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## Introduction

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) long-range transportation plan (Transportation 2035 Plan) demonstrates that the region's transit system is not sustainable based on current projections of system costs and anticipated revenues. Real operating costs (independent of inflation) of the "Big 7" transit agencies have increased significantly faster than the level of increases in service provided and ridership in the same timeframe (Figure 1).

Figure 1: "Big 7" Bay Area Transit Agencies - Increases in Operating Cost, Service, and Passenger (1997-2008)


Note: This chart is a modification of prior versions. It only includes the "Big 7" transit agencies (see "Methodology" chapter) and does not include paratransit, cable car, or ferries.
In March 2010, the MTC began its Transit Sustainability Project (TSP). The goal of the project is to establish a framework and implementation plan for a more robust, financially viable transit system that is cost-effective and customer-focused, and will provide for the region's future transit needs. The TSP intends to be a comprehensive, fact-based analysis of the existing system focused on service design and delivery, financial viability, and decision-making structures. The first phase focuses mainly on the financial aspect of the analysis. The MTC defined the following goals for the financial work:

- Clearly understand specific cost drivers, both internal and external, and understand the relative impact of cost reforms.
- Recommend cost reforms and a stable revenue source to deliver an effective, efficient transit system throughout the region.

The next phases of the TSP will study the service and institutional aspects of the region's transit systems with these financial goals in mind.

This report presents the financial analysis completed to date, including the following:

- Methodology
- Overview of Region's Operating Costs
- Cost Driver Analysis
- Cost Control Strategies
- Conclusion


## Methodology

This section describes the approach and data sources used in the financial analysis.
Data were compiled for operating expenses by object class and function for the largest seven transit operators ("Big 7") in the San Francisco Bay Area. This initial analysis focused solely on these "Big 7" because they comprise 93 percent of the Bay Area operators' 2008 operating costs, 88 percent of the 2008 revenue vehicle hours, and 96 percent of the 2008 ridership. The "Big 7 " agencies include:

- Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit);
- Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART);
- Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District (Golden Gate);
- San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA);
- Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain);
- San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans); and
- Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA).

Unlike the other "Big 7" agencies, Caltrain operates a contracted service. Therefore, for many of the data items collected as part of the financial analysis, Caltrain figures were not available or applicable. In those cases, the other six agencies (referred to as the "Big 6") are shown with their corresponding data, but Caltrain is excluded.

Twelve years of data were compiled from the National Transit Database (NTD) from 1997 through 2008. Additionally, the consultant team conducted interviews with each of the "Big 7" transit agencies and reviewed various documents provided by the agencies. Additional data sources include agency websites, board meeting notes, Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports (CAFRs), Transportation Development Act (TDA) Audits, and DASH \& Associates transit salary reports.

This analysis also includes many inflation adjustment calculations, which are calculated using the San Francisco-Oakland-Fremont consumer price index. For details regarding the inflation calculations, see Appendix I.

At the outset, it is important to acknowledge that each agency's service area differs in size, topography, and demographics. The agencies may also differ with respect to the age and condition of their rolling stock and infrastructure, and there are differences among the agencies regarding the modes of fixed-route service they provide. All of these factors can affect an agency's operating costs.

## Overview of Region's Operating Costs

## 10-Year Operating Cost Trends

Between 1997 and 2008, total operating and maintenance costs for the "Big 7" increased by 90 percent, from $\$ 1.02$ billion to $\$ 1.95$ billion. ${ }^{1}$ When adjusted to 1997 dollars (reflecting no inflation), costs increased by 37 percent. As shown in Figure 2 and Table 1, all of the "Big 7" agencies' costs increased; however, costs grew by more than 40 percent for the following four agencies: AC Transit ( 50 percent), SFMTA (49 percent), Caltrain (47 percent), and SamTrans (46 percent). It is likely that operating cost growth has slowed since 2008 because of the implementation of service cuts, employee furloughs and layoffs, and other cost-containment measures associated with less available funding.

Figure 2: "Big 7" Inflation-Adjusted O\&M Cost Trends (1997-2008, in thousands)


Source: NTD (1997-2008)
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## Table 1: Change in Total O\&M Costs by Agency ${ }^{1}$

| Operator | Before Adjusting for Inflation |  | After Adjusting for Inflation |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1997-2008 | Average Annual | 1997-2008 | Average Annual |
| AC Transit | 108\% | 6.9\% | 50\% | 3.7\% |
| SFMTA ${ }^{2}$ | 107\% | 6.8\% | 49\% | 3.7\% |
| Caltrain | 104\% | 6.7\% | 47\% | 3.5\% |
| SamTrans | 103\% | 6.6\% | 46\% | 3.5\% |
| BART | 79\% | 5.4\% | 29\% | 2.3\% |
| VTA | 73\% | 5.1\% | 25\% | 2.0\% |
| Golden Gate ${ }^{3}$ | 52\% | 3.9\% | 9\% | 0.8\% |
| TOTAL | 91\% | 6.0\% | 37\% | 2.9\% |

Source: NTD (1997-2008)

1. Change in total costs is not adjusted to account for changes in service levels. Also, a significant cost driver for SamTrans, VTA, and the SFMTA is their Caltrain operating subsidy. Additionally, during this period, SamTrans made significant financial contributions to the BART extension to San Francisco International Airport, which increased Samtrans' operating expenses.
2. The SFMTA's total operating costs also include cable car, which is a mode unique to the SFMTA.
3. Golden Gate's total operating costs include ferry service, which is a mode unique to Golden Gate.
4. Costs include paratransit costs.

While costs have risen significantly for the "Big 7" agencies between 1997 and 2008, cost metrics alone do not account for how much service was provided during that timeframe. Overall agency budgets are obviously impacted by the amount of service they provide. To normalize for the amount of service provided, cost per vehicle service hour was evaluated. Figure 3 shows the trends in cost per vehicle service hour, adjusted for inflation. Increases ranged from roughly 45 to 70 percent increases in the cost per vehicle service hour. One operator, Caltrain, experienced a decrease in cost per vehicle service hour over the period.

Figure 3: "Big 7" Inflation-Adjusted Cost Per Vehicle Service Hour Trends (19972008)


An analysis of the percentage change in operating costs, revenue vehicle hours, and passenger increases by mode showed significant operating cost increases across all modes, and significant variation in the outcomes (service provided and passengers served) by mode. Bus service-level increases were not commensurate with cost increases (which some agencies have asserted may be affected by congestion on streets that slows operating speeds, and thereby increases the cost associated with delivering the same level of service). Additionally, the light rail systems clearly increased service in this timeframe; however, their ridership levels did not increase proportionately. ${ }^{2}$ Finally, the commuter and heavy rail systems' operating costs were consistent with their service provided and passenger growth. It should be noted, however, that the rail systems' upfront capital costs are not included in this analysis (Figure 43).

Figure 4: Aggregate Percentage Change in "Big 7's" Operating Cost, Service, and Passenger Increases (1997-2008)


Source: NTD (1997-2008);
Excludes paratransit.
Excludes motor bus costs BART and Caltrain recorded in 1997 but not in 2008.

Cost per vehicle service hour is also an effective measure of operating efficiency (Figure 54). This analysis shows how the "Big 7" costs per vehicle service hour are significantly higher than the smaller agencies in the Bay Area. One explanation is that the greater use of contracted service by smaller agencies, versus providing services "in-house," is a key source of cost savings for the smaller agencies. However, it is important to note that all of the smaller agencies utilize unionized employees to provide service, regardless of whether they contract for service or provide service directly. While agencies that contract for service clearly are benefiting from cost efficiencies, even those smaller agencies that operate service directly show substantially lower costs per hour than the large agencies in the region. Some factors influencing the costs of the

[^1]large agencies may include: many of the larger Bay Area agencies are older "legacy" agencies, which operate under collective bargaining agreements that have been negotiated over several decades and represent accumulated agreements made over those many years; many of the larger agencies have larger administrative staffs covering a larger number of responsibilities than smaller agencies.

