

SAMTRANS
CORRESPONDENCE
as of 12-23-2022

From: [Mass Transit Board \(@samtrans.com\)](#)
To: [Mass Transit Board \(@samtrans.com\)](#)
Subject: Looking for a new career opportunity? Check out Mass Transit's Career Center!
Date: Tuesday, December 20, 2022 11:04:22 AM

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from email you do not know.

[Click Here](#) to view online

MASS TRANSIT 
Career CENTER
Moving Transit Careers Forward



START YOUR SEARCH

**ACCESS YOUR NEXT
CAREER OPPORTUNITY**

Mass Transit Career Center —
Your guide to open positions in the transit industry.

SEARCH NOW »

Sponsored by:



Click [here](#) to unsubscribe.

You may unsubscribe at any time. Read our [privacy policy](#).

Contact us by emailing emailsolutions@endeavorb2b.com, or writing:

Endeavor Business Media, LLC

c/o E-mail Unsubscribe

30 Burton Hills Blvd., Suite 185

Nashville, TN 37215 USA

© 2022 Endeavor Business Media, LLC. All Rights Reserved.

From: [Lieberman, Dan](#)
To: [Media - Editors - RWC Pulse](#); [Board \(@samtrans.com\)](#)
Subject: RE: Reporter from Redwood City Pulse questions FW: Route 260
Date: Monday, December 19, 2022 5:02:43 PM
Attachments: [image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)

Michelle,

Answers below, please let me know if you need any further information on this issue.

Q: The board unanimously voted in March to eliminate the route. (I have watched previous board meetings.) Before making that decision, did the board consult with County probation, JJDPC, Chief John Keene, private defenders, parents or others at the YSC who work there or may use the route? Why or why not?

A: No, in the outreach for Reimagine SamTrans, we were not able to reach out to every interested party. However, the District conducted a significant publicity program, utilizing public meetings, board signage, paid marketing advertisements, email and text blasts regarding all the route changes. The decision making around the reduction on service on the 260 was made primarily based on its extremely low ridership and the need to reallocate those resources to elsewhere in the county.

Ridership to the YSC was less than a single rider per day, making it difficult to justify preserving the service at the expense of routes that had more demand. All service decisions were made after a three year planning process that factored in ridership and needs throughout the County. In light of desire to use SamTrans' limited resources in the most effective manner, the theme guiding Reimagine SamTrans was to reallocate service from extremely underperforming routes, like this one, to high equity areas with greater transit dependence and ridership. (Also, a technical point, the route hasn't been eliminated, just the segment of the route that served the YSC. The 260 is still running.)

Q: Although the census tracts suggest that the route be classified as a non-minority, and a non-low-income route, the youth and their families who'd use the bus routes are minorities, according to JJDPC. The youth at YSC is 99% minority, per the JJDPC's latest inspection report.

Did the board consider these facts before making that vote?

A: Yes, but the route itself only runs through 11% minority census tracts, and only 19% low income. As a point of comparison, the 141, which has expanded its service due to Reimagine SamTrans, runs through 98% minority census tracts, and 55% low income. Additionally, 85% of SamTrans ridership identify as members of racial or ethnic minority groups and 90% are low income with 64% being extremely low income based on the San Mateo County affordable housing income criteria. The resources reallocated from the reduction of this route continue to serve largely low income, non-white communities. And again, our data shows that the amount of people that used the 260 to get to the YSC is practically non-existent. We are open to discussing the matter with the YSC and exploring other transportation options available in the County.

Q: Would the board consider reinstating the route? Why or why not?

A: SamTrans bus routes are always being reviewed and may be adjusted; however, recent route changes were made as a result of a three year outreach effort and no further changes are planned to route 260 at this time. In this case, the demand is too low to justify reinstating the route in its previous form.

Our Board-adopted Service Policy Framework dictates that we provide service where demand exists, with an emphasis on serving designated Equity Priority Areas. With our operator shortage, running inefficient, low-demand routes or route segments deprives others from having access to transit that they rely upon. Shifting service to Equity Priority Areas and areas of high ridership is why our ridership is currently up 15% over where it was before the beginning of implementation of Reimagine SamTrans in August 2022. These changes have replaced empty buses with full ones, in keeping with our mission and serving the needs of this county.

Dan Lieberman, Public Affairs Specialist
1250 San Carlos Ave San Carlos, CA 94070
Cell Phone: 650.622.2492
Websites: [Caltrain](#) | [SamTrans](#) | [TA](#)



From: Michelle Iracheta <miracheta@rwcpulse.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2022 1:52 PM
To: Board (@samtrans.com) <board@samtrans.com>
Subject: Route 260

You don't often get email from miracheta@rwcpulse.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders.

Good afternoon Board Members,

My name is Michelle Iracheta. I am a reporter with the Redwood City Pulse. I am writing you today about Bus Route 260.

Recently, the JJDPC commissioners asked the Samtrans Board to reinstate route 260 after sending a letter to the board. Have board members had a chance to read the letter? (see attached).

The route was eliminated last month and provided services to families that needed to go to the Youth Services Center, which houses foster care and adoptions, youth delinquency court, juvenile dependency court, CPS, juvenile hall, and traffic court, to name a few.

