light rail and without access to south area with the removal of bus 2.

Bus 51 is too far for many and not convenient. RT is making the right moves to lower fares, increase frequency, extend hours, but coverage is also needed. Areas ~~is~~ are being left without convenient service. People ~~are~~ left with only alternative to drive their own vehicles contrary to the purpose and mission of public transportation. Please don't put all efforts into service for leisure and entertainment usage of the bus. People in River Oaks are workers who commute to work down-

town (many government and private sector workers who employers ~~are~~ encourage using the bus), students, ~~low~~ indigent who need the bus, senior citizens).

RT proposal to add service along the River Oaks portion of Riverside Blvd. by adding it to bus 11 is good since you want to remove bus 38 and bus 2. It will give us continued service to downtown connections and to the south.

My fellow riders of bus 38 are doing writing campaign to RT.

Please consider our comments and keep service to River Oaks and Riverside Blvd from Broadway to the south.

Thank you for letting us comment.

Frances Harte

January 12, 2019

Regional Transit

Attention SacRT Planning Department

Attention Board of Directors

POBox 2110, Sacramento CA 95816-2110

Subject SacRT Forward Plan Changes

To Planning Department and Board of Directors,

Please reconsider elimination of the Bus 38 and Bus 2.

I reside in the northern Land Park neighborhood where River Oaks is located. I ride the Bus 38 on a regular basis at least 5 times a week catching it from the River Oaks stops and traveling to downtown and midtown and often to the end of the 38 route. I see many other regular Bus 38 riders in River Oaks who use it throughout the week. We have discussed this and we are all upset with the discontinuation of 38. We are left with no convenient bus service. The Bus 51 is too far for many of the patrons in this River Oaks neighborhood. This neighborhood has students, people who rely on the bus, low income who need the bus, work commuters, senior citizens, those who enjoy using the bus - - the variety of patrons that a public transportation system services.

I also often ride the Bus 2 in both directions of the route that you are also discontinuing. Bus 2 provides service on Riverside Boulevard a major street. I don't understand why you are removing service from a major street such as Riverside Boulevard. Without Bus 38 and 2, northern Land Park is left with no convenient service.

I haven't been able to get a clear understanding from your RT staff since it isn't clear to me, but it appears the SacRT Forward Plan Changes will provide service on the northern Land Park part of Riverside Boulevard by adding it to the Proposed Revised Bus 11. Although I want the Bus 38 to stay as is since it is needed in the River Oaks neighborhood, if you do eliminate 38, then please implement the change to Bus 11 to give service to northern Land Park.

I applaud RT for lowering fares, increasing frequency of service, and annexing the Folsom Bus Line but the changes seem to force people to cars or placing a hardship with no convenient service to riders. You are removing service from core areas and core patrons. Widespread coverage is also needed - can't you create a hybrid plan to try to meet both coverage and frequency?


RT seems to have a narrow focus at times. There seems to be a concentration on light rail with increasing frequency and wanting to extend the line. RT has added service for the Sports arena events downtown and adding to the Bus 51X but you are neglecting my neighborhood and other neighborhoods. I use light rail, but it isn't full all the times, but you continue to add to it.

My neighbors and I have been contacting you with our concerns on Bus 38.

I personally want the Bus 38 to continue its route through River Oaks. If you don't do that, please at least consider maintaining some service on Riverside Boulevard for the northern Land Park neighborhood by keeping Route 2 or adding it to Route 11.

Please reconsider your plan.

Thank you.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Mr. D. J. ...' with a stylized flourish at the end.

January 4, 2019

Regional Transit
ATTN: Planning Dept.
Board of Directors

This letter is for the
proposed changes for SacRT
Forward project.

I am happy that you want
to increase service but

I am unhappy you
will eliminate

BUS 38

BUS 2

Residents of Upper Land Park -

River Oaks need service

Bus 2 provides service

on a major street Riverside

Broadway bus is far

for Seavy Circle residents

and Upper Land Park. Bus

38 is needed.

The change to Bus 11

to Riverside gives

service to us. I am

happy you will increase

frequency for Bus 11 too,

and it will be on

Riverside.

Please reconsider Bus 38

and Bus 2. Thank you.

Tracy Gutierrez

#66067

February 10, 2019

Administrative Offices
Sacramento Regional Transit
1400 N Street
Sacramento, CA 95816

Customer Advocacy
Regional Transit
P.O. Box 2110
Sacramento, CA 95812-2110

To Whom It May Concern:

Many times in the past, I had threatened to quit Regional Transit and purchase me an automobile. That will soon come to fruition in the coming year thanks to unwelcome changes to the routes I take.

Allow me to put in perspective what has happened that now pushes me to this point.

In 2008 when I lived Downtown, Regional Transit (RT) had to scale back services because then-Gov. Schwarzenegger had raided the General Fund trying to balance out the state budget. You had cut service and certain routes leaving only "NO BUS: TEMPORARILY NO SERVICE" signs on routes that you were going to reactivate once things got better. The routes have yet to return but these signs have been at these routes for over a decade.

Then you cut service to end around 9pm. My boss had to adjust my schedule back then to accommodate me. Even so, making the connection from the Light Rail to catch the #30 outbound at J and 8th Streets proved to be a nightmare because, as the train would pull up at 8th and K station, the #30 would leave or, in most cases, already be gone.

You cut the #34 on the weekends, which was understandable due to low ridership. What I didn't understand was why did it end at Sutter Hospital when some riders needed to get to Sac State and transfer there to #82 or #87 or even the #30 to get to University/65th Street?

When I lived in Rancho Cordova, my biggest complains was no connection with the Light Rail around 6pm. I would get the 6:08 Light Rail and would miss bus connections at Watt/Manlove and Mather Mills stations having to take an additional hour before I can get home. On the weekends it was worse when the #21 coming from Sunrise would miss the #72 or #75 by MINUTES, therefore having to wait another 45 minutes before a connection is made.

It now brings me to this point.

Three years ago, I had a minor stroke. Though I am better now, some things I can no longer do (like walk long distances). When the #80 passed by me when there was construction going on Watt Avenue, I had to walk four miles to home. It nearly killed me. Now if you think I am having problems, then you must get an earful from your riders who are wheelchair-bound But even then, I made adjustments which you shattered.

Most of the time at the Watt/I-80 station, the elevators are out, so you have to climb the stairs which is sometimes problematic. Then the shuttle is on the northbound side of Watt Avenue along with the bus I need. IT DOESN'T MOVE OR SYNC UP WITH LIGHT RAIL. One time one of your drivers fell asleep AT THE STOP. I've always missed the connecting bus because of this.

So then I got wise: I would take 8:08pm Light Rail to Watt/Manlove, catch the 8:37pm #80 to Watt/I-80 and connect with the #93 and head home. It was that simple, the ride was long, I can unwind for a little bit, it worked.

Then in January, you made the #80 leave TEN MINUTES LATER from Watt/Manlove, making no connection to the last #93 period. The last #93 leaves Watt/I-80 at 9:20; in contrast, the #80 arrives and leaves at 9:25-your drivers won't hold the bus for more than three minutes.

And speaking of #93, WHY IS IT ALWAYS LATE IN THE MORNINGS? Why can't you add on additional service in the mornings and evenings? People miss their connecting lines because it is always late.

These are the reasons I am looking to get a car and reducing my reliance on your system. Because everytime you make changes to your system, it affects me and everyone else who must rely on it.

Sincerely,

Bhim Kumar-Reyes

5948 Waterga Rd, Unit 4
Sac, CA 95842

SacRT Forward Bus Network Proposal

The recent SacRT Forward bus network proposal is the most effective, and most sensible, series of service changes that has been proposed since RT's very successful new route expansions of the mid-late 70's. Finally, RT is looking to strengthen the best segments of individual bus routes with major traffic generators, and eliminating bus route segments with historically low ridership. The end result is a simpler, and more user friendly bus network.

Ultimately, this should have the following positive impacts:

- Will increase overall system ridership, once the new network has been established for a period of time. Longer trips will be easier to make, with reduced travel times, and without requiring a transfer.
- Will improve bus frequencies in key good ridership areas, as opposed to low frequency coverage with resulting low ridership, all over the District. Frequency of service has historically been at the top of most transit rider surveys for several decades.
- Will simplify the overall system, by reducing the sheer number of bus routes, making it easier for riders (as well as staff) to understand and use the network. The current bus system is very complex and difficult to understand.
- Will increase farebox recovery, which will appease the taxpayers that fund 75-80% of the system.
- Creation of longer routes that serve more traffic generators, creating more bus trips that won't require a transfer. Transferring bus to bus is usually the biggest reason for non-riders to not use public transit.

Some existing ridership is always lost when major service changes occur. However, that loss should be more than offset by the gain in new riders over the next few years.

In closing, it was never the intent of SB 325 for RT to operate bus routes that carried less than 15 passengers per hour. The SacRT Forward plan would eliminate RT's so-called "Lifeline Service", taking local politics out of transit route planning. This in itself would be a major improvement to the transit district.

Respectfully,

Bob Blymyer (RT retiree)

2-18-19

Dean Fairbanks
1491 Florin Road
Sacramento CA 95822
(916) 616-8790
Deanie1965@gmail.com

SacRT Planning Dept
Attn: James Drake
sacrtforward@sacrt.com

Dear Mr. James Drake,

I am opposed to the Route 13 proposed changes because they completely eliminate service to the North Market Corridor (NMC). As a state employee working for the Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA), I rely on Route 13 as part of my daily commute. Each leg of my commute consists of Bus-Train-Bus and takes approximately 1.5 hours of commute time. Three hours of my day is commuting to and from my full-time job. That makes for a very long day, in and of itself. When RT delays occur, that causes me to be late to work or arriving home late.

The proposed changes indicate that Route 13 will increase frequency to 45 minute headways. This would allow commuters to build a better “back-up plan”. Back-up plans are necessary because many of the NMC commuters take multiple legs to Natomas. For example, it is common knowledge that the Blue and Gold Lines can have delays cause by mechanical issues or blocked tracks which is outside of RT control. Today if you miss a connection or if it’s late, you won’t make the Route 13 departing from Arden-DelPaso Light Rail. So a back-up plan is needed. Route 11 is my current back-up bus.

I request that the RT Board review these concerns and proposed recommendations in order to keep service along the NMC service area, at a minimum, M-F and during the peak commute times between 6-9AM and 3-6PM. **Please consider us working commuters that utilize RT to get to and from our jobs!!!**

Proposed Route 13 Concerns

1. Eliminating NMC service will require commuters to board/exit at Truxel & Arena, and walk the rest of the way to their places of employment. For DCA employees, that is 0.6 miles each way; however, there are commuters who work between National and Northgate, which is over 1.8 miles each way.
2. **Not Pedestrian Friendly** – There are no sidewalks along 600 – 956 North Market Blvd. If commuters walk from San Juan & Northgate, the sidewalk along the I-80 over-crossing is dangerous, not well marked or lit appropriately.
3. **The draft Title VI Service Equity Analysis relies on 2013 survey data.** While the report shows no disparate impacts to minority and low-income populations, removing service from an industrial corridor that is home to several dozen manufacturing and corporate businesses, is problematic for those affected employees who rely on RT to access employment. Many of these employees fall into minority and low-income populations.
4. **Low-Income Revenue Miles** – These miles remain the same after the proposed changes. In fact these miles stay the same for routes 11, 13 and 86 respectively. These routes provide coverage in the proposed service areas. Out of these three routes, Route 13 maintains a higher percent of low-income revenue miles at 57.5% versus total system average at 55.5% post change.

5. **Pride Industries Effect on Service** – The decision made last year by Pride Industries to move their operations to Roseville and Rancho Cordova, forced RT to eliminate one Route 13 morning run. RT has not shared any justification with current riders why NMC service is being eliminated. We deserve to know how this decision was made including any surveys, reports, analyses, customer complaints or contacts with the businesses located within the 95834 zip code.
6. **No Bus Shelter at Truxel & Arena (SW Corner)** – There needs to be a bus shelter at this location due to the heat of summer and rainy conditions in the winter.
7. **Using Route 11 as an alternative route** – Eliminating this NMC service would make Route 11 an option to get commuters from Downtown to Natomas. It is common knowledge that you cannot set your watch to Route 11 service. By adding additional service to Sac City College and increasing frequency to 45 minutes, how is RT prepared to improve service reliability?
8. **Duplication of Service** – The proposed Route 13 duplicates service affecting two routes: Route 86 currently serves San Juan between Northgate and Truxel. Route 11 currently serves Truxel between San Juan and Del Paso. There have been no proposed changes on Route 86. How can RT justify this duplication of service? How does this affect increasing frequency to 45 minutes on Routes 11 and 13? We deserve to know how this decision was made including any surveys, reports, analyses, customer complaints or contacts with the businesses located along San Juan and Truxel Roads.

Recommended Change Proposals

I am offering three alternate Route 13 proposals that will continue NMC service, while offering more retail and residential access in Natomas.

Proposal #1 – Continue existing Route 13 service along Northgate to North Market. Continue existing service along North Market, west to Gateway Park Drive. Go north on Gateway Park Drive to Del Paso Road. Go west on Del Paso Road, to complete the proposed new route. This alternative keeps service to the NMC area, while offering service to the new housing development along Gateway Park, and the retail area on Del Paso Road.

Proposal # 2 – This proposal follows the same route as in proposal #1, but only during M-F and peak commute hours of 6-9AM and 3-6PM. The route would run the RT proposed service routes between 9AM and 3PM, M-F and on weekends/holidays. This alternate keeps service to the NMC area during peak commute times, M-F where it is needed.

Proposal #3 – This proposal utilizes Jibe Express as a transfer option to provide commuter service along the NMC during M-F and peak commute hours of 6-9AM and 3-6PM.

For these reasons, I ask the RT Board to consider all of these concerns and proposals when coming to a final decision on Route 13. If you intend to eliminate service which affects over 30 dedicated commuters, then we demand a better explanation than “you can walk” or “you can take a Lyft or Uber the rest of the way”. I believe together, we can reach a happy medium for us commuters who work along the NMC in 95834.

Respectfully,

Dean Fairbanks

JAN 18 2018

January 15, 2019

Clerk To The Board

To the Sacramento Regional Transit District Board,

I am writing to you about the proposed major changes to the 34 bus route. As a faithful patron of this route since the early 1980s, I am deeply troubled by this prospect, as are many of my neighbors and fellow riders.

To begin with, the 34 bus route is the oldest continuously operated line (the old Number 1 route) in the city of Sacramento. It has faithfully served the residents of this important part of the city for well over half a century. Over the decades the 34 bus has added to the quality of life of the neighborhoods it serves by helping to provide a sense of community to the areas of River Park, East Sacramento, Midtown and Alkali Flat.

Currently the 34 route directly services riders attempting to get to Sacramento County and Federal Courthouses (e.g. potential jurors), those that need to have direct access to county, state and federal programs, seniors, those with limited mobility and those without automobiles to stores and other bus and light rail line connections at various times of the day. Limiting the times of operation will severely impact access to these sites as well as schools and day care facilities.

By drastically limiting the times for the 34 route, many residents from CSUS to lower Midtown will be severely limited in their public transportation options going in East-West directions. This will effectively take a four mile strip running East to West, from J/L streets to Elvas-C streets and River Park (an area of roughly four square miles) out of service and off the grid for many hours of the day. Few if any will walk seven to nine blocks to catch the J/L Streets bus, (30 route) – in turn adding more cars and congestion to the city's already crowded streets.

Besides servicing CSUS students, the 34 route provides transportation for students from four other schools (Washington, Theodore Judah, Caleb Green and Sutter Middle schools). These cuts in service for the 34 line will also place an added burden of hardship on the many of us who are seniors from these neighborhoods who largely depend on the buses to get around as we drive less or not at all.

Overtime, there will also probably be an increased demand in ridership from many of the new residents of the McKinley Village and old Sutter Hospital developments. In the case of McKinley Village and River Park communities, many riders will have no alternative bus routes to access when the 34 route is not in operation. They will instead be forced into their cars, adding even that much more to the region's high levels of traffic and pollution.

Then there is another issue to be considered, namely the future development of the rail yards project and a possible soccer stadium, Township Nine and the thousands of potential new riders along this strategic commuter corridor that need to be factored into your decision making. It seems rather short sighted at the very least, to limit a potential alternate transportation option to J/L Streets and

Light Rail corridors as well as the Railroad Station transportation hub. The 34 line could provide much needed access to the Rail Yards and aid in future development of this new sector of the city.

Also it is next to impossible to provide comments for the proposed changes to the 34 route when there is no clear, timely information provided to stated plans to "realign bus route off of Coloma Way and Pala Way to use a more direct routing." Just me and two other commuters, along with their four children who ride with their parents to day care, use these stops alone on a daily basis! (Any alternative of using the 30 route is out of the question for them when it comes to trying to cross a busy H street.)

I know that there are some along the 34 bus route who want it discontinued because they do not like it passing through their neighborhoods. Some even go so far as to park vehicles in such a way that it prevents the bus drivers from turning onto their streets and having to go way out of the their way to complete their trip. Is trying to meet their shortsighted needs part of the reason for any rerouting? They should keep in mind that bus trips will actually cut down on the number of car trips through their streets and that blocking bus access to their streets will also block fire engines and other larger emergency vehicles from reaching a house on it in a timely fashion. Many riders (including myself) would like to know what factors are going into any decision for more "direct routing."

I, along with many others in the community, urge you in the strongest possible terms to continue to provide much needed full bus service to this vital part of the city and not deny to hundreds of daily riders access to public transportation.



John Allen

540 – 46th Street

Sacramento, CA 95819

cc

General Manager Henry Li

Senator Richard Pan

Assemblyman Kevin McCarty

Mayor Daryl Steinberg

Council Members Steve Hansen and Jeff Harris

From: Sarah Poe
To: mary_beth_barber@yahoo.com
BC Sarah Poe
Date: 2/19/2019 5:11 PM
Subject: Re: Feedback #66151 - Please analyze the needs of the San Juan School District before finalizing bus routes/schedule plan

>>> sacrtforward 2/19/2019 5:11 PM >>>
Ms. Barber,

Thank you for sending your comments about SacRT Forward. The deadline for comments to be presented at the February 25, 2019 Board of Directors meeting has passed; however, all comments will continue to be reviewed by staff, and recorded in the project documents. Thank you for your input to this important process.

>>> Mary Beth Barber <mary_beth_barber@yahoo.com> 2/18/2019 9:43 PM >>>
Please see the attached letter regarding the current planning with the Regional Transit bus routes and schedules, from a group of parent leaders in the San Juan Unified School District. I've copied/pasted the text of the letter into the email text as well for easy reading.

Mary Beth Barber

February 18, 2019
Board of Directors
Sacramento Regional Transit District (SacRT)
P.O. Box 2110
Sacramento, CA 95812-2110

Dear SacRT Board of Directors,

We are a group of parent and community leaders in the San Juan Unified community who are very concerned about the SacRT Forward planning process currently underway.

The parent and community leaders associated with San Juan Unified below emphatically request that SacRT include a deep analysis of public transportation needs of San Juan Unified students and families before finalizing the bus infrastructure with SacRT Forward.

The San Juan Unified School District (San Juan Unified) is the largest school district in Sacramento County with its entire territory serviced by SacRT. The district sits principally in the unincorporated areas of the county.[1] The district has a large number of students who could benefit by a dynamic series of public transportation routes devoted to the locations and schedules for San Juan Unified schools, especially for middle and high schools.

Historically public transportation was not a systematic consideration for San Juan because of a number of factors, including demographics of the district and the provision of school busing to a significant portion of the students. But this description applies to San Juan Unified from a decade or more ago. These dynamics today have drastically changed.

The district provides internal transportation for students with education challenges and special needs, but not for the general population. This shift is a statewide trend. Over 90% of our students do not have district-provided transportation.

Students at open-enroll schools can live miles away from the campus. Even neighborhood schools can have over a mile of walking involved when high-speed streets with few stoplights are taken into consideration. The distances are especially pronounced at the middle and high school level.

There are also demographic shift of the San Juan population that aren't immediately recognized by the general public in Sacramento County. Over half of the students in the San Juan Unified School District are either low income or English language learners or both. (See list of schools, attached).

Many of the areas of Sacramento County within the San Juan school district boundaries resemble urban

districts in terms of diversity, mixing of socio-economic groups, and the need for public transportation. The undersigned parent and community leaders have spent years participating in outreach to the wide San Juan Unified community. We conclude that most families in the San Juan community who might consider public transportation as an option have been resigned to "take what's there."

But the public transportation options are lacking ideal school routes and the scheduling unsuitable for our children. Routes do not match up to neighborhood-school boundaries or typical patterns for students. Scheduling is highly problematic for students, with potential routes too early in the morning to be realistic options (such as #29).

The end result has been low student ridership - not because of the lack of desire or need, but because of the limitations of the current system. Routes for students don't exist or are extremely limited, so students don't ride. The perception from many authorizers is that the San Juan Unified community does not have the desire for public transportation. We disagree. If the routes existed, our students would

The SacRT Forward planning process looks at current ridership - a reasonable approach. But we believe that the process is missing an enormous opportunity with the San Juan Unified School District.

We ask that you reach out to the district leaders and staff at San Juan Unified and conduct a comprehensive analysis of need and go beyond an analysis of current ridership. We also ask for assistance and coordination with outreach about this planning process, as the focus for SacRT Forward appears to have had its planning outreach principally focused on current ridership.

Please feel free to reach out if you have questions. The current chair and vice chair of the Parent Advisory Committee for San Juan Unified's Local Control and Accountability Plan may be reached at LCAPPAC@sanjuan.edu. We'd be happy to connect you to our superintendent, our board members, and any of the staff at San Juan Unified who can help with this analysis and planning.

Sincerely,

Mary Beth Barber

Chair, LCAP Parent Advisory Committee (current), San Juan Unified

Tom Nelson

Vice-Chair, LCAP Parent Advisory Committee (current); Chair (past) of Curriculum, Standards, Instructional, and Student Services Committee, San Juan Unified

Juan Yniguez

Chair, LCAP Parent Advisory Committee (2016-17), Chair (past) of the Facilities, Transportation & Finance advisory committee, San Juan Unified

Amy Kassouni

Chair, LCAP Parent Advisory Committee (2015-16), Vice Chair (2016-17), San Juan Unified

David Balla-Hawkins

Vice-Chair, LCAP Parent Advisory Committee (2015-16), San Juan Unified

Joy Wake

Chair (past), San Juan Unified Facilities, Transportation & Finance advisory committee, San Juan Unified

San Juan Unified 2018-19

English Learners and/or free/reduced Lunch (and foster youth)

High Schools

Encina Preparatory High **96.8%**

San Juan High **77.4%**

Mesa Verde High **66.2%**

Mira Loma High **53.5%**

Del Campo High **50.7%**

El Camino Fundamental High **47.7%**

Casa Roble Fundamental High **35.6%**

Bella Vista High **27.9%**

Rio Americano High **22.0%**

Middle Schools

Sylvan Middle **69.6%**

Will Rogers Middle **69.6%**
Arcade Fundamental Middle **69.1%**
John Barrett Middle **52.8%**
Winston Churchill Middle **44.8%**
Louis Pasteur Fundamental Middle **40.4%**
Arden Middle **38.7%**
Andrew Carnegie Middle **36.1%**

K-8 Schools

Starr King K-8 **95.0%**
Kingswood K-8 **86.2%**
Thomas Edison Language Institute K- 8 **83.7%**
Lichen K-8 **70.8%**
Woodside K-8 **58.7%**
Sierra Oaks K-8 **49.6%**
Gold River Discovery Center K-8 **30.7%**
Orangevale Open K-8 **22.7%**

Elementary Schools

Dyer-Kelly Elementary **99.4%**
Howe Avenue Elementary **97.4%**
Greer Elementary **97.0%**
Whitney Avenue Elementary **91.7%**
Charles Peck Elementary **88.0%**
Carmichael Elementary **83.1%**
Mariposa Avenue Elementary **83.1%**
Cottage Elementary **82.7%**
Northridge Elementary **82.4%**
Skycrest Elementary **80.9%**
Cameron Ranch Elementary **79.6%**
Pasadena Avenue Elementary **79.5%**
Coyle Avenue Elementary **78.6%**
Grand Oaks Elementary **75.3%**
Del Paso Manor Elementary **68.9%**
Arlington Heights Elementary **65.6%**
Thomas Kelly Elementary **64.4%**
Ottomon Way Elementary **62.9%**
Carriage Drive Elementary **58.8%**
Albert Schweitzer Elementary **50.1%**
Oakview Community Elementary **47.6%**
James R. Cowan Fundamental Elementary **43.9%**
Mary Deterding Elementary **43.6%**
Trajan Elementary **43.2%**
Harry Dewey Fundamental Elementary **40.3%**
Pershing Elementary **35.5%**
Cambridge Heights Elementary **34.6%**
Twin Lakes Elementary **31.3%**
Mission Avenue Open Elementary **27.2%**
Earl Legette Elementary **26.2%**
Mariemont Elementary **24.7%**
Green Oaks Fundamental Elementary **24.0%**

Del Dayo Elementary **19.6%**

Other schools (specialized, continuation, independent study, etc.)

