

Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority  
**Board Action/Information Summary**

<input checked="" type="radio"/> Action <input type="radio"/> Information	MEAD Number: 100672	Resolution: <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
---	------------------------	--

**TITLE:**

Acceptance of Public Hearing Staff Report

**PURPOSE:**

To present the Staff Report on the Public Hearings for Proposed Service Adjustments and the General Manager's Proposed FY2011 Budget.

**DESCRIPTION:**

Six public hearings were conducted in the District of Columbia, Maryland and Virginia between March 4 and April 6, 2010, to solicit and obtain public comment on proposals to balance the FY2011 Metro operating budget. The proposals being considered included increases for parking rates and fees, as well as adjustments to fares and service levels for Metrobus, Metrorail and MetroAccess. Approximately 5,475 inputs were received during the public comment period, Metro was copied on 1,286 letters to jurisdictional officials, and 3,633 completed on-line questionnaires. Among the 1,842 inputs received at hearings or provided in writing, 1,454 (79%) specifically opposed cuts to service, and 1,093 (59%) asked that local jurisdictions increase their contributions to Metro's operating budget. A number of comments reflected opposition to changes proposed to specific bus routes or the need for improved service on certain lines. The attached Staff Report presents a summary of the public hearing testimony.

**FUNDING IMPACT:**

No impact on funding

**RECOMMENDATION:**

That the Board accept the Staff Report on the Public Hearings.

**STAFF REPORT**  
**Public Hearings**  
**On**  
**Details of the Proposed Adjustments to Metrorail, Metrobus**  
**and MetroAccess Passenger Fares, Routes and Hours of**  
**Service; and Changes to MetroAccess Policies**

**April 8, 2010**

**Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority**

## **Executive Summary**

### **GENERAL INFORMATION**

- A public comment period was held between March 4 and April 6, 2010 to solicit and obtain public comment on proposals to balance the FY 2011 Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (Metro) operating budget. Six public hearings were conducted between March 22 and April 1, 2010, and the public could provide written testimony or participate on-line via a questionnaire. The proposals being considered included increases for parking rates and fees, as well as adjustments to fares and service levels for Metrobus, Metrorail and MetroAccess.
- Approximately 5,475 inputs were received during the public comment period. These inputs were provided either by people testifying at a public hearing, submitting their comments in writing, or filling out the on-line questionnaire.
- Additionally, Metro was copied on 1,286 letters to leading elected officials in the governments of Metro's partnering jurisdictions. Most of these letters urged the respective jurisdictions to increase their contributions to Metro's operating budget.
- It is important to note, that regardless of the channel by which customers delivered their input on the FY 2011 budget, these comments reflect only the comments of those who responded to the call for testimony. This is an analysis of qualitative data which uses percentages merely to organize information collected. The results should not be represented as an accurate gauge of the opinion of Metro customers in general.

### **PUBLIC HEARING AND WRITTEN INPUT**

- Among the 1,842 inputs received at hearings or provided in writing, 1,454 (79%) specifically opposed cuts to service, and 1,093 (59%) asked that local jurisdictions increase their contributions to Metro's operating budget.
- A number of comments reflected opposition to changes proposed to specific bus routes or the need for improved service on certain routes. The routes mentioned in oral and written testimony (and in the letters to the jurisdictions) were:
  - o P17/P18/P19
  - o B27, B29
  - o C2, C11, C12, C13, C14
  - o W13, W14, W19
  - o C2, C4, C8
  - o D12, D13, D14
  - o F2, F13
  - o G2, G8

