

FY06 Ridership per Revenue Hour (RH) by Route  
Compared to FY06 Service Standards

ATTACHMENT 1

Below  
Service Standard

Below Service Standard &  
No Major Change in FY06

Route Type	Route #	FY06 Ridership Service Standard	FY06 Avg Ridership per RH	% of FY06 Service Standard
Central City	142	9.6	22	226%
	141	9.6	17	178%
	140	9.6	8	86%
	143	9.6	8	82%
Commuter	3	17.4	43	244%
	7	17.4	37	211%
	29	17.4	30	170%
	106	17.4	29	168%
	31	17.4	29	165%
	109	17.4	28	161%
	102	17.4	26	149%
	101	17.4	22	127%
	104	17.4	22	127%
	103	17.4	22	125%
	89	17.4	21	123%
	100	17.4	21	119%
	107	17.4	19	108%
	76	17.4	14	78%
105	17.4	12	70%	
Crosstown	81	19.2	42	217%
	26	19.2	35	182%
	87	19.2	33	174%
	23	19.2	31	164%
	68	19.2	28	148%
	1	19.2	28	148%
	67	19.2	28	146%
	82	19.2	27	141%
	84	19.2	27	138%
	25	19.2	26	137%
	21	19.2	25	131%
	80	19.2	25	130%
	65	19.2	23	118%
	83	19.2	17	90%
91	19.2	15	80%	
Feeder	5	15.9	29	184%
	22	15.9	27	170%
	14	15.9	24	152%
	13	15.9	24	152%
	24	15.9	23	144%
	8	15.9	22	139%
	19	15.9	21	131%
	4	15.9	21	131%
	93	15.9	21	129%
	20	15.9	21	129%
28	15.9	18	111%	

FY06 Ridership per Revenue Hour (RH) by Route  
Compared to FY06 Service Standards

ATTACHMENT 1

Route Type	Route #	FY06 Ridership Service Standard	FY06 Avg Ridership per RH	% of FY06 Service Standard
Local**	55	18.4	40	219%
	72	18.4	36	197%
	75	18.4	26	139%
	54	18.4	22	119%
	73	18.4	20	110%
	74	18.4	14	75%
Radial	51	17.6	38	217%
	56	17.6	36	207%
	86	17.6	31	176%
	61	17.6	28	158%
	88	17.6	28	157%
	30	17.6	27	155%
	62	17.6	27	152%
	11	17.6	26	149%
	2	17.6	26	149%
	36	17.6	26	147%
	15	17.6	26	145%
	38	17.6	25	141%
	34	17.6	22	125%
	6	17.6	19	105%
	50	17.6	17	98%
63	17.6	14	82%	
64	17.6	12	65%	
Shuttle***	33	5.5	38	756%
	16	5.5	12	235%
	47	5.5	10	207%
	9	5.5	10	193%
	18	5.5	9	185%
	95	5.5	7	134%
	37	5.5	6	126%
	10	5.5	6	117%
	94	5.5	3	51%

\* Route has experienced significant changes within the last year.

\*\* The FY06 Local Route Service Standard of 17.3 excludes three months of FY06 data from local routes 12 and 79, before their elimination.

\*\*\* The FY06 Shuttle Service Standard of 5.5 excludes six months of FY06 data from Route 17, before its elimination in January 2006 as well as all of the data from Route 33, which had extraordinary ridership.

FY05 Ridership per Revenue Hour (RH) by Route  
Compared to FY05 Service Standards

Route Type	Route #	FY05 Ridership Service Standard	FY05 Avg Ridership per RH	% of FY05 Service Standard	Recent Change(s) -OR- Planned Action to Routes Not Meeting Service Standard
Central City	142	11.3	29.9	264%	
	141	11.3	19.0	168%	
	140	11.3	8.9	79%	Increase Headways to 60 mins btwn 9am-3pm, 9/2005
	143	11.3	6.9	61%	Increase Headways to 60 mins btwn 9am-3pm, 9/2005

Below Service Standard

Commuter	60	16.5	35.0	212%		
	3	16.5	34.8	211%		
	52	16.5	32.0	193%		
	7	16.5	28.6	173%		
	31	16.5	27.7	167%		
	66	16.5	27.0	163%		
	29	16.5	26.4	160%		
	57	16.5	25.3	153%		
	101	16.5	25.0	151%		
	102	16.5	23.7	143%		
	59	16.5	22.8	138%		
	109	16.5	22.6	137%		
	104	16.5	21.2	128%		
	103	16.5	19.8	120%		
	107	16.5	19.2	116%		
	106	16.5	18.3	111%		
	105	16.5	17.7	107%		
	100	16.5	17.0	103%		
		76	16.5	14.7	89%	RT staff is working with Route 76 riders to promote service
		89	16.5	13.8	84%	RT will contact the South Natomas TMA to evaluate potential promotional efforts