La Vista Center **80.0%**

La Entrada Continuation High **67.9%**

Laurel Ruff Transition **52.8%**

El Sereno Alternative Education **51.3%**

Ralph Richardson Center **39.0%**

UnSchool **34.0%**

San Juan Unified **47.9%**

NPS School Group for San Juan Unified **45.6%**

Source: 2018-19 School List with Unduplicated Counts, presented to the LCAP Parent Advisory Committee, February 2019

[1] San Juan's enrollment for 2017-18 was 50,044. Elk Grove is larger with 63,297, but the City of Elk Grove has public transportation provided by e-Tran. For comparison, Sac City Unified had an enrollment of 46,595 last year, and Twin Rivers had 32,538. Information provided by the California Department of Education at <https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/ceflargesmallldist.asp>

Michael S. Beckman
7549 Greenhaven Drive, #122
Sacramento, CA 95831

January 22, 2019

Via E-mail

Mr. James Drake
Sacramento Regional Transit
Member of the Board of Supervisor
Principal Planner
1400 29th Street
Sacramento, CA 95816-6406

Re: SacRT's Proposed Plan to Downsize Current Public Transportation System

Dear Mr. Drake,

Is the proposed plan to minimize service throughout the Greater Sacramento Area made to provide the *best* public transportation it can offer to the public or will the Board's decision on February 25th be primarily based upon the profitability of Sacramento's transportation system *itself*? To streamline our existing system by eliminating areas that currently have less ridership than others and eliminate routes that may overlap is counter-productive if the Board's primary purpose is to encourage the public to leave their vehicles at home and cut down on traffic congestion. If that is *not* the purpose, then the Board has little concern to have a positive effect on carbon emissions and ultimately Sacramento's air quality.

If the Board is primarily focused on designing a transportation system that best serves the public and is *not* focused on profit, then all areas currently covered should continue to be. To vote otherwise is to ignore all of those customers without any other means of transportation and ignore customers who currently use public transportation because they can't afford an alternative. An educated guess is that the majority of people who choose to use public transportation either choose to do so because of its convenience and/or to save money. In an economy with inflation that seems to be spiraling out of control, it is probable that many people who use public transportation do so to stretch their budget. The Board should *not* ignore this group of people who *desperately* count of Regional Transit's service. After all, what is public transportation's *purpose* but to make the Greater Sacramento Area as *accessible* as possible to as *many people* as possible?

The problems that Regional Transit currently face are that some areas are less traveled, routes overlap and as the Board probably sees it, results in less efficiency and less profitability. But if convenience and saving money are the primary reasons why people use public transportation, couldn't the problem be solved by using our local news networks to advertise the public's benefits that Regional Transit offers? It seems to me that our local news stations would see promoting ridership and encouraging the public to use what is available to us as being newsworthy and a responsibility they have to keep the public informed by getting the word out that "if Regional Transit's ridership doesn't improve, it will have no alternative but to begin eliminating certain overlapping routes and minimize service to less traveled areas."

Please take these comments into consideration and discuss them with the Board, preferably *prior* to the upcoming Board meeting scheduled for Monday, January 28th at 5:30 p.m. Meanwhile, I will carbon copy this letter to Mayor Darrell Steinberg, Sacramento's news networks and the SacBee News Team in hopes that they will inform the public of the upcoming meeting, encourage the public to reach out to the Board with any concerns, and above all, to broadcast the message with fair regularity of the *importance* to use public transportation as it is not only convenient and saves money but that it greatly helps lessen traffic that nearly gridlocks the Greater Sacramento Area at times. Reducing traffic obviously helps to reduce carbon emissions by taking literally *thousands* of cars off the road. Better air quality, less traffic and easy

on the household budget offers Sacramentans a win/win situation, and as Sacramento's Regional Transit advertises, our public transportation system is "clean, save & convenient" to use. As for "convenient," *currently* that's true. If service is decreased *throughout* Sacramento, then *not* so true.

Thank you, and I know the Board will do the right thing by choosing "Service to the Public" over profit. Sacramento's sudden growth is *rapid* and as we become a "Destination City," we *must* keep up with the demands and expectations this population *explosion* places on the *importance* of a public transportation system that reaches all areas adequately, including the Pocket, an area that would suffer *most* if the proposed changes go through. Travel *throughout* our city should be made as effortlessly as *other* "Destination Cities" in California. Los Angeles and San Francisco's public transportation systems are not only used by tourists. Local citizens *of all walks of life* use their system *because* a bus stop or subway is within walking distance to nearly everyone's home. Whether citizens use it for work, shopping or enjoying their day off, the system in their "Destination City" works for everyone. Sacramento should do the same.

Respectfully,

Mike Beckman

cc: Members of the Sacramento Board of Supervisors
Mayor Darrell Steinberg
KCRA, Sacramento 10 and CBS News Teams
Sacramento Bee New Tips

To: James Blake

I am writing you in regard to the proposed changes and cutbacks to Lime #6 and #2.

Let me introduce myself, my name is Marlene May and I have always resided here on So Land Park Drive and have been a bus rider since moving here in 1957. Yes, 1957. Even tho my husband owned 2 Auto agencies here in town I preferred riding the bus as opposed to driving. We had great 15 minute service and it served my purpose. I rode back and forth to my career at Sutter Hospital for 25 years. The bus service was better then having a car as I never had to worry about a flat tire or gas!!!!

Anyway, I am writing you now as the cutbacks will really create a hardship for us seniors who depend on the bus service. We reside at a senior apartment dwelling and for many of us who do not drive due to handicaps, failing eyesight etc. we would be negatively affected by a cutback. I put the enclosed paperwork in the clubhouse here for

signatures and a notice to riders and am enclosing it for your perusal.

I used to attend all the monthly meetings and would have input, however due to failing eyesight and no bus to transport me after hours have to bring this to you as I am unable to attend the evening meetings anymore.

If you find it necessary to cutback could you consider one of the "Shuttles" like the one serving the Franklin Blvd area, but would service the area to where the Nugget and Rite Aid stores on Florin Rd and Greenhaven are located? (from South Land Pk and 35th Ave)

I hope you will give consideration to our needs, WE NEED THE BUS!!!!!

I know ridership is not what you would like on Land Park Drive, but you keep cutting and making the service less by reducing it hourly so it is not conducive to use and therefore you lose rather than gain customers.

One of the worst faux pas was when they joined the 6 & 56, rather than combining the

6 & 2 lines and snaking it in and out every couple blocks down Riverside and Land Park Drive and running it every half hour! After all it started and ended at the same place!

The customers some times come up with better ideas then the folks in charge. Think about it. We use it and know the foibles.

I would like to have a response from you.

Marlene May

6000 S Land Pk Drive #228, Sac CA 95822

916 382 4382

ATTENTION ALL RT BUS RIDERS FROM VINTAGE GLEN!

**Be aware the number 6 and number 2
Bus are in grave danger of being cutback
to only six trips per day (3 peak time in
the morning and 3 in the afternoon) these
lines experience too few riders, so RT
does not find it feasible to provide service
that does not make a profit, so they cut
the lines that affect this. "Use it Or Lose
it" I attend the monthly meetings and
would like you to sign my petition to keep
these two lines intact.**

**I will present this petition at the February
meeting. I thank you for reading and
signing:**

Marlene May

916 382 4382 (if you have any questions)

NAME ADDRESS

Bonnie Wheelon
6000 S. Land Park Dr. 122
Sac. Cal. 95822

KEITH LEXION
6000 SOUTHWIND PARK DR 239
SACTO CA. 95822

Sharon Cumming
6000 S. Land Park Dr. #253
SACTO, CA 95822

Sumiko Smith
6000 S Land Park Dr. #111
Sacto, Ca. 95822

Joan Herrera
6000 S. Land Park Dr. #152
Sacramento CA 95822

Telephone: 925 - 822 - 6608

Jilisa Martens (916) 869-9032
6000 So. Land Park Dr.
Sacto, Ca 95822

Peter Papac 6000 S-LAND PARK DR ~~244~~
~~244~~ 2

Reinette Fairweather 6000 So. Land Park Dr.

Barbara Maier
6000 S. Land Park Dr #143
Sacramento ca 95822

Marsha Cain
6000 S Land Park Dr #160
SAC. CA 95822

KETH L
6000 Southland Pk Dr
SACB CA 95822

MURRAY M CHNEY
6000 S LAND PARK DR #246

Marga Reynolds
6000 So Land Park Dr #153

Robert H. Richards
6000 S. Land Park Dr. # 274
SAC. CA. 95822

BARBARA KOKONAS
6000 SLP Drive #109
SAC CA 95822

Rosena Allen
~~60~~

6000 S. LAMB, Park Dr.
SAC, Ca 95822 #230

Sarah Poe - Re: SacRTD Route Optimization Study - Funding Options and Route Analysis

From: James Drake
To: mike_barnbaum@comcast.net
Date: 1/22/2019 8:35 AM
Subject: Re: SacRTD Route Optimization Study - Funding Options and Route Analysis
Cc: sacrtforward; Sarah Poe; James Boyle; Henry Li; Christopher Flores

Mike,

Thank you for your comments. We are in the process of reviewing each route and we may make adjustments to the plan based on customer feedback such as yours.

James

James Drake

Principal Planner

Sacramento Regional Transit District

916-556-0505 | jdrake@sacrt.com



Check out the new SacRT network!

>>> Mike Barnbaum <mike_barnbaum@comcast.net> 1/20/2019 1:11 PM >>>

Dear Transportation Stakeholder:

For over the course of now several months, Sacramento Regional Transit District Staff and consultants from Jarrett Walker and Associates have teamed together to reimagine the Sacramento Regional Transit District Bus Network. Over the course of many community events, open houses, and receiving phone calls, Emails, and letters, and presentations, somewhere in the range of 8,000 to 10,000 comments have been received, and will continue to be received until the close of business on Friday, February 15th.

This particular Email is going to look at two things: Funding (State and Local/Regional) followed by recommendations to the route descriptions that were originally made public back on Monday, December 10, 2018 - at the final Sacramento Regional Regional Transit District Board of Directors Meeting of 2018.

Several comments made on and since December 10th have brought up areas and/or roads that would lose service through the use of existing funds, and assuming no new funds would be coming in to SacRTD coffers. This portion of this Email will do its best to describe potential state and local funding sources to financially cover areas missing of service so as to best address how to provide future service starting on Sunday, June 16th.

The State of California has a mostly friendly climate of funding sources in which the Sacramento Regional Transit District could take advantage of throughout the year, including the state budget process, going on now for the 2019-2020 Fiscal Year. The Sacramento Regional Transit District could take advantage of

Transportation Development Act Funds, Low Carbon Transit Operation Funds, State Transit Assistance, SB-1 Competitive Grant Funds, Cap-and-Trade auction revenues, vehicle registration fees/taxes, as well as the California State Public Transportation Account.

Locally/Regionally, the Sacramento Regional Transit District has Measure A, competitive grant funding through the Sacramento Area Council of Governments, Measure U via the City of Sacramento, and the Sacramento Transportation Authority. As a side note, Measure U should not be used for bus purchases or for the procurement of equipment. A new/additional Measure A should be used for this. As we develop the specifics of a new local/regional transportation measure, we must monitor ACA-1 (Celia Aggjar-Curry) in the current legislative session and see where this specifically is going to go and end up. One additional source that can perhaps be realized is locally elected discretionary funding. This could come by means of a city, Sacramento County, or through the office(s) of a specific elected representative who so wishes to appropriate funding for the betterment of their particular district. As we go through each route description that was made public back on December 10th, this prospective funding source will be mentioned quite often.

Now onto the Route Recommendations. We will look at each one developed from back on December 10th, add others, and modify existing proposals. Should anything cost more, the funding sources identified earlier, and other funding sources, can be utilized in covering any funding gaps created by any of the following going forward.

Route 1 Greenback: Maintain route alignment, frequency, along with days and hours of service from Watt/I-80 to Sunrise Mall Transit Center. Extend route at 30-minute headways along Greenback Lane from Sunrise Mall Transit Center to Historic Folsom Station. Funds to pay for this extension could be through the Cities of Citrus Heights and Folsom, along with Sacramento County District Four discretionary funding obtained through the office of Sue Frost.

Route 2 Riverside: Maintain staff recommendation and renumber to #102 Riverside.

Route 3 Riverside Express: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 5 Meadowview/Valley Hi: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 6 Land Park: Maintain staff recommendation and renumber to #106 Land Park.

Route 7 Pocket Express: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 108 Power Inn Alliance: This new peak hours only route would serve businesses (commercial and industrial) as well as residential in what otherwise and at other times would become a transit desert should service not exist or be completely eliminated. Route would operate out of the University/65th Street Station and travel bi-directionally via Folsom Boulevard, South Watt Avenue, Jackson Highway, Florin-Perkins Road, Fruitridge Road, Power Inn Road, 14th Avenue, and 65th Street to the University/65th Street Light Rail Station. This peak hours only route would operate weekdays only every on an every twenty minutes frequency from 6am to 9am, and again from 3pm to 6pm. Places served, include, but would not be limited to Sacramento State via short walk from the University/65th Street Station, Sacramento County Family Courts, College Greens Shopping Center, Cristo Rey High School, Sacramento Flea Market and Auction, U.S. Social Security Administration, Watt/Manlove Station, South Sacramento PRIDE Industries, FoodLink, former U.S. Army Depot, and Hiram Johnson High School among others. For riders traveling along Fruitridge Road and west of 65th Street, "New Network" Route 61 can be used. Funding for this route could come from City of Sacramento district discretionary funding. Much of this service coverage lies within Sacramento City Council District Six. Currently, the elected official holding that office is Eric Guerra. He does not serve, at this time, on the Sacramento Regional Transit District Board of Directors.

Route 9 Hazel/Sierra College: If the Sacramento Regional Transit District, along with Roseville Transit, Placer County Transit, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments, Placer County Transportation

Planning Agency, Sacramento County, and Placer County wish to participate in a collaborative regional funding partnership, then this route would be highly recommended. This route could operate between Hazel Light Rail Station and Sierra Community College in Rocklin via Hazel Avenue and Sierra College Boulevard. Future extensions of service North of Sierra College, in Placer County, into Bickford Ranch could also be pursued. Existing service on Placer County Transit takes riders today on a route between Sierra College and the blue line at the Watt/I-80 Light Rail Station. Riders also have the option of traveling on this route in the eastbound direction to the Auburn Capitol Corridor Station. This proposed route would allow for riders to connect to the Gold Line, which, from Sierra College, is not possible to do today. We put this proposal out there for consideration by the Sacramento Regional Transit District as well as including the potential funding partners in this proposal should this regional collaboration wish to be pursued further than just a proposal in an Email.

Route 11 Truxel: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 13 Northgate: Maintain staff recommendation with regards to frequency and extending operating days from weekdays only to all days. Change route alignment so that from westbound Del Paso Road, Route 13 would travel to Sacramento International Airport via Northbound Interstate Five and the Airport Boulevard exit. Span of service hours would be from 5am to 10pm on all days. In terms of funding, Sacramento City Council Districts 2, 3, and 1 would be where this route would travel through, as well as Sacramento County District One. Since a multitude of districts and jurisdictions would be covered through this route alignment, several identified district discretionary funds can be utilized to pay for this route, as well as a possible SACOG competitive grant, and a competitive state of California grant funding source. This route would not compete with existing YoloBus service at Sacramento International Airport because it would take a vastly different approach to both funding and route alignment. While YoloBus service would take Sacramento County riders to and from Downtown Sacramento via Interstate Five, Route 13 would take airport travelers to Truxel Road in North Natomas, Northgate Boulevard in South Natomas, and the Arden/Del Paso Station in North Sacramento. Riders going further than Arden/Del Paso would connect to the rest of the SacRTD System via the light rail blue line.

Route 15 Rio Linda Boulevard: Maintain staff recommendation, but allow riders to remain on the bus to/from Downtown Sacramento by changing all trips to Route 88 at the Arden/Del Paso Station. From Arden/Del Paso Station to Downtown Sacramento, route would travel via El Camino Avenue/West El Camino Avenue, Interstate Eighty, Interstate Five, Richards Boulevard, North Seventh Street, Seventh Street, Q Street, Eighth Street, laying over on Eighth Street at O Street, at the existing Route 15/Route 34 layover zone. This change in route recommendation would resolve a "service desert" made in public comment by Director Hansen with service to the "River Oaks" community of South Natomas. Regional Transit would seek to go after City Council district discretionary funding through the offices of Districts two and four should any shortage of operating funds be realized through this route change.

Route 19 Rio Linda: Extend Route along Elverta Road to Walerga Road in Antelope. Route would turn in Antelope at and/or near the WinCO to return to Rio Linda and Arden/Del Paso via staff recommendation of route alignment from Rio Linda back into North Sacramento. Should staff recommendation regarding frequency be maintained, staff would need to seek out district discretionary funding from City of Sacramento District Two, as well as Sacramento County District One. However, as mentioned in a previous electronic comment, SacRTD could pay for the route itself, through its own existing budget by stretching the headways to once every sixty minutes. While hourly routes is something staff is strongly recommending against doing. This route is one in which it could be possible, simply given the "rural" nature of the landscape and the environment that this route would be operating under. Should the Board of Directors agree to this assessment, this would then become the only hourly route in the entire "new network" of routes being taken into consideration.

Route 21 Sunrise: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 22 Arden: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 23 El Camino: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 24 Madison/Greenback: Maintain staff recommendation. See Route 1 Greenback for replacement service along Greenback with potential funding gap covered by the cities of Citrus Heights, Folsom, and Sacramento County District Four.

Route 25 Marconi: Maintain staff recommendation from Marconi/Arcade Station to the Louis/Orlando Transfer point. Extend western portion of route from Marconi/Arcade Station to Arden/Del Paso Station via Arcade Boulevard and Del Paso Boulevard on all days of the week.

Route 26 Fulton: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 28 Fair Oaks: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 29 Arden/California Avenue: Extend route span of service to every thirty minutes on weekdays and every forty-five minutes on weekends/holidays. First weekday trip in both directions would begin at 6am, while last trip in both directions would begin no later than 11pm. Span of service hours would cover Arden Fair Mall hours as well as hours for nightlife events in and around Downtown Sacramento and the Sacramento Riverfront. Discretionary funding from the offices of elected locally elected officials as well as competitive state and regional grants would most likely be needed to cover any shortage in operating costs to operate this route. Should the Sacramento Regional Transit District want to explore a funding opportunity with Arden Fair Mall and DOCO Sacramento, a public/private partnership would also be an excellent opportunity with regards to funding transit operations in a case like Route 29.

Route 30 J Street: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 33 Dos Rios: Maintain existing route through public/private funding opportunities. Possible partners could include, but not be limited to Francis House, Sacramento Steps Forward, as well as Loaves & Fishes.

Route 34 McKinley: Maintain staff recommendation, including new route alignment upon completion of new road infrastructure, and renumber to #134 McKinley.

Route 36 Folsom Boulevard: This new/old route would be brought back as an emergency bus bridge route only. Whenever the Gold Line goes down, and cannot operate either due to SacRTD or non-SacRTD related causes, Route 36 would operate every fifteen minutes on all days from Sacramento Valley Station to Historic Folsom Station. From Sacramento Valley Station, route would travel via Sacramento Valley Station Roadway, H Street, 7th Street, Q Street, 15th Street, T Street, 16th Street, Capitol Avenue/Folsom Boulevard to the Historic Folsom Station. From 16th Street and Capitol Avenue to Historic Folsom Station, route would not turn. A straight/direct bus bridge route would maintain reliability and on-time performance in a real time of need while crews work diligently to make necessary repairs in order to get the Gold Line back up and operating at normal service levels.

Route 38 P/Q Streets: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 47 Phoenix Park: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 50 Stockton Boulevard/T Street: New Route would operate from Sacramento Valley Station to Cosumnes River College via U.C. Davis Medical Center at 15-minute weekday frequencies and 20-minute frequencies on weekends/holidays. From Sacramento Valley Station Roadway, route would travel to Cosumnes River College via H Street, 7th Street, T Street, Stockton Boulevard, Mack Road, Valley Hi Drive, and Bruceville Road to the Cosumnes River College Light Rail Station. Inbound Downtown Sacramento alignment would have route traveling via T Street to 5th Street to reduce/eliminate excess time, mileage, traffic delay, and turns getting into Sacramento Valley Station that using 8th Street would otherwise cause.

Route 51 Broadway: Eliminate all service along Stockton Boulevard. See Route 50, just above, for frequent Stockton Boulevard service. New Route 51 would travel from Sacramento Valley Station to University/65th Street Station along an alignment that would mainly combine existing Route 51 service on Broadway west of Stockton Boulevard, and existing Route 38 service on Broadway and 65th Street east of Stockton Boulevard. This route would travel via Sacramento Valley Station Roadway, H Street, 7th Street, Q Street, 9th Street, Broadway, and 65th Street to the University/65th Street Station. To Sacramento Valley Station, Route 51 would travel Broadway to 5th Street to reduce/eliminate excess time, mileage, traffic delay, and turns getting into Sacramento Valley Station that using 8th Street would otherwise cause. This route would operate at 15-minute frequencies on weekdays, with 20-minute frequencies on weekends/holidays.

Route 54 Center Parkway: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 55 Florin/CRC: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 56 Meadowview: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 61: Maintain staff recommendation. For service in areas east of 65th Street and west of South Watt Avenue, see Route 108 Power Inn Alliance for weekday circulator service and the funding opportunities contained in the proposal in order to make that new route function.

Route 62 Freeport: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 65 Franklin South: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 67 MLK/Franklin: Maintain staff recommendation regarding route alignment between Arden Fair Mall and Franklin Station. Using Sacramento City Council District Eight discretionary funds, extend route west on Cosumnes River Boulevard to the Delta Shores Shopping Center. This much needed funding from District Eight would provide a critical route extension in gaining access to jobs for employees in a highly coveted shopping center covering jobs mostly in retail, restaurant, and movie entertainment. A master planned community adjacent to the retail power center is in the works, and should be complete within the next five to ten years.

Route 68 MLK/44th Street: Maintain staff recommendation for route alignment from Florin Towne Centre to Arden Fair Mall. Eliminate service from Arden Fair Mall to Morse Avenue, Cottage Way, and Butano Drive. This particular elimination would be necessary so as to not cause any operating redundancy with regards to proposal to Route 29, and existing alignment of Route 82, which we will see later, is not proposed to change in the Kaiser Morse Area under the "new network" at all.

Route 72 Rosemont: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 74 Rancho Cordova: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 75 Mather: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 80 Watt/Elkhorn: Eliminate as is. Upon receiving semi-annual payments through Sacramento County and the Nexus Study identifying future bus rapid transit corridors, as presented to the Sacramento Regional Transit District Board of Directors at the January 14, 2019 Board of Directors Meeting, re-introduce Route 80 and rename as "Route 80 Greenback/Elkhorn" going forward. This new route would operate from Sacramento International Airport to the Historic Folsom Light Rail Station via Airport Boulevard, Southbound Interstate 5, Northbound Highway 99, Elkhorn Boulevard/Greenback Lane to the Historic Folsom Station. Staff and Sacramento County would have the final say in determining frequency, span of service hours, and whether the new Bus Rapid Transit Line would operate weekdays only, or all days. Until such time arrives to reintroduce this route, effective Sunday, June 16, 2019 this route, as it exists in today's network is being recommended for complete elimination.