Figure 5: Cost Per Vehicle Service Hour (Bus Only, 2009)


Source: NTD (2009)

## Cost Drivers Overview

This analysis defines major cost drivers to be either of the following:

- Cost components that represent a large portion of a transit agency's operating cost budget; or
- Cost components of the transit agency's operating cost budget that are growing rapidly.

As shown in Figure 65, the three largest cost components of the "Big 7's" operations and maintenance (O\&M) costs in 2008 were fringe benefits, ${ }^{3}$ operators' wages, ${ }^{4}$ and other wages. ${ }^{5}$ These three cost components comprise over 70 percent of the total systemwide operating costs. Additionally, after adjusting for inflation, between 1997 and 2008, operators' wages increased by 12 percent, other wages increased by 19 percent, and fringe benefits increased by 69 percent.

[^2]Figure 6: "Big 7" Percentage of 2008 Systemwide Operating Costs


* Other costs include services, fuel and lube, tires and others, utilities, casualties and liabilities, purchased transportation, etc. Note: Systemwide operating costs do not include paratransit, cable car, or ferry costs. Source: NTD (1997-2008)

This analysis also considers work rules, service changes, and staffing levels to be potential cost drivers. Work rules establish working conditions and procedures for operating service, and they have significant implications on operators' salaries and fringe benefits. Service changes and staffing levels also impact these same labor costs. The following sections analyze each of these cost drivers in detail; including trends, peer comparisons, and recommendations for controlling these costs.

## Cost Driver Analysis

The following sections provide a description and analysis associated with each of the cost drivers (operator wages, other wages, fringe benefits, service levels, staffing levels, and work rules) initially identified. For each cost driver, the section includes a recommendation depending on whether the cost driver is considered to have significant potential for cost savings.

## Operator Wages

Among the "Big 7," operator wages account for 16 percent of agencies' 2008 system-wide operating costs. Operators include bus drivers and heavy or light rail train operators who are agency employees. Operator wages include base wages for work hours and premium pay for work hours (e.g., overtime and night shift premiums). Operator wages do not include fringe benefits such as paid sick leave, holidays, and vacation. In many cases, wage rates and work rules that affect operator pay are a result of decades of collective bargaining. In fact, in some cases, outside factors impact an agency's ability to control costs (e.g., until the adoption of a charter amendment in 2010, for several decades, the San Francisco City Charter guaranteed that SFMTA operators would receive the average hourly rate of the two-highest comparable transit systems in the country).

Over a 12-year analysis period from 1997 to 2008, the overall percentage change in operator wage costs for the six largest transit agencies in the Bay Area ranged from 25 percent to 86 percent, without adjusting for inflation (Table 2). Together, the six largest transit agencies that directly operate service experienced an average change in operator wage costs of 55 percent from 1997 to 2008. The largest increases occurred at BART ( 86 percent), AC Transit ( 60 percent), and SFMTA ( 60 percent). The average annual change in operator wage costs ranged from 2 percent to 5.8 percent per year, with an average annual change (without adjusting for inflation) of about 4 percent.

Table 2: Percentage Change in Systemwide Operator Wage Costs ${ }^{1}$

| System | Before Adjusting for Inflation |  | After Adjusting for Inflation |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1997-2008 | Avg. Annual | 1997-2008 | Avg. Annual |
| BART | 86\% | 5.8\% | 34\% | 2.7\% |
| SFMTA | 60\% | 4.4\% | 15\% | 1.3\% |
| AC Transit | 60\% | 4.4\% | 15\% | 1.3\% |
| VTA | 46\% | 3.5\% | 5\% | 0.4\% |
| SamTrans | 41\% | 3.1\% | 1\% | 0.1\% |
| Golden Gate | 25\% | 2.0\% | -10\% | -1.0\% |
| TOTAL | 55\% | 4.1\% | 12\% | 1.0\% |

Source: NTD (1997-2008)

1. Excludes Caltrain because Caltrain contracts for rail operations and maintenance services. Also, data is not adjusted to account for changes in service levels.
2. Costs include paratransit costs.

Changes in operator wage costs were driven by both changes in service levels (and hence the number of operators employed by each agency) and changes in operator wage rates. It is important to note that growth rates in the analysis account for both changes in the total number of operators employed by each agency and in the rate of pay received by individual operators.

Table 3 outlines the annual wage cost per vehicle operations employee. As the table shows, the wages per employee varied significantly among the "Big 7" agencies, with the average annual rate change between 2002 and 2008 ranging from -3.6 percent to almost 5 percent, after controlling for inflation.

Table 3: Salaries/Wages as a Cost Driver for the "Big 7"

| Operator | Annual Wage Cost per Vehicle Operations FTE (\$2008) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2002 | 2008 | 2002-2008 | Avg. Annual |
| Santa Clara VTA | \$40,718 | \$54,254 | 33.2\% | 4.9\% |
| SFMTA | \$45,235 | \$51,204 | 13.2\% | 2.1\% |
| BART | \$19,614 | \$23,801 | 21.3\% | 3.3\% |
| AC Transit | \$46,531 | \$50,349 | 8.2\% | 1.3\% |
| Golden Gate | \$48,138 | \$44,282 | -8.0\% | -1.4\% |
| SamTrans | \$63,456 | \$51,080 | -9.5\% | -3.6\% |
| TOTAL |  |  | 8.1\% | 1.1\% |

Top operator wage rates for the "Big 7" (excluding contracted services like Caltrain) that directly operate service range from $\$ 24.71$ to $\$ 30.27$ per hour. In comparison to national peer agencies, the top base hourly rate for several of these agencies appears to be at the high end of the range; however, when adjusted for the cost of living in each area these wage rates are comparable.

Figure 76 shows the percentage change in top operator wage rates between 2001 and 2009 for six of the region's largest agencies compared to the change in the Consumer Price Index (CPI), and regional, state, and national wage indices. From 2001 to 2009, growth in top operator wage rate was lower than growth in regional and state wage indices for "all occupations." Three of five were below national wage growth rate for all occupations.

Figure 7: Percentage Change in Top Operator Wage Rate versus Percentage Change in National, State, and Regional Wage Indices (2001-2009)


Source for Wage Indices and CPI: Bureau of Labor Statistics. Source for top operator wage rates: Dash \& Associates and "Big 6" agencies.

## Recommendation on Operator Wages

The region's base operator wage rates are higher than many peers, but when adjusted for the cost of living, appear comparable. Moreover, increases in the base wage rates were higher than inflation, but lower than the overall regional wage index; therefore, it is recommended that there be no further analysis of operator base wage rate. However, work rules and staffing levels should be analyzed in more detail.

## Other Wages

Other wages represents almost 25 percent of the "Big 7 " agencies' 2008 systemwide operating costs and refers to all non-operator wages, which includes employees performing maintenance, dispatch, supervision, and administration and other support functions. A breakdown of the 2008 non-operator wages for the "Big 7 " is shown in Figure 87.

Figure 8: 2008 Non-Operator Wage Break-down


Source: NTD (2008)

Table 4 shows the overall percentage change and the average annual change in other wage costs over the 12 -year analysis period. Other wages increased an average of 65 percent for all of the largest six transit agencies that directly operate service. Those systems with the largest increase include SFMTA (110 percent), SamTrans (102 percent) and AC Transit (71 percent).

