



# VINE TRANSIT TITLE VI FARE EQUITY ANALYSIS

December 2014

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	2
2	BACKGROUND.....	2
2.1	July 2015 Fare Adjustment.....	3
3	TITLE IV POLICIES & DEFINITIONS.....	3
4	METHODOLOGY.....	4
5	EFFECTS OF PROPOSED FARE CHANGES ON MINORITY & LOW INCOME POPULATIONS.....	5
5.1	System-Wide Effects.....	5
5.2	Disparate Impact Analysis.....	6
5.3	Disproportionate Burden Analysis.....	6
6	LIST OF APPENDICES.....	6

# VINE TRANSIT TITLE VI FARE EQUITY ANALYSIS

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in programs and activities receiving Federal financial assistance. Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) Circular 4702.1B requires FTA recipients serving populations of 200,000 or greater to evaluate any fare change and any major service change at the planning and programming stages to determine whether those changes have a discriminatory impact. Although VINE Transit is not required by FTA Circular 4702.1B to perform an equity analysis as a matter of policy VINE Transit performs equity analyses as guided by FTA Circular 4702.1B. This document is an analysis of VINE Transit's planned fare increase which will increase fares by approximately 7%.

## 2 BACKGROUND

In December 2013 the VINE Transit system embarked on an extensive restructuring of the system to improve performance and efficiency. The intention was to reverse a long precipitous slide downward of system ridership which would have resulted in service reductions. Since the system restructuring, ridership has been steadily increasing totaling approximately 327,000 new rides in nearly two years and an additional \$190,000 during the same period in total farebox revenues. If trends continue, it is anticipated that the system will have 865,000 unlinked passenger trips on the VINE fixed-route system and approximately \$1,027,000 in farebox revenue for FY 2014-2015. Since the last fare increase in 2011, costs have increased 40% or approximately \$2,000,000.

By law, the VINE Transit system must collect through fares, advertising and local contribution an amount equal to 16% of its operating cost. This is referred to as the farebox recovery ratio. Over the last two fiscal years, VINE Transit has failed to reach the required farebox ratio and as a result, is subject to statutory penalties which may jeopardize a portion of our Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding NCTPA can claim. If TDA funding were to be reduced, VINE Transit would initiate service reductions.

Additionally the NCTPA Board of Directors in July 2014 adopted a Fare Policy which directs VINE Transit to propose a reasonable fare adjustment every three years or when operations fail to reach its required farebox ratio. VINE Transit missed its obligatory 16% target in Fiscal Year 2013-2014 and through the first five months of Fiscal Year 2014-2015 VINE Transit is projected to miss the required 16% farebox ratio by approximately \$40,000 for the year.

### 2.1 July 2015 Fare Adjustment

VINE Transit is proposing an increase in adult fares of 7% from \$1.50 to \$1.60 per ride. This change would result in a \$1.10 youth fare and a \$.80 senior and disabled fare per the adopted VINE Fare Policy. The fare increase would subsequently change the pass fare structure as well in accordance with the VINE Fare Policy. This proposed

fare increase would change the standard VINEGo fare as well to \$3.20 for a single zone and \$6.40 for a multi zone trip. All Route 29 passes would all be priced at the same level as the adult pass pricing. Additionally the Route 29 31-day Ferry Pass would increase to \$65.00 to bring pricing in line with NCTPA's VINE Fare Policy which states pass prices equal twenty times the cash fare on the Route 29. The proposed new fares are included in Appendix 1.

### 3 TITLE VI POLICY

NCTPA will ensure that their programs, policies, and activities all comply with the Department of Transportation's (DOT) Title VI regulations. NCTPA is committed to creating and maintaining public transit service that is free of all forms of discrimination. The agency will take whatever preventive, corrective, and disciplinary action necessary to address behavior that violates this policy or the rights and privileges it is designed to protect.