Route 81 Florin Road/65th Street: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 82 CSUS/ARC: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 84 Watt: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 86 San Juan/Grand: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 87 Howe: Maintain staff recommendation, but begin weekday start times at Marconi/Arcade Station at 6:00am. Current first weekday departure from Marconi/Arcade Station is approximately 6:44am.

Route 88 West El Camino: From Downtown Sacramento, all trips would turn into Route 15 upon arriving at the Arden/Del Paso Station. Slightly new route alignment from Downtown Sacramento would operate to serve a new master planned community as commented upon by Director Steve Hansen at the December 10th Sacramento Regional Transit District Board of Directors Meeting. From Downtown Sacramento, route would travel from the 8th & O Streets Light Rail Station via 8th Street, F Street, North 7th Street, Richards Boulevard, Northbound Interstate Five, Westbound Interstate Eighty, West El Camino Avenue, Colfax Street, and Arden Way to the Arden/Del Paso Light Rail Station. From Arden/Del Paso Station, all trips would change into Route 15 for travel along the alignment of Route 15 to the Watt/I-80 Light Rail Station. Frequency, span of service hours, and operating on all days would be maintained as recommended by staff in the December 10th issue paper. In order to cover the costs of this route, staff may have to seek Sacramento City Council Districts Four and Two discretionary funding, if that appears necessary to do.

Route 93 Hillsdale: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 103 Auburn Boulevard: Maintain staff recommendation.

Route 109 Hazel Express: Maintain staff recommendation.

Routes 170-173 JIBE Routes:
Maintain staff recommendation.

Routes 175-177 Rancho Cordovan: Maintain staff recommendations.

Should you have any further comments or questions on this sensitive topic, please feel free to contact me at your convenience, and prior to 5:30pm on February 25th

Sincerely,

Mike Barnbaum, Founder
"Ride Downtown 916"
Mobile Phone: (916) 390-3989

CC: Laura Fickle - Power Inn Alliance

Sent from my iPhone
While "RIDING" Public Transportation
Or "FLYING" Southwest Airlines

On Jan 2, 2019, at 8:16 AM, James Drake <JDrake@sact.com> wrote:

Thanks for the suggestion Mike. We will take it into consideration. Happy New Year!

James

James Drake

Principal Planner
Sacramento Regional Transit District
916-556-0505 | jdrake@sacrt.com
<IMAGE.png>

[Check out the new SacRT network!](#)

>>> Mike Barnbaum <mike_barnbaum@comcast.net> 1/1/2019 9:25 PM >>>
Happy New Year James and James:

Hope all is going well with you both.

I wanted to send you two a request regarding Route 19 (Rio Linda) bus service. I had a meeting with a rider on Route 87 (Howe) about Route 19 back on Monday - New Year's Eve. After discussing the proposed route modifications versus what is actually currently occurring, I think a "meet me in the middle" solution can be achieved. Based on what the Route 87 (Howe) rider and I discussed, here is the Route 19 solution we have come up with:

Route 19: (Rio Linda) Eliminate route along all of Watt Avenue from Elverta Road to Interstate 80. New route alignment would follow existing route from Arden/Del Paso Station to Elverta Road and Walerga Road, where it would turn around in and around the WinCo Foods SuperStore as well as make connections with newly aligned Route 26 (Fulton) and Route 84 (Watt). This route would maintain existing 60-minute frequencies with first inbound weekday trip arriving Arden/Del Paso Station by or before 6:00 a.m., and first weekend inbound trip arriving Arden/Del Paso Station by or before 7:00 a.m. It would be recommended that on a daily basis that the last outbound trip from Arden/Del Paso Station depart no later than 10:50pm so as to make the bus schedule align with blue line night schedules. Although the northbound Blue Line does extend currently past midnight on all nights except Sunday Nights, the one common denominator is that, at least on paper, there is always a northbound Blue Line train arriving at the Arden/Del Paso Station on all nights at 10:46pm, assuming that it remains on its tight time schedule, and does not encounter anything non-RT related that would cause operational deficiencies resulting in schedule delays and/or tardiness arriving at stations, causing riders to miss critical connections.

If you have any further questions for me, please do not hesitate to send them my way. I look forward to our upcoming board meetings on the 14th and 28th of the current month, as well as the 25th of next month for the final approval of the new network, set to debut on June 16th.

Sincerely,

Mike Barnbaum
Mobile Phone: (916) 390-3989

Sent from my iPhone
While "RIDING" Public Transportation
Or "FLYING" Southwest Airlines



Sarah Poe - RE: Re: Feedback #64915 - SacRT Forward - FYI

From: Denise Escobar at Florin HS <DEscobar@egusd.net>
To: James Drake <JDrake@sacrt.com>
Date: 1/17/2019 1:42 PM
Subject: RE: Re: Feedback #64915 - SacRT Forward - FYI
Cc: James Boyle <JBoyle@sacrt.com>, Jessica Gonzalez <JGonzalez@sacrt.com>, ...

Hello Mr. Drake,

Florin High School has had a wonderful relationship with Regional Transit for many years. Specifically, we communicate with Alan Fong at R.T. regarding our school schedule and any misbehaving students, and he has been very supportive and helpful.

Since we have an established point of communication, I was troubled when we received the first notice regarding Regional Transit's proposed fixed route changes from Russel Devorak first on December 20th (not received) and again on January 10th (highlighted below), well after the South Sacramento Open House on December 19th and after all significant opportunities for public input had occurred. When I look at the revised map for South Sacramento, I see almost no fixed-route service to one the most highly impoverished, highly transient, and non-English-speaking Immigrant dense regions in Sacramento County (east of Highway 99; north of Calvine Road; south of Highway 50). If I didn't live in the area, I would look at the Regional Transit services map for South Sacramento and assume it was open farm or grazing land, not that it was a densely populated region. In addition, the Sac RT Forward Video presentation on your website skips over the elimination of Route 5 completely – an innocent, but significant oversight.

My specific concerns relate to the high poverty and limited transportation of the students and families in the Florin Region where regular services are being reduced and eliminated. I recognize that RT will maintain Bus 5 service September through June at the beginning and the end of the school day. However, our school year runs from early to mid-August through the end of June, and our students and families also rely on this route for transportation to attend parent-teacher conferences, to get home after practices and detentions, for early dismissals to dentist/doctor appointments, etc. – not just at the beginning and end of the school day.

In my twenty-nine years at Florin High School, the first ten of which I was also a resident in the region, I have learned not to mistake my families' silence with a lack of need or a lack of caring. I've also learned that one voice can represent the needs and concerns of many who, for a multitude of reasons, remain silent. The issues that student Pablo Meza raises are legitimate. Given RT's lapses in communication with Florin High School and the Florin region, any communication you receive from our students, families, and/or staff deserve RT's serious consideration.

Thank you very much for forwarding Pablo's email. I hope this is the beginning of a productive dialogue.

Denise Escobar
Principal
Florin High School

[\(916\) 689-8600](tel:9166898600)



From: Russel Devorak [<mailto:RDevorak@sacrt.com>]
Sent: Thursday, January 10, 2019 5:50 AM
To: Tanya Lucas at Florin HS <tlucas@egusd.net>
Subject: Fwd: 2019 Spring semester & proposed service changes. /// Follow up

Good morning, I'm following up on an email that I sent three weeks ago. The attached email was sent to Florin & Valley High, both schools would be impacted by the proposed changes of RT's route restructuring project know as "SacRT Forward". Since no one has responded to the group email I'm sure that it is sitting in a spam folder. So here is the original email that was sent, feel free to let me know if there is anything you need my assistance with.

>>> Russel Devorak 12/20/2018 10:35 AM >>>

I also wanted to invite everyone to visit the "SacRT Forward" page:

<http://www.sacrt.com/apps/sacrtforward/> . Sacramento Regional Transit is in the process of redesigning the bus network, as part of this process some routes may be discontinued so here is a link to the page that gives more details; <http://www.sacrt.com/apps/sacrt-forward-draft-networks/> scroll down to the summary for details regarding each route. At this point in the process it looks like both route 5 and route 54 will be discontinued, but we plan to cover both Florin High and Valley High with a trip to cover both the morning and afternoon bell schedule. If you have any question or concerns feel free to contact me.

Thanks Russ

From: James Drake <JDrake@sacrt.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2019 9:31 AM
To: Denise Escobar at Florin HS <DEscobar@egusd.net>
Cc: James Boyle <JBoyle@sacrt.com>; Jessica Gonzalez <JGonzalez@sacrt.com>; Laura Ham <LHam@sacrt.com>; Russel Devorak <RDevorak@sacrt.com>; Sarah Poe <SPoe@sacrt.com>; Theresa Weaver <TWeaver@sacrt.com>
Subject: Fwd: Re: Feedback #64915 - SacRT Forward - FYI

Hi Denise,

I'm forwarding an email and response from one of your students regarding SacRT bus changes proposed for Route 5. The student was concerned about proposed elimination of the bus. I wanted to make clear that we intend to keep the morning and afternoon trip on Route 5 that are currently well-used by students travelling to/from Florin HS. The proposed bus route changes are part of a systemwide restructuring we are doing to the bus network which is described more at sacrt.com. We have sent out notices to our school contacts, but with the busy holidays season, changing contact info over the years, etc., this may not have

reached you. Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns. I have copied SacRT communications, customer service, scheduling staff as an FYI.

Best regards,

James Drake

Principal Planner
Sacramento Regional Transit District
[916-556-0505](tel:916-556-0505) | jdrake@sacrt.com



The new generation network

[Check out the new SacRT network!](#)

>>> James Drake 1/17/2019 9:25 AM >>>

Hi Pablo,

Thanks for your comment on Route 5. We would retain the morning trip on Route 5 that leaves Meadowview light rail station at 7:16 a.m. and the afternoon trip on Route 5 that leaves Florin High School at 3:40 p.m. The route number would change to #205. Hopefully this would meet your needs and those of your fellow students. We have found that these two trips are well-used by students, but the remainder of the Route 5 trips run mostly empty with minimal ridership, which is why we're proposing to discontinue the remainder of the route. [More info.](#)

Thank you for reaching out and let me know if you have any other questions or comments.

Regards,

James Drake

Principal Planner
Sacramento Regional Transit District
[916-556-0505](tel:916-556-0505) | jdrake@sacrt.com



The new generation network

[Check out the new SacRT network!](#)

>>> "tweaver" <tweaver@sacrt.com> 1/17/2019 8:29 AM >>>

Date Received: 01-17-2019

Feedback Id: 64915

Department: Planning

CC Department:

Feedback Type: Inquiry

Feedback Subtype: SacRT Forward

First Name: Pablo

Last Name: Meza

Email: mexican3077@gmail.com

Cell Phone:

Home Phone:

Priority: 1

Target Date: 02-01-2019

Incident Date: 01-17-2019

Incident Start Time:

Incident Details: >>> Pablo Meza <mexican3077@gmail.com> 01/17/19 04:31 >>>

Hi, I am a student attending Florin High School and recently learned from our school administrators that RT is planning to eliminate Route 5. Although the implementation of SmartRide might be convenient, it is not convenient for those who want to come to school on time as the SmartRide buses do not have lots of room and also because not everyone has access to a cellular device with data to order the SmartRide. Also the implementation of 56 does not help in any way shape or form for us students taking the bus to Florin High School. Please reconsider to having this route open again as it's our only hope for us to be to school on time and every day to have a brighter future for us. Thank you for your consideration.

- Pablo Meza, Sophomore at Florin High School

Line Id: 005

Route Details: MEADOWVIEW - VALLEY HI

From: Sarah Poe
To: sasha.addison@dca.ca.gov
CC: Theresa Weaver
Date: 1/30/2019 10:11 AM
Subject: RE: Feedback #64975 - SacRT Forward - FYI

I will communicate your concerns. Thanks for taking the time to comment.

>>> "Addison, Sasha@DCA" <Sasha.Addison@dca.ca.gov> 1/30/2019 10:11 AM >>>

Sarah and Theresa,

I do not meant to take any of this out on you two I am just really frustrated with this route change. I have been riding with you guys for 10 years and love your bus drivers and light rail drivers. I could give you names and all that they have done for me and other riders. I really love riding RT it gives me a peace of mind on the way home and allows me to make new friends who I love to joke around with on the way home. It is just that with this route change it puts me in a real bad bind and many others of us. It really to be honest just sucks to put it as nice as I can. I pray and hope that you guys at least consider making an express run for those of us that do work on North Market because if there is no consideration you may lose more riders and I really do not want to be one of the people you guys lose.

I hope that you all read our concerns and take keeping North Market Blvd on the bus 13 route into consideration. Thank you for your time.

Sasha Addison
LCSW Evaluator
Board of Behavioral Sciences
1625 N. Market Blvd., Ste S-200
Sacramento, CA 95834
Phone: 916-574-7823

☞ Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

Helpful Numbers and Links

BBS Exam Unit (Exam questions) bbsexamunit@dca.ca.gov
PSI (Schedule L&E exams) 877-392-6422 or www.candidate.psiexams.com
Forms and Publications (applications) www.bbs.ca.gov/forms.shtml
Breeze (online renewal) www.breeze.ca.gov
Breeze Online Help: breeze@dca.ca.gov

Direct Phone Line for Breeze Online Assistance - 916-557-1208

NASW (Legal and ethical questions) CA Chapter: 916-442-4565

ASWB (National Clinic Exam) www.aswb.org : 888-579-3926

-----Original Message-----

From: Sarah Poe <SPoe@sacrt.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2019 10:01 AM
To: Addison, Sasha@DCA <Sasha.Addison@dca.ca.gov>

Cc: Theresa Weaver <TWeaver@sacrt.com>
Subject: RE: Feedback #64975 - SacRT Forward - FYI

Sasha,

We have had RT staff ride this route, and your concerns are valid and understood. All of the comments we get are carefully looked at, and considered throughout this process. Every single comment is copied, word for word, and shared with Management and the Board of Directors, so please be assured that you, and all of your fellow riders, are indeed being heard.

>>> "Addison, Sasha@DCA" <Sasha.Addison@dca.ca.gov> 1/30/2019 9:56 AM >>>
Good Morning Sarah and Theresa,

The issue is not walking. I am not lazy and have no problem walking. Of course I am not going to appreciate getting to work in soaked clothes on the day it is raining but to me this route change is not feasible for many of us. And what happens if something happens to me on the dark streets when I am walking to work? So you expect people who have to be at work at 7 to walk all the way from Truxel all the way to Del Paso and Northgate or National and North Market? That is more than a 15 minute walk and would cause them to be extremely late. Why does the route have to change to San Juan when you already have the 11 & 86 that cover the area you plan on the bus going to. What is wrong with considering an express route during the peak business hours between 6 & 8 am and between either 3 & 5 pm or 4 & 6 pm. I am just asking for some consideration as there is many state workers that utilize the route on North Market. You are not only inconveniencing me but many others. Even if you keep the route the way it is, can you make the runs from 6 to 8 am and either 3-5/4-6 run down North Market? You guys do not ride the bus and do not see or communicate with the hard workers that use the bus to get to their job that is either on North Market or right off of it. Like I told you there is already 2 ladies that walk from North Market/Northgate bus stop to Del Paso and Northgate. So you expect them to walk all the way from Truxel/Walmart to Del Paso & Northgate? Would you want to walk over an hour to your job at 6:30/6:45 in the morning on a street that is not very well lite and does not have a sidewalk all the way down the street? I honestly do not think you would want to do that. Not all of us have or can afford to drive to work or take Uber/Lyft. You are completely cutting us out of the equation and not considering us at all.

In response to my question about how am I going to get from Madison & Hillsdale to 1625 North Market is that I can still take my normal route and just walk the 15 minutes it would take me to get to my job right? Would the bus be at Truxel by 6:45 am every morning Monday through Friday because if not I am not able to ride RT no more if you change the route. I am due to be at work at 7 am and if the bus does not get to Wal-Mart by 6:45 am then I will be late every day.

I really wish one of you would just take the time in the next week or so and ride bus 13 at 6:23 or 7:23 am and look at all the people you will be affecting. Not only adults but children too that go to the schools that are right there close to the McDonalds on Northgate. I am frustrated with this whole thing and really feel that you are not hearing us. Many of us that have emailed you about this bus route have gotten the same general response and it appears as though you are not hearing our concerns. You are strictly eliminating our only way to get to work by 7am and your only solution is by you leaving us with no choice but to walk more than 15 minutes to get to our job by 7 am. Which is not feasible especially if they work on the other end of the North Market.

Sasha Addison
LCSW Evaluator
Board of Behavioral Sciences
1625 N. Market Blvd., Ste S-200
Sacramento, CA 95834

-----Original Message-----

From: Sarah Poe <SPoe@sacrt.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2019 9:32 AM
To: Addison, Sasha@DCA <Sasha.Addison@dca.ca.gov>

Cc: Theresa Weaver <TWeaver@sacrt.com>
Subject: Re: Feedback #64975 - SacRT Forward - FYI

Dear Sasha,

Thank you for sending us your comments about the proposed changes to Route 13. The changes to this route are primarily due to the segment along Northgate between San Juan and N. Market being in a largely industrial area with low density. Moving the route over to Truxel allows us to serve a corridor with higher density, and allows us to extend the route north to two high schools, a library, and a junior college. Although the Route 13 is proposed not to run along N. Market, the closest bus stop at Truxel and Arena is located within walking distance (1/2 mile to National Drive), will be served by both Route 11 and Route 13. This may create a longer walk than you are used to, but it does provide more service on a more frequent basis, with both routes operating every 45 minutes instead of every 60 minutes. Additionally, this change will allow us to add weekend service to Route 13, and Sunday/Holiday service to Route 11.

If you are not able to walk the distance to/from a bus stop due to a disability or health-related condition, you may be eligible for paratransit service.

Thank you again for your comments. They will be included in the public record, and presented to the Board of Directors for their review and consideration.

Sincerely,

Sarah C. Poe
Assistant Planner
Sacramento Regional Transit District
spoe@sacrt.com
916.556.0518

>>> "tweaver" <tweaver@sacrt.com> 1/18/2019 12:36 PM >>>

Date Received: 01-18-2019

Feedback Id: 64975

Department: Planning

CC Department:

Feedback Type: Inquiry

Feedback Subtype: SacRT Forward

First Name: Sasha

Last Name: Addison

Email: Sasha.Addison@dca.ca.gov

Cell Phone: 9168071633

Home Phone:

Priority: 1

Target Date: 02-04-2019

Incident Date: 01-18-2019

Incident Start Time:

Incident Details:

>>> "Addison, Sasha@DCA" <Sasha.Addison@dca.ca.gov> 01/18/19 12:28 >>>

Is it true that you are rerouting bus 13 to Truxel and not having it run on N. Market Blvd? The reason I am asking is because you have more than several state employees and other employees that ride this bus and really utilize N. Market Blvd on what is currently your 6:23 am and 7:23 am bus. Is there a way that for these 2 bus times you could have the bus go down North Market Blvd? With you stopping the bus from going down North Market you may loose several riders me being one of them. It will be a great inconvenience if I have to change the route I take currently (Bus 13 which drops me right in front of the job) to take Bus 88 from Arden to transfer to Bus 11 to take it to Truxel (By Wal Mart) and then have to walk 15 minutes to my job. There are many that ride the 13 at the two times mentioned above. Can you make an express route to go down N. Market at 6:23 am and 7:23 am and then at 4 and 5 in the evening? This change will have a huge impact on several state workers and may cause you to loose ridership because we will have no other choice but to drive ourselves in. I currently use Bus 13, and 93 and the light rail.

A response from you would be greatly appreciated. You could reach out to the State departments that are on or near North Market Blvd to get a response from us or better yet have a representative come ride the bus with all of us at 6:23 and 7:23 am so you can see that we do utilize North Market a lot and by you cutting North Market out of this route would be devastating.

Line Id: 013

Route Details: NORTHGATE

Sarah Poe - Feedback #64975 - Bus 13

From: sacrtforward
To: Sasha.Addison@dca.ca.gov
Date: 1/30/2019 10:51 AM
Subject: Feedback #64975 - Bus 13
Bc: Sarah Poe

Ms. Addison:

RT will continue gathering public and rider feedback through mid-February. The Board will receive the revised network design at their regular board meeting on February 25. Please continue to watch for updates to the proposals based on feedback we are receiving. SacRT appreciates you taking the time to share your feedback about the proposal for route 13.

>>> "Addison, Sasha@DCA" <Sasha.Addison@dca.ca.gov> 1/30/2019 7:33 AM >>>

You may have improved it but with the "so-called" improvements you are cutting not only state workers out of the route and their way to work. You are affecting more than 20 people and the bus they use to get to work. Why don't one of you make an attempt to ride the bus 13 at 6:23 am in the morning and hear our concerns. I am sure you guys will not do that but there are at least 12 people in the morning that utilize North Market Boulevard at 6:23 am and even more at 7:23 am. Majority of the riders at 7:23 am are state workers. **You are eliminating all of us out of the bus route completely.** We will have no way to get to work other than Uber, Lyft or inconveniencing our kids and families by having them have to get up before 6 am to be able to take us to work in the morning instead of conveniently riding RT's Light Rail and Bus systems. You already have the 86 that goes down San Juan and the 11 that goes on Truxel. Can you extend the "so-called" new route to go to North Market Blvd where the 12 or more of your riders at 6:23 am use the route to get to work on or around North Market?

I know 2 ladies who ride at 6:23 am and they walk from the first stop on North Market and walk **all the way** to Del Paso to the Napa Auto Parts/AM PM on Del Paso. You expect them now with the "new" changes to walk all the way to Del Paso at 6:35ish from the AM/PM on San Juan. **That does not line up with your "Mission", doing that does not improve access our make it safe, or reliable for us.** Period not at all. That is ridiculous. You guys are completely eliminating your riders way to work.

I am seriously asking if you could please reconsider the new changes you plan on making to this route. At least consider having it go down Northgate to North Market and then turn right on Truxel. You are cutting my only way I have to get to work via transit. I have been riding with you guys for 10 plus years and this is such a slap in the face to all of us who utilize this route especially so we can get to work by 7 am. I have never had any complaints in regards to RT and its employees. But you guys are so wrong for this. You could even make it an express route. But to complete cut out the North Market Blvd and the industrial area near North Market out is wrong in so many ways.

For the first time since I have been riding with RT. Any issues that may have arisen and you guys have taken care of I have truly appreciated but this here is flat out an inconvenience

and utter disrespect for your riders that utilize bus 13 currently. And it definitely does not align with your so called mission. I live near Hillsdale & Madison by Scandia and currently the husband drops me off at the light rail by 6 am so I can get to work and he can take our children to school. If I take the bus 93 that runs at 6 am I am not able to catch the 6:23 am bus. How with **“your horribly new improved route”** do you suggest I get to work at the Department of Consumer Affairs (State Building) by 7 am since you are providing me such a safe and reliable way to get to work? Or how about the 2 ladies who already walk from Northgate & North Market to Del Paso how about them how do you suggest they get to work safely. That’s right by walking from San Juan all the way to Del Paso Rd at 6 something in the morning?

I would really appreciate a response on how you suggest I utilize your bus system to get to work once you eliminate the route from going down North Market Blvd? **Since it is your mission** to provide safe, reliable and fiscally responsible transit service.

Our mission is to promote and improve access in the Sacramento region by providing safe, reliable, and fiscally responsible transit service that links people to resources and opportunities.

Sasha Addison
LCSW Evaluator
Board of Behavioral Sciences
1625 N. Market Blvd., Ste S-200
Sacramento, CA 95834

From: sacrtforward sacrtforward <sacrtforward@sacrt.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2019 3:27 PM
To: Addison, Sasha@DCA <Sasha.Addison@dca.ca.gov>
Subject: Feedback #64975 - Bus 13

Ms. Addison:

On behalf of SacRT, thank you for commenting on the SacRT Forward Draft Network. We have updated information for route 13. We have extended service to two high schools, library and jurnior college; improved weekday frequency to 45 minutes; added Saturday and Sunday/Holiday service (see attachment). Please let us know if you have any additional questions or concerns.

Our mission is to promote and improve access in the Sacramento region by providing safe, reliable, and fiscally responsible transit service that links people to resources and opportunities.