## Table 4: Percentage Change in Systemwide Other Wage Costs ${ }^{1,2}$

| System | Before Adjusting for Inflation |  | After Adjusting for Inflation |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1997-2008 | Avg. Annual | $\mathbf{1 9 9 7 - 2 0 0 8}$ | Avg. Annual |
| SFMTA | $110 \%$ | $7.0 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ |
| SamTrans | $102 \%$ | $6.6 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ |
| AC Transit | $71 \%$ | $5.0 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ |
| BART | $45 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ |
| VTA | $43 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| Golden Gate | $24 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $-11 \%$ | $\mathbf{- 1 . 0 \%}$ |
| Average | $\mathbf{6 5 \%}$ | $\mathbf{4 . 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 6 \%}$ |

Source: NTD (1997-2008)

1. Excludes Caltrain because Caltrain contracts for rail operations and maintenance (O\&M) services.
2. Data is not adjusted to account for changes in service levels.
3. Costs include paratransit costs.

Additionally, this analysis considered the non-operator wages per employee; however, the data available on historical employee counts by agency was inconsistent and therefore deemed not reliable for this analysis. As an alternative, a region-wide breakdown of the changes in wage costs per employee by functional area (e.g., maintenance, administration) was developed from 2002 through 2008. As shown in Table 5, the maintenance wage costs per employee rose faster than wage costs in either the vehicle operations or administrative categories.

Table 5: "Big 7" Wage Growth per Employee by NTD Functional Class

| Category | 2002-2008 | Average Annual |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle Operations | $7.0 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ |
| Maintenance | $16.2 \%$ | $2.7 \%$ |
| Administrative | $8.3 \%$ | $1.4 \%$ |
| Source: |  |  |

Source: NTD (2002 - 2008)
These changes are likely driven by changes in service levels (and hence the number of staff employed by each agency), changes in the level of resources devoted to specific activities (e.g., increased maintenance activities designed to improve service reliability), and changes in nonoperator wage rates. For the agencies that were evaluated, the average annual increase in other wage costs was 5 percent, or 1 percent higher than the growth rate in operator wages, and nearly 2 percent above the rate of inflation.

It is also important to note that since 2008, all of the "Big 7 " have implemented measures designed to control non-operator wage costs (Table 6).

Table 6: "Big 7" Non-Operator Wage Cost-Control Strategies Implemented

| Cost Containment Strategies | "Big 7" Agencies Implementing these Strategies |
| :--- | :--- |
| Layoffs/Attrition | AC Transit, BART, Caltrain, Golden Gate, SamTrans, SFMTA |
| Furloughs | SamTrans, SFMTA, VTA, Caltrain |
| Wage/Hiring Freezes | BART, Caltrain, Golden Gate, SamTrans, VTA, AC Transit |

## Recommendation on Other Wages

To develop a better understanding of what has driven the changes in non-operator wages, it is recommended to undertake case studies of the changes in non-operator employee counts and costs at one or more specific agencies. This would entail collecting and analyzing data from 2002 through 2008 (or perhaps through 2010, to provide a more up-to-date picture) that disaggregates employee counts and wage costs into broad non-operator job categories, such as:

- Executive staff (i.e., General Manager, Division/Department Heads, etc.);
- "Professional" job classifications (i.e., engineers, planners, finance, human resources, information technology);
- "Administrative" job classifications (i.e., clerical, supervisory, managers); and
- Maintenance job classifications.

Depending upon how the agencies have categorized their information, the employee count and wage data could also be analyzed based on functional areas, such as by organizational unit (e.g., Maintenance Division, Administration \& Finance Division, Planning, etc.). This type of analysis would provide a clearer explanation of why non-operator wage costs rose faster than operator wage costs, and could be undertaken as part of the upcoming institutional task.

## Fringe Benefits

Fringe benefits comprised 34 percent of the "Big 7" agencies' 2008 systemwide O\&M costs. During this period, fringe benefit expenses grew at an average of 8 percent per year and, in aggregate, fringe benefit costs increased from $\$ 355$ million in 1997 to $\$ 601$ million in 2008, resulting in a 69 percent increase on an inflation-adjusted basis from 1997 to 2008 (Figure 98). ${ }^{6}$ The largest components of agencies' fringe benefits include retirement and health insurance. Other costs classified as fringe benefits include sick leave, vacation and holiday pay, workers compensation, life insurance and dental/vision insurance.

[^3]Figure 9: "Big 7" Fringe Costs (2008 \$)


Source: NTD (1997 - 2008)
Table 7 shows the overall percentage change and the average annual change for fringe benefits over the 12 -year analysis period. Fringe benefit costs increased an average of 72 percent for all of the largest six systems after adjusting for inflation. Systems with the highest percentage increase included SamTrans ( 139 percent), BART ( 82 percent) and AC Transit ( 81 percent). Note: The percentage change in fringe benefit costs does not reflect any changes in overall staffing levels that occurred, or the change in fringe benefit costs per employee. Per employee calculations are not included in this report due to inconsistent FTE counts available from the transit agencies.

Table 7: Percentage Change in Systemwide Fringe Benefits Costs ${ }^{1,2,3}$

| System | Before Adjusting for Inflation <br>  |  | After Adjusting for Inflation |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SamTrans | $232 \%$ | $11.5 \%$ | $139 \%$ | Avg. Annual |
| BART | $153 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ | $82 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ |
| AC Transit | $152 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ |
| SFMTA | $134 \%$ | $8.0 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $4.9 \%$ |
| VTA | $117 \%$ | $7.3 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $4.2 \%$ |
| Golden Gate | $67 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ |
| Average | $\mathbf{1 3 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 . 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 2 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 0 \%}$ |

Source: NTD (1997-2008)

1. Excludes Caltrain because Caltrain contracts for rail O\&M services.
2. Data is not adjusted to account for changes in service levels.
3. Costs include cable car, ferry, and paratransit costs

## Pension and Other Post-Employment Benefits Plans

All agencies provide their employees with "defined benefit" pension plans. These retirement plans use formulas to determine a retiree's pension payments based on the employee's years of service and percentage of compensation during the employee's final one or more years of work. Employees must reach a certain age and years of service thresholds before they are eligible to retire. For unionized employees, these formulas are established in collective bargaining agreements. As shown in Table 8, pension plans for both operators and non-operators are
generally the same for the "Big 7" transit agencies. In some cases, particularly where operators belong to agency-specific pension plans, and non-operators belong to a CalPERS plan (BART, SamTrans, and Golden Gate), the minimum service requirements differ, because the CalPERS vesting period is 5 years.
Transit Sustainability Project
Table 8: "Big 7" Retirement Formulas for Operators and Non-Operators As of May 2011