### 4 METHODOLOGY

Using the results of the recently completed MTC VINE Survey, NCTPA staff compared the demographic information gathered about VINE riders with the 2013 five year American Community Survey data. Extrapolating from this data, staff was able to predict how the proposed fare change would affect certain populations based upon the overall service area demographics.

The geographical areas included all incorporated jurisdictions; Napa, St. Helena, Calistoga, Yountville and American Canyon. The County of Napa was excluded because the population centers of the unincorporated County are not in VINE Transit's service area. The smaller jurisdictions up valley and American Canyon are included because the residents receive VINE service via the routes 10 and 11.

The Disproportionate Burden Analysis was completed by comparing the percentage of households with income under 200% of the federal poverty line. This is a standard measure in the Bay Area in determining Communities of Concern. Staff also compared the percentage of zero vehicle households as these people are more likely to be transit dependent.

### 5 EFFECTS OF PROPOSED FARE CHANGES ON MINORITY AND LOW INCOME POPULATIONS

#### 5.1 System Wide Effects

The recommended fare change would increase the base adult fare by \$.10 from \$1.50 to \$1.60 and increase all other fare types in accordance with the VINE Fare Policy. The increase will apply to routes 1 – 8, 10, 11 and 25. The routes 29 and 21 cash fares would not be affected per the approved VINE Fare Policy. The Route 29 passes would all be priced at the adult pricing level and the 31-Day Ferry Pass would increase to \$65. The total projected change in fare revenue resulting from the fare increase is approximately \$66,000.

## 5.2 Disparate Impact Analysis

Table 5-1 VINE Rider and General Population Demographics

	VINE Ridership	General Population	Difference
Percent Minority Population	55%	47%	8%
Percent of Households Under 200% of Poverty Level	11%	29%	-18%
Percent of Zero Vehicle Households	35%	5%	30%

The minority population among VINE ridership is 8% greater than that of the general population within the affected jurisdictions. Though the minority population is greater than the general population, the analysis indicates that it is not so high as to constitute a disparate impact.

## 5.3 Disproportionate Burden Analysis

In analyzing the percentage of households with annual income under 200% of the federal poverty level, NCTPA staff found that VINE riders are less likely than the general population to be under 200% of the federal poverty level by 18%. Therefore these findings indicate that there is no disproportionate burden based on household income. NCTPA staff also analyzed the percentage of zero vehicle households and found that VINE riders are more likely to live in households without vehicles by 30% compared to the general population. This is important because these riders are more likely to be transit dependent and therefore more affected by an increase in fares. This realization has to be balanced by the alternative solution to address the farebox problem which would be to cut service. The alternative solution would likely result in greater negative impact on these transit dependent riders.

## 7 LIST OF APPENDICES & ATTACHMENTS

Appendix 1	Proposed Fare Table
Appendix 2	American Communities Survey 2013 5yr Data
Appendix 3	2014 VINE Transit ON-Board Transit Survey Data Analysis
Attachment 1	2014 VINE Transit ON-Board Transit Survey

Appendix 1

VINE Routes 1-8, 10, 11, and 25 Cash Fares and Passes

	Cash Fare	31-Day Pass	Punch Pass	Day Pass	Single Ride Pass
Adult (19-64)	\$1.60	\$53.00	\$29.00	\$6.50	\$1.60
Youth (6-18)	\$1.10	\$36.00	\$20.00	\$4.50	\$1.10
Senior (65+), Disabled and Medicare	\$.80	\$26.50	\$14.50	\$3.25	\$.80

VINE Route 29 Cash Fares and Passes

	Cash Fare (Ferry)	Cash Fare (BART)	31-Day Pass (Ferry)	31-Day Pass (BART)
Adult (19-64)	\$3.25	\$5.50	\$65.00	\$120.00
Youth (6-18)	\$3.25	\$5.50	\$65.00	\$120.00
Senior (65+), Disabled and Medicare	\$3.25	\$5.50	\$65.00	\$120.00