>>> "Addison, Sasha@DCA" <Sasha.Addison@dca.ca.gov> 1/29/2019 12:16 PM >>>

I am a current rider on Bus 13 and I would like to know that you are not only affecting those that work on or off of North Market Blvd but you are also going to be affecting disabled riders. I want to say it was last Thursday or Friday that Bus 13 heading to Arden/Del Paso at or around 4pm stopped to pick up a passenger right there on Northgate once we turned right onto it from North Market, this passenger was

disabled in a wheelchair and with some additional bags. This had me thinking. (Please note at the corner of Northgate & North Market there are business that assist low income or people who are trying to see their kids or get custody back of their kids. I have talked to several of them riding the route for the last 2 years. If you guys change the route to where it does not come to North Market at all how would this disable person get to the closest bus to get picked up. He would have to walk or wheelchair on the overpass that does not have a sidewalk and then attempt to cross the freeway onramp. How safe does that sound?

Or what about the parents that use the bus to get there children to the school that is right there by or near by the McDonalds? You expect them to walk at 7 in the morning with their children who are 5, or 6 sometimes even younger.

I feel as though since Pride Industries has moved from their building we somehow are being punished for their move. You stopped the 7:08 from running which was a great back up bus to get to work in case I was late. That is no longer the case now. And now you are trying to completely do away with the bus. Honestly just because they left that building does not mean that they are not people utilizing the bus route. Yes it may be consider an "industrial area" but there are people that work out here and really on the transportation to get here.

I am really trying to advocate for bus route 13 because not only have I met great bus drivers on this route but I have made good friends. We use this bus for good reasons such as getting to work and for you to sweep this route out from us completely. Is just wrong, completely wrong.

I am asking if you at SACRT could please consider making this route a commuter bus or express route where it runs from Arden at 6:23, 7:23 and maybe 8:23 and then again from Natomas/Walmart to Arden at 3, 4 and 5. Something is better than nothing.

Thank you for taking the time to hear my frustration for you trying to cut my route that I use weekly.

Sasha Addison
LCSW Evaluator
Board of Behavioral Sciences



Pocket Greenhaven Community Association

Sacramento, CA 95831

January 15, 2019

Sacramento Regional Transit District
1400 29th St
Sacramento, CA 95812

Dear Sacramento Regional Transit Board of Directors,

Thank you for seeking to make the best use of our region's limited transportation resources. We understand that this is a challenging process that cannot possibly please everyone. While continuing the status quo may be the easiest path, it would not be in the best interest of our region or our local community.

We appreciate your staff's thorough and informative presentation to our association on January 8th, as well as their outreach and the consideration that has gone into the proposal. There are several notable improvements which we wholeheartedly applaud, most critically increasing nearly all routes to 30 minute intervals and ensuring effective connection between lines at a common terminus in the Pocket-Greenhaven neighborhood.

Our community has expressed concerns about other specific proposed changes, however. Notably, the proposal omits half of our neighborhood from any coverage during non-commute hours. As staff takes into consideration the feedback they have received from ours and other community groups, we ask that the proposal be modified to achieve the following:

1. Maintain the current hub/terminus at Rush River/Windbridge, which is
 - a. A more central, walkable/bikeable location that will best serve the community
 - b. A less impacted intersection, improving operations without impeding traffic
 - c. Well placed to help achieve the items below
2. Ensure coverage for all schools, including Kennedy, SES, K-8 schools, and the library
3. Ensure coverage for all large apartment buildings and senior complexes
4. Ensure that changes to regular routes do not impact paratransit coverage
 - a. For example, enacting a policy to ensure that residents within $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile of eliminated lines remain eligible for paratransit use
5. Ensure outreach to current riders by including signage & fact sheets on impacted routes

We understand that without additional resources, it is impossible to increase service on certain routes without decreasing service on other routes, but we believe that very modest changes to the proposal can significantly improve service in our local community.

We understand this project is focused on refining the use of existing traditional bus resources. We do ask, however, that our community be considered for a SmartRide pilot or early rollout, especially if changes are made that create a significant gap in coverage for our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Will Cannady, President, Pocket-Greenhaven Community Association

On behalf of board members Pat Aguiar, Tristan Brown, Jim Geary, Devin Lavelle, Mary McCune & Erin Peth

***SacRT Forward Public Meetings
and Presentations –
Comment Cards***



The new generation network

Comment Card

Please share any thoughts, comments, or questions you have about SacRT Forward.

~~IT~~ IT WILL BE TOO GENEROUS AND EXTRAVAGANT TO HAVE LIGHT RAIL RUN EVERY 15 MINUTES ON WEEKENDS BECAUSE ON WEEKENDS, THEY'RE ALL 2-CAR TRAINS EVERY 30 MINUTES AND THEY ARE NOT CROWDED

Name ▶ DAVID GARLICK

Email Address ▶

How did you hear about this event? ▶ LAST STOP NEWS DECEMBER

You may submit your comments to staff today or directly to sacrtforward@sacrt.com



Regional Transit



The new generation network

Comment Card

Please share any thoughts, comments, or questions you have about SacRT Forward.

1. Eliminating the 38 does not allow for any bus service from the 50 freeway to Broadway. What will happen as the Aggie Square campus and other residential (apts + homes) along this corridor evolve.
2. What about services from Stockton Blvd to the 65th Express way on 21st Ave and Broadway. These are up and coming neighborhoods needing this service. This would also increase ridership in the developing Southeast area of Sacramento.

Name ▶ Willie Walton

Email Address ▶ wwcbbwalton@gmail.com

How did you hear about this event? ▶ My Neighborhood's Nextdoor

You may submit your comments to staff today or directly to sacrtforward@sacrt.com



Regional Transit

Comment Card

Please share any thoughts, comments, or questions you have about SacRT Forward.

We need a change in perspective in Sacramento by encouraging folks to ride transit rather than drive. That starts with people/rider-first policies & ensuring the Board rides transit themselves. Some recommendations:

- I support efficiency routes conversion - more frequency = more riders.
- Consider an equity analysis, ensuring changes don't reduce ridership among low-income riders in favor of ^{high} income riders.
- Consider capital improvements like transit signal priority & bus lanes in Downtown.

I support proposals for 117 30 buses!

↔ Please add a crosswalk for 30 riders at Alhambra & Granada Way/L.
→ Let's get an Airport Express prior to Green line completion.

especially for J & L St.

Name ▶ Dustin Foster
 Email Address ▶ _____
 How did you hear about this event? ▶ e-mail

You may submit your comments to staff today or directly to sacrtforward@sacrt.com



Comment Card

Name: Jelani Young Email: jelani.y@yahoo.com

How did you hear about this event? friend

Comments:
 I like the potential proposal to increase efficiency of routes. I would like to see a serious effort be made to make transit free by subsidizing fares to households that have a person to car ratio of 4:1 or less. This would incentivize people to use transit and not own a personal vehicle, along with helping the state meet its green house-gas reduction targets.

Was your question/comment addressed?
 Yes No

Comment Card

Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

ANY added REVENUE should be ~~added~~ used to
Routes that were cut or New Routes that are
needed in New Growth areas.

Name:

Robert Coplin

Email:

R.COPLIN2001@yahoo.com
SACRTU

How did you hear about this event?

SACRTU

You can submit your
comments to staff today
or directly to:

sacrtforward@sacrt.com



**Regional
Transit**

Comment Card

Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

I WAS at a SHOC meeting today and they were
concerned about the loss of Bus Route 33 which a
lot of the homeless population like to use and
Light Route 33 as if or combine the route with
67 and 68 but Route

Either extend the light rail line past township
9 or eliminate the light rail line as nobody
uses that light rail line.

Name:

Robert Coplin

Email:

R-COPLIN2001@yahoo.com

How did you hear about this event?

SACRTU

You can submit your
comments to staff today
or directly to:

sacrtforward@sacrt.com



**Regional
Transit**

Comment Card

Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

Route Maps 93, 88, 84, 82, 81, 86, 75, 74
 Legends - 72, 68, 67, 65, 62, ~~61~~ 56, 55
 Bullet Points - 54, 51, 38, 34, 33, 30, ~~38~~ 28, 21, 26
 Destinations - 23, 24, 23, 22, 19, 15, 13, 11, 6, 2, 1
 I would like a pilot Express - 5X30X, 1X - 4/4 - Transfer points
 I would like a Pilot - 2 week ARC - Aug-Sept
 Start 10 minute - before or after 15" Route
 Shuttles ARC (1) Jan?

Name: Jeffery Tardaguila
 Email: JEFFTARD17@GMAIL.COM
 How did you hear about this event? Board Meeting

You can submit your comments to staff today or directly to:
sacrtforward@sacrt.com



Comment Card

Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

MAPS for Each Change
 3 to 5 destination each Route - ~~La Grange~~ / Granger
 Legend for each Map
 Bullet Points Labeled
 Landmarks, Libraries, Shopping Areas, Points of Interest

Name: Jeffery Tardaguila
 Email: JEFFTARD17@GMAIL
 How did you hear about this event? Bad Meeting

You can submit your comments to staff today or directly to:
sacrtforward@sacrt.com



Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

30 + 62 = Slow down - Separate Times,
 15 + 51 = In to SVS = North to Blue (15)
 South to - 51
 15 and 86 = Combine to Downtown = Extension
~~38 - Start - 29th out to Power Inn or farther~~
~~Down town to~~
 38 - other way = 29th up - Around McKinley

Name: Jeffery Tardaguila
 Email: JEFFTARDI17@GMAIL.COM
 How did you hear about this event? Board Meeting

You can submit your comments to staff today or directly to:
sacrtforward@sacrt.com



Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

Green line include to Gold line with
 Amtrak Arrivals or Departures
 Hour or half-hour = SVS or Township 9 -
 38 divide into 2 routes = 11
 30 - 29th - out Broadway bypass 65 - continue outward
 Down town front Area to - 81

Name: Jeffery Tardaguila
 Email: JEFFTARDI17@GMAIL.COM
 How did you hear about this event? Board Meeting Monday

You can submit your comments to staff today or directly to:
sacrtforward@sacrt.com



12/19/18



Comment Card

Please share any thoughts, comments, or questions you have about SacRT Forward.

Tear Down ~~THE~~ WATT 180 Upper
And Only use Lower For All Buses

Name ▶ RFSD

Email Address ▶ RFSD

How did you hear about this event? ▶ _____

You may submit your comments to staff today or directly to sacrtforward@sacrt.com



12/19/18



Comment Card

Please share any thoughts, comments, or questions you have about SacRT Forward.

19 SHOULD AT LEAST GO TO
WATT & SILVERTON going to hunt
recruits + students on streets

Name ▶ Scott Whitley
Email Address ▶ ScottWhitley@sinclair.edu
How did you hear about this event? ▶ ?

You may submit your comments to staff today or directly to sacrtforward@sacrt.com



Comment Card

Name: Arthur K Email: _____

How did you hear about this event? _____

Comments:
Arthur wants a bus book
sidewalk issues on Watt, near Rt 26 on
Watt near McClellan



Was your question/comment addressed?

Yes No



Comment Card

Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

Difficult to get to Meadowview from Florin and north, e.g., Sac State
Use of Smart Ride for fixed-route trips, e.g., #56
Amerisource, north of PRIDE
Why are guards at stations Florin, Medv only 8:30 - 4:30

Name: _____

Email: _____

How did you hear about this event? _____

You can submit your comments to staff today or directly to:
sacrtforward@sacrt.com



Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

Remove Route 30 from Sacramento Valley Station and "replace" with Route 51 (Broadway/Stockton). Inbound via 8th Street, I Street, and 5th Street to Sacramento Valley Station. Outbound via Sacramento Valley Station roadway, which becomes H Street - H Street to 7th Street. No other recommended changes at this time.

Name:

MIKE BARNBAUM

Email:

mike_barnbaum@comcast.net

How did you hear about this event?

Other RT Meeting

You can submit your comments to staff today or directly to:

sacrtforward@sacrt.com



**Regional
Transit**

Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

We need more transit of all kinds.
I appreciate making routes more
efficient but we need more options
to really eliminate traffic gridlock.

Name:

Barbara Steinberg

Email:

How did you hear about this event?

Facebook

You can submit your
comments to staff today
or directly to:

sacrtforward@sacrt.com



**Regional
Transit**

Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

A friend of mine suggested that something be done about the way payments are handled in on the bus. He said often times the machine does not work & much money is lost. maybe either have a back up machine ready to use, or have two at all times. Remake that device so we can find the error that is most common to occur. you may have to get a new device and scanner & computer system, that is smart enough to track and record what the error is. I'm not sure if they do that as of present. maybe to even have that be logged via. Wifi or blue tooth. Maybe even adding wifi to buses. would

Name: Victoria Creech

Email: intaxiv89@gmail.com

How did you hear about this event? Online

You can submit your
comments to staff today
or directly to:

sacrforward@sacr.com



**Regional
Transit**

Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

My main concern are the changes to the #2 line. Before I retired, I took the #2 and 3 lines to and from work. I can tell you that the #2 is important to senior citizens along Riverside. Currently it runs once an hour, M-F. Making this an express line on weekdays would not serve the community. RT should look into combining the #2 route with another (perhaps ~~#6~~ 6 and 7) instead of essentially eliminating #2. RT is looking to eliminate lines to cut back on expenses, but cutting out lines will decrease ridership. The city's transportation system is part of its urban infrastructure, and it needs to be maintained.

Name: John Eng

Email: j.w.eng@comcast.net

How did you hear about this event? NextDoor.com

You can submit your
comments to staff today
or directly to:

sacrtforward@sacrt.com



**Regional
Transit**



The new generation network

Comment Card

Please share any thoughts, comments, or questions you have about SacRT Forward.

I'm disappointed to see midday service disappear on routes #2 and #6. I live between them north of Fruitridge Rd and use one or the other to get downtown for occasional meetings. I'm retired and try to leave my car in the garage as often as possible, either by bus or by bicycle.

Please improve bus stops ^{like} on Solund Park Drive, there are bus stops without even a concrete slab. Terrible!

Name ▶ Sue Teranishi

Email Address ▶ sue328ter@gmail.com

How did you hear about this event? ▶ friend

You may submit your comments to staff today or directly to sacrtforward@sacrt.com



**Regional
Transit**

Comment Card

Name: Peggy Delgado-Fava Email: pfava@bridge-network.org

How did you hear about this event? @ Laura Fickle

Comments:

① School Tripper #212 isn't available for Hiram Johnson High School and could be a huge impact if their pick-up at 65th & 14th Avenue is 3:05 am and should be bumped to 3:20 pm (students are in school til 3:15 pm).

② We have student interns working til 7 pm and are having to Uber/Ride-Share because of the infrequency of 65/61 (hour increments)

③ Community  **Regional Transit** Member (elderly) - underserved

Was your question/comment addressed?

Yes No

Comment Card

Name: Alyssa Lee Email: alyssa.lee@asm.ca.gov

How did you hear about this event? Alex Harold (Asm. McCarty's Office)

Comments:

- I've been left at the J + 11th stop by the 30 bus before. They drove right past me! I think the bus drivers might want to try harder to look for people at stops.

- An app for the bus tracker would be wonderfully helpful!

- On the website, the "find stops near me" button doesn't work on the website

Was your question/comment addressed?

Yes No



Regional Transit

***SacRT Forward
Operator Comments***

1-23-19



Comment Card

Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

Route 67.

To reroute the 67 Line from Franklin Blvd up MLK would be a mistake. To send buses up MLK every 15 minutes is a waist! Very little ridership along MLK.

Lots of passengers want service up Franklin past 21st Ave. where the 67 line runs now. They have to walk up Franklin Blvd. From 21st Ave now having them walk from Broadway or up the unsafe neighborhood St. from MLK is WRONG!

Send the 67 Line from Broadway all the way up Franklin Blvd instead of MLK. SMART RIDE will not be able to cover all this area unless it was a Franklin Blvd Express Smart Ride.

Name: John Krilanovich / 7476

Email: JohntheK60@Ymail.com

How did you hear about this event? _____

You can submit your comments to staff today or directly to: sacrtforward@sacrt.com



Regional Transit



Comment Card

Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

Also you will leave a lot of passengers i.e. Senior, disabled, handicapped, student, working class. Stranded on weekends and holidays as there is no 61 line along Fruitridge or SmartRide that runs on these days

Name: _____

Email: _____

How did you hear about this event? _____

You can submit your comments to staff today or directly to: sacrtforward@sacrt.com



Regional Transit

1-23-19



Comment Card

Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

The 19 Route is NOT going to work, anyone can see that. Take it to Watt & Elverta, so there is a bus to pick up a secretment that uses us daily to go to the VA. & children going to Rio Linda High. People are pissed. These changes are NOT going "FORWARD" IT'S GOING BACKWARDS

Name: Scott Whittlesey
 Email: SCOTTWHITTLES@GMAIL.COM
 How did you hear about this event? DRIVERS Rm

You can submit your comments to staff today or directly to:
sacrtforward@sacrt.com



Comment Card

Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

SOME OF THESE ROUTES BEING ELIMINATED BRING PEOPLE TO/FROM WORK AT INDUSTRIAL COMPLEXES, ESPECIALLY THE POORER WORKING CLASS. PEOPLE DON'T NEED A BUS THEY CAN'T USE.
 13 / 61 FOR EXAMPLE.
 1/2 HOUR SERVICE MIGHT BRING MORE RIDERS TO WORK

Name: operator
 Email: _____
 How did you hear about this event? _____

You can submit your comments to staff today or directly to:
sacrtforward@sacrt.com





The new generation network

Comment Card

Please share any thoughts, comments, or questions you have about SacRT Forward.

For routes terminating at the new "Flores & Greenhorne" layover.

1) Where would buses turn around. Can NOT make a u-turn there

2) NOT enough area for multiple multiple buses to be laying over

Name ▶ David Becker

Email Address ▶ norcal79@icloud.com

How did you hear about this event? ▶ operator

You may submit your comments to staff today or directly to sacrtforward@sacrt.com



The new generation network

Comment Card

Please share any thoughts, comments, or questions you have about SacRT Forward.

WITH THE NEW ROUTE # 13 -

It would be helpful for the route to be extended to Arena Blvd.

Example:

- Del Paso Rd
- L- EL CENTRO Rd
- L- ARENA BLVD
- L- DUCKHOORN DR
- R- EL CENTRO Rd
- R- DEL PASO Rd

- * ON EL CENTRO Rd, WE HAVE A SENIOR CITIZEN Apartment complex & SENIOR MOBILE HOME PARK.
- * ON ARENA BLVD, WE HAVE A BEL AIR SHOPPING center and apartment. also walking distance for the new Medical HQ going in @ E. Commerce way
- * DUCKHOORN Rd HAS THE U.T.I. COLLEGE.

Name ▶ DAVID BECKER

Email Address ▶ NORCAL79@ICLOUD.COM

How did you hear about this event? ▶ operator

You may submit your comments to staff today or directly to sacrtforward@sacrt.com





The new generation network

Comment Card

Please share any thoughts, comments, or questions you have about SacRT Forward.

FOR ROUTE #19.

HAVE THE NEW TERMINAL @ WATT & ELVERTA. THIS WAY THE PASSENGERS OF ELVERTA HAVE ACCESS TO THE NEW ROUTE 26 & CURRENT ROUTE 84.

Name ▶ DAVID Becker

Email Address ▶ norcal7a@icloud.com

How did you hear about this event? ▶ operator

You may submit your comments to staff today or directly to sacrtforward@sacrt.com



The new generation network

Comment Card

Please share any thoughts, comments, or questions you have about SacRT Forward.

FOR ROUTE #23. KEEP CURRENT ROUTE ON FAIR OAKS BLVD TO SAN JUAN BLVD. EITHER:

A: L - WINDING WAY
R - MANZANITA AVE
L - MADISON AVE
CONT W/ NEW ROUTE

B: L - MADISON AVE
CONT. W/ NEW ROUTE

* A lot of apt complexes are ON Fair Oaks from the split @ Manzanita to San Juan.

Name ▶ DAVID Becker

Email Address ▶ norcal7a@icloud.com

How did you hear about this event? ▶ operator

You may submit your comments to staff today or directly to sacrtforward@sacrt.com





The new generation network

Comment Card

Please share any thoughts, comments, or questions you have about SacRT Forward.

WITH THE ROUTE 38 BEING ELIMINATED - NO! THIS ROUTE SERVES NOT ONLY A MAJOR HOSPITAL/MED CENTER, IT ALSO GOES BY 7 BLOCKS (50TH-57TH) OF A SERVICE CITIZEN COMMUNITY & HOUSING ON BROADWAY. THREE OPTIONS ARE

[A]	[B]	[C]
Keep Route 38 from 65th Light Rail Station to 21st St Light Rail Station	Commuter Route (Full) 3 trips in Am 3 trips in Pm	Full Route 3 trips in Am. 65th to 29th Midday. Full Route 3 trips in P.M.

*THIS IS ONLY MEAN WAY SOME CAN GET AROUND. MUST ACANT MAKE THE WALK FROM STOCKTON & BROADWAY (SI LINE) ALL THE WAY TO THE MED CENTER. ALSO, THE E.D.D. IS FAR FROM THE SAME SI LINE STOP.

Name ▶ DAVID BECKER DISABILITY

Email Address ▶ norcal79@icloud.com

How did you hear about this event? ▶ operator

You may submit your comments to staff today or directly to sacrforward@sacrt.com



The new generation network

Comment Card

Please share any thoughts, comments, or questions you have about SacRT Forward.

FOR THE NEW ROUTE 61 -

THE 61 SHOULD STAY ON FRUITLEDGE RD. LEFT (SOUTH) ON SOUTH LAND PARK DRIVE. RIGHT ON 35TH TO THE NEW ROUTE. WITH THIS WAY, THE STUDENTS FROM SAM BRANNAN MIDDLE SCHOOL (THE NORMAL STOP FOR THEM WAS ON RIVERSIDE @ CASILADA WAY WHICH IS BEING ELIMINATED) LESS OF A WALK TO GET HOME & TO SCHOOL

Name ▶ David Becker

Email Address ▶ norcal79@icloud.com

How did you hear about this event? ▶ operator

You may submit your comments to staff today or directly to sacrforward@sacrt.com





The new generation network

Comment Card

Please share any thoughts, comments, or questions you have about SacRT Forward.

WITH ~~ON~~ CHANGING some route to commuter routes (2, 4, 34, 29),
RT SHOULD ~~BE~~ make all express \rightarrow commuter the same type of number.

Examples:

2 - 102 103 - 133 or 130

3 - 103 109 - 109

7 - 107

29 - 129

34 - 134

* With all commuter routes starting with
the number 1xx, it will help.

Name \blacktriangleright DAVID Becker

Email Address \blacktriangleright norcal79@icloud.com

How did you hear about this event? \blacktriangleright operator

You may submit your comments
to staff today or directly to
sacrtforward@sacrt.com



**Regional
Transit**



Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:


PLEASE RETAIN THE 80 LINE. THERE^{ARE} PEOPLE ON LA RIVIERA DRIVE, INFIRMED AND OTHERWISE, WHO WILL BE UNABLE TO WALK TO WATT AVE. TO CATCH THE 84 LINE.

Name: ROBERT W THOMPSON

Email: _____

How did you hear about this event? _____

You can submit your comments to staff today or directly to:
sacrtforward@sacrt.com



Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

My thoughts on changes are that if all changes made considered a bathroom AVAILABLE to Drivers. ALSO have routes been driven to find out any delays, traffic?

Name: ROSA Garcia

Email: Toucansam75@gmail.com

How did you hear about this event? Advertisement

You can submit your comments to staff today or directly to:
sacrtforward@sacrt.com





Comment Card

Please share any thoughts, comments, or questions you have about SacRT Forward.

23 Line needs to go to Sunrise because I pick up a lot of people on Fair Oaks & San Juan

Name ▶ _____

Email Address ▶ _____

How did you hear about this event? ▶ _____

You may submit your comments to staff today or directly to sacrtforward@sacrt.com



Regional Transit



Comment Card

Please share any thoughts, comments, or questions you have about SacRT Forward.

Route 54 should still operate during peak times.

If nothing more than CRC to Florn Station. Trips can operate at 5:40, 6:10, 6:40, & 7:10 am, and do something similar in the p.m. That way dozens of Valley High children have a ride to school; and commuters on Center Pkwy can reach light rail without having to walk a mile to a bus stop at Franklin or Mack.