Below Service Standard & No

Crosstown	81	20.3	44.2	218%	
	26	20.3	34.9	172%	
	87	20.3	33.9	167%	
	23	20.3	32.8	162%	
	68	20.3	31.5	155%	
	84	20.3	31.3	154%	
	67	20.3	30.4	150%	
	1	20.3	26.9	133%	
	80	20.3	26.3	130%	
	82	20.3	26.3	130%	
	25	20.3	25.8	128%	
	21	20.3	25.3	125%	
	65	20.3	18.6	92%	Individual Trips Eliminated, 6/2005
	83	20.3	17.0	84%	Individual Trips Eliminated, 6/2005

Feeder	5	15.0	29.3	195%	
	22	15.0	27.1	180%	
	19	15.0	26.8	178%	
	14	15.0	23.0	153%	
	13	15.0	22.7	151%	
	93	15.0	21.1	140%	
	8	15.0	20.0	133%	
	4	15.0	19.3	128%	
	28	15.0	18.2	121%	
	20	15.0	16.7	111%	
	24	15.0	12.1	80%	Increase Headways to 60 Mins, 9/2005

Local	72	13.5	38.6	285%	
	55	13.5	32.9	243%	
	54	13.5	22.7	167%	
	75	13.5	20.7	153%	
	73	13.5	14.5	107%	
	91	13.5	14.3	105%	
	74	13.5	12.4	92%	Eliminated service after 8pm, 9/2005
	79	13.5	10.0	74%	Route Eliminated, 9/2005
12	13.5	8.0	59%	Route Eliminated, 9/2005	

Radial	51	16.3	37.1	227%	
	56	16.3	31.0	190%	
	86	16.3	29.6	181%	
	61	16.3	26.9	165%	
	88	16.3	26.9	165%	
	30	16.3	26.1	160%	
	38	16.3	25.1	154%	
	15	16.3	24.5	150%	
	2	16.3	23.8	146%	
	34	16.3	22.7	139%	
	62	16.3	22.6	138%	
	36	16.3	22.0	135%	
	11	16.3	18.9	116%	
	50	16.3	18.2	111%	
	6	16.3	15.8	97%	Individual Trips Eliminated, 6/2005
	63	16.3	13.3	82%	Individual Trips Eliminated, 6/2005 & 9/2005
	64	16.3	11.9	73%	Individual Trips Eliminated, 6/2005 & 9/2005

FY05 Ridership per Revenue Hour (RH) by Route  
Compared to FY05 Service Standards

Route Type	Route #	FY05 Ridership Service Standard	FY05 Avg Ridership per RH	% of FY05 Service Standard	Recent Change(s) -OR- Planned Action to Routes Not Meeting Service Standard
Shuttle*	33	7.0 / 4.2	49.7	1176%	
	18	7.0 / 4.2	11.3	268%	
	47	7.0 / 4.2	11.3	267%	
	16	7.0 / 4.2	9.8	233%	
	95	7.0 / 4.2	6.0	142%	
	9	7.0 / 4.2	5.7	134%	
	10	7.0 / 4.2	5.7	134%	
	37	7.0 / 4.2	4.6	108%	
	53	7.0 / 4.2	2.3	55%	Route Eliminated (Area service now provided by the City of Elk Grove), 1/2005
	94	7.0 / 4.2	2.2	51%	<b>RT will contact the City of Citrus Heights</b>
	17	7.0 / 4.2	1.5	36%	Route to be Eliminated, 1/2006

Supplemental	213	41.6	91.8	221%	
	200	41.6	86.2	207%	
	246	41.6	86.1	207%	
	212	41.6	86.0	207%	
	201	41.6	81.0	195%	
	247	41.6	78.3	188%	
	214	41.6	78.0	188%	
	206	41.6	76.8	185%	
	227	41.6	75.5	182%	
	211	41.6	68.5	165%	
	205	41.6	65.7	158%	
	226	41.6	65.4	157%	
	252	41.6	64.8	156%	
	255	41.6	61.5	148%	
	210	41.6	58.4	140%	
	248	41.6	58.4	140%	
	207	41.6	57.0	137%	
	251	41.6	48.4	116%	
	228	41.6	43.8	105%	
	262	41.6	43.3	104%	Route Eliminated, 9/2005
	241	41.6	42.0	101%	
	239	41.6	41.6	100%	
	249	41.6	39.7	96%	
	235	41.6	28.6	69%	
	236	41.6	26.1	63%	Route Eliminated, 9/2005
	237	41.6	26.0	63%	
	261	41.6	24.6	59%	AM trip added, 9/2005

\* Due to Route 33's continued extraordinary performance, the service standard for Shuttle routes was calculated with and without its ridership productivity. While both service standard calculations are included in the FY05 Ridership Service Standard Field, only the figure without Route 33's ridership was used to determine whether a shuttle route did or did not meet its service standard.