- J4
  - L2
  - M2, M4, M6
  - N2, N3, N4, N6, N8
  - R2, R3, R12
  - S2, S4, S9
  - T12, T14, T16
  - V5
  - X1, X3
  - 9, 10, 29, 31, 34, 36, 54, 69, 80, 96, 97
  - 2T, 3T
  - 7A, 7F
  - 13A, 13B
  - 15M
  - 18E, F
  - 24T
- Additionally, there was specific opposition to proposed closures/service reductions at the following stations: Huntington, Friendship Heights, New York Avenue, Deanwood, Morgan Boulevard, Cheverly, U Street/African American Civil War Memorial/Cardozo and Shaw.
  - There was specific interest in instituting the 5-cent surcharge to raise money for capital improvements at the following Metrorail stations: Tenleytown-AU and Union Station.
  - The breakdown of inputs received by jurisdiction follows:
    1. Maryland – 868
    2. District of Columbia – 441
    3. Virginia – 225
    4. Unidentified – 308

#### **ON-LINE QUESTIONNAIRE INPUT**

- To facilitate public input, a non-scientific questionnaire on the 252-page docket was developed, presenting about 85 choices to respondents. Respondents were asked to select options that they would most likely support. If they didn't support any options, they could make no selection at all. During the public comment period, (3,633) questionnaires were completed.
- Support for specific items on the docket will be presented in the body of the report. Overall support for options available to close the budget gap is summarized below from highest to lowest.
  1. Metrorail off-peak fare increase – 2,938 (80%)
  2. Metrorail peak fare increase – 2,783 (76%)

3. Local governments should increase contributions to Metro operating budget – 2,597 (71%)
  4. Metrorail peak-of-the-peak fare increase – 2,612 (71%)
  5. Metrobus boarding charge increase – 2,551 (70%)
  6. Increased boarding charge for airport shuttles (B30, 5A) – 2,455 (67%)
  7. Metrobus express boarding charge increase – 2,361 (64% )
  8. Use additional capital funds in Metro operating budget – 2,239 (61%)
  9. Increase MetroAccess fares – 2,008 (55%)
  10. Raise daily parking rates at Metrorail facilities by \$1.15 – 868 (23%)
- Service cuts received far less support. For example, the greatest level of support for Metrorail service changes was 1,303 (35%) for the closure of single entrances at 10 Metrorail stations on weekends. On the other hand, closing Metrorail at midnight on weekends received support in only 255 (7%) of the responses and eliminating 8-car trains received support in only 405 (11%) of responses.
  - For Metrobus service changes, the greatest level of support, 1,557 (42%), was for reducing service on the day after Thanksgiving and the week between Christmas and New Years. The lowest level of support, 380 (10%), was for increasing time (headways) between buses.
  - Only 691 (19%) of the responses favored restricting the MetroAccess service area to  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile from available fixed route service, and restricting customers who are eligible for full paratransit service from the free ride program on Metrobus and Metrorail.
  - The jurisdictional breakdown of the questionnaires is as follows:
    1. Virginia – 1111
    2. District of Columbia – 1065
    3. Maryland – 1023
    4. Undisclosed – 434

### **LETTERS TO ELECTED OFFICIALS**

- As stated above, Metro received copies of 1,286 letters urging local jurisdictions to increase contributions to Metro's operating budget. Those who copied Metro on letters to their elected officials were from the following jurisdictions:
  1. Maryland – 579
  2. District of Columbia – 400
  3. Fairfax County, Va. – 105
  4. Arlington, Va. – 102
  5. City of Alexandria – 90
  6. City of Falls Church – 7
  7. Fairfax City – 3

## General Information

### Public Comment Period Process

The following report is a summary of the comments on the FY 2011 Metro operating budget received by Metro staff and Board members during a public comment period and at a series of public hearings held between March 4 and April 6, 2010. This Staff Summary Report reflects oral and written comments received at each public hearing, those mailed, faxed or e-mailed to Metro headquarters, those received on comment cards handed out at public meetings, and the results of an on-line questionnaire.

The purpose of the public hearings is twofold. First, the public hearings satisfy the requirements of Section 62 of the Metro Compact and Federal Transit Administration statutes that require public hearings be held prior to implementing a fare increase or service reduction. Second, the hearings allow Metro to solicit and obtain public comment regarding the proposed fare increase and changes to parking rates and fees.