Name ▶ Matthew Luech

Email Address ▶ ransfn916@stcglobal.net

How did you hear about this event? ▶ RT Operations

You may submit your comments to staff today or directly to sacrtforward@sacrt.com



Regional Transit



Comment Card

Please share any thoughts, comments, or questions you have about SacRT Forward.

I like most of the changes

Name ▶ *Michael Ackman*

Email Address ▶ *michael.ackman2000@yahoo.com*

How did you hear about this event? ▶ *In the drivers room*

You may submit your comments to staff today or directly to sacrtforward@sacrt.com



Tarjeta de Comentario

Por favor comparta cualquier pensamiento, comentario, o pregunta que tenga sobre el SacRT Forward.

*EXACTLY WHO IS COMING UP WITH THESE PROPOSALS?
NAME NAMES*

Nombre ▶ _____
Dirección de correo electrónico ▶ _____
¿Cómo te enteraste acerca de este evento? ▶ _____

Puede enviar sus comentarios al personal hoy o directamente a sacrtforward@sacrt.com





The new generation network

Comment Card

Please share any thoughts, comments, or questions you have about SacRT Forward.

Consider running the 51 through saevoy circle.
It's easy from Broadway, Rt on 5th contin around
through main, left back on Broadway, Rt on 6th for
route (Inbound)

Name ▶ _____

Email Address ▶ _____

How did you hear about this event? ▶ _____

You may submit your comments to staff today or directly to sacrforward@sacrt.com



The new generation network

Comment Card

Please share any thoughts, comments, or questions you have about SacRT Forward.

Some of the routes need better breaks. Some routes only 2 minutes or 7 minutes recovery. Not enough time for bathroom.

Name ▶ _____

Email Address ▶ _____

How did you hear about this event? ▶ _____

You may submit your comments to staff today or directly to sacrforward@sacrt.com





Comment Card

Please share any thoughts, comments, or questions you have about SacRT Forward.

Make Bathrooms Available with Enough Time to Use them at least every round trip.

* 24 - Don't Eliminate Route - They need at least one Fix Route

* 38 - Need a bus to UC Davis Med Cent, 51 is too far to walk for some

* 6 - If taken away, what bus goes to the zoo?

Name ▶ Michelle Holloman #2463
Email Address ▶ mholloman1968@gmail.com
How did you hear about this event? ▶ in office

You may submit your comments to staff today or directly to sacrtforward@sacrt.com



Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

As a daily commuter and an active community member of the Pocket/Greektown district, the proposal changes that are being discussed would affect disproportionately two minority groups the hardest. 1) The students who attend Clark College and Los Rios College Campus; mainly SCC. As a student myself, the convenience of having the 62 line and thus all connecting lines leave from Bel-Air into downtown is no longer available would not only make our commute much longer but also students who need usage of the stores, bank, and pharmacy would struggle a lot more. Usually students who use the bus are low-income and are otherwise using this means of transit as a way to save and help the environment. 2) The senior community, who I see a lot of leaving from pocket to their daily need and can hardly walk out some sort of assistance would be gravely put out of their basic necessities. Please reconsider this action and submit a formal

Name: Omar Martinez

Email: omartinez1125@gmail.com

How did you hear about this event? Nextdoor Neighbor App/

Bus Driver

You can submit your comments to staff today or directly to:

sacrforward@sacrt.com



**Regional
Transit**

Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

it would be nice if the scheduals had accurate time points, and the new routes provide actual break time. I would driving the routes in a bus. especially on Routes that have a turn around. (example (54-25 at curvius).) it would help keep scheduals on time, and we need break. 26 need more time since it will now go into mcdellown.

Name: 2821

Email: _____

How did you hear about this event? _____

You can submit your comments to staff today or directly to:
sacrtforward@sacrt.com



Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

YOU CAN TAKE OUT 2ND Street
on the 19 route.

Name: Scott Whittles
Email: scottwhittles@gmail.com
How did you hear about this event? Driver Room

You can submit your
comments to staff today
or directly to:
sacrtforward@sacrt.com



Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

it would be nice if the scheduals
had accurate time points, and the
new routes provide actual break time.
I would driving the routes in a bus.
especially on routes that have a turn
around. example (84-25 at Cyprus.)
it would help keep scheduals on time,
and we need breaks. 26 need more
time since it will now go into mcclendon.

Name: 2821
Email: _____
How did you hear about this event? _____

You can submit your
comments to staff today
or directly to:
sacrtforward@sacrt.com



Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

If #5 is canceled students can't get to
summer school

Name: _____

Email: _____

How did you hear about this event? _____

You can submit your
comments to staff today
or directly to:

sacrtforward@sacrt.com



Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

If #5 is canceled students can't get to practice
during winter/summer break

Name: _____

Email: _____

How did you hear about this event? _____

You can submit your
comments to staff today
or directly to:

sacrtforward@sacrt.com





Comment Card

Please share any thoughts, comments, or questions you have about SacRT Forward.

• 38 has a lot of elderly passengers would suggest keeping it.
• 45 would probably have more ridership if it ran on the weekends with there being delta shores / the theater

Name ▶ _____

Email Address ▶ _____

How did you hear about this event? ▶ _____

You may submit your comments to staff today or directly to sacrtforward@sacrt.com





Comment Card

Please share any thoughts, comments, or questions you have about SacRT Forward.

Route 61 should make a right turn on Power Inn to cover Avondale & Glen Elder neighborhoods. Route should end at Florin Towne Center,

People in the area battled for years to get service restored.

Name ▶ Matthew Lucien

Email Address ▶ ramsfn916@sbcglobal.net

How did you hear about this event? ▶ RT Operator

You may submit your comments to staff today or directly to sacrforward@sacrt.com



COMMENT CARD

What are your thoughts on the High Frequency Alternative? Are these the routes that should be high frequency? Will they be easy for people to access? Are there major ridership generators we're missing, that should be connected to this network?

Keep 84^B straight on walegrova to Elverta

TURN LEFT Elverta LEFT ON WATT LEFT

ON ANTOLOPE RIGHT ON WALEGROVA THEN

NORMAL ROUTE [this give better coverage]

This will stop people from RUNNING ~~across~~ accross watt.

What are your thoughts on the High Coverage Alternative? Does it cover all the areas that it should cover?

What percentage of SacRT's resources should be spent on High Frequency versus High Coverage?

Name: Jon D. Hamly

Contact info:

Thank you for your interest!
Please visit: sacrtforward.com for project updates

***SacRT Forward
Route/Station Level Outreach
Comment Cards***

Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

Don't eliminate 28 and 74 we need
these routes to commute to work.

I use these buses. I've been a long
time and would appreciate these routes
to stay as they are.

Name: Reonda Uveges 9163504288

Email: gbueg78@yahoo.com

How did you hear about this event? _____

You can submit your
comments to staff today
or directly to:

sacrtforward@sacrt.com



**Regional
Transit**

Comment Card

Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

The 19 shouldn't go all the way down watt
it should turn around before Elverta

Name: _____

Email: _____

How did you hear about this event? _____

You can submit your
comments to staff today
or directly to:
sacrtforward@sacrt.com

Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

The 19 needs to run all the way to Elverta
I'm not for the 80 or any other bus picking up
the route, it's inconvenient for my power chair

Name: Edward

Email: _____

How did you hear about this event? @ Bus stop

You can submit your
comments to staff today
or directly to:
sacrtforward@sacrt.com



**Regional
Transit**

Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

I think either the 23 stop next to in-and-out
should be moved past the stop light
due to high traffic and not being able to
see the people at the stop because of traffic.

Name: Shayne

Email: _____

How did you hear about this event? Route Checker

You can submit your
comments to staff today
or directly to:

sacrtforward@sacrt.com



**Regional
Transit**

Comment Card

Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

I think the 23 shouldn't change, a lot of people including myself rely on it.

Name: Eric

Email: _____

How did you hear about this event? _____

You can submit your comments to staff today or directly to:

sacrtforward@sacrt.com



**Regional
Transit**



Comment Card

To whom it may concern,
Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

I recently heard about route 23 changes from Sunrise-ORC since the closing of Sams club of Watt & el camino I was lucky to relocate to citrus heights Sams club with route 23 being my only means of transportation if that route changes id have no way of getting to work. I hope you guys reconsider this change & how it may negatively impact those in the Arden area community.

Name: Ana Gonzalez

Email: pandezy123@yahoo.com

How did you hear about this event? sacrt proposals

sincerely, a concerned rt passenger
You can submit your comments to staff today or directly to:
sacrtforward@sacrt.com



Regional Transit

Arden El Paso



Comment Card

Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

I think that the bus drivers should have some kind of training on how to deal with passengers because sometimes they get out of hand.

Name: _____

Email: _____

How did you hear about this event? _____

You can submit your comments to staff today or directly to: sacrforward@sacrt.com



01/24/19



Comment Card

Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

RE: #55 bus,
 The bus stops right outside my house that is one ~~REASON~~ REASON I MOVE to this home now you ARE going to MOVE the stop over 1/4 mile away.
 I AM disabled can't walk that FAR for bus to get to doctors and STORES.
 DON'T CHANGE #55 bus

Name: O. MORENO

Email: dont HAVE

How did you hear about this event? ON BUS

You can submit your comments to staff today or directly to:
sacrtforward@sacrt.com



65



Comment Card

Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

I work at Fedex and have employees that take this bus to work. This is the only bus that we have to get to work on and back home

Name: _____

Email: _____

How did you hear about this event? _____

You can submit your comments to staff today or directly to:

sacrtforward@sacrt.com



**Regional
Transit**

65



Comment Card

Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

- fruitridge and power m, have students, there's a school over there.
- this bus.
- I had a rider, wait 1.5 on franklin and mack for the bus going towards 18th.
- a rider bus stops right in front of her house, she has this bus take her kids to school, doctors appts, stores, etc.
- ~~all~~ all the rider need this bus to go through the little neighborhood by Kennedy school

Name: _____

Email: _____

How did you hear about this event? route checker

You can submit your comments to staff today or directly to: sacrtforward@sacrt.com





Please share your thoughts, comments, or questions:

- People who miss bus at Franklin station, have to wait for the next bus, to go to delta shores.
- bus don't run on weekend. people on the weekend want to go to the movies and walmart.
- running on hour buses, people have to wait 2 to 4 hours for the next bus to come.
- Since bus don't run on weekend, they go to another route to get to another local-mart or location.

Name: _____

Email: _____

How did you hear about this event? YouTube channel

You can submit your comments to staff today or directly to:

sacrtforward@sacrt.com



**Regional
Transit**

Rider Alert

Proposed Service Changes

Additional revisions to plan will be made based on [your](#) feedback. Revised plan will be presented to SacRT Board on February 25, 2019. Any changes would take effect minimum 90 days after approval.

Send feedback to:
sacrforward@sacrt.com

Route	Changes	Route	Changes	Route	Changes	Route	Changes
1	UPDATED: Improve evening frequency and reduce early morning frequency. Add new trips from Sunrise Mall at 6:29, 6:59, and 7:29 p.m. and from Watt/I-80 at 7:04, 7:34, 8:04, and 8:34 p.m. Eliminate trips from Sunrise Mall at 5:14 and 5:44 a.m. and from Watt/I-80 at 5:49 and 6:19 a.m. Eliminate weekend trips from Watt/I-80 at 5:06, 5:36, and 6:06 a.m. Add a Saturday trip leaving Sunrise Mall at 9:11 p.m. Shift Sunday/Holiday trip leaving Watt/I-80 at 8:36 p.m. 30 minutes later to 9:06 p.m.	13	UPDATED: Combine with Route 22 and extend north and west in Natomas. Eliminate part of existing route through Natomas. Improve headways to 45 minutes. Add Saturday/Sunday service with 45 minute frequency from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Extend north on Truxel Road, west on San Juan Road to Duckhorn. From Arden/Del Paso station, new route would go east like existing Route 22 but extend to Butano Dr and El Camino Ave. Discontinue service on North Market Drive, National Drive, and on Northgate Blvd north of San Juan Road. Instead use San Juan Road to Truxel Drive. Detour the two morning trips that currently begin at Arden/Del Paso station at 6:23 and 7:23 a.m. to serve state offices via Gateway Park Dr to North Market Dr, and back to Truxel Rd. Continue service to/from Arden Fair Mall to 9:00 p.m.	23	UPDATED: Reroute from Ethan Way to Howe Ave. Shift trips beginning from Arden/Del Paso station at 9:45 and 10:45 p.m. later approximately 5 minutes for train transfers. Adjust schedules to maintain more even headways and passenger loads. Add outbound trips from approximately 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. to help with heavy passenger loads from Arden/Del Paso to Watt Avenue. Add Saturday morning trip beginning at Arden/Del Paso at 7:48 a.m. Improve Sunday/Holiday headways from 60 to 45 minutes until approximately 7:00 p.m.	30	UPDATED: Combine Route 30 and Route 38. Both routes would use J/L Street from Sacramento Valley Station to 39th Street. Route 30 would continue to CSUS as it does today. On weekdays, each route would have 30 minute base frequency. From downtown to 39th Street, weekday customers would be able to catch either #30 or #38, for effective 15-minute frequency. Route 30 would have additional trips from 7:00-8:30 a.m. from Sac Valley and from 2:30 to 5:00 p.m. from CSUS to achieve 15 minute frequency on its own, independent of #38. Reroute from Capitol Mall to L Street. Reroute outbound trips from Sacramento Valley to use H St, and 6th St direct to J St rather than looping back to 3rd St. On Saturdays, every other #30 trip (currently 30-minute frequency) would become a #38 trip. Change weekday trip beginning downtown at 9:10 p.m. to a #38 trip. Eliminate weekday trip beginning at CSUS at 9:23 p.m. Last trip from CSUS will remain at 9:53 p.m. Add extra eastbound trips beginning downtown between 7:00 and 8:00 a.m.
2	UPDATED: Eliminate #2 Riverside except for the trips leaving Rush River Dr and Windbridge at 5:29, 6:29, 7:29, and 8:29 a.m. and at 3:29 p.m. and the trips leaving 8th Street and F Street at 7:25 a.m. and 2:25, 3:25, 4:25, and 5:25 p.m. Change number to #102.	15	UPDATE: Eliminate route south of Arden/Del Paso station. Customers may use Blue Line instead or #11 Truxel along Richards Blvd. Improve Saturday frequency to 30 minutes from 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Add a Sunday/Holiday trip from Arden/Del Paso at approximately 8:20 a.m., eliminate the trip beginning at Grand/Marysville at 8:55 p.m., and improve Sunday/Holiday frequency to 45 minutes from approximately 8:30 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Extend evening trips that end at Marysville Blvd to Watt/I-80.	24	Eliminate route. Area is covered by SmarT Ride microtransit.	33	UPDATED: No changes.
3	Change number to #103. No other changes.	19	UPDATED: Add one Saturday/Sunday morning trip in each direction beginning an hour earlier on Saturdays and Sundays. New routing from Norwood Ave, east on Bell Ave, north on Rio Linda Blvd, west on Elkhorn Blvd, north on 2nd St, east on M St, to Oak St, 10th St, east on O St, south on Dry Creek Road, east on Elkhorn Blvd non-stop, north on Watt Ave to Elverta Rd.	25	UPDATED: Eliminate service on Madison Ave and to Sunrise Mall. New route would go from Mercy San Juan hospital on Coyle Ave, north on Dewey Drive, continuing onto Van Maren Ln, north on Auburn Blvd to Louis/Orlando transit center. All trips would operate the entire length of the route. Weekday service would have 30 minute frequency from approximately 5:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. and hourly service from approximately 8:00 p.m. to 10:30 p.m. Improve Saturday frequency to 45 minutes until approximately 8:00 p.m. and add night service at 60 minute frequency until approximately 10:00 p.m. Add Sunday/Holiday service at 60 minute frequency from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.	34	Eliminate route except for morning trips beginning at 6:03, 7:03, and 8:03 a.m. and evening trips beginning at 2:30, 3:20, 4:20, and 5:20 p.m., with departure times subject to change. Begin 2:30 p.m. trip from F Street and 29th Street. Change number to #134. Realign bus route off of Coloma Way and Pala Way to use new 53rd Street extension through former Sutter Hospital site, upon construction. East Sacramento will also be covered by new SmarT Ride Zone.
5	UPDATED: Eliminate except for the outbound trip leaving Meadowview station at 7:16 a.m. and the inbound trip leaving Cottonwood Lane at 3:40 p.m. Change name and number to #105 Elsie. Alternate routes include new #56, 67, and 68 and new SmarT Ride Gerber.	21	UPDATED: Operate all trips the full length of the route from Mather/Mills station to Louis/Orlando transit center. Eliminate weekday trips beginning at Sunrise Mall at 4:41, 5:11, and 5:41 a.m. and leaving Mather station at 5:22 a.m. Operate at 45 minute frequency on Saturdays until approximately 8:00 p.m. and 60 minutes until approximately 10:00 p.m. Eliminate Saturday/Sunday trip beginning from Sunrise Mall at 6:12 a.m.	26	UPDATED: Extend route north on Watt Ave to Elverta Road. Loop through McClellan Park via Peacekeeper Way, Dudley Blvd, and James Way. Extend weekday evening hours from 7:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at 30 minute frequency and from 8:00 p.m. to 10:30 p.m. at 60 minute frequency. Improve Saturday frequency to 30 minutes until 6:00 p.m. Extend Saturday hours to 10:00 p.m. at 60 minute frequency. Add Sunday trips from Watt/Elverta around 7:30 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. and from 65th St station at 7:29 a.m. and 6:29, 7:29, and 8:29 p.m.	38	UPDATED: Combine Route 30 and 38. New Route 38 would run on J/L Streets from 3rd Street to 39th St, south on 39th Street, southeast on Stockton Blvd, east on Broadway, and north on 65th St to the Gold Line. On weekdays, improve Route 38 frequency to 30 minutes from 6:30 a.m. to 8:30 p.m. with 60 minute frequency for the last trip of the night, leaving downtown between 9:00 and 9:30 p.m. and last trip from 65th St station leaving approximately 8:30 p.m. Add a Saturday trip leaving Downtown Sacramento around between 9:00 and 9:30 p.m.
6	UPDATED: Eliminate #6 Land Park except for the morning trips leaving Rush River Dr at 7:13 and 8:13 a.m. and the afternoon trips leaving 8th/F Street at 2:07, 3:07, 4:07, 5:07. The 2:07 p.m. trip would begin at Land Park & Vallejo Dr and not run during summer. Change number to #106.	22	UPDATED: Combine with Route 13.	28	Eliminate route. Customers may use Route 21 or 75 as an alternative.	47	Eliminate route due to redundancy with nearby routes. Area is served by Routes 56, 67, and 81.
7	Change number to #107. No other changes.			29	Change number to #129.		
11	UPDATED: Extend route south to City College. Improve midday frequency to every 45 minutes, with peak-hour frequency remaining at 30 minutes. Improve Saturday frequency to 45 minutes. Add Sunday/Holiday service from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. with 45 minute frequency. City College extension would run from 7th & F Streets, south on 7th St, west on P St, south on 3rd St, east on Broadway, south on Riverside Blvd, east on 8th Ave, south on Land Park Drive, east on Sutterville Rd to City College station. In northbound direction, use 5th Street from Broadway to Q Street, to 8th Street.						

Rider Alert Proposed Service Changes

REVISED
February 18, 2019

Additional revisions to plan will be made based on [your](#) feedback. Revised plan will be presented to SacRT Board on February 25, 2019. Any changes would take effect minimum 90 days after approval.

Send feedback to:
sacrforward@sacrt.com

Route	Changes	Route	Changes	Route	Changes	Route	Changes
51	UPDATED: Improve Saturday frequency to 20 minutes from 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Add Saturday trips beginning from Florin Towne Centre at 6:44 and 7:44 p.m. Improve Sunday/Holiday frequency from 30 to 20 minutes from 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.	51	UPDATED: Improve Saturday frequency to 20 minutes from 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Add Saturday trips beginning from Florin Towne Centre at 6:44 and 7:44 p.m. Improve Sunday/Holiday frequency from 30 to 20 minutes from 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.	51	UPDATED: Realign north end of route. From Watt/I-80 station go north on Watt Ave, east on Don Julio Dr, north on Walerga Rd, and west on Elverta Rd to Watt Ave. Run #84 on La Riviera Dr and Folsom Blvd on weekdays only. Use Watt Ave on weekends. Improve weekday frequency to 30 minutes from 6:00 a.m. to approximately 8:00-8:30 p.m. from Watt/Manlove and add an additional two hours of service at 60 minute frequency. Add Saturday trips from Watt/Manlove station at 7:03 and 7:37 a.m., and at 30 minute frequency until 6:03 p.m., with hourly trips at 6:03, 7:03, 8:03, and 9:03 p.m. and from Watt/Elverta at around 7:43, 8:13, and 8:43 a.m., at 30 minute frequency until 6:43 p.m., and at 7:43 and 8:43 p.m. Add Sunday service with 60 minute frequency beginning in both directions at 7:00 a.m. with last trips in both directions beginning around 8:00 p.m.	93	UPDATED: Reroute from Elkhorn Blvd, Greenback Ln, and Auburn Blvd to Louis/Orlando via Andrea Blvd, Tupelo Blvd, Antelope Road, and Auburn Blvd. Improve Saturday frequency to 45 minutes. Add Saturday/Sunday trips beginning at Louis/Orlando around 7:35 a.m. and 7:35 p.m. and beginning at Watt/I-80 around 7:14 and 8:14 p.m.
54	Eliminate route. Area west of SR-99 covered by #56, #67, and #81. Area east of SR-99 covered by #68 and new SmaRT Ride microtransit service.	68	UPDATED: Reroute from 44th St to MLK Blvd from 14th Ave to Fruitridge Rd. Reroute from Steiner Dr to Stockton Blvd via 47th Ave. Extend route south to cover Route 55. On Stockton Blvd from Elder Creek continue south on Stockton, east on Florin Rd, south on Palmer House Dr, east on Scottsdale Dr, south on Power Inn Rd, west on Gerber Rd, south on Stockton, west on Elsie Ave and south to Cosumnes River College via Valley Hi Dr, Wyndham Dr, and Bruceville Rd. Add two southbound trips to improve weekday evening frequency to 30 minutes. Improve Saturday frequency to 30 minutes.	84	UPDATED: Add a Saturday/Sunday morning trip from Mather/Mills station at 7:25 a.m. Add Saturday trips from Mather at 7:25 and 8:25 p.m. and from Manlove at 8:02 p.m. Add a Sunday trip from Mather at 7:25 p.m. and trips from Manlove at 7:02 and 8:02 p.m.	95	Combine with #93.
55	UPDATED: Eliminate route and extend #68 south to cover on slightly different routing.	72	UPDATED: Add a Saturday/Sunday morning trip from Mather/Mills station at 7:25 a.m. Add Saturday trips from Mather at 7:25 and 8:25 p.m. and from Manlove at 8:02 p.m. Add a Sunday trip from Mather at 7:25 p.m. and trips from Manlove at 7:02 and 8:02 p.m.	86	UPDATED: Add weekday trips from Downtown Sacramento at 6:57, 7:57, and 9:27 p.m. Improve Saturday/Sunday frequency to 45 minutes. Add Saturday trips leaving downtown at 9:05 p.m. and leaving Marconi station at 9:11 p.m. Add one hour earlier morning service in each direction on Sundays and extend Sunday hours to 8:00 p.m.	103	Change number to #193. No other changes.
56	UPDATED: Reroute to Brookfield Dr and Franklin Blvd from Meadowview Rd west of Franklin Blvd. Improve Sunday frequency to 45 minutes.	74	UPDATED: Combine with Route 75.	87	UPDATED: Add weekday evening trips from 65th St station at 7:30, 8:30, and 9:00 p.m. and from Marconi station at 7:33 p.m. Improve Saturday/Sunday frequency to 45 minutes. Add Sunday trips from 65th St station at around 6:27, 7:27, and 8:27 p.m. and from Marconi station at around 7:26 and 8:26 a.m. and 7:26 and 8:26 p.m.	109	No changes.
61	UPDATED: Combine with parts of Route 2 and 65 and improve frequency. Eliminate service east of Power Inn Rd and to the Gold Line (riders may transfer to #81 at 65th St). From Fruitridge Rd and Power Inn Rd, extend route south on Power Inn, west on Elder Creek Rd, south on 75th St, west on Lawnwood Dr, south on Briggs Dr, west on Florin Road to Florin Towne Centre. From Fruitridge Rd at South Land Park Drive, extend south on South Land Park Dr, west on 43rd Ave, continuing on southbound Riverside Blvd, east on Florin Rd, south on Gloria Drive, south on Rush River Dr to Pocket Transit Center. Improve weekday frequency from 30 minutes until 7:00 p.m. Add Saturday/Sunday service with 45 minute frequency from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. and 60 minute frequency to 8:00 p.m. Maintain two peak-hour shuttle trips on Florin-Perkins Rd (See Route 161).	75	UPDATED: Combine with parts of Routes 28 and 74. Improve weekday frequency to 30 minutes. Extend weekend hours to 8:00 p.m. New route would go from Butterfield station to Mather station via Folsom Blvd, then continue through Mather Park and parts of Rancho Cordova via Mather Field Rd, Rockingham Dr, Old Placerville Rd, Schriever Rd, Armstrong Rd, Bleckley St, McCuen Blvd, Femoyer St, International Dr, Data Dr, and Capital Center Dr.	88	UPDATED: Add weekday trips beginning in Downtown Sacramento at 6:55 and 9:25 p.m. Improve Saturday frequency to 45 minutes. Improve Sunday frequency to 45 minutes from through 7:00 p.m. Eliminate the Saturday trip beginning in downtown at 6:15 a.m. and add a Saturday trip beginning downtown at 9:12 p.m. Add a Sunday trip beginning at Arden/Del Paso station around 7:46 a.m.	161	New route from College Greens station to Belvedere Ave at Florin-Perkins Road, with one morning trip arriving at Belvedere at 7:45 a.m. and one afternoon trip departing Belvedere at 4:15 p.m.
62	UPDATED: Reroute to L Street from Capitol Mall in Downtown Sacramento. Reroute from 13th St to South Land Park Dr via 43rd Ave. Add Sunday service with 60 minute frequency from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.	80	Eliminate route. Watt Ave and North Highlands would be covered by new #26 and #84.			170-173	No changes.
65	UPDATED: Combine with Routes 61 and 67.	81	UPDATED: Improve Sunday frequency to 30 minutes from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. in the eastbound direction and from 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. in the westbound direction.			175-177	No changes.
67	UPDATED: Reroute off of Florin Rd and instead continue south on Franklin Blvd from Florin Rd to Mack Rd, east on Mack, south on Valley Hi, and south to Cosumnes River College via Valley Hi, Wyndham, and Bruceville. Add two southbound trips and one northbound trip to improve weekday evening frequency to 30 minutes. Improve Saturday frequency to 30 minutes and add a Saturday trip from Arden Fair Mall at 9:22 p.m.	82	UPDATED: Reroute from Mission Ave, Engle Rd, Eastern Ave, Edison Ave, Pasadena Ave, and Winding Way to Walnut Ave and Winding Way. Improve weekend frequency to 45 minutes.			SmaRT Ride Gerber	Add SmaRT Ride on-demand microtransit service in the area bounded by Power Inn Road, Gerber Road, the Union Pacific Railroad, and Calvine Road from 7am to 7pm Monday-Friday with non-stop connections to Cosumnes River College station.