**Sacramento Regional Transit District**  
**Bus Route Performance Comparison - July 2003 through July 2004**

Route	Service Type	04Passengers per RH	04Service Standard	% of Service Standard	7/1/2004 Weekdays	7/1/2003 Weekdays	Start Date if New Route
3	Commute	33	17	194%	29	48	
7	Commute	25	17	147%	21	44	
29	Commute	25	17	147%	24	33	
31	Commute	31	17	182%	22	32	
52	Commute	32	17	188%	29	44	
57	Commute	28	17	165%	19	31	
59	Commute	35	17	206%	23	32	
60	Commute	38	17	224%	33	52	
66	Commute	21	17	124%	24	28	
76	Commute	13	17	76%	5	11	
89	Commute	7	17	41%	7		1/4/2004
100	Commute	22	17	129%	15	35	
101	Commute	24	17	141%	17	30	
102	Commute	25	17	147%	21	30	
103	Commute	19	17	112%	19	26	
104	Commute	24	17	141%	22	28	
105	Commute	10	17	59%	8	16	
106	Commute	31	17	182%	24	29	
107	Commute	23	17	135%	18	36	
109	Commute	24	17	141%	23	34	
1	Crosstown	27	21	129%	25	27	
21	Crosstown		21		25		6/13/2004
23	Crosstown	33	21	157%	32	28	
25	Crosstown	27	21	129%	24	24	
26	Crosstown	34	21	162%	29	34	
65	Crosstown	16	21	76%	17	26	
67	Crosstown	35	21	167%	32	33	
68	Crosstown	34	21	162%	32	29	
80	Crosstown	24	21	114%	26	19	
81	Crosstown	43	21	205%	36	44	
82	Crosstown	29	21	138%	22	24	
83	Crosstown	17	21	81%	15	28	
84	Crosstown	31	21	148%	30	26	
87	Crosstown	36	21	171%	31	31	
4	Feeder	25	17	147%	19	44	
5	Feeder	21	17	124%	30	26	
8	Feeder	20	17	118%	18	22	
13	Feeder	23	17	135%	21	25	
14	Feeder	26	17	153%	25	26	
19	Feeder	29	17	171%	24	24	
20	Feeder	20	17	118%	17	24	
22	Feeder	31	17	182%	34	33	
24	Feeder	17	17	100%	12	24	
28	Feeder	23	17	135%	16	25	
93	Feeder	27	17	159%	19	23	
12	Local	10	23	43%	12	14	
54	Local	21	23	90%	17	42	
55	Local	34	23	145%	26	38	
72	Local	41	23	175%	27	29	
73	Local	27	23	115%	12	33	

**Sacramento Regional Transit District**  
**Bus Route Performance Comparison - July 2003 through July 2004**

74	Local	19	23	81%	11	23	
75	Local	28	23	119%	17	27	
79	Local	12	23	51%	6	8	
91	Local	19	23	81%	13	18	
140	Central City	13	16	81%	9	15	
141	Central City	27	16	169%	25	29	
142	Central City	32	16	200%	31	24	
143	Central City	9	16	56%	9	7	
2	Radial	25	18	139%	19	26	
6	Radial	18	18	100%	19	18	
11	Radial	22	18	122%	16	15	
15	Radial	29	18	161%	24	24	
30	Radial	40	18	222%	33	39	
34	Radial	23	18	128%	24	26	
36	Radial	28	18	156%	24	25	
38	Radial	27	18	150%	24	27	
50E	Radial		18	0%	19		
51	Radial	43	18	239%	35	44	
56	Radial	30	18	167%	23	29	
61	Radial	29	18	161%	23	29	
62	Radial	23	18	128%	20	34	
63	Radial	14	18	78%	11	18	
64	Radial	16	18	89%	12	18	
86	Radial		18		27		4/4/2004
88	Radial	31	18	172%	30	36	
9	Shuttle	7	4	175%	8	5	
10	Shuttle	8	4	200%	8	7	
16	Shuttle	8	4	200%	9	13	
17	Shuttle	2	4	50%	1	2	
18	Shuttle	3	4	75%	5	5	
33	Shuttle	54	4	1350%	53		4/4/2004
37	Shuttle	5	4	125%	6		9/28/2003
47	Shuttle	11	4	275%	10		1/4/2004
53	Shuttle	3	4	75%	3	14	
94	Shuttle	3	4	75%	3	2	
95	Shuttle	6	4	150%	10	7	