A series of six public hearings were conducted from March 22 to April 6, 2010. Two public hearings were held in each jurisdiction. A detailed list of hearing times and locations is provided in Appendix A, as is the hearing docket. The public was also informed that if approved, any fare or service modifications were expected to take effect on or about June 27, 2010.

Formal notice of these hearings was made in The Washington Post. Advertisements were also placed in The Washington Hispanic, El Pregonero, India This Week, Express India, and El Tiempo Latino. In addition, notice was posted on Metro's Web site, in Metro buses and trains and sent to area libraries in Arlington, Fairfax, Montgomery and Prince George's counties, the City of Alexandria and the District of Columbia.

Standard procedures were employed at each public hearing. Prior to the hearing, Metro staff was available to respond to questions on the fare proposal and on Metro operations in general. A series of documents were available describing the proposals being considered to balance the FY 2011 Metro operating budget. Metro staff also offered a variety of service information to attendees prior to the start of the hearings during an "open house" period.

At the beginning of each hearing, the presiding Board member read a prepared statement outlining the public hearing process. Then, a senior member of the Metro staff or a Board member provided an explanation of the major proposed changes. Following this, pre-registered speakers were called to the podium to offer testimony. Following the testimony of pre-registered speakers, the presiding Board member called upon speakers in the order that they registered at the hearing. Public officials were given five minutes to speak. All others were allowed three minutes to make their comments. Additionally, all attendees were informed that Metro would accept written testimony until 5 p.m. April 6, 2010.

## **Sources of Public Input**

Metro received 1,842 inputs via testimony at a public hearing or in writing. In reviewing the report, it is important to remember that an input may have addressed several different topics.

Metro also developed a questionnaire, made available on the internet, which customers could use to identify their preferred method for balancing the FY 2011 budget. There were 3,633 questionnaires completed.

Additionally, Metro was copied on 1,286 letters to leading elected officials in the governments of Metro's partnering jurisdictions. Most of these letters urged the respective jurisdictions to increase their contributions to Metro's operating budget.

It is important to note, that regardless of the channel by which customers delivered their input on the FY 2011 budget, these comments reflected only the comments of those who responded to the call for testimony. This is an analysis of qualitative data which uses percentages merely to organize information collected. The results should not be represented as an accurate gauge of the opinion of Metro customers in general.

Each channel of input will be discussed separately in the remainder of this document, unless otherwise noted.

## **Public Opinion or Concerns Not Directly Related to Actions in the Docket**

There were a number of themes mentioned in testimony provided in writing or at the public hearings, as well as in the letters to elected official, which are not directly related to items on the docket. The major themes are summarized below in no specific order:

1. Metro should increase revenue by increased enforcement of rules and levying of fines on customers violating those rules.
2. Metro should install credit card payment equipment at all parking facilities.
3. Metro should re-institute the use of paper transfers for bus customers.
4. Metro should eliminate discounts for seniors, for people with disabilities, and for people who are transferring from one transit mode to another.
5. The MetroAccess program is too large a drain on Metro finances.
6. If Metro raises fares, commuters should see the lowest increase. It was suggested that tourists be among the groups that should see the highest fare increases.
7. The fare increase for the airport shuttles (5A and B30) is too high.
8. Metro should cut costs by instituting an adopt-a-Metrorail station program, whereby stations would be cleaned by volunteer groups.
9. Metro should charge for weekend parking.
10. Metrorail should charge a flat rate, and have the same rate in effect all day.
11. Metro should cut costs by either turning escalators off completely, or reducing the number of hours they run.
12. Metro should have dedicated funding for its operational budget. One idea put forth was to tax private garages and provide the money to Metro, and another was to cut the transit benefit in half and provide the money to Metro.