Maps and more info available at:

www.sacrt.com/sacrforward

Rider Alert


Proposed Service Changes

North Area

Updated
Feb. 2019



Questions/Comments?
sacrt.com/sacrforward
sacrforward@sacrt.com
 (916) 557-4545
 SacRT Planning Dept.,
 P.O. Box 2110
 Sacramento, CA 95816-2110



Route	Key Changes
11	Extend south to City College (not shown). Improve midday and Saturday frequency to 45 minutes. Add Sunday/Holiday service.
13	Reroute to Truxel Rd from North Market Dr and extend north on Truxel Rd and west on Del Paso Rd. Combine with #22 on Arden Way. Improve frequency to 45 minutes and add Saturday/Sunday service every 45 minutes.
15	Eliminate service from Arden/Del Paso to Downtown (covered by light rail). Improve weekend frequency to 30 minutes.
19	New routing from Rio Linda Blvd to Watt/Elverta via Elkhorn Blvd and Watt Ave. No service on Watt south of Elkhorn or north of M St in Rio Linda.
22	Combine with #13, including new weekend service.
23	Reroute to Howe Ave from Ethan Way. Improve Sunday frequency to 45 minutes. Add weekday afternoon and Saturday morning trips.
25	Reroute from Sunrise Mall to Louis/Orlando transit center (not shown). Improve Saturday frequency to 45 minutes. Add hourly Sunday service.
26	Extend route north on Watt Ave to Elverta Rd. Maintain loop through McClellan Park. Improve Saturday frequency to 30 minutes.
29	Change route number to #129. No other changes. (Not shown)
67/68	Improve Saturday frequency to 30 minutes on both routes. Add evening trips on weekdays and Saturdays. Extend south to Cosumnes River College (not shown).
80/84	Eliminate #80 (covered by #26 and #84). Improve frequency on #84 to every 30 minutes on weekdays and Saturdays. Add Sunday #84 service every 60 minutes. Reroute #84 to Walerga Rd and Elverta Rd.
82	Reroute to Walnut Ave from Mission Ave, Engle Rd, etc. (not shown). Improve weekend frequency to 45 minutes.
86	Improve weekend frequency to 45 minutes. Add evening trips.
87	Improve weekend frequency to 45 minutes. Add evening trips.
88	Improve weekend frequency to 45 minutes. Add a Saturday evening trip.
JIBE	No changes to JIBE Express (not shown).

These are **DRAFT** service changes, subject to change based on customer feedback.
 This is not a comprehensive list of changes.
 For complete list of proposed changes please visit sacrt.com.




Rider Alert

Proposed Service Changes

Updated
Feb. 2019

East Area



Route	Key Changes
1	Add evening trips weekdays and Saturdays. Cut four early morning trips.
19	Discontinue service on Watt Ave south of Elkhorn Blvd. New routing to/from Rio Linda via Elkhorn. Add Saturday/Sunday morning trips.
21	Extend Sunrise Mall trips to Louis/Orlando. Eliminate four early morning trips. Run every 45 minutes on Saturday entire length of route.
23	Add afternoon trips and Saturday morning trip. Improve Sunday frequency to 45 minutes.
24	Eliminate route. Covered by SmaRT Ride dial-a-ride service.
25	Reroute from Sunrise Mall to Louis/Orlando transit center via Dewey Dr, Van Maren Ln, and Auburn Blvd. Improve Saturday frequency. Add Sunday service.
26	Extend route north on Watt Ave from McClellan Park. Add weekend and evening trips. Improve Saturday frequency to 30 minutes. Add Saturday/Sunday trips.
28	Combine Folsom Blvd service with #75. Eliminate remainder of route. Covered by #21 Sunrise and SmaRT Ride.
29	Change number to #129. No other changes.
74/75	Combine into one Route 75 serving Folsom Blvd from Butterfield to Mather plus Mather Park, Data Dr, and vicinity every 30 minutes on weekdays and every 60 minutes on weekends. Add Saturday/Sunday evening trips.
80	Discontinue route. Covered by #26 and #84.
82	Reroute to Walnut Ave and Winding Way from Mission, Engle, Eastern, Edison, and Pasadena. Improve weekend frequency to 45 minutes.
84	Reroute to Elverta Rd from Antelope Rd. Reroute to La Riviera Dr on weekdays like existing #80. Add evening service and Sunday service to match existing #80. Improve frequency to 30 minutes on weekdays and Saturdays.
93	Reroute to Andrea Blvd, Tupelo Dr, Roseville Rd, and Antelope Rd from Elkhorn, Greenback, and Auburn Blvd. Improve Saturday frequency to 45 minutes.
95	Eliminate route. Covered by new #93.
103	Change number to #193. No other changes.
175-177	No changes to Rancho Cordo/Van routes.

These are **DRAFT** service changes, subject to change based on customer feedback.


For complete list of proposed changes please visit sacrt.com.

Rider Alert

Proposed Service Changes

Updated
Feb. 2019

South Area



Please visit sacrt.com for additional details.

These are **DRAFT** service changes, subject to change based on customer feedback.

Questions/Comments?

sacrt.com/sacrtforward
sacrtforward@sacrt.com

(916) 557-4545

SacRT Planning Dept., P.O. Box 2110
Sacramento, CA 95816-2110



Route	Key Changes
2, 6	Eliminate except for several peak-hour trips. Renumber to #102 and #106.
5	Eliminate route except for 7:16 a.m. trip from Meadowview station and 3:40 p.m. trip from Cottonwood Ln.
3, 7	Renumber to #103 and #107. No other changes.
11	Extend south to City College. Improve midday and Saturday frequency to 45 minutes. Add Sunday/Holiday service.
30	Combine with #38. Run #30 every 15 minutes at peak, every 30 minutes off-peak, and every 60 minutes on weekends.
38	Combine with #38 on J/L Street from downtown to 39th St. Run #38 every 30 minutes on weekdays and every 60 minutes on weekends.
47	Eliminate route. Covered by #56, 67, 81, and Smart Ride.
51	Improve weekend frequency to 20 minutes. Add Saturday evening trips.
54	Eliminate route. Covered by #56, 67, 81 and future Smart Ride.
55	Eliminate route. Covered by #68
56	Reroute to Brookfield Dr and Franklin Blvd from Mack Rd west of Franklin Blvd. Improve Sunday frequency to 45 minutes.
61	Extend west end to Rush River Dr via Riverside Blvd. Reroute east end of route to Florin Towne Centre via Power Inn Rd, Briggs Dr, and Florin Rd. Improve weekday frequency to 30 minutes. Add weekend service.
62	Reroute to L Street from Capitol Mall. Reroute to South Land Park Dr from 13th St. Add Sunday service.
65	Eliminate route. Covered by #61, 67, 81 and Smart Ride.
67	Reroute and extend south end from Florin Towne Centre to Cosumnes River College via Franklin Blvd, Mack Rd, and Bruceville Rd. Improve frequency on weeknights and Saturdays. Add later Saturday night service.
68	Reroute from 44th St to MLK Blvd and from Steiner Way to Stockton Blvd. Extend south to Cosumnes River College via former #55 route with minor adjustments. Improve frequency on weeknights and Saturdays.
81	Improve Sunday frequency to 30 minutes.
SmaRT Ride	New Smart Ride on-demand microtransit zone serving area bounded by Power Inn Rd, Gerber Rd, Union Pacific Railroad, and Calvine Rd plus direct service to Cosumnes River College. Operate 7 am to 7pm Mon-Sat.

RESOLUTION NO. 19-02-_____

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

February 25, 2019

**APPROVING A TITLE VI SERVICE CHANGE EQUITY ANALYSIS
FOR WEEKEND LIGHT RAIL FREQUENCY IMPROVEMENTS
AND THE SACRT FORWARD PLAN**

WHEREAS, the SacRT Forward plan proposes a major service change, as defined in Resolution 15-12-0137; and

WHEREAS, SacRT temporarily implemented weekend light rail frequency improvements on January 6, 2019, which meet the definition of a major service change in Resolution 15-12-0137; and

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

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

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

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

PATRICK KENNEDY, Chair

A T T E S T:

HENRY LI, Secretary

By: _____
Cindy Brooks, Assistant Secretary



Title VI Equity Analysis
for Service Changes
Proposed for 2019

REVISED

February 18, 2019



Exhibit A

(this page intentionally left blank)

CONTENTS

1. Purpose of Analysis.....	1
2. Project Description	1
3. Title VI Requirements.....	1
4. Data and Methodology	3
5. Effect on Minority Populations.....	5
6. Effect on Low-Income Populations.....	8
7. Impacts of SacRT Forward Project.....	11
8. Impacts of Light Rail Headway Improvements	11

FIGURES

1. Demographics of Existing Routes	2
2. Demographics of Proposed Routes.....	2
3. Existing Revenue Miles Per Route	3
4. Proposed Revenue Miles Per Route	4
5. Minority Population Density.....	5
6. Existing Minority Revenue Miles by Route	6
7. Proposed Minority Revenue Miles by Route	7
8. Low-Income Population Density.....	8
9. Existing Low-Income Revenue Miles by Route	9
10. Proposed Low-Income Revenue Miles by Route	10
11. Summary of Impacts	11
12. Light Rail Rider Demographics.....	12
13. Demographics of New Light Rail Service	12

(this page intentionally left blank)

1. Purpose of Analysis

Pursuant to RT's major service change policy and in accordance with federal Title VI civil rights requirements, the purpose of this analysis is to identify and document any potential disparate impacts on minority populations or disproportionate burdens on low-income populations resulting from a variety of service changes proposed to take effect throughout 2019 and potentially 2020.¹

2. Project Description

This analysis encompasses two separate service change projects:

- Changes to potentially all of SacRT's bus routes, and potential changes to light rail schedules, as part of the **SacRT Forward** project
- Improvement of **weekend light rail headways** from 30 to 15 minutes, which took effect on a temporary basis on January 6, 2019

The potential changes from the SacRT Forward project are intended for implementation beginning June 16, 2019, but due to the large number of changes, implementation could potentially take effect in phases throughout the remainder of 2019 and early 2020. Details on the project are available at sacrt.com.

The light rail headway improvements took effect on January 6, 2019, and would be made permanent with adoption of a final Title VI analysis. This analysis will focus first on the more complicated SacRT Forward project, then cover the light rail headway improvements in Section 8.

3. Title VI Requirements

SacRT policy requires a draft Title VI service change equity analysis be made available for a 30-day public review and comment, that the SacRT Board of Directors and staff review public comments and take them into consideration, and that the SacRT Board of Directors approve a final equity analysis prior to adoption of major service changes. A draft version of this report was published on January 18, 2019.

This version reflects revisions made to the SacRT Forward plan published on or about February 18, 2019 and is intended to serve as the final analysis of the project for purposes of satisfying Title VI approval requirements.

¹ RT's major service change policy is stated in Resolution No. 13-08-0125. The Federal Transit Administration's (FTA's) guidance related to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Executive Order 12898 is specified in FTA Circular 4702.1B.

**Figure 1
Demographics of Existing Routes**

Route	Percent Minority	Percent Low-Income	Route	Percent Minority	Percent Low-Income	Route	Percent Minority	Percent Low-Income
1	62.4%	58.7%	28	50.7%	29.5%	68	83.3%	64.6%
2	76.8%	28.4%	29	26.1%	10.8%	72	70.9%	55.9%
3	68.8%	4.7%	30	58.9%	37.2%	74	73.7%	40.6%
5	90.1%	62.3%	33	70.4%	91.7%	75	60.9%	64.7%
6	75.8%	33.0%	34	50.0%	25.7%	80	67.9%	58.7%
7	63.2%	0.0%	38	69.4%	43.4%	81	86.1%	58.2%
11	80.5%	35.2%	47	85.7%	68.8%	82	65.8%	53.8%
13	74.5%	57.5%	51	78.5%	61.1%	84	65.1%	54.6%
15	74.7%	66.9%	54	85.7%	57.7%	86	82.5%	50.2%
19	67.6%	52.9%	55	87.9%	67.3%	87	73.1%	63.8%
21	61.9%	49.8%	56	90.9%	62.2%	88	69.9%	44.8%
22	69.4%	55.6%	61	80.2%	50.9%	93	73.3%	62.4%
23	62.5%	64.1%	62	71.1%	51.3%	95	47.3%	48.8%
24	61.4%	38.2%	65	88.8%	54.9%	103	30.8%	8.3%
25	56.6%	54.1%	67	80.4%	64.8%	109	37.5%	11.8%
26	76.2%	67.5%						

**Figure 2
Demographics of Proposed Routes**

Route	Percent Minority	Percent Low-Income	Route	Percent Minority	Percent Low-Income	Route	Percent Minority	Percent Low-Income
1	62.4%	58.7%	56	90.9%	62.2%	88	69.9%	44.8%
11	80.5%	35.2%	61	80.2%	50.9%	93	73.3%	62.4%
13	74.5%	57.5%	62	71.1%	51.3%	102	76.8%	28.4%
15	74.7%	66.9%	67	80.4%	64.8%	103	68.8%	4.7%
19	67.6%	52.9%	68	83.3%	64.6%	105	90.1%	62.3%
21	61.9%	49.8%	72	70.9%	55.9%	106	75.8%	33.0%
23	62.5%	64.1%	75	60.9%	64.7%	107	63.2%	0.0%
25	56.6%	54.1%	81	86.1%	58.2%	109	37.5%	11.8%
26	76.2%	67.5%	82	65.8%	53.8%	129	26.1%	10.8%
30	58.9%	37.2%	84	65.1%	54.6%	134	50.0%	25.7%
33	70.4%	91.7%	86	82.5%	50.2%	161	80.2%	50.9%
38	69.4%	43.4%	87	73.1%	63.8%	193	30.8%	8.3%
51	78.5%	61.1%						

4. Data and Methodology

In April 2013, an on-board passenger survey was conducted aboard SacRT buses and light rail trains. Passengers on randomly selected trips on all SacRT routes completed a self-administered questionnaire on various rider characteristics. Figures 1 and 2 provide the demographics of each route, existing and proposed, based on these surveys. For new or majorly altered routes, a benchmark route was chosen from the existing system.

For this analysis, revenue miles are used as an indicator of level of service. The analysis considers the distribution of service for the existing and proposed system. For the purpose of the SacRT Forward project and this analysis, 46 regular fixed-route bus routes were considered to be part of the existing system. This excludes supplemental/seasonal bus routes (typically operated to address overcrowding due to school ridership) and contract service (i.e., service paid for by third parties and operated by SacRT through a service agreement).

Figure 3
Existing Revenue Miles Per Route

Route	Weekday	Saturday	Sun/Hol	Annual	Route	Weekday	Saturday	Sun/Hol	Annual
1	1,008	550	525	315,554	51	1,095	602	441	335,449
2	284	0	0	72,093	54	300	142	0	83,664
3	97	0	0	24,729	55	413	151	127	120,377
5	194	0	0	49,304	56	618	515	253	198,622
6	286	0	0	72,735	61	338	0	0	85,951
7	62	0	0	15,850	62	630	304	0	175,697
11	384	243	0	110,154	65	399	0	0	101,417
13	209	0	0	53,150	67	708	342	342	217,863
15	631	319	285	193,721	68	681	329	329	209,352
19	608	419	419	200,998	72	430	162	155	126,664
21	882	444	339	267,052	74	143	0	0	36,347
22	131	0	0	33,335	75	74	58	58	25,318
23	1,054	873	461	340,236	80	578	487	386	194,883
24	133	0	0	33,823	81	1,122	669	323	338,933
25	608	293	0	169,771	82	870	408	368	263,789
26	579	179	171	166,461	84	443	295	0	127,908
28	353	0	0	89,573	86	669	307	230	199,546
29	63	0	0	16,093	87	385	203	147	117,104
30	583	266	141	170,187	88	450	198	198	136,293
33	91	0	0	23,114	93	554	222	222	165,430
34	214	0	0	54,397	95	159	0	0	40,315
38	239	206	164	81,093	103	71	0	0	18,004
47	142	0	0	36,058	109	97	0	0	24,557

**Figure 4
Proposed Revenue Miles Per Route**

Route	Weekday	Saturday	Sun/Hol	Annual	Route	Weekday	Saturday	Sun/Hol	Annual
1	1,013	531	498	314,205	75	335	141	141	100,844
11	627	499	499	214,619	81	1,215	683	592	378,872
13	567	484	484	197,827	82	922	540	500	291,768
15	356	331	229	121,171	84	1,018	776	418	323,586
19	403	346	346	140,872	86	677	448	382	217,899
21	856	506	363	265,056	87	421	287	245	136,253
23	1,184	1,001	600	388,161	88	459	309	271	148,718
25	957	574	383	295,560	93	582	339	233	179,125
26	874	745	401	284,351	102	105	0	0	26,772
30	389	144	135	114,292	103	97	0	0	24,740
33	109	0	0	27,603	105	13	0	0	3,190
38	408	201	147	122,867	106	68	0	0	17,336
51	1,104	671	653	353,800	107	62	0	0	15,850
56	581	536	340	195,426	109	97	0	0	24,597
61	795	483	483	255,572	129	64	0	0	16,139
62	667	323	301	204,104	134	66	0	0	16,695
67	965	797	429	311,885	161	3	0	0	864
68	1,074	887	477	347,104	193	71	0	0	17,993


Figure 3 shows the revenue miles per day and year for the 46 routes in the project, which total 5,932,965 revenue miles per year. Revenue miles would total 6,225,570 per year for the proposed system, as shown in Figure 4.



5. Effect on Minority Populations

FTA defines a minority person as anyone who is American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, or Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander. Figure 5 shows minority population density within the SacRT service area.

Figure 5
Minority Population Density



Based on the demographic composition of the ridership of the 46 existing routes in the project, 4,281,802 revenue miles per year (72.2 percent) benefit minority populations and 1,651,163 revenue miles per year (27.8 percent) benefit non-minority populations.

Under the proposed system, of the 6,225,570 revenue miles in the project, 4,498,794 revenue miles per year (72.3 percent) would benefit minority populations and 1,726,776 revenue miles (27.7 percent) would benefit non-minority populations.

Figure 6
Existing Minority Revenue Miles by Route

Route	Revenue Miles Per Year	Percent Minority	Minority Revenue Miles	Non-Minority Revenue Miles
1	315,554	62.4%	196,950	118,605
2	72,093	76.8%	55,357	16,736
3	24,729	68.8%	17,001	7,728
5	49,304	90.1%	44,443	4,861
6	72,735	75.8%	55,103	17,633
7	15,850	63.2%	10,010	5,839
11	110,154	80.5%	88,721	21,433
13	53,150	74.5%	39,591	13,559
15	193,721	74.7%	144,781	48,940
19	200,998	67.6%	135,935	65,063
21	267,052	61.9%	165,187	101,865
22	33,335	69.4%	23,130	10,205
23	340,236	62.5%	212,494	127,742
24	33,823	61.4%	20,777	13,046
25	169,771	56.6%	96,153	73,617
26	166,461	76.2%	126,876	39,585
28	89,573	50.7%	45,436	44,137
29	16,093	26.1%	4,198	11,895
30	170,187	58.9%	100,312	69,875
33	23,114	70.4%	16,265	6,849
34	54,397	50.0%	27,198	27,198
38	81,093	69.4%	56,288	24,805
47	36,058	85.7%	30,907	5,151
51	335,449	78.5%	263,309	72,140
54	83,664	85.7%	71,712	11,952
55	120,377	87.9%	105,805	14,572
56	198,622	90.9%	180,615	18,007
61	85,951	80.2%	68,892	17,059
62	175,697	71.1%	125,002	50,695
65	101,417	88.8%	90,034	11,384
67	217,863	80.4%	175,180	42,683
68	209,352	83.3%	174,460	34,892
72	126,664	70.9%	89,856	36,808
74	36,347	73.7%	26,782	9,565
75	25,318	60.9%	15,411	9,907
80	194,883	67.9%	132,401	62,482
81	338,933	86.1%	291,797	47,136
82	263,789	65.8%	173,596	90,192
84	127,908	65.1%	83,251	44,658
86	199,546	82.5%	164,716	34,830
87	117,104	73.1%	85,553	31,551
88	136,293	69.9%	95,290	41,003
93	165,430	73.3%	121,221	44,210
95	40,315	47.3%	19,058	21,257
103	18,004	30.8%	5,540	12,464
109	24,557	37.5%	9,209	15,348
Total	5,932,965	72.2%	4,281,802	1,651,163


Figure 7
Proposed Minority Revenue Miles by Route

Route	Revenue Miles Per Year	Percent Minority	Minority Revenue Miles	Non-Minority Revenue Miles
1	314,205	62.4%	196,107	118,098
11	214,619	80.5%	172,861	41,758
13	197,827	74.5%	147,361	50,466
15	121,171	74.7%	90,559	30,612
19	140,872	67.6%	95,272	45,600
21	265,056	61.9%	163,952	101,104
23	388,161	62.5%	242,425	145,735
25	295,560	56.6%	167,397	128,163
26	284,351	76.2%	216,731	67,620
30	114,292	58.9%	67,366	46,926
33	27,603	70.4%	19,425	8,179
38	122,867	69.4%	85,284	37,583
51	353,800	78.5%	277,714	76,086
56	195,426	90.9%	177,709	17,717
61	255,572	80.2%	204,847	50,724
62	204,104	71.1%	145,213	58,892
67	311,885	80.4%	250,781	61,104
68	347,104	83.3%	289,253	57,851
72	129,854	70.9%	92,119	37,735
75	100,844	60.9%	61,383	39,461
81	378,872	86.1%	326,181	52,691
82	291,768	65.8%	192,009	99,759
84	323,586	65.1%	210,610	112,976
86	217,899	82.5%	179,866	38,033
87	136,253	73.1%	99,543	36,711
88	148,718	69.9%	103,976	44,741
93	179,125	73.3%	131,255	47,870
102	26,772	76.8%	20,557	6,215
103	24,740	68.8%	17,008	7,731
105	3,190	90.1%	2,876	315
106	17,336	75.8%	13,133	4,203
107	15,850	63.2%	10,010	5,839
109	24,597	37.5%	9,224	15,373
129	16,139	26.1%	4,210	11,929
134	16,695	50.0%	8,348	8,348
161	864	80.2%	692	171
193	17,993	30.8%	5,536	12,457
Total	6,225,570	72.3%	4,498,794	1,726,776

6. Effect on Low-Income Populations

FTA defines a low-income person as a person whose household income is at or below the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) poverty guidelines. The HHS definition varies by year and household size. For the purpose of this analysis, RT used HHS poverty guidelines from 2013. Survey participants were asked their household size and their household income from a list of ranges. For the purposes of this survey, the participant’s income is assumed to be the midpoint of the range selected.² Figure 8 shows low-income population density within the SacRT service area.