The board unanimously voted in March to eliminate the route. (I have watched previous board meetings.) Before making that decision, did the board consult with County probation, JJDPC, Chief John Keene, private defenders, parents or others at the YSC who work there or may use the route? Why or why not?

Although the census tracts suggest that the route be classified as a non-minority, and a

non-low-income route, the youth and their families who'd use the bus routes are minorities, according to JJDPC. The youth at YSC is 99% minority, per the JJDPC's latest inspection report.

Did the board consider these facts before making that vote?

Would the board consider reinstating the route? Why or why not?

I would appreciate your responses. I also reached out to SamTrans public relations, but I would like to hear responses from board members. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Michelle Iracheta (she/her)

Editor, Redwood City Pulse

o: 650-223-6523 m: 832-729-2105

t: @cephira

RWCPULSE

Sign up for [Express](#), our daily newsletter.

Support local journalism — become a [RWCP Member](#).

From: [Michelle Iracheta](#)
To: [Board \(@samtrans.com\)](#)
Subject: Re: Route 260
Date: Friday, December 16, 2022 2:31:22 PM
Attachments: [RWCPsig100x.png](#)

You don't often get email from miracheta@rwcpulse.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders.

Good afternoon,

I am writing again to ask whether I should expect a response from some on the board. I have reached out to probation, the juvenile private defenders, Chief Keene, JJDPDC and others, including parents of children in YSC. I hope to have an article sometime in late January, possibly February. Please let me know who on the board I should connect with.

Thank you! Have a great weekend.

Michelle Iracheta (she/her)
Editor, Redwood City Pulse
o: 650-223-6523 m: 832-729-2105
t: @cephira

RWCPULSE

Sign up for **Express**, our daily newsletter.
Support local journalism — become a **RWCP Member**.

On Tue, Dec 13, 2022 at 3:51 PM Michelle Iracheta <miracheta@rwcpulse.com> wrote:

Good afternoon Board Members,

My name is Michelle Iracheta. I am a reporter with the Redwood City Pulse. I am writing you today about Bus Route 260.

Recently, the JJDPDC commissioners asked the Samtrans Board to reinstate route 260 after sending a letter to the board. Have board members had a chance to read the letter? (see attached).

The route was eliminated last month and provided services to families that needed to go to the Youth Services Center, which houses foster care and adoptions, youth delinquency court, juvenile dependency court, CPS, juvenile hall, and traffic court, to name a few.

The board unanimously voted in March to eliminate the route. (I have watched previous board meetings.) Before making that decision, did the board consult with County probation, JJDPDC, Chief John Keene, private defenders, parents or others at the YSC who work there or may use the route? Why or why not?

Although the census tracts suggest that the route be classified as a non-minority, and a non-low-income route, the youth and their families who'd use the bus routes

are minorities, according to JJDPC. The youth at YSC is 99% minority, per the JJDPC's latest inspection report.

Did the board consider these facts before making that vote?

Would the board consider reinstating the route? Why or why not?

I would appreciate your responses. I also reached out to SamTrans public relations, but I would like to hear responses from board members. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Michelle Iracheta (she/her)

Editor, Redwood City Pulse

o: 650-223-6523 m: 832-729-2105

t: @cephira

RWCPULSE

Sign up for **Express**, our daily newsletter.

Support local journalism — become a **RWCP Member**.

From: [Michelle Iracheta](#)
To: [Board \(@samtrans.com\)](#)
Subject: Route 260
Date: Tuesday, December 13, 2022 1:52:19 PM
Attachments: [RWCPsig100x.png](#)
[2022 Letter on SAMTRANS Access to YSC.docx.pdf](#)

You don't often get email from miracheta@rwcpulse.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

ATTENTION: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links from unknown senders.

Good afternoon Board Members,

My name is Michelle Iracheta. I am a reporter with the Redwood City Pulse. I am writing you today about Bus Route 260.

Recently, the JJDPC commissioners asked the Samtrans Board to reinstate route 260 after sending a letter to the board. Have board members had a chance to read the letter? (see attached).

The route was eliminated last month and provided services to families that needed to go to the Youth Services Center, which houses foster care and adoptions, youth delinquency court, juvenile dependency court, CPS, juvenile hall, and traffic court, to name a few.

The board unanimously voted in March to eliminate the route. (I have watched previous board meetings.) Before making that decision, did the board consult with County probation, JJDPC, Chief John Keene, private defenders, parents or others at the YSC who work there or may use the route? Why or why not?

Although the census tracts suggest that the route be classified as a non-minority, and a non-low-income route, the youth and their families who'd use the bus routes are minorities, according to JJDPC. The youth at YSC is 99% minority, per the JJDPC's latest inspection report.

Did the board consider these facts before making that vote?

Would the board consider reinstating the route? Why or why not?

I would appreciate your responses. I also reached out to SamTrans public relations, but I would like to hear responses from board members. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Michelle Iracheta (she/her)
Editor, Redwood City Pulse
o: 650-223-6523 m: 832-729-2105
t: @cephira

RWCPULSE

Sign up for **Express**, our daily newsletter.
Support local journalism — become a **RWCP Member**.