| Agency | Operator Pension | Non-Operator Pension | Other Retirement Plans |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AC Transit | - Age 55/8 years @ 2\%, 60/8 years @ 2.25\%, or 65/8 years @2.5\% of final 3 years <br> (AC Retirement Plan) | Represented Employees: <br> - Age 55/5-8 years (depending on union) <br> - $2.5 \% \times$ average of final 3 years <br> Non-Represented Employees: <br> - Age 50/5 years $2.5 \%$ x average of final 3 years <br> (AC Retirement Plan) | Deferred compensation plan |
| BART | - Age 55/5 years <br> - $2.0 \%$ x high year (CalPERS) | Non-Safety Employees: <br> - Age 55/5 years <br> - $2.0 \%$ x high year <br> Police: <br> - Age 50/5 years <br> - $3.0 \% \times$ high year (CaIPERS) | BART does not belong to the Social Security System. Instead, most employees participate in the "Money Purchase Pension Plan", a supplemental "defined contribution plan." ${ }^{11}$ BART contributes $6.65 \%$ of eligible compensation up to a maximum of \$1,868 per year. Previously, non-represented employees received an additional 1.627\% contribution, but this was suspended in January 2010 through FY2013. |
| Golden Gate | - Age 55/15 years or 50/25 <br> - $2 \%$ x high year <br> (GGT Amalgamated Retirement Plan) | - Age 55/5 years <br> - $2.5 \%$ x high year (CaIPERS) | Employees may contribute to a "deferred compensation plan," but there is no employer contribution |
| SamTrans | - Age 55/5 years <br> - $2.0 \%$ x high 3 years (CaIPERS) | - Age 55/5 years <br> - 2.0\% x high 3 years (CalPERS) | Employees may contribute to a "deferred compensation plan;" no employer contribution |
| SFMTA | - Age 50/20 years or Age 60/10 years <br> - Ranges from $1.6 \%$ to $2.3 \% \times$ high year (City Retirement System) | - Age 50/20 years or Age 60/10 years <br> - Ranges from $1.6 \%$ to $2.3 \% \times$ high year (City Retirement System) <br> - Employees contribute 7.5\% | Employees may contribute to a "deferred compensation plan;" no employer contribution |
| VTA | - Age $55 / 15$ years at $2.0 \%$ of high 3 years or <br> - Age $65 / 10$ years at $2.4 \% \times$ high 3 years (These apply to all ATU employees, including certain non-operators) | - Age 55/5 years <br> - $2.0 \%$ x high 3 years (CaIPERS) | AFSCME and Non-Represented employees may contribute to a "deferred compensation plan;" no employer contribution |

[^4]
## Pension and Other Post-Employment Benefits Peer Comparisons

A significant issue for the region's transit agencies is the level of pension and Other PostEmployment Benefits (OPEB) liability. OPEB is an accounting concept created by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) designed to address expenses that entities may or may not be legally bound to pay. OPEB generally includes: medical benefits to retirees and surviving spouses, retiree life insurance, survivor dental and vision benefits, and medical benefits to survivors of active employees. As a basis for comparison, Figure 10 presents the level of funded pension liability data from several cities and county governments in the region, state governments, and private industry as compared with Bay Area transit agencies. Similarly, Figure 11 shows the same information for OPEB liability.

Figure 10: Peer Analysis of Funded Pension Liability


Source: Transit Agency Combined Annual Financial Reports (CAFRs)

1 Data as of June 30, 2008, from Pew Center on the States report entitled "Trillion Dollar Gap," dated February 2010.
2 Data as of June 30, 2008, from Pew Center on the States report entitled "Trillion Dollar Gap," dated February 2010.
3 Based on S\&P 500 Indices (https://www.sp-
indexdata.com/idpfiles/indexalert/prc/active/pressreleases/SP500_PENSIONS\ +\ OPEB\ pr\ \ final_US.pdf)

Figure 11: Peer Analysis of Funded Other Post-Employment Benefits Liability


Source: Transit Agency Combined Annual Financial Reports (CAFRs)
These figures demonstrate that the region's pension plans are mostly funded; however, unfunded pension liability in the region still totals $\$ 482$ million. ${ }^{7}$ On the other hand, the region's OPEB costs are mostly unfunded-with outstanding costs totaling over $\$ 1.32$ billion. In recent years, the "Big 7" made about two-thirds of their "annual required contribution," (which is the amount calculated by an actuary that would cover that year's cost of benefits). Agencies are addressing their outstanding OPEB liability, but it represents a substantial and growing burden on operating budgets for the foreseeable future. BART, Golden Gate, SamTrans, AC Transit, and VTA have established OPEB Trusts, and will fund their unfunded liabilities over 30 years, in accordance with GASB guidance. ${ }^{8}$

## Recommendation on Fringe Benefits

Fringe benefits are a significant issue for the region's agencies-both in the short- and long-term-and represent major cost drivers. The growth in the cost of these benefits is unsustainable and has already created substantial unfunded liabilities. It is recommended that agencies determine which cost-containment strategies associated with fringe benefits are most applicable to themselves and develop implementation strategies to advance reforms.

[^5]
## Service Changes

As detailed previously, operating costs have increased substantially between 1997 and 2008 at 2.4 percent on average annually after adjusting for inflation, Table 9 shows how service changed relative to the operating costs. As the table indicates, many of the "Big 7" experienced growth in revenue vehicle hours and miles, suggesting increased service levels may have had an impact on the operating costs.

Table 9: Change in Operating Cost and Service Provided (1997-2008)

|  | Operating Costs <br> (before adjusting <br> for inflation) | Operating Costs <br> (after adjusting <br> for inflation) | Revenue <br> Vehicle Miles | Revenue <br> Vehicle Hours |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Caltrain | $104 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $105 \%$ | $155 \%$ |
| SFMTA | $102 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| AC Transit | $98 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| Samtrans | $93 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $-3 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| BART | $81 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| VTA | $62 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $-1 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Golden Gate | $39 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $-35 \%$ | $-23 \%$ |
| Avg Annual \% Change | $\mathbf{5 . 6 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 . 4 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0 \%}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 7 0 \%}$ |
| Soun |  |  |  |  |

Source: NTD (1997-2008)
Note: Cost and service estimates only represent fixed route service. They do not include paratransit, cable car, or ferry service.

Another aspect of the service changes cost driver analysis is related to system speeds. Agency staff suggested that changes in operating speeds have been a factor in increasing the operating costs, particularly for those bus operators providing service in congested urban environments. NTD data showed that speeds of the largest five bus operators decreased by 7 percent between 1997 and 2008, while the operating cost per hour increased by 23 percent. Bus speeds may be affected by congestion on the local street network, lack of coordinated or priority signal timing, bus stop spacing and location inefficiencies, and slow boarding for crowded buses.

The SFMTA has identified increasing operating speed as a strategy to reduce operating costs. As part of its Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP), the SFMTA estimated that for every mile per hour the Muni systemwide speed is increased, Muni could realize approximately a 10 -percent cost savings. Additional strategies to speed service include signal priority treatments, enforcement of parking/bus lane restrictions, faster boarding, etc. Similarly, Caltrain has realized significant benefits from restructuring its service through the use of its Baby Bullet service. By reducing the number of stops served by its Baby Bullet trains, Caltrain's overall average speed increased more than 9 percent and its average operating cost per hour of service decreased 14 percent.

Note: Many agencies have cut service in recent years in response to funding shortfalls. Service cuts can be detrimental to an agency for several reasons. No matter how much service is cut, agencies have many fixed costs (including the General Manager, procurement, human resources, etc.) that do not vary significantly with relatively small changes in service levels and overall agency staffing levels. Therefore, service cuts can result in an increased operating cost per hour. Additionally, "discretionary" riders may stop riding, which can result in decreased ridership and fare revenues.

## Recommendation on Service Changes

At this stage, the project team does not have the information required to determine how much of the increase in wage and fringe costs were driven by increased service levels and decreased
system speeds versus other factors, such as hourly wage increases, vacation/sick leave, changes in health insurance premiums, changes in retirement expenses, and other cost drivers. It is recommended that this issue be further analyzed as part of the service task.