13. Metro should earn more revenue by selling its printed schedules rather than providing them for free.
14. Metro should end its “Art in Transit” program.
15. Metro should cut maintenance costs on escalators by building covers over all outdoor escalators.
16. Metro should earn more revenue by making employees and retirees pay for their transit use.
17. If the Board decides to limit MetroAccess service to the area  $\frac{3}{4}$  miles from available fixed route service, the current MetroAccess customers should be exempt from that restriction.
18. Metro should open its call center during emergencies like the recent blizzards.
19. A transit surtax should be implemented on private garages to fund Metro.
20. A portion of SmartBenefits should be paid directly to Metro.

## **Public Comment on the proposals to balance the FY 2011 Metro Operating Budget**

### **Letters to Elected Officials**

Metro was copied on 1,286 letters addressed to elected officials in the governments of Metro’s partnering jurisdictions. The basic text of these letters was as follows:

*I urge you to find room in the budget for a fair share for Metro. Please find room in your FY 2011 budget, through higher revenues or lower expenses, to contribute your share of a \$73.7 million increase in local contributions to Metro.*

The letters were addressed to elected officials of the following jurisdictions:

1. Maryland – 579
2. District of Columbia – 400
3. Fairfax County, Va. – 105
4. Arlington, Va. – 102
5. Alexandria, Va. – 90
6. City of Falls Church – 7
7. Fairfax City – 3

### **Official Public Hearing Input Received in Writing or at the Public Hearings**

Among the 1,842 inputs received at hearings or provided in writing, 1,454 (79%) specifically opposed cuts to service, and 1,093 (59%) asked that local jurisdictions increase their contributions to Metro’s operating budget.

A number of comments reflected opposition to changes proposed to specific bus routes or the need for improved service on certain routes.

The routes mentioned in oral and written testimony (and in the letters to the jurisdictions) were:

- P17/P18/P19
- B27, B29
- C2, C11, C12, C13, C14
- W13, W14, W19
- C2, C4, C8
- D12, D13, D14
- F2, F13
- G2, G8
- J4
- L2
- M2, M4, M6
- N2, N3, N4, N6, N8
- R2, R3, R12
- S2, S4, S9
- T12, T14, T16
- V5
- X1, X3
- 9, 10, 29, 31, 34, 36, 54, 69, 80, 96, 97
- 2T, 3T
- 7A, 7F
- 13A, 13B
- 15M
- 18E, F
- 24T

Additionally, there was specific opposition to proposed closures/service reductions at the following stations: Huntington, Friendship Heights, New York Avenue, Deanwood, Morgan Boulevard, Cheverly, U Street/African American Civil War Memorial/Cardozo and Shaw.

There was specific interest in instituting the 5-cent surcharge to raise money for capital improvements at the following Metrorail stations: Tenleytown-AU and Union Station.

The breakdown of inputs received by jurisdiction follows:

1. Maryland – 868
2. District of Columbia – 441
3. Virginia – 225
4. Unidentified – 308

### **Official Public Hearing Input Received Via an On-line Questionnaire**

To facilitate public input, a non-scientific questionnaire on the 252-page docket was developed that presented about 85 choices to respondents. During the public comment period, 3,633 questionnaires were completed.

Respondents were initially asked if they wanted to accept the Metro General Manager's proposed fare increases and service cuts, accept a fare increase that would avoid service cuts, or select from a much larger range of options. 130 (3.5%) chose to adopt the Metro General Manager's proposed options, 1,363 (37%) chose a fare increase that avoided budget cuts, and 2,064 (56%) wanted to select from a larger range of options.

Throughout the remainder of the questionnaire, participants were asked to select options that they would most likely support. If they didn't support any options, they could make no selection at all.

Overall support for options available to close the budget gap is summarized below from highest to lowest. The summary combines support for the items in the General Manager's proposal, the items in the proposal that would avoid a fare increase, and items selected individually, or "a la carte."