Figure 8
Low-Income Population Density



² For example, if a passenger selected a household income range of \$25,000 to \$35,000, that passenger’s income was assumed to be \$30,000 for the purposes of this analysis.

Figure 9
Existing Low-Income Revenue Miles
by Route

Route	Revenue Miles Per Year	Percent Low-Income	Low-Income Revenue Miles	Non-Low-Income Revenue Miles
1	315,554	58.7%	185,326	130,229
2	72,093	28.4%	20,481	51,612
3	24,729	4.7%	1,164	23,566
5	49,304	62.3%	30,699	18,605
6	72,735	33.0%	24,034	48,701
7	15,850	0.0%	0	15,850
11	110,154	35.2%	38,779	71,375
13	53,150	57.5%	30,546	22,604
15	193,721	66.9%	129,650	64,071
19	200,998	52.9%	106,325	94,673
21	267,052	49.8%	132,985	134,067
22	33,335	55.6%	18,519	14,816
23	340,236	64.1%	218,211	122,026
24	33,823	38.2%	12,914	20,909
25	169,771	54.1%	91,886	77,884
26	166,461	67.5%	112,444	54,017
28	89,573	29.5%	26,431	63,142
29	16,093	10.8%	1,733	14,360
30	170,187	37.2%	63,281	106,906
33	23,114	91.7%	21,188	1,926
34	54,397	25.7%	13,988	40,409
38	81,093	43.4%	35,211	45,881
47	36,058	68.8%	24,790	11,268
51	335,449	61.1%	205,072	130,377
54	83,664	57.7%	48,286	35,378
55	120,377	67.3%	80,994	39,383
56	198,622	62.2%	123,451	75,171
61	85,951	50.9%	43,743	42,208
62	175,697	51.3%	90,101	85,596
65	101,417	54.9%	55,656	45,761
67	217,863	64.8%	141,151	76,712
68	209,352	64.6%	135,245	74,107
72	126,664	55.9%	70,743	55,921
74	36,347	40.6%	14,750	21,598
75	25,318	64.7%	16,382	8,936
80	194,883	58.7%	114,388	80,495
81	338,933	58.2%	197,174	141,759
82	263,789	53.8%	141,959	121,830
84	127,908	54.6%	69,824	58,084
86	199,546	50.2%	100,205	99,341
87	117,104	63.8%	74,694	42,411
88	136,293	44.8%	61,097	75,196
93	165,430	62.4%	103,293	62,137
95	40,315	48.8%	19,689	20,626
103	18,004	8.3%	1,500	16,503
109	24,557	11.8%	2,889	21,668
Total	5,932,965	54.8%	3,252,870	2,680,095

Figure 10
Proposed Low-Income Revenue Miles
by Route

Route	Revenue Miles Per Year	Percent Low-Income	Low-Income Revenue Miles	Non-Low-Income Revenue Miles
1	314,205	58.7%	184,533	129,672
11	214,619	35.2%	75,555	139,065
13	197,827	57.5%	113,693	84,133
15	121,171	66.9%	81,095	40,076
19	140,872	52.9%	74,519	66,353
21	265,056	49.8%	131,992	133,065
23	388,161	64.1%	248,947	139,214
25	295,560	54.1%	159,968	135,592
26	284,351	67.5%	192,078	92,273
30	114,292	37.2%	42,497	71,795
33	27,603	91.7%	25,303	2,300
38	122,867	43.4%	53,350	69,517
51	353,800	61.1%	216,291	137,509
56	195,426	62.2%	121,465	73,961
61	255,572	50.9%	130,068	125,504
62	204,104	51.3%	104,669	99,435
67	311,885	64.8%	202,066	109,819
68	347,104	64.6%	224,235	122,869
72	129,854	55.9%	72,525	57,329
75	100,844	64.7%	65,252	35,592
81	378,872	58.2%	220,408	158,463
82	291,768	53.8%	157,016	134,752
84	323,586	54.6%	176,644	146,943
86	217,899	50.2%	109,421	108,478
87	136,253	63.8%	86,908	49,346
88	148,718	44.8%	66,666	82,051
93	179,125	62.4%	111,844	67,281
102	26,772	28.4%	7,606	19,166
103	24,740	4.7%	1,164	23,575
105	3,190	62.3%	1,986	1,204
106	17,336	33.0%	5,728	11,607
107	15,850	0.0%	0	15,850
109	24,597	11.8%	2,894	21,704
129	16,139	10.8%	1,738	14,401
134	16,695	25.7%	4,293	12,402
161	864	50.9%	440	424
193	17,993	8.3%	1,499	16,494
Total	6,225,570	55.8%	3,476,357	2,749,213

Based on the demographic composition of the ridership of the 46 existing routes in the project, 3,252,870 revenue miles per year (54.8 percent) benefit low-income populations and 2,680,870 revenue miles per year (45.2 percent) benefit non-low-income populations.

Under the proposed system, of the 6,225,570 revenue miles in the project, 3,476,357 revenue miles per year (55.8 percent) would benefit low-income populations and 2,749,213 revenue miles (44.2 percent) would benefit non-low-income populations.

7. Impacts of SacRT Forward Project

As proposed, the SacRT Forward project would redistribute service in a way that would result in a slight increase in the percent of that service that benefits both minority and low-income populations. The percent of revenue miles available to minority riders would increase from 72.2 to 72.3 percent. The percent of service available to low-income riders would increase from 54.8 to 55.8 percent.

**Figure 11
Summary of Impacts**

	Percent Minority	Percent Low-Income
Existing	72.2%	54.8%
Proposed	72.3%	55.8%

Based on these results, this analysis finds that *the proposed changes would result in no disparate impacts to minority populations and no disproportionate burdens on low-income populations.*

8. Impacts of Light Rail Headway Improvements

The weekend light rail headway improvements implemented on January 6, 2019 have been evaluated separately from the SacRT Forward project. The headway improvements affected both the Blue Line and the Gold Line. Blue Line weekend ridership is substantially higher percentage minority (81.6 percent) and low-income (65.7 percent) than the SacRT system 69.0 percent and 53.0 percent, respectively); however, Gold Line weekend ridership is slightly lower percentage minority (66.1 percent) and low-income (51.3 percent) than the SacRT system.

**Figure 12
Light Rail Rider Demographics**

	Percent Minority	Percent Low-Income
Blue Line Weekend Ridership	81.6%	65.7%
Gold Line Weekend Ridership	66.1%	51.3%
SacRT Systemwide Ridership	69.0%	53.0%

The headway improvements add 76,609 revenue miles to the Blue Line and 56,989 revenue miles to the Gold Line per year. After factoring in the demographic composition of these two lines, the new revenue mileage added to the system is 75.0 percent minority and 59.6 percent low-income, both of which exceed the existing systemwide average. *Therefore, these changes would result in no disparate impacts to minority populations and no disproportionate burdens to low-income populations.*

**Figure 13
Demographics of New Light Rail Service**

	New Revenue Miles Per Year	% Minority Ridership	Minority Revenue Miles	% Low-Income Ridership	Low-Income Revenue Miles
Blue Line	76,609	81.6%	62,513	65.7%	50,332
Gold Line	56,989	66.1%	37,670	51.3%	29,235
Total	133,598	75.0%	100,183	59.6%	79,568

FTA Title VI guidance recommends taking multiple service changes into consideration in aggregate. Because both the light rail headway improvements and the SacRT Forward changes are positive to minority and low-income populations with respect to Title VI, this report also finds that *in aggregate, the proposed changes would result in no disparate impacts to minority populations and no disproportionate burdens to low-income populations.*

RESOLUTION NO. 19-02-_____

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

February 25, 2019

**APPROVING WEEKEND LIGHT RAIL FREQUENCY IMPROVEMENTS
THAT TOOK EFFECT TEMPORARILY ON JANUARY 6, 2019**

WHEREAS, SacRT temporarily implemented weekend light rail frequency improvements on January 6, 2019, which meet the definition of a major service change in Resolution 15-12-0137; and

WHEREAS, a Title VI service change equity analysis of the changes has been prepared, made available for a 30-day comment period, publicized in accordance with SacRT policy on major service changes, and reviewed by and approved by the Board of Directors, in accordance with SacRT major service change policy.

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

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

THAT, the weekend light rail frequency improvements set forth in Exhibit B are hereby approved.

PATRICK KENNEDY, Chair

A T T E S T:

HENRY LI, Secretary

By: _____
Cindy Brooks, Assistant Secretary

Weekend Light Rail Frequency Improvements

Effective January 6, 2019

Route	Day(s)	Description
Blue Line	Saturday, Sunday, and Holidays	Improve frequency to 15 minute service in both directions from approximately 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. on Saturdays and 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Sundays/Holidays
Gold Line	Saturday, Sunday, and Holidays	Improve frequency to 15 minute service in both directions from approximately 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. on Saturdays and 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Sundays/Holidays

RESOLUTION NO. 19-02-_____

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

February 25, 2019

APPROVING THE SACRT FORWARD NEW NETWORK PLAN

WHEREAS, the SacRT Forward New Network plan proposes a major service change, as defined in Resolution 15-12-0137; and

WHEREAS, a Title VI service change equity analysis of the changes has been prepared, made available for a 30-day comment period, publicized in accordance with SacRT policy on major service changes, and reviewed by and approved by the Board of Directors, in accordance with SacRT major service change policy.

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

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

THAT, the SacRT Forward New Network plan and associated service changes set forth in Exhibit C are hereby approved, and the General Manager/CEO is hereby authorized to implement such changes effective on June 16, 2019, or any date thereafter but not later than June 30, 2020.

PATRICK KENNEDY, Chair

A T T E S T:

HENRY LI, Secretary

By: _____
Cindy Brooks, Assistant Secretary

Rider Alert Proposed Service Changes

Additional revisions to plan will be made based on [your](#) feedback. Revised plan will be presented to SacRT Board on February 25, 2019. Any changes would take effect minimum 90 days after approval.

Send feedback to:
sacrforward@sacrt.com

Route	Changes	Route	Changes	Route	Changes	Route	Changes
1	UPDATED: Improve evening frequency and reduce early morning frequency. Add new trips from Sunrise Mall at 6:29, 6:59, and 7:29 p.m. and from Watt/I-80 at 7:04, 7:34, 8:04, and 8:34 p.m. Eliminate trips from Sunrise Mall at 5:14 and 5:44 a.m. and from Watt/I-80 at 5:49 and 6:19 a.m. Eliminate weekend trips from Watt/I-80 at 5:06, 5:36, and 6:06 a.m. Add a Saturday trip leaving Sunrise Mall at 9:11 p.m. Shift Sunday/Holiday trip leaving Watt/I-80 at 8:36 p.m. 30 minutes later to 9:06 p.m.	13	UPDATED: Combine with Route 22 and extend north and west in Natomas. Eliminate part of existing route through Natomas. Improve headways to 45 minutes. Add Saturday/Sunday service with 45 minute frequency from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Extend north on Truxel Road, west on San Juan Road to Duckhorn. From Arden/Del Paso station, new route would go east like existing Route 22 but extend to Butano Dr and El Camino Ave. Discontinue service on North Market Drive, National Drive, and on Northgate Blvd north of San Juan Road. Instead use San Juan Road to Truxel Drive. Detour the two morning trips that currently begin at Arden/Del Paso station at 6:23 and 7:23 a.m. to serve state offices via Gateway Park Dr to North Market Dr, and back to Truxel Rd. Continue service to/from Arden Fair Mall to 9:00 p.m.	23	UPDATED: Reroute from Ethan Way to Howe Ave. Shift trips beginning from Arden/Del Paso station at 9:45 and 10:45 p.m. later approximately 5 minutes for train transfers. Adjust schedules to maintain more even headways and passenger loads. Add outbound trips from approximately 1:30 to 3:00 p.m. to help with heavy passenger loads from Arden/Del Paso to Watt Avenue. Add Saturday morning trip beginning at Arden/Del Paso at 7:48 a.m. Improve Sunday/Holiday headways from 60 to 45 minutes until approximately 7:00 p.m.	30	UPDATED: Combine Route 30 and Route 38. Both routes would use J/L Street from Sacramento Valley Station to 39th Street. Route 30 would continue to CSUS as it does today. On weekdays, each route would have 30 minute base frequency. From downtown to 39th Street, weekday customers would be able to catch either #30 or #38, for effective 15-minute frequency. Route 30 would have additional trips from 7:00-8:30 a.m. from Sac Valley and from 2:30 to 5:00 p.m. from CSUS to achieve 15 minute frequency on its own, independent of #38. Reroute from Capitol Mall to L Street. Reroute outbound trips from Sacramento Valley to use H St, and 6th St direct to J St rather than looping back to 3rd St. On Saturdays, every other #30 trip (currently 30-minute frequency) would become a #38 trip. Change weekday trip beginning downtown at 9:10 p.m. to a #38 trip. Eliminate weekday trip beginning at CSUS at 9:23 p.m. Last trip from CSUS will remain at 9:53 p.m. Add extra eastbound trips beginning downtown between 7:00 and 8:00 a.m.
2	UPDATED: Eliminate #2 Riverside except for the trips leaving Rush River Dr and Windbridge at 5:29, 6:29, 7:29, and 8:29 a.m. and at 3:29 p.m. and the trips leaving 8th Street and F Street at 7:25 a.m. and 2:25, 3:25, 4:25, and 5:25 p.m. Change number to #102.	15	UPDATE: Eliminate route south of Arden/Del Paso station. Customers may use Blue Line instead or #11 Truxel along Richards Blvd. Improve Saturday frequency to 30 minutes from 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Add a Sunday/Holiday trip from Arden/Del Paso at approximately 8:20 a.m., eliminate the trip beginning at Grand/Marysville at 8:55 p.m., and improve Sunday/Holiday frequency to 45 minutes from approximately 8:30 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Extend evening trips that end at Marysville Blvd to Watt/I-80.	24	Eliminate route. Area is covered by SmarT Ride microtransit.	33	UPDATED: No changes.
3	Change number to #103. No other changes.	19	UPDATED: Add one Saturday/Sunday morning trip in each direction beginning an hour earlier on Saturdays and Sundays. New routing from Norwood Ave, east on Bell Ave, north on Rio Linda Blvd, west on Elkhorn Blvd, north on 2nd St, east on M St, to Oak St, 10th St, east on O St, south on Dry Creek Road, east on Elkhorn Blvd non-stop, north on Watt Ave to Elverta Rd.	25	UPDATED: Eliminate service on Madison Ave and to Sunrise Mall. New route would go from Mercy San Juan hospital on Coyle Ave, north on Dewey Drive, continuing onto Van Maren Ln, north on Auburn Blvd to Louis/Orlando transit center. All trips would operate the entire length of the route. Weekday service would have 30 minute frequency from approximately 5:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. and hourly service from approximately 8:00 p.m. to 10:30 p.m. Improve Saturday frequency to 45 minutes until approximately 8:00 p.m. and add night service at 60 minute frequency until approximately 10:00 p.m. Add Sunday/Holiday service at 60 minute frequency from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.	34	Eliminate route except for morning trips beginning at 6:03, 7:03, and 8:03 a.m. and evening trips beginning at 2:30, 3:20, 4:20, and 5:20 p.m., with departure times subject to change. Begin 2:30 p.m. trip from F Street and 29th Street. Change number to #134. Realign bus route off of Coloma Way and Pala Way to use new 53rd Street extension through former Sutter Hospital site, upon construction. East Sacramento will also be covered by new SmarT Ride Zone.
5	UPDATED: Eliminate except for the outbound trip leaving Meadowview station at 7:16 a.m. and the inbound trip leaving Cottonwood Lane at 3:40 p.m. Change name and number to #105 Elsie. Alternate routes include new #56, 67, and 68 and new SmarT Ride Gerber.	21	UPDATED: Operate all trips the full length of the route from Mather/Mills station to Louis/Orlando transit center. Eliminate weekday trips beginning at Sunrise Mall at 4:41, 5:11, and 5:41 a.m. and leaving Mather station at 5:22 a.m. Operate at 45 minute frequency on Saturdays until approximately 8:00 p.m. and 60 minutes until approximately 10:00 p.m. Eliminate Saturday/Sunday trip beginning from Sunrise Mall at 6:12 a.m.	26	UPDATED: Extend route north on Watt Ave to Elverta Road. Loop through McClellan Park via Peacekeeper Way, Dudley Blvd, and James Way. Extend weekday evening hours from 7:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at 30 minute frequency and from 8:00 p.m. to 10:30 p.m. at 60 minute frequency. Improve Saturday frequency to 30 minutes until 6:00 p.m. Extend Saturday hours to 10:00 p.m. at 60 minute frequency. Add Sunday trips from Watt/Elverta around 7:30 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. and from 65th St station at 7:29 a.m. and 6:29, 7:29, and 8:29 p.m.	38	UPDATED: Combine Route 30 and 38. New Route 38 would run on J/L Streets from 3rd Street to 39th St, south on 39th Street, southeast on Stockton Blvd, east on Broadway, and north on 65th St to the Gold Line. On weekdays, improve Route 38 frequency to 30 minutes from 6:30 a.m. to 8:30 p.m. with 60 minute frequency for the last trip of the night, leaving downtown between 9:00 and 9:30 p.m. and last trip from 65th St station leaving approximately 8:30 p.m. Add a Saturday trip leaving Downtown Sacramento around between 9:00 and 9:30 p.m.
6	UPDATED: Eliminate #6 Land Park except for the morning trips leaving Rush River Dr at 7:13 and 8:13 a.m. and the afternoon trips leaving 8th/F Street at 2:07, 3:07, 4:07, 5:07. The 2:07 p.m. trip would begin at Land Park & Vallejo Dr and not run during summer. Change number to #106.	22	UPDATED: Combine with Route 13.	28	Eliminate route. Customers may use Route 21 or 75 as an alternative.	47	Eliminate route due to redundancy with nearby routes. Area is served by Routes 56, 67, and 81.
7	Change number to #107. No other changes.			29	Change number to #129.		
11	UPDATED: Extend route south to City College. Improve midday frequency to every 45 minutes, with peak-hour frequency remaining at 30 minutes. Improve Saturday frequency to 45 minutes. Add Sunday/Holiday service from 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. with 45 minute frequency. City College extension would run from 7th & F Streets, south on 7th St, west on P St, south on 3rd St, east on Broadway, south on Riverside Blvd, east on 8th Ave, south on Land Park Drive, east on Sutterville Rd to City College station. In northbound direction, use 5th Street from Broadway to Q Street, to 8th Street.						

Rider Alert Proposed Service Changes

REVISED
February 18, 2019

Additional revisions to plan will be made based on [your](#) feedback. Revised plan will be presented to SacRT Board on February 25, 2019. Any changes would take effect minimum 90 days after approval.

Send feedback to:
sacrforward@sacrt.com

Route	Changes	Route	Changes	Route	Changes	Route	Changes
51	UPDATED: Improve Saturday frequency to 20 minutes from 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Add Saturday trips beginning from Florin Towne Centre at 6:44 and 7:44 p.m. Improve Sunday/Holiday frequency from 30 to 20 minutes from 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.	51	UPDATED: Improve Saturday frequency to 20 minutes from 9:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Add Saturday trips beginning from Florin Towne Centre at 6:44 and 7:44 p.m. Improve Sunday/Holiday frequency from 30 to 20 minutes from 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.	51	UPDATED: Realign north end of route. From Watt/I-80 station go north on Watt Ave, east on Don Julio Dr, north on Walerga Rd, and west on Elverta Rd to Watt Ave. Run #84 on La Riviera Dr and Folsom Blvd on weekdays only. Use Watt Ave on weekends. Improve weekday frequency to 30 minutes from 6:00 a.m. to approximately 8:00-8:30 p.m. from Watt/Manlove and add an additional two hours of service at 60 minute frequency. Add Saturday trips from Watt/Manlove station at 7:03 and 7:37 a.m., and at 30 minute frequency until 6:03 p.m., with hourly trips at 6:03, 7:03, 8:03, and 9:03 p.m. and from Watt/Elverta at around 7:43, 8:13, and 8:43 a.m., at 30 minute frequency until 6:43 p.m., and at 7:43 and 8:43 p.m. Add Sunday service with 60 minute frequency beginning in both directions at 7:00 a.m. with last trips in both directions beginning around 8:00 p.m.	93	UPDATED: Reroute from Elkhorn Blvd, Greenback Ln, and Auburn Blvd to Louis/Orlando via Andrea Blvd, Tupelo Blvd, Antelope Road, and Auburn Blvd. Improve Saturday frequency to 45 minutes. Add Saturday/Sunday trips beginning at Louis/Orlando around 7:35 a.m. and 7:35 p.m. and beginning at Watt/I-80 around 7:14 and 8:14 p.m.
54	Eliminate route. Area west of SR-99 covered by #56, #67, and #81. Area east of SR-99 covered by #68 and new SmaRT Ride microtransit service.	68	UPDATED: Reroute from 44th St to MLK Blvd from 14th Ave to Fruitridge Rd. Reroute from Steiner Dr to Stockton Blvd via 47th Ave. Extend route south to cover Route 55. On Stockton Blvd from Elder Creek continue south on Stockton, east on Florin Rd, south on Palmer House Dr, east on Scottsdale Dr, south on Power Inn Rd, west on Gerber Rd, south on Stockton, west on Elsie Ave and south to Cosumnes River College via Valley Hi Dr, Wyndham Dr, and Bruceville Rd. Add two southbound trips to improve weekday evening frequency to 30 minutes. Improve Saturday frequency to 30 minutes.	84	UPDATED: Add a Saturday/Sunday morning trip from Mather/Mills station at 7:25 a.m. Add Saturday trips from Mather at 7:25 and 8:25 p.m. and from Manlove at 8:02 p.m. Add a Sunday trip from Mather at 7:25 p.m. and trips from Manlove at 7:02 and 8:02 p.m.	95	Combine with #93.
55	UPDATED: Eliminate route and extend #68 south to cover on slightly different routing.	72	UPDATED: Add a Saturday/Sunday morning trip from Mather/Mills station at 7:25 a.m. Add Saturday trips from Mather at 7:25 and 8:25 p.m. and from Manlove at 8:02 p.m. Add a Sunday trip from Mather at 7:25 p.m. and trips from Manlove at 7:02 and 8:02 p.m.	86	UPDATED: Add weekday trips from Downtown Sacramento at 6:57, 7:57, and 9:27 p.m. Improve Saturday/Sunday frequency to 45 minutes. Add Saturday trips leaving downtown at 9:05 p.m. and leaving Marconi station at 9:11 p.m. Add one hour earlier morning service in each direction on Sundays and extend Sunday hours to 8:00 p.m.	103	Change number to #193. No other changes.
56	UPDATED: Reroute to Brookfield Dr and Franklin Blvd from Meadowview Rd west of Franklin Blvd. Improve Sunday frequency to 45 minutes.	74	UPDATED: Combine with Route 75.	87	UPDATED: Add weekday evening trips from 65th St station at 7:30, 8:30, and 9:00 p.m. and from Marconi station at 7:33 p.m. Improve Saturday/Sunday frequency to 45 minutes. Add Sunday trips from 65th St station at around 6:27, 7:27, and 8:27 p.m. and from Marconi station at around 7:26 and 8:26 a.m. and 7:26 and 8:26 p.m.	109	No changes.
61	UPDATED: Combine with parts of Route 2 and 65 and improve frequency. Eliminate service east of Power Inn Rd and to the Gold Line (riders may transfer to #81 at 65th St). From Fruitridge Rd and Power Inn Rd, extend route south on Power Inn, west on Elder Creek Rd, south on 75th St, west on Lawnwood Dr, south on Briggs Dr, west on Florin Road to Florin Towne Centre. From Fruitridge Rd at South Land Park Drive, extend south on South Land Park Dr, west on 43rd Ave, continuing on southbound Riverside Blvd, east on Florin Rd, south on Gloria Drive, south on Rush River Dr to Pocket Transit Center. Improve weekday frequency from 30 minutes until 7:00 p.m. Add Saturday/Sunday service with 45 minute frequency from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. and 60 minute frequency to 8:00 p.m. Maintain two peak-hour shuttle trips on Florin-Perkins Rd (See Route 161).	75	UPDATED: Combine with parts of Routes 28 and 74. Improve weekday frequency to 30 minutes. Extend weekend hours to 8:00 p.m. New route would go from Butterfield station to Mather station via Folsom Blvd, then continue through Mather Park and parts of Rancho Cordova via Mather Field Rd, Rockingham Dr, Old Placerville Rd, Schriever Rd, Armstrong Rd, Bleckley St, McCuen Blvd, Femoyer St, International Dr, Data Dr, and Capital Center Dr.	88	UPDATED: Add weekday trips beginning in Downtown Sacramento at 6:55 and 9:25 p.m. Improve Saturday frequency to 45 minutes. Improve Sunday frequency to 45 minutes from through 7:00 p.m. Eliminate the Saturday trip beginning in downtown at 6:15 a.m. and add a Saturday trip beginning downtown at 9:12 p.m. Add a Sunday trip beginning at Arden/Del Paso station around 7:46 a.m.	161	New route from College Greens station to Belvedere Ave at Florin-Perkins Road, with one morning trip arriving at Belvedere at 7:45 a.m. and one afternoon trip departing Belvedere at 4:15 p.m.
62	UPDATED: Reroute to L Street from Capitol Mall in Downtown Sacramento. Reroute from 13th St to South Land Park Dr via 43rd Ave. Add Sunday service with 60 minute frequency from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m.	80	Eliminate route. Watt Ave and North Highlands would be covered by new #26 and #84.			170-173	No changes.
65	UPDATED: Combine with Routes 61 and 67.	81	UPDATED: Improve Sunday frequency to 30 minutes from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. in the eastbound direction and from 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. in the westbound direction.			175-177	No changes.
67	UPDATED: Reroute off of Florin Rd and instead continue south on Franklin Blvd from Florin Rd to Mack Rd, east on Mack, south on Valley Hi, and south to Cosumnes River College via Valley Hi, Wyndham, and Bruceville. Add two southbound trips and one northbound trip to improve weekday evening frequency to 30 minutes. Improve Saturday frequency to 30 minutes and add a Saturday trip from Arden Fair Mall at 9:22 p.m.	82	UPDATED: Reroute from Mission Ave, Engle Rd, Eastern Ave, Edison Ave, Pasadena Ave, and Winding Way to Walnut Ave and Winding Way. Improve weekend frequency to 45 minutes.			SmaRT Ride Gerber	Add SmaRT Ride on-demand microtransit service in the area bounded by Power Inn Road, Gerber Road, the Union Pacific Railroad, and Calvine Road from 7am to 7pm Monday-Friday with non-stop connections to Cosumnes River College station.