## Appendix 2

### C17002: RATIO OF INCOME TO POVERTY LEVEL IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS - Universe: Population for whom poverty status is determined

#### 2009-2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

	American Canyon city, California	Calistoga city, California	Napa city, California	St. Helena city, California	Yountville city, California
	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate
Total:	19,607	5,158	76,386	5,788	2,479
Under .50	443	220	3,491	131	80
.50 to .99	1,253	434	5,016	263	53
1.00 to 1.24	683	369	3,902	348	48
1.25 to 1.49	627	132	4,204	265	51
1.50 to 1.84	889	407	5,219	196	135
1.85 to 1.99	330	115	1,988	136	50
2.00 and over	15,382	3,481	52,566	4,449	2,062

Total Households
109,418

Total Under 200%	Percent of Total
31478	29%

### DP04: SELECTED HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS 2009-2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

VEHICLES AVAILABLE	American Canyon city, California		Calistoga city, California		Napa city, California		St. Helena city, California		Yountville city, California		Totals	Percent of Total
	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent		
Occupied housing units	5,594	5,594	2,068	2,068	28,568	28,568	2,648	2,648	1,240	1,240	40118	
No vehicles available	94	1.7%	79	3.8%	1,665	5.8%	204	7.7%	84	6.8%	2126	5%
1 vehicle available	1,334	23.8%	691	33.4%	9,346	32.7%	989	37.3%	606	48.9%		
2 vehicles available	2,125	38.0%	922	44.6%	11,501	40.3%	1,060	40.0%	460	37.1%		
3 or more vehicles available	2,041	36.5%	376	18.2%	6,056	21.2%	395	14.9%	90	7.3%		

DP05: ACS DEMOGRAPHIC  
AND HOUSING ESTIMATES  
2009-2013 American  
Community Survey 5-Year  
Estimates

HISPANIC OR LATINO AND RACE	American Canyon city, California		Calistoga city, California		Napa city, California		St. Helena city, California		Yountville city, California		COMBINED	
	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent
Total population	19,656	19,656	5,204	5,204	77,698	77,698	5,862	5,862	2,968	2,968	111388	
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	5,376	27.4%	2,088	40.1%	29,312	37.7%	1,289	22.0%	389	13.1%	38454	35%
Not Hispanic or Latino	14,280	72.6%	3,116	59.9%	48,386	62.3%	4,573	78.0%	2,579	86.9%	72934	65%
White alone	5,234	26.6%	2,994	57.5%	44,350	57.1%	4,025	68.7%	2,343	78.9%	58946	53%
Black or African American alone	1,487	7.6%	41	0.8%	695	0.9%	51	0.9%	85	2.9%	2359	2%
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	41	0.2%	0	0.0%	307	0.4%	22	0.4%	25	0.8%	395	0%
Asian alone	6,661	33.9%	25	0.5%	1,658	2.1%	219	3.7%	77	2.6%	8640	8%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	138	0.7%	29	0.6%	60	0.1%	72	1.2%	0	0.0%	299	0%
Some other race alone	83	0.4%	27	0.5%	34	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	144	0%
Two or more races	636	3.2%	0	0.0%	1,282	1.6%	184	3.1%	49	1.7%	2151	2%
Two races including Some other race	55	0.3%	0	0.0%	17	0.0%	10	0.2%	0	0.0%	82	0%
Two races excluding Some other race, and Three or more races	581	3.0%	0	0.0%	1,265	1.6%	174	3.0%	49	1.7%	2069	2%

### Appendix 3

Household Size	200% of Poverty Level (\$)	Total Households Under
1	\$ 23,340.00	63
2	\$ 31,460.00	50
3	\$ 39,580.00	61
4	\$ 47,700.00	45
5	\$ 55,820.00	33
6	\$ 63,940.00	13
7	\$ 72,060.00	10
8+	\$ 80,180.00	8

Total 283

Total Households Surveyed 2631

Percent under 200% 11%