1. Metrorail off-peak fare increase – 2,938 (80%)
2. Metrorail peak fare increase – 2,783 (76%)
3. Local governments should increase contributions to Metro operating budget – 2,597 (71%)
4. Metrorail peak-of-the-peak fare increase – 2,612 (71%)
5. Metrobus boarding charge increase – 2,551 (70%)
6. Increased boarding charge for airport shuttles (B30, 5A) – 2,455 (67%)
7. Metrobus express boarding charge increase – 2,361 (64%)
8. Use additional capital funds in Metro operating budget – 2,239 (61%)
9. Increase MetroAccess fares – 2,008 (55%)
10. Raise daily parking rates at Metrorail facilities by \$1.15 – 868 (23%)

Service cuts received far less support. For example, the greatest level of support for Metrorail service changes was 1,303 (35%) for the closure of single entrances at 10 Metrorail stations on weekends. On the other hand, closing Metrorail at midnight on weekends received support in only 255 (7%) of the responses and eliminating 8-car trains received support in 405 (11%) of responses.

For Metrobus service changes, the greatest level of support, 1,557 (42%), was for reducing service on the day after Thanksgiving and the week between Christmas and New Years. The lowest level of support, 380 (10%), was for increasing time between buses.

Only 691 (19%) of the responses favored restricting the MetroAccess service area to  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile from available fixed route service, and restricting customers who are eligible for full paratransit service from the free ride program on Metrobus and Metrorail.

- The jurisdictional breakdown of the questionnaires is as follows:
  1. Virginia – 1111
  2. District of Columbia – 1065
  3. Maryland – 1023
  4. Undisclosed – 434

**APPENDIX A:**  
**Comments Received Via On-Line Questionnaire**

The list below provides the specific options put forward in the docket with the number of responses supporting each option. The summary combines support for the items whether they were selected as part of the General Manager’s proposal, as part of the proposal that would avoid a fare increase, or “a la carte.” These are listed in the order in which they appear on the questionnaire.

- |   |            |
|---|------------|
| 1. Raise Metrorail peak period boarding charge to \$1.90. Increase peak mileage charges by 15%. Increase the maximum peak fare charges to \$5.00 (Adds \$42 million in revenue.)  | 925 (25%)  |
| 2. Raise Metrorail peak period boarding charge to \$2. Increase peak mileage charges by 21%. Increase the maximum peak fare charges to \$5.45 (Adds \$57.9 million in revenue)  | 1858 (51%) |
| 3. Implement Metrorail peak-of-the-peak pricing (10 cents added to peak boarding charge 7:30-9 am and 4:30-6 pm and also applicable to fares for Seniors and people with disabilities at those times) (Adds \$5 million in revenue)   | 611 (17%)  |
| 4. Implement Metrorail peak-of-the-peak pricing (20 cents added to peak boarding charge 7:30-9 am and 4:30-6 pm and also applicable to fares for Seniors and people with disabilities at those times) (Adds \$9.5 million in revenue) | 1733(48%)  |
| 5. Implement Metrorail peak-of-the-peak pricing (50 cents added to peak boarding charge 7:30-9 am and 4:30-6 pm and also applicable to fares for Seniors and people with disabilities at those times) (Adds \$20 million in revenue)  | 268 (7%)   |
| 6. Increase Metrorail off-peak boarding charge to \$1.55 and increase off peak mileage charges up to 15%. The maximum off-peak fare would be \$2.70. (Adds \$14.8 million in revenue)   | 845 (23%)  |
| 7. Increase Metrorail off-peak boarding charge to \$1.65 and increase off peak mileage charges up to 22%. The maximum off-peak fare would be \$2.85. (Adds \$14.8 million in revenue)   | 2093 (57%) |
| 8. Proportional increase to Metrorail weekly passes of 15% (Adds \$600,000 in revenue)  | 711 (19%)  |
| 9. Proportional increase to Metrorail weekly passes of up to 25% (Adds \$2.4 million in revenue)  | 2143 (59%) |
| 10. Reduce bus-to-rail transfer from 3 hours to 2 hours (Adds \$1.8 million)  | 2936 (80%) |
| 11. Increase the bus-to-rail transfer discount to 75 cents (Decreases revenue by \$4.5 million)   | 212 (6%)   |
| 12. Decrease the bus-to-rail transfer discount to 25 cents (Adds \$2.9 million in revenue)  | 728 (20%)  |