Maps and more info available at:

www.sacrt.com/sacrforward



SacRT Board Meeting February 25, 2019

Agenda Item #7

SacRT Forward

Major Goals Included:

- New Regional Mobility Options
- Develop New Bus Network
- Engage the Public
- Understand Travel Demand Patterns

Public Involvement

Public Outreach:

- August 2017 – February 2019

Three Phases:

- Phase 1 – August 2017 to September 2018
- Phase 2 – October 2018 to December 2018
- Phase 3 – December 2018 to February 2019

Materials:

- Thousands of outreach materials distributed
- Thousands of customers, citizens and employees reached

Public Involvement Summary included in Board Packet



Public Involvement

Community Awareness:

- Pop-Up Events = 47
- Presentations = 33
- Open Houses, Workshops and Stakeholder Meetings = 20
- YouTube Videos = 3
- Twitter, Facebook and Instagram Posts
- NextDoor Posts




Public Feedback

Major Common Themes:

- More weekend service
- More frequent service
- More late night service
- More places
- 7 day-a-week routes



Top Five Number of Comments by Route



Top Five Number of Comments by Route

Routes 38 and 62

- Most concerns were addressed

Route 34

- Concerns of losing midday service.... Will leave peak-hour, peak-directional trips
- 51% of ridership is concentrated on just 7 trips (out of 27 total)
- Off-peak riders can use Route 30 – good frequency, slightly longer walk distance – or SmarT Ride (June 2019)

Route 13


- Main concern is walking distance, safety and lighting
- 284 boardings perday, 14.9 boardings per revenue hour
- Boardings by stops affected between .25 mile and .5 mile walk = 34
- We added two morning trips off-route to serve North Market corridor

Route 2

- Main concern is access to midday service
- 389 boardings per day, 14.5 boardings per revenue hour
- 62% of riders on 11 peak-hour trips that are *not* eliminated
- Estimated 90% of remaining riders may take #11 or #61—with better frequency
- Will retain additional trip departing downtown at 6:02 p.m.


Existing Network Overview

- 70 Routes
- Confusing/disorderly
- Half of routes lack 7-day service
- Hourly service
 - 28% of Weekday routes
 - 75% of Saturday routes
 - 90% of Sunday routes
- Duplicative service
- Extension to CRC, routes never revisited



Existing Network Overview


SacRT Fixed-Route Bus Ridership
Average Daily Boardings



Existing Network Overview

Productivity by Route

- Standards vary by route type
- Fixed bus = 20 boardings per revenue hour
- Peak-Only Bus by trip, not revenue hour
- Weekend and CBS = 15 boardings per revenue hour
- Notice the groupings of routes and how they perform
- 15 minute frequency vs 60 minute frequency




Existing Network Overview

Heat map represents where ridership is highest in existing network

Warmer the color, higher the ridership


Notice green lines vs red or blue lines



Existing Network Coverage

Existing Network Stats


- 927,926 population
- 474,178 jobs
- 21.9% in poverty
- 54.6% minority
- 13.0% seniors (65+)
- 23.5% youth (18-)
- 7.4% limited English
- 27% frequent service



Existing Route Comparison

Route 51


- Highest ridership route
- 3,000 average daily boardings
- 24.2 boardings per revenue hour
- 7 day a week service
- 12-15 minute frequency
- Linear
- Connectivity
- Strong Anchors (Sac Valley and Florin TC)
- Density



Existing Route Comparison

Route 65


- 373 Average Daily Boardings
- 12 Passengers per Revenue Hour
- 5 days/week
- Hourly service
- Non-linear route
- Low density (industrial, warehouse)
- Lack of strong generators of activity



Route Design

Good Route Design


- Linear
- Density
- Walkability
- Proximity
- Strong Anchors
- Frequency
- Reliability
- Public Feedback



How do we best allocate our resources?

We should be replicating Route 51's as much as possible

Percent Frequent Service



27% 33%

Existing

Proposed



Existing Network

- 927,926 persons covered by BASIC service
- 251,245 persons (27%) covered by FREQUENT service

Proposed Network

- 876,060 persons covered by BASIC service
- 293,083 persons (33%) covered by FREQUENT service
- +100,000 from Smart Ride

Number of Routes

	<u>Existing</u>	<u>New Network</u>
Weekday All-Day	41	27
Saturdays	27	26
Sundays/Holidays	22	26
Peak-Only	5	10
Frequent Corridors	5	6

Excludes contract service and Smart Ride

Frequency Breakdowns

What percent of routes have frequency x?

WEEKDAYS

	<u>Existing</u>	<u>New Network</u>
12-15m frequency	9.8%	14.8%
20-30m headways	46.3%	74.1%
45m headways	0.0%	7.4%
60m headways	43.9%	3.7%

Frequency Breakdowns

SATURDAYS		<u>Existing</u>	<u>New Network</u>
	20-30m headways	25.9%	42.3%
	45m headways	0.0%	38.4%
	60m headways	74.1%	19.2%

SUNDAYS		<u>Existing</u>	<u>New Network</u>
	20-30m headways	9.1%	11.1%
	45m headways	0.0%	38.4%
	60m headways	90.9%	50.0%

New Network Highlights

Revenue Vehicle Hours


	Existing	New	Change
Weekday	467,393	454,068	-2.9%
Saturday	39,849	55,427	39.1%
Sunday	28,409	48,371	70.3%
TOTAL	535,651	557,866	4.1%

Average Headways


	<u>Existing</u>	<u>New Network</u>
Weekdays	42 minutes	31 minutes
Saturdays	50 minutes	42 minutes
Sundays/Holidays	57 minutes	50 minutes

New Network

Weekdays




Downtown



Highlights

New Network

- 27 regular routes
- 10 peak-only routes
- 26 routes have 7-day service
- Focus on major corridors
- More direct, less circuitous
- Scalable to higher frequencies
- Complements the new 15-minute frequency on weekend light rail




New Network Highlights

New Network Coverage:


- 876,060 population
- 445,909 jobs
- 22.5% in poverty
- 55.2% minority
- 12.8% seniors (65+)
- 23.5% youth (18-)
- 7.6% limited English
- 33% frequent service

Figures based on 1/2 mile walk from regular all-day fixed-route service. Coverage figures *exclude* Smart Ride.




New Network Highlights

How many PERSONS are covered by all-day transit service?




Total Ridership Impact

- Ridership is forecasted to go up  between 400,000 and 1,000,000 boardings per year
- Early loss is to be expected
- Building ridership over time, need one year to accurately measure
- Reliability improvements
- On-time performance
- Work on campaigns to promote the new network and build ridership!

Bus Hubs/Stops


- Developed Capital Improvement Program to update stops and hubs
- Coordinate with City, County, Rancho Cordova and Citrus Heights
- Detailed analysis of bus stops and bus stop spacing will commence once adopted by Board



New Network Schools

- Local school districts were invited to participate in the Stakeholder Resources Group and outreach continued through February 2019.
- Staff has directly communicated with several key school stakeholders (SAVA, Florin HS, SES, San Juan School District, Sac State, Los Rios, etc.)
- Current: close to 95% of all schools are within .5 mile or better of a bus route
- Proposed: No major change. 95% of all schools are within .5 mile or better of a bus route
- 15 School Trip 200 series: no changes proposed/add 4 additional trips.

Public School Districts Within Sacramento County





New Network

Population Density US Census 2016

Population

People living per square mile. American Community Survey, 2016.





New Network

Job Density US Census 2016

Jobs

Jobs per square mile. Employment statistics from LEHD, 2015.





New Network

Poverty US Census 2016

Poverty

People per square mile falling below the nation-wide poverty level. American Community Survey, 2016.





New Network

Minority US Census 2016

Minority

People per square mile who are non-White or of Hispanic origin. American Community Survey, 2016.





New Network

Car free households US Census 2016

Car Free

Households per square mile with no vehicle available. American Community Survey, 2016.





New Network

Disabled US Census 2016

Disabled

People per square mile who have a disability.
American Community Survey, 2016.





New Network

State of California EnviroScreen 3.0

CalEnviroScreen 3.0

Highest scores represent census tracts which have the most environmental burden and vulnerable communities. (OEHHA 2018)




New Network

State of California Low Income and Disadvantaged Communities

Low-Income + DAC in RT Service Area

Low-income and disadvantaged (DAC)
communities within RT's service area.
(OEHHA, 2017; HCD, 2017)

- Low-income Communities
- Disadvantaged and Low-income
Communities
- Low-income Communities within a ½
mile of a DAC





New Network


Limited English proficiency by Household

Limited English


Households per square mile with limited English speaking status. American Community Survey, 2016.




New Network Routes South Area



New Network Routes Northeast Area



New Network Routes East Area



New Network Routes

ROUTE 1

- Improve evening frequency
- Additional weekend trips

Population within ½ mile = 48,000
Jobs within ½ mile = 21,000
Avg Daily Boardings = 1,805



New Network Routes

ROUTE 2 (Route 102)



- Convert to Peak Trips only
- Strong directional flow
- Demand for commute trips
- Direct to Downtown


Route 2:

Population within
 $\frac{1}{2}$ mile = 41,000
Jobs within
 $\frac{1}{2}$ mile = 87,000
Average Daily
Boardings = 389
62% are peak trips

Route 6:

Population within
 $\frac{1}{2}$ mile = 41,000
Jobs within
 $\frac{1}{2}$ mile = 87,000
Average Daily
Boardings = 316
41% are peak trips

ROUTE 6 (Route 106)



New Network Routes

ROUTE 5 (Route 105)

- Convert to Peak Trips only
- Strong directional flow
- Connects to Florin HS
- Student demand high



Population within ½ mile = 50,000

Jobs within ½ mile = 10,000

Average Daily Boardings = 176

New Network Routes


ROUTE 11

- Extend south of downtown, cover River Oaks neighborhood
- Connects Natomas to Sac Zoo and City College
- Add more frequency
- Add Sunday/Holiday service

Population within ½ mile = 66,000

Jobs within ½ mile = 105,000

Average Daily Boardings = 619



New Network Routes

ROUTE 13

- Combine with Route 22
- Improve frequency
- Add Saturday and Sunday/Holiday service
- Detour two morning trips to serve to North Market Drive, State office buildings

Population within ½ mile = 60,000

Jobs within ½ mile = 51,000

Average Daily Boardings = 276



New Network Routes


ROUTE 15

- Eliminate south of Arden Del Paso, duplicates Blue Line.
- Improve Saturday and Sunday/Holiday frequency

Population within ½ mile = 29,000

Jobs within ½ mile = 7,000

Average Daily Boardings = 1,094



New Network Routes


ROUTE 21

- Good north/south connection
- Citrus Heights to Rancho Cordova
- Medium ridership/productivity
- Improve weekend frequency
- Eliminating parallel Route 28 should put additional riders on Route 21, improving capacity utilization

Population within ½ mile = 64,000

Jobs within ½ mile = 20,000

Average Daily Boardings = 988



New Network Routes


ROUTE 23

- Reroute from Ethan Way to Howe Ave
- Good anchors
- Density
- Linearity
- Improve Sunday/Holiday frequency
- Add weekday trips for capacity
- Adjust schedules

Population within ½ mile = 85,000

Jobs within ½ mile = 48,000

Average Daily Boardings = 1,541



New Network Routes


ROUTE 25

- Reroute from San Juan Hospital to Louis Orlando transit hub, discontinue service over to Sunrise Mall
- Improve Saturday frequency
- Add Sunday/Holiday service

Population within ½ mile = 85,000

Jobs within ½ mile = 25,000

Average Daily Boardings = 964



New Network Routes


ROUTE 26

- Good north/south service on Fulton Ave
- Extend north to North Highlands via Watt Ave
- Extend evening service
- Improve weekend frequency
- Add Sunday trips

Population within ½ mile = 102,000

Jobs within ½ mile = 43,000

Average Daily Boardings = 977



New Network Routes


ROUTE 30

- High ridership
- Good productivity
- Combine with Route 38
Downtown to 39th St
- 15 minute frequency on Route 30 during peak hours
- J /L Streets major transit corridors downtown

Population within ½ mile = 37,000

Jobs within ½ mile = 117,000

Average Daily Boardings = 1,720




New Network Routes

ROUTE 34 (Route 134)

- Convert to peak-only
- Realign to Coloma Way
- Alternative routes
 - #30 J Street
 - SmarT Ride (June 2019)

Population within ½ mile = 37,000
Jobs within ½ mile = 107,000
Average Daily Boardings = 245



51% percent of riders concentrated on 7 trips

New Network Routes


ROUTE 38

- Combine with Route 30
- Common trunk on J/L St from 3rd to 39th St
- Improve frequency
- Add Saturday trip
- Serves UCD Med Center

Population within ½ mile = 48,000

Jobs within ½ mile = 138,000

Average Daily Boardings = 383



New Network Routes


ROUTE 51

- SacRT's best performing route
- Highest ridership
- Highest productivity
- Strong anchors
- Density
- Linearity
- Improve Saturday and Sunday/Holiday frequency

Population within ½ mile = 65,000

Jobs within ½ mile = 110,000


Average Daily Boardings = 3,029



New Network Routes

ROUTE 56

- Good east/west route
- Minor reroute
- Improve Sunday frequency



Population within ½ mile = 63,000


Jobs within ½ mile = 17,000

Average Daily Boardings = 999

New Network Routes

ROUTE 61



- Combine with parts of Route 2 and Route 65
- Improve weekday frequency to 30 minutes
- Add Saturday and Sunday/Holiday service
- Maintain two peak hour shuttle trips to Florin-Perkins Rd (Route 161)



Population within ½ mile = 84,000
Jobs within ½ mile = 19,000
Average daily boardings = 512

New Network Routes

ROUTE 62



- Minor reroute from 13th St to Land Park Dr
- Better access to South Hills Shopping Center
- Maintains access to Alice Birney Middle School
- Add Sunday/Holiday service

Population within ½ mile = 62,000
Jobs within ½ mile = 122,000
Average Daily Boardings = 989

New Network Routes


ROUTE 67

- Improve weekday evening frequency
- Improve weekend frequency
- Reroute south to Mack Rd and CRC

Population within ½ mile = 87,000

Jobs within ½ mile = 55,000

Average Daily Boardings = 1,119



New Network Routes


ROUTE 68

- Reroute southern section to cover sections of Route 55
- Improve Weekday frequency
- Improve Saturday frequency

Population within ½ mile = 101,000

Jobs within ½ mile = 60,000

Average Daily Boardings = 1,130



New Network Routes


ROUTE 72

- Add Saturday and Sunday morning trips
- Serves low income, minority areas

Population within ½ mile = 37,000

Jobs within ½ mile = 14,000

Average Daily Boardings = 873



New Network Routes

ROUTE 75


- Combines parts of Routes 28, 74, and 75
- Serves 2-mile gap between stations on Folsom Blvd
- Serves library
- Improves weekday frequency to every 30 minutes
- Adds weekend service on Folsom Blvd and Data Dr

Population within

½ mile = 21,000

Jobs within ½ mile = 13,000

Average Daily Boardings = n/a



New Network Routes


ROUTE 81

- Crosstown connections
- Improve Sunday/Holiday frequency

Population within ½ mile = 70,000

Jobs within ½ mile = 22,000

Average Daily Boardings = 2,318



New Network Routes


ROUTE 82

- Minor rerouting
- Good anchors
- Improve weekend frequency

Population within ½ mile = 57,000

Jobs within ½ mile = 45,000

Average Daily Boardings = 1,546



New Network Routes


ROUTE 84

- Realign north end to cover North Highlands
- Serve La Riveria Dr on weekdays
- Run on Watt Ave on weekends
- Add Saturday trips
- Add Sunday service

Population within ½ mile = 118,000

Jobs within ½ mile = 39,000

Average Daily Boardings = 728



New Network Routes


ROUTE 86

- Add Weekday trips
- Improve Saturday Frequency
- Improve Sunday/Holiday frequency
- Longer span of hours

Population within ½ mile = 56,000

Jobs within ½ mile = 87,000

Average Daily Boardings = 1,072



New Network Routes


ROUTE 87

- Add Weekday evening trips
- Add Sunday/Holiday trips
- Improve Saturday and Sunday frequency

Population within ½ mile = 33,000

Jobs within ½ mile = 30,000

Average Daily Boardings = 1,067




New Network Routes

ROUTE 88

- Improve Saturday frequency
- Improve Sunday/Holiday frequency

Population within ½ mile = 33,000
Jobs within ½ mile = 86,000
Average Daily Boardings = 740



New Network Routes


ROUTE 93

- Rerouting to better serve low-income, minority areas
- Strong anchors
- Improve Saturday frequency
- Add Saturday and Sunday trips

Population within ½ mile = 57,000

Jobs within ½ mile = 12,000

Average Daily Boardings = 758



New Network Routes


ROUTE 161

- PRIDE Industries shuttle
- Reaches important employment centers
- One morning, one afternoon trip per day
- New route, peak only

Population within ½ mile = 2,000

Jobs within ½ mile = 4,000

Average Daily Boardings = n/a



Potentially Discontinued Routes

Route 22: Average Daily Weekday Ridership = 251
Represents .74% of Total Daily Boardings
Productivity = 18.8 passengers per hour
Will be combined with Route 13

Route 24: Average Daily Ridership =142
Represents .42% of Total Daily Boardings
Productivity = 11 passengers per hour
Area is covered by existing SmarT Ride service

Route 28: Average Daily Weekday Ridership = 305
Represents .9% of Total Daily Boardings
Productivity = 10.6 passengers per hour
Customers can use Route 21 or Route 75

Potentially Discontinued Routes

- Route 47:** Average Daily Weekday Ridership = 121
Represents .36% of Total Daily Boardings
Productivity = 9 passengers per hour
Area is served by 56, 67 and 81
- Route 54:** Average Daily Weekday Ridership = 264
Represents .78% of Total Daily Boardings
Productivity = 9.1 passengers per hour
Area is covered by 56, 67 and 81 and Smart Ride
- Route 55:** Average Daily Weekday Ridership = 660
Represents 1.9% of Total Daily Boardings
Productivity = Passengers per hour = 17.2
Covered by extension of Route 68

Potentially Discontinued Routes

Route 65: Average Daily Boardings = 393,
Represents 1.15% of Total Daily Boardings
Productivity = Passengers per hour 14.3
Combined with Routes 61 and 67

Route 74: Average Daily Boardings = 176
Represents .5% of Total Daily Boardings
Productivity = Passengers per hour = 9.8
Combined with Route 75, east end covered by Cordovan


Route 80: Average Daily Boardings = 889
Represents 2.6% of Total Daily Boardings
Productivity = Passengers per hour = 17.9
Combined with Routes 26 and 84

Potentially Discontinued Routes

Route 95: Average Daily Boardings = 58
Represents .17% of Total Daily Boardings
Productivity = Passengers per hour = 5.1
Combined with Route 93

SmaRT Ride


1. Citrus Heights
2. Antelope
3. Orangevale/Fair Oaks
4. Franklin
5. Gerber
6. Downtown/East Sac
7. North Sac
8. Power Inn
9. Rancho Cordova
10. Anatolia
11. Arden
12. Carmichael



SmaRT Ride

Gerber Zone


- Would be created by SacRT Forward
- Effective June 2019
- Covers #5, 54
- 2 square miles
- Bounded by Power Inn Rd, Gerber Rd, UPRR, and Calvine Rd
- Non-stop service to CRC



SmaRT Ride

Downtown/East Sac

- Funded by STA grant
- SacRT Forward recommends extension to River Oaks
- Impossible to serve with full-size bus without circuitous routing
- Route 11 will provide nearby service
- SmaRT Ride will cover seniors and others unable to walk to Broadway or Riverside




River
Oaks

SmaRT Ride

Power Inn

- Formerly “Farm-to-Future” zone
- Expand to cover Power Inn
- Bounded by Power Inn Rd, Folsom Blvd, Florin-Perkins Rd, Florin Rd
- Non-stop connections to Florin Towne Centre
- Funded by STA grant



Key Takeaways

1. More Consistent Network (7 day a week)
2. Complements new 15-minute weekend light rail service
3. Major reduction in hourly routes
4. Better weekend service
5. New and Improved Schedules
6. Better Reliability
7. Equitable
8. Network to build upon

Next Steps

- Board Adoption
- Staff executes Implementation Plan
- Major Marketing Campaign (Middle and High Schools)
- Monthly monitoring and reporting of Network Performance to the Board
- Quarterly service changes
- Continue Detailed Bus Stop Analysis/Consolidation work
- Update Short Range Transportation Plan (SRTP)

Questions?