## Staffing Levels

An analysis of administrative costs as a percentage of total operating costs shows that Bay Area operators dedicate a higher percentage of operating budgets to administrative costs than their peers. As shown in Table 10, the "Big 7" (excluding Caltrain) dedicates almost 20 percent of their operating costs to administrative costs, while the peer average is closer to 14 percent. The Bay Area's administrative costs (per service unit) are mixed compared to peers. The administrative cost relative to the service provided (a measure of service efficiency) is higher than most peers, except for New York and Philadelphia. The administrative cost relative to the passenger carried (a measure of service effectiveness) is significantly higher than all except Atlanta (Table 10).

Table 10: Administrative Cost Comparison ${ }^{1}$

| Operator | Admin Cost (\$000s) | Revenue Vehicle Hour (RVH) (000s) | Unlinked Passenger Trips (000s) | Admin Cost per RVH | Admin Cost per Trip | Admin Cost as a $\%$ of Total Operating Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| "Big 7" Agencies (excluding Caltrain) | \$326,676 | 9,322 | 459,510 | \$35.0 | 0.71 | 19.9\% |
| CTA, Chicago | \$117,676 | 7,730 | 526,336 | \$15.2 | 0.22 | 9.4\% |
| LACMTA, Los Angeles | \$185,442 | 7,823 | 474,228 | \$23.7 | 0.39 | 16.0\% |
| King County, Seattle | \$78,529 | 3,096 | 118,692 | \$25.4 | 0.66 | 16.5\% |
| MBTA, Boston | \$90,118 | 3,171 | 368,954 | \$28.4 | 0.24 | 9.7\% |
| MTA, New York | \$614,524 | 15,362 | 3,330,949 | \$40.0 | 0.18 | 11.7\% |
| SEPTA, Philadelphia | \$138,843 | 4,652 | 339,168 | \$29.8 | 0.41 | 15.1\% |
| WMATA, DC | \$321,539 | 4,134 | 423,524 | \$77.8 | 0.76 | 15.8\% |
| MARTA, Atlanta | \$76,686 | 2,356 | 150,503 | \$32.5 | 0.51 | 19.9\% |
| Group Avg |  |  |  | \$34.1 | 0.42 | 14.3\% |

1. Dollars are adjusted to SF-Oakland 2008 Consumer Price Index.
2. "Big 7" agencies total includes the cost data for all modes, with the exception of vanpools, cable car, ferry, and paratransit. It also does not include Caltrain costs.

The peer group for this comparison was selected according to two criteria: 1) total operating costs, and 2) network structure. Chicago (CTA), Los Angeles (LACMTA), Washington D.C. (WMATA), and New York (MTA) were chosen because their total operating cost, as reported to NTD, were similar in magnitude to the combined Bay Area cost figures. Seattle, Boston (MBTA), Philadelphia (SEPTA), and Atlanta (MARTA) were selected because they were believed to have transit systems with similar network structures to that of the Bay Area.

## Recommendation on Staffing Levels

There is a wide variation among the peers' administrative costs. The Bay Area average employee per service unit (revenue vehicle hours) is less than peer group average; however, the administration cost (per service unit) appears higher than the national average. It is important to understand why the Bay Area's administrative costs as a percentage of operating costs is substantially higher than most of the peers cited above. It is recommended that the agencies' staffing levels be analyzed further as part of the institutional analysis task, and that opportunities for reducing administrative costs be identified.

## Work Rules

Work rules govern the roles and responsibilities of management and employees, and they are determined by a history of Collective Bargaining Agreements and agency practices. They have significant implications on how transit service is provided and the cost to provide the service. Work rules are agency-specific, and many transit agencies have conducted assessments of potential savings that could result from specific changes. Table 11 shows the general categories of work rules and their associated issues.

Table 11: Work Rules and Associated Issues

| Work Rule Areas | Examples of issues covered by work rules |
| :--- | :--- |
| Service design and assignment | Layover, interlining, division service sharing, special service |
| Crew scheduling | Spread, daily guarantee, use of part-timers, run requirements (4-10s, <br> splits, straights), report and travel time |
| Daily service delivery | Extra board management, absenteeism |
| Business model | In-house versus outsourced service delivery |

Figure 12 presents data on the "peak to base" ratio for each of the "Big 7" agencies, which compares the number of vehicles required to provide period service to the number of vehicles required to provide service during non-peak "base" hours. A peak to base ratio of 1.0 would indicate that there is no difference between the amount of service provided during peak and off-peak hours. As the peak to base ratio increases over 1.0, this indicates that an agency is operating more service during the peak periods than during off-peak periods. The commute-oriented service plan operated by Golden Gate Transit is an example of a high peak to base ratio.

Figure 12: Peak to Base Ratio (2008)


Source: NTD (2008)
Figure 13 presents the ratio of pay hours to platform hours for five of the "Big 7." A pay hour to platform hour ratio of 1.0 indicates that an agency is paying operators only for time during which they are driving a vehicle (platform time). A pay to platform ratio that is higher than 1.0 indicates than an agency is paying for some amount of work time that is not being spent operating a vehicle. Agencies with higher peak to base ratios that also provide daily pay guarantees to their operators will tend to pay for more non-driving hours.

Figure 13: Pay to Platform Ratio (2008)


* SFMTA Pay to Platform Ratio is from 2009

Source: NTD (2008) and agency-provided data
Note: BART is not included due to data being unavailable.

## Recommendation on Work Rules

As discussed in more detail in the section on Cost Control Strategies, the TSP's preliminary analysis shows that work rules can have significant impacts on the cost of delivering service. Premium pay data suggests further analysis could produce options for significantly lowering operating costs. A business model that relies more on part-time operators, reduction of absenteeism and the size of the extra-board, and consideration of more outsourcing of certain services may yield savings. As a next step, more analysis should be conducted as part of the service analysis task.

## Cost Control Strategies

The following section describes the cost control strategies already undertaken or under consideration by the "Big 7." Additionally, this section includes a summary of the potential order of magnitude cost savings, especially if undertaken on a region-wide basis. Appendix II of this report presents a case study of the cost containment strategies undertaken by the Santa Clara VTA.

## Summary of Cost Control Strategies Undertaken by the "Big 7"

As described in this report, potential cost drivers identified for the region's transit agencies include operator wages, other wages, fringe benefits, work rules, service changes, and staffing levels. To control these cost drivers (and other costs), the "Big 7" have undertaken or are considering many different cost containment strategies (Table 12) since 2008 in response to the economic crisis.

Table 12: "Big 7" Cost Containment Strategies as of September 2010

|  | Cost Containment Strategy | $\sum_{\substack{\text { en }}}^{\mathbb{E}}$ | $\underset{\substack{\mathrm{\alpha}}}{\substack{\alpha}}$ |  |  |  | $\S$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Service cuts ${ }^{1}$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |
|  | Layoffs/Attrition | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | O | $\bullet$ |
|  | Hiring freeze | 0 | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |  | $\bullet$ |
|  | Furloughs | $\bullet$ |  |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |
|  | Non-Operator wage freezes/decreases |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |
|  | Conduct compensation study |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | O |  |  |
|  | Contract out new or existing services |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |  | O |  |
|  | Tiered Retirement Programs | $\bullet$ |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | O |  |
|  | Complete benefits audit |  | $\bullet$ |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |
|  | Establish an Internal Revenue Code (IRC) irrevocable trust fund to accumulate OPEB funds | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |
|  | Eliminate Retirement Sick Leave Buy-Back \& convert unused sick leave earned to PERS Service credit at time of retirement |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Elimination of a portion of the Money Purchase Pension Plan |  | $\bullet$ |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |
|  | Moving to a defined contribution plan, away from a defined benefit plan |  |  |  |  |  | O |  |
|  | Retirement Seminars | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Only pay for the employers' share (or +1 dependent) of health insurance costs |  |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
|  | Implement/increase employees and retirees' co-pay |  | - | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
|  | Medical insurance premium cap |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
|  | Implement employee share of health insurance premium |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |
|  | Medical "Opt-Out in lieu" payments of \$100 per month |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |
|  | Eliminate wellness program | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 12: "Big 7" Cost Containment Strategies (continued)