13. Institute free rail-to-bus transfer on weekends (Decreases revenue \$950,000)	216 (6%)
14. Institute free bus-to-rail transfer on weekends (Decreases revenue \$30 million)	108 (3%)
15. Institute a Metrorail directional peak-of-the-peak surcharge in the congested core during periods of high demand (Undetermined financial impact)	319 (9%)
16. Charge peak-period Metrorail fares on weekend late night service from 12:01 a.m. to closing (Adds \$800,000 in revenue)	958 (26%)
17. Charge a flat fare on Metrorail weekend late night service from 12:01 a.m. to closing of up to \$4. (Adds \$400,000 in revenue)	461 (13%)
18. Institute a 5 cent surcharge for entry and exit at up to two Metrorail stations in each jurisdiction (VA, DC, MD) for the purpose of funding specific capital improvements at the stations at which the surcharge is levied. (Adds \$1.6 million in revenue)	747 (20%)
19. Eliminate select rail passes, including the Metrorail Weekly Short Trip Pass, One-Week Pass, Transit Line Card on MARC and VRE, and the Transit Link Card on MTA. (Adds \$750,000 in revenue)	536 (14%)
20. Institute a loyalty reward that allows customers who purchase 11 Metrorail weekly passes to get the 12th weekly pass free (Decreases revenue)	287 (8%)
21. On Saturdays, Metrorail trains would run at 15-20 minutes intervals before 9:30 p.m. and at least every 30 minutes after 9:30 p.m. On Sundays, trains would run at least every 20 minutes before 9:30 p.m. and at least every 30 minutes after 9:30 p.m. (Save \$3.5 million)	530 (14%)
22. Weekday Metrorail trains would run at 15 minute intervals at between 9:30 a.m. and 3:30 p.m. and between 6:30-9:30 p.m. After 9:30 p.m. they would run at least every 30 minutes (Save \$4.43 million)	418 (11%)
23. Weekdays from 6-6:30 am, Metrorail trains every six to eight minutes (Save \$460,000)	916 (25%)
24. Change peak period Metrorail Red Line service such that there will be trains every three minutes from Grosvenor to Silver Spring and every six minutes from Silver Spring to Glenmont and from Grosvenor to Shady Grove. (Save \$1.3 million)	927 (25%)
25. Eliminate 8-car Metrorail trains (Save \$2.69 million)	405 (11%)
26. Reduce Metrorail seasonal service to bring it in line with actual service needs on the day after Thanksgiving and the week between Christmas	