| Cost Containment Strategy |  | $\sum_{\substack{\mathbb{N}}}^{\mathbb{K}}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & \text { ㄷ } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 『 | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & x \\ & \vdots \\ & \vdots \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | Changes to Work Rules | O | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\mathrm{O}^{2}$ |  |  |
|  | Service cuts | - | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - | - | $\bullet$ |
|  | Fuel purchase contracts (long-term) in place ${ }^{3}$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |
|  | Joint fuel procurements |  |  |  | $\bullet$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |
|  | Fuel Hedge (or Hedge type) Fund |  |  |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ |
| $$ | Comprehensive review of operations to optimize service \& decrease travel time | $\bullet$ |  |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ | - | $\bigcirc$ |
|  | Reduce other agency contribution levels | O |  |  | $\bullet$ |  | O |  |
|  | Reduce work orders | $\bullet$ |  | O |  |  |  |  |
|  | Refinance outstanding debt to lower debt service costs |  | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |  |
|  | Create new agreements between operating partners | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  | $\bullet$ | 0 |  |  |
|  | JPB member agencies agreed to repay the District for their share of the original investment made in Caltrain ROW |  |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |
|  | Eliminate free employee parking | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Contract out aspects of operations |  |  | O |  | $\bullet$ | O | $\bullet$ |
|  | Conduct internal audit to identify cost control opportunities |  |  | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Improve fare recovery | $\bullet$ | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Voluntary cut in vendor contracts | $\bullet$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Increased efficiencies through technology (i.e., ETC, new banking collections, automated information, etc.) |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |
|  | Reduce administrative expenses (overhead) |  | $\bullet$ |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |
|  | Negotiate lower rent for new SF bus lot |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | Investigate elimination of comp time for some employees |  |  |  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  |  |

- Implemented

O Under Consideration

1. In September 2010, SFMTA restored 6.1 percent of the 10 percent service cut implemented in May 2010.
2. Golden Gate is not formally changing any work rules; however, the agency is always looking for ways to re-interpret existing contract language.
3. BART's "fuel" refers to traction electric power.

## Summary of Potential Regional Cost Savings

During the past several years, the region's transit agencies have implemented a wide range of cost-saving measures, including service reductions, employee furloughs and employee layoffs. Consistent with the key cost drivers analyses undertaken as part of the TSP, many measures have focused on controlling the cost of employee benefits. Table 13 summarizes several of the health insurance and pension cost containment strategies that have been implemented or are under consideration.

Financial Task Summary

Table 13: Sample Employee Benefit Cost Control Strategies

| Cost Control Strategy | Order of Magnitude Cost Savings (Annually) |
| :---: | :---: |
| HEALTH INSURANCE |  |
| Medical insurance cap ${ }^{1}$ | - Lowered retiree medical liability from $\$ 434$ million to $\$ 362$ million. <br> - Estimated on-going savings of $\$ 8$ million annually (as of 2013) |
| Agency pays a capped \% of health insurance costs for active employees ${ }^{2}$ | Every 5\% of costs shifted to employees saves \$1.2 million |
| Agency limits its share of premium costs to Employee + 1 Dependent for active employees ${ }^{2}$ | \$6 million in savings per year |
| PENSION |  |
| Create new pension tier for new hires ${ }^{3}$ | $\$ 7$ million (only produces significant savings in 30-year timeframe) |

Source: Agency Data

1. Based on BART labor agreement.
2. Based on a VTA proposal.
3. Based on an AC Transit proposal.

In addition, several Bay Area transit agencies have recently undertaken analyses of their work rules, and ways in which work rules could be altered to provide cost savings. Table 14 summarizes the results from these analyses. Additional detailed analysis of potential changes to work rules and the business model is being conducted and will be covered in a separate report.

Table 14: Potential Annual Savings Associated with Work Rules

| Area | Examples Of Issues Evaluated | Potential Annual Savings as \% of Operating Budget* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Service design and assignment | Layover allocation, spread premiums, part-time driver limits, weekly guarantee, break and travel time optimization, division consolidation. | $\sim 1 \%$ to 2\% |
| Crew scheduling |  |  |
| Daily service delivery | Reducing absenteeism and extra board | $\sim 1 \%$ |
| Business model | Outsourcing of specific routes/services | 2\% to 7\% |
| Multiple areas | Overtime rate, break rules, eliminating pay for time spent on union business | ~3\% |

Source: Based on agencies that completed recent analysis of work rule changes
As noted in the Staffing Levels section of this report, an analysis of agency staffing levels in the region compared to other major metropolitan areas indicates that the Bay Area uses a higher proportion of its operating funds for administrative expenses than other metropolitan areas. Additional analysis is needed to better understand administrative staffing levels and cost issues in the region and will be conducted as part of the institutional analysis.

Based on the analyses completed to date, preliminary cost savings estimates been developed, which provide a sense of the level of savings that could be achieved from applying cost savings measures across the region. This analysis was conducted by extrapolating individual agencies' cost savings to the whole region. Fringe benefits-specific cost containment strategies are detailed in Table 15, while all cost containment strategies explored for the region's potential cost drivers are detailed in Table 16.

In the context of an estimated region-wide annual operating deficit of $\$ 100$ million to $\$ 380$ million, savings measures such as these must play a significant role in restoring the region's transit systems to financial stability. Based on the analysis undertaken thus far, these types of measures could generate between $\$ 240$ million and $\$ 270$ million per year in cost savings. These estimates will be refined as the TSP advances.

## Table 15: Cost Containment Strategies with Estimated Cost Savings

| Category | Cost Control Strategy | Order of Magnitude Cost Savings |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Health <br> Insurance | Agency pays a capped \% of health insurance <br> costs for active employees (based on a VTA <br> proposal) | Every 5\% of costs shifted to employees <br> results in \$13 million in regional savings <br> $(4 \%$ of region's health insurance costs) |
| Health <br> Insurance | Agency limits its share of premium costs to <br> "Employee + 1 Dependent" for active employees <br> (based on a VTA proposal) | $\$ 66$ million (22\% of region's health <br> insurance costs) |
| Retirement | Create New Pension Tier for New Hires \|(based <br> on AC Transit proposal) | $\$ 44$ million (28\% of region's pension <br> costs, but only produces significant <br> savings in long-term) |
| All Fringe <br> Costs | Agencies Implement Strategies that Reduce <br> Agency Fringe Benefit Costs By 10\% or 20\% | $10 \%$ reduction in agency fringe benefit <br> costs requires \$5,500 per employee in <br> savings to be identified region-wide <br> $20 \%$ reduction in agency fringe benefit <br> costs requires \$11,000 per employee in <br> savings to be identified region-wide |

Table 16: Preliminary Cost Savings Estimates from Applying Cost Savings Strategies Region-Wide

| Area | Findings/Strategies Identified | Potential Savings |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fringe Benefits | Findings: Fringe benefits have increased significantly; accounts for $34 \%$ of operating costs <br> Strategies: Two-tiered pension system, employee contributions, cap agency contribution to medical insurance, limit coverage options | \$50-\$80 million |
| Work Rules ${ }^{1}$ | Findings: Premium pay data suggests further analysis could produce options for lowering operating costs <br> Strategies: Secure regional savings equal to $5 \%$ of operating costs through agency-specific efforts | \$80 million |
| Staffing Levels ${ }^{2}$ | Findings: Bay Area operators dedicate a higher percentage of operating budgets to administrative costs than peers; <br> Strategies: Reduce percentage of costs going to administration to be inline with peers | \$90 million |

1. More detailed analysis of work rules is available as part of a separate report..
2. Will be updated in future efforts of the TSP.

Appendix II outlines the approach and outcomes associated with a cost savings analysis that Santa Clara VTA recently underwent.

## Initial Findings and Next Steps

The financial analysis has analyzed the components of the region's transit operating costs, focusing on the Bay Area's "Big 7" agencies, and on identifying the key cost drivers behind the region's growth in operating costs from 1997 through 2008. As described previously, some of the identified cost drivers (e.g., operator base wages) appear to be within national norms and may not require additional analysis. Others (e.g., fringe benefits) are substantial cost drivers and should be explored aggressively for potential cost savings. Others (e.g., work rules, service changes) require additional analysis. Table 17 provides a summary of these findings.

Table 17: Summary of Cost Driver Findings

| Cost Drivers | Finding | Next Step |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Operator Wages | - Base wage rates appear reasonable | -No further base wage analysis. <br> See Work Rules |  |
| Non-Operator <br> Wages | -Base wage comparisons difficult due to <br> quantity of job classifications | •No further base wage analysis, <br> but further study about how <br> agencies classify and <br> compensate non-operator <br> employees |  |
| Fringe Benefits | -Annual increases commensurate with <br> operator wage increases | Significant issue in short \& long-term. <br> The region's OPEB costs are mostly <br> unfunded (\$1.32 billion unfunded) | -Recommend potential cost <br> containment strategies |
| Work Rules <br> (overtime, premium <br> pay, etc.) | -Potentially a cost driver. Initial analysis <br> indicate significant savings opportunities | -Analyze further as part of <br> service task |  |
| Service Changes | -Potentially a cost driver (slower vehicle <br> speeds require more vehicles, more <br> operators and higher operating costs to <br> maintain same frequency of service) | -Analyze further as part of <br> service task |  |
| Staffing Levels | -Potentially a cost driver <br> Bay Area average employee per service unit <br> provided is less than national average <br> Administration cost per service unit appears <br> higher | •Analyze further with <br> institutional task |  |

MTC has proposed a draft performance framework for consideration by the TSP Steering Committee. The draft financial vision underlying this framework is as follows:

A system that can cover its operating and capital costs through increased passengers and fare revenues, as well as more reliable streams of public funding.

The vision would be implemented through a series of financial principles and financial targets, which could be met, at least in part, by implementing financial strategies that have been described in this report (see Figure 14).

Figure 14: Implementation of Financial Vision


## Example Strategies

The following describes the three draft financial principles intended to implement the vision. Draft Principle \#1 focuses on improving operating efficiency. The intent would be to reduce the cost per hour of service when normalized for service hours. (See Figure 15).

Figure 15: Operating Efficiency Framework

a) Improve operating performance (speed, schedule efficiency, etc.)
b) Reduce fringe benefit costs (e.g. cost sharing/employee contributions, two-tiered pension programs)
c) Reduce overhead costs
d) Reduce overtime
e) Evaluate changes to business model for service delivery

The intent of draft Financial Principle \#2 is to control cost growth by keeping any real increases in operating cost per hour or operating cost per mile equal to or less than increases in the amount of service provided (see Figure 16).

Figure 16: Cost Control Framework

a) Reduce fringe benefit costs and long term liabilities (cost sharing/employee contributions, two-tiered pension programs, etc.)
b) Control growth in wages

The final principle, draft Financial Principle \#3, is to stabilize operating revenues (see Figure 17).

Figure 17: Stabilize Operating Revenues Framework

a) Secure increased and more reliable funding equal to $X \%$ of regional operating costs
b) Create regional operating reserve of $X \%$ annual operating costs as hedge against revenue fluctuations

a) Secure new revenue source dedicated to transit
b) Rely primarily on fare revenue from growth in passengers; index fares to inflation to minimize spikes in fares
c) Assume no real growth in sales tax revenue consistent with 1997 - 2009 experience
d) Reserve: manage cash flow to moderate impacts of unstable revenue and spiked pension payments

This interim report summarizes the cost analysis completed to date. There is more detailed analysis underway in several areas. As the TSP progresses, the project will return to the initial financial principles and targets discussed here in an iterative fashion as the project advances towards final recommendations at the end of 2011.

[^6]
## Appendix I-Inflation Calculations

The following describes the steps taken for all of the inflation calculations utilized in this analysis:

1. Deflate 2008 operating costs to 1997 dollars terms using change in Bay Area CPI for that period ( $38.9 \%$ change): 2008 costs $/ 1.389=2008$ costs in 1997 dollar terms
2. Calculate the inflation-adjusted percentage change between 1997 costs and the 2008 costs in 1997 dollar terms $=(90.6 \% / 38.9 \%)-1=37.2 \%$.

Results are:

- $38.9 \%$ inflation, from the Bay Area CPI in \#1
- $37.2 \%$ change in inflation-adjusted costs, calculated in \#2

The two combined inflation rates result in a $90.6 \%$ overall growth rate, due to the compounding effects of growth over time (i.e., growth upon growth). Compound growth is calculated by multiplying the two rates together, rather than adding them together, i.e., the $90.6 \%$ total change in operating costs $=$ inflation rate x change in inflation-adjusted costs or $(1+38.9 \%) *(1+37.2 \%)=(1+90.6 \%)$.

[^7]Mt $\begin{aligned} & \text { T R A A N S I T T } \\ & \text { SUSTAINABILITY }\end{aligned}$

## Appendix II - Case Study (Santa Clara VTA)

At the same time that the TSP process has been underway, transit agencies in the region have been identifying ways to address the imbalance between their operating expenses and operating revenues. Santa Clara VTA has been no exception. However, VTA took a different approach to developing longer-term fiscal solutions.

In response to a dramatic reduction in operating revenues caused by the economic recession, in December 2009, VTA’s Board of Directors established an "Ad Hoc Financial Recovery Committee" comprising three VTA Board members and stakeholders representing employee labor unions, local business organizations and VTA riders. The committee's mission was to provide the committee's recommended financial principles and savings targets by category to the full Board of Directors, which could be used to guide the development of FY2012-FY2013 biennial budget. Initially, the committee met monthly to review background information on VTA's operating revenues, expenses and 10-year financial projections, and begin considering draft financial principles and spending priorities. In August 2010, the committee met weekly to finalize its financial principles and develop recommended operating deficit reduction targets by category, which were approved by the committee on September 1, 2010. The committee presented its recommendations to the Board in October 2010, and the Board of Directors adopted final principles and targets on December 9, 2010.

## Financial Context - Trends in Revenues \& Expenses

The committee spent a considerable amount of time reviewing the trends in VTA's operating revenues and expenses, ${ }^{9}$ and projections of operating revenues and expenses for the next 10 years. Highlights of the changes that occurred between 2001 and 2009 include:
3. Sales tax revenues, which represent 70 percent of VTA operating revenues, had dropped 25 percent;
4. Service levels (as measured in vehicle revenue hours) fell 11 percent;
5. VTA employee counts were 18 percent lower;
6. Despite the reductions in service levels and employment, the total cost of wages and benefits had increased by 35 percent, and total compensation per employee had increased by 64 percent;
7. The increase in compensation per employee was driven primarily by increases in the cost of employee benefits:

- Wage costs per employee had increased by 42 percent, whereas
- Benefit costs per employee had increased by 123 percent.