and New Years Day. Additionally, run a holiday schedule on Martin Luther King Day, Presidents Day Columbus Day and Veterans Day (Save \$140,000)	1192 (33%)
27. Reduce Metrorail Yellow Line Service late weeknight and on weekends to a rail shuttle between Huntington and King Street (Save \$1.32 million)	655 (18%)
28. Eliminate Metrorail Yellow Line extension to Fort Totten (Save \$1.84 million)	833 (23%)
29. At 10 Metrorail stations with multiple entrances, close a single entrance on weekends, except during major events. The 10 station entrances proposed for closure are: Anacostia-North, Stadium Armory-North, Navy Yard-West, New York Avenue-South, Friendship Heights-South, Shaw Howard U.-South, L'Enfant Plaza-West, King Street-North, U Street-East, Silver Spring-North. (Save \$670,000)	1303 (36%)
30. At five Metrorail stations with multiple entrances, close a single entrance at 8 pm. The five station entrances proposed for closure at 8 p.m. are: King St.-North, Stadium Armory-North, McPherson-West, Shaw Howard U.-South, Friendship Heights-South. (Save \$200,000)	1034 (28%)
31. Close three Metrorail stations on weekends. Stations are: Morgan Blvd, Cheverly, Deanwood. (Save \$100,000)	617 (17%)
32. Later Metrorail weekend opening (1 hour) (Save \$620,000)	624 (17%)
33. Later Metrorail weekday opening (30 minutes) (Save \$790,000)	474 (13%)
34. Metrorail to close at 2 a.m. Friday and Saturday (Save \$2.24 million)	625 (17%)
35. Metrorail to close at 1 a.m. Friday and Saturday (Save \$4.3 million)	335 (9%)
36. Metrorail to close at midnight Friday and Saturday (Save \$6.29 million)	255 (7%)
37. Raise Metro daily parking rates by \$1.15 (Adds \$13 million in revenue)	868 (24%)
38. Raise Metro reserved parking fees \$65 per month (Adds \$600,000)	1237 (34%)
39. Change the time at which Metro reserved parking reverts to general parking from 10 am to 9 am (Decreases revenue \$500,000)	183 (5%)
40. Expand the hours during which Metro charges for parking to 24 hours a day Monday through Friday. (Adds \$500,000)	781 (21%)
41. Increase the rate for Metro parking meters from the current rate of 25 cents for 15 minutes to 30 cents for 15 minutes. (May decrease revenue)	137 (4%)
42. Adjust the rates for parking meters in order to promote full utilization	

at most Metrorail stations. (Increases revenue)	988 (27%)
43. Raise Metrobus regular service boarding charge to \$1.50. Cash fares will rise from \$1.35 to \$1.60. (Adds \$11 million)	814 (22%)
44. Raise Metrobus regular service boarding charge to \$1.60. Cash fares will rise from \$1.35 to \$1.70. (Adds \$13 million)	1737 (48%)
45. Institute a Metrobus peak period boarding charge of up to 50 cents on high-ridership lines. (Financial impact undetermined)	125 (3%)
46. Institute a Metrobus peak-of-the peak period boarding charge of 50 cents. (Adds \$1.8 million in revenue)	357 (10%)
47. Institute a Metrobus peak period, directional boarding charge. (Financial impact undetermined)	147 (4%)
48. Raise Metrobus express service boarding charge \$3.65. Cash fares will rise from \$3.10 to \$3.75. (Adds \$1.5 million)	511 (14%)
49. Raise Metrobus express service boarding charge to \$4. Cash fares will rise from \$3.10 to \$4.10. (Adds \$2 million)	1850 (51%)
50. Raise boarding charge on Metrobus shuttles (5A, B30) to Dulles International Airport and BWI-Thurgood Marshall Airport to \$6. (Adds \$1.2 million in revenue)	2455 (67%)
51. Raise Metrobus express service boarding charge for Seniors and people with disabilities to \$2. (Adds \$10,000 in revenue)	1855 (51%)
52. Raise the Metrobus weekly flash pass price to \$15 (Adds \$6 million)	2520 (69%)
53. Reduce bus-to-bus transfer from 3 hours to 2 hours (Adds \$4 million in revenue)	2826 (78%)
54. Reduce rail-to-bus transfer from 3 hours to 2 hours (Adds \$900,000 in revenue)	2638 (72%)
55. Increase the rail-to-bus transfer discount to 75 cents (Reduces revenue \$2.9 million)	170 (4%)
56. Decrease the rail-to-bus transfer discount to 25 cents. (Adds \$2.9 million in revenue)	678 (18%)
57. Increase the cash price for Metrobus fares by 25 cents (Adds \$3.1 million in revenue)	883 (24%)
58. Eliminate the SmarTrip discount for bus fares. (Adds \$3.6 million in revenue)	446 (12%)
59. Increase time between buses or eliminate trips for select lines	