The projections of VTA's structural operating deficit also were discussed in detail, and highlighted the uncertainty regarding future levels of sales tax revenue.

[^8]
## Expenditure Prioritization

In developing VTA's Biennial Operating Budget and associated financial plans, VTA determined that it would prioritize its activities in the following order:
8. Preserving the level of fixed route transit service and paratransit service provided to VTA riders to the greatest extent possible.
9. Activities that directly support the provision of transit service, i.e., only those core operating, management and administrative functions that are necessary and essential to support the provision of the existing level of transit service, both in terms of the types of functions required and level of resources needed to support service.
10. Support for Regional Partnerships (e.g., Caltrain, ACE, Dumbarton Express, etc.).
11. Activities that clearly contribute to increasing and diversifying VTA's operating funding.
12. Activities that provide information to riders, employees, stakeholders and the public.
13. Activities that would prudently and strategically expand VTA transit service, when sustainable revenues are available to support the service growth.

## Financial Principles

The Committee them developed the following six financial principles to guide the financial decision-making of the Agency:

## Principle 1: Operating Reserve at 15 Percent

VTA will take the necessary steps to protect its financial liquidity by building and maintaining an Operating Reserve equal to 15 percent of annual operating expenses, which is equal to just under two months of operating cash flow requirements. To the extent that the Operating Reserve level falls below the 15 percent target, during the next biennial budget process, VTA must identify measures necessary to reach the 15 percent threshold within a 3 -year period, and begin implementation of some or all of those measures during the next biennial budget process. However, to the extent possible, VTA should avoid the implementation of service reductions as a means of achieving the 15 -percent operating reserve target.

## Principle 2: Limit Use of Capital Funding for Operating Purposes

When determining whether to use all or a portion of its eligible Federal capital funding (specifically, Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307 and 5309 grant funds) for operating-related purposes, such as preventive maintenance, VTA should attempt to balance the needs of its day-to-day operations with its longer term needs to preserve, protect and renew its capital assets, and maintain VTA's vehicles, facilities and infrastructure in a "state of good repair." 100 percent of eligible FTA capital funding may be used for operating purposes, but should be reviewed on an annual basis. In addition, VTA's Board reaffirmed its prior policy that no more than 18.457 percent of its year 2000 Measure A sales tax revenues may be used for operating purposes, with the remainder to be used to finance the Measure A capital improvement program.

## Principle 3: Control Cost Growth

VTA will take appropriate steps to ensure that its operating costs do not grow faster than its reasonably anticipated operating revenues. Unless required by Federal, state or local law, measures that increase operating expenses should not be implemented until the funding for those increases has been identified with reasonable certainty.

## Principle 4: Achieve Internal Efficiencies

Efficiencies should be achieved through a variety of systemic cost reduction actions, which are not one-time in nature. Such actions may include, but are not limited to, the elimination of unfilled budgeted positions, not filling staff positions that become vacant through attrition, other staff reductions, consolidation of services, reductions in ongoing cost commitments, etc. Such reductions will be achieved to the greatest degree possible in a manner consistent with the preservation of service.

## Principle 5: Negotiate Sustainable Bargaining Agreements

In developing cost reduction strategies and plans, and in negotiating labor agreements, VTA will work collaboratively with its employee bargaining units to identify ways to protect VTA's financial condition and liquidity, including ways to control the cost to VTA of employee benefit programs for bargaining unit and non-represented employees, while also preserving the quality and integrity of VTA services. Consideration will be given to partnering with Santa Clara County and other cities within the county to provide the greatest leverage in negotiating with benefit providers.

## Principle 6: Use of Contracted Services

14. VTA will periodically evaluate the use of contracted services for the delivery of service on selected VTA transit routes, and the delivery of other services utilized in the course of operating and supporting VTA transit service. In making decisions regarding the use of contracted services, VTA should compare the expected impacts on cost, safety, reliability and customer service associated with contracted service delivery, and any related long term financial risks, against the performance and cost of utilizing VTA staff in delivering those same services.
15. With input from stakeholders, contracting principles should be developed and designed to consider the risks and rewards of contracting in and out. These principles should consider multiple service delivery options and contain a method for rigorous cost benefit analysis.
16. This principle includes the provision of contracted services with partner agencies such as Caltrain, Altamont Commuter Express, Dumbarton Express, etc. Such contributions to be reduced proportionally to the total of VTA's annual operating deficit.
17. VTA will continually work with contracted service providers (OUTREACH, Santa Clara County Sheriff's Department, Allied Barton, etc.) to maximize efficiency and control costs.

## Deficit Reduction Targets

After much discussion regarding the potential for setting deficit reduction targets using specific dollar amounts or ranges, the Board of Directors opted to approve targets by category based on percentages of the deficit.

## Table II-1: Summary of Annual Deficit Reduction Targets by Category

| Category | Related Principle | Proposed Deficit Reduction <br> Target Range |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Internal Efficiencies | Principle 4 | $12.5-37.5 \%$ |
| Employee Expenses | Principle 5 | $12.5-32.5 \%$ |
| Service Delivery | Principle 6 | $12.5-30 \%$ |
| New Revenue | Revenue Enhancement Committee | $0-50 \%$ |
| Overall Annual Savings Target | Principle 3 | $100 \%$ |
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Figure 1
Source: NTD (1997-2008)

| "Big 7" |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1997 |  | 2008 |  | 2008 unadjusted |  |
| Operating Costs | \$ | 958,806 | \$ | 1,280,813 | \$ | 1,779,029 |
| Revenue Vehicle Hours |  | 8,398 |  | 9,624 |  | - |
| Unlinked Passenger Trips |  | 441,384 |  | 471,851 |  |  |

Not including ferry for GGBHTD or cable car for SFMTA
Figures do not inclde Paratransit service
Figures do not inclde Paratransit service
Adjust to 1997 \$
Operating Costs

## Figure 2 amd Table 1 Source: NTD (1997-2008)



Adjusted to 1997 \$

## CPI -

CPI - Adjusted for 1997

| Agency | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | Percent Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BART | \$163.49 | \$177.59 | \$173.77 | \$170.90 | \$167.83 | \$164.47 | \$161.98 | \$195.88 | \$228.80 | \$231.16 | \$251.84 | \$256.12 | 44\% |
| AC Transit | \$94.94 | \$94.12 | \$104.56 | \$116.61 | \$123.54 | \$140.24 | \$150.20 | \$106.90 | \$112.79 | \$139.16 | \$145.85 | \$146.25 | 55\% |
| Santa Clara VTA | \$110.55 | \$115.12 | \$116.90 | \$131.89 | \$137.91 | \$163.03 | \$171.96 | \$164.41 | \$170.44 | \$172.33 | \$173.14 | \$170.87 | 48\% |
| SamTrans | \$87.73 | \$90.68 | \$86.01 | \$98.32 | \$105.13 | \$109.21 | \$105.82 | \$118.14 | \$121.65 | \$131.36 | \$139.05 | \$148.73 | 64\% |
| CalTrain | \$364.18 | \$350.51 | \$357.74 | \$384.16 | \$389.56 | \$325.00 | \$256.11 | \$267.26 | \$310.89 | \$313.92 | \$317.47 | \$291.01 | -17\% |
| SFMTA | \$94.17 | \$99.89 | \$110.58 | \$117.67 | \$122.19 | \$127.06 | \$122.07 | \$124.77 | \$134.80 | \$143.04 | \$154.72 | \$170.