and routes(Save \$4.47 million)	380 (10%)
60. Eliminate select Metrobus routes or route segments (Save \$5.27 million)	428 (12%)
61. Eliminate select Metrobus lines (Save \$9.12 million)	407 (11%)
62. Restructure Metrobus service on select routes and lines (Save \$2.63 million)	756 (21%)
63. Eliminate Metrobus overlap with local bus service (Save \$2.16 million)	923 (25%)
64. Reduce Metrobus service on four holidays: Martin Luther King Day, Presidents Day, Columbus Day, and Veterans Day (Save \$2 million)	1090 (30%)
65. Reduce seasonal Metrobus service to bring it in line with actual service needs for the day after Thanksgiving and the week between Christmas and New Years Day. (Save \$670,000)	1557 (42%)
66. Reduce weekend late night Metrobus service (Save \$930,000)	476 (13%)
67. Reduce bus stops on select Metrobus lines (Save \$1.04 million)	781 (21%)
68. Double the MetroAccess fare to twice the proposed bus fare to as much as \$3.20. (Adds \$1 to 1.9 million in revenue)	1644 (45%)
69. Increase MetroAccess fare to twice the fixed route fare for the fastest trip, as determined by the Metro Trip Planner. The Metro Trip Planner may determine that the fastest trip is by bus, rail, or a combinaton of the two. (Adds \$4.6 million)	364 (10%)
70. Restrict MetroAccess service area to 3/4 mile from available fixed route service. Restrict customers who are eligible for full paratransit service from the free ride program on Metrobus and Metrorail. (Saves \$5.4 million)	691 (19%)
71. Increase the supplemental MetroAccess fare for one-way trips that begin or end between 3/4 and 3 miles beyond fixed route service (increase from \$1 to \$5) (Adds \$280,000)	420 (11%)
72. Increase the supplemental MetroAccess fare for one-way trips that begin or end between 3.1 and 6 miles beyond fixed route service (increase from \$2 to \$10) (Adds \$40,000)	277 (7%)
73. Increase the supplemental MetroAccess fare for one-way trips that begin or end between 6.1 and 9 miles beyond fixed route service (increase from \$3 to \$15) (Adds \$10,000)	279 (7%)
74. Increase the supplemental MetroAccess fare for one-way trips that begin or end 9 miles or more beyond fixed route service (increase from \$4 to \$20) (Financial impact undetermined)	278 (7%)

75. Increase bike locker annual fee to \$200 (Adds \$200,000 in revenue)	2246 (62%)
76. Charge up to 50 cents more for the use of paper farecards on Metrorail. Twenty-five cents for trips costing up to \$2.50 and 50 cents for trips more than \$2.50. (Adds \$9 million)	1002 (27%)
77. Decrease the age that children can ride free on Metro from under age five to under age three. (Based on information currently available, adds an estimated \$3,000 in Metrobus revenue and an estimated \$6,000 in Metrorail revenue.)	408 (11%)
78. Allow the general manager to institute a special fare of no more than 5 times the normal rate for fares and passes on bus and rail, and charge up to \$25 for parking for special events such as presidential inaugurations, other historic or political events, major sporting or entertainment events, and to implement special emergency fares. (Financial Impact To Be Determined)	393 (11%)
79. Metro should ask local governments to increase contributions to prevent a fare increase and service cuts.	555 (15%)
80. Metro should ask local governments to increase contributions in coordination with a fare increase and service cuts.	271 (7%)
81. Metro should ask local governments to increase contributions in coordination with a fare increase to avoid service cuts.	1774 (49%)
82. Additional capital funds, \$30 million or less, should be used for preventive maintenance.	505 (14%)
83. Additional capital funds, \$30 million or less, should be used for preventive maintenance, providing those funds are paid back in a later budget cycle.	672 (18%)
84. Additional capital funds, more than \$30 million, should be used for preventive maintenance.	519 (14%)
85. Additional capital funds, more than \$30 million, should be used for preventive maintenance, providing those funds are paid back in a later budget cycle.	543 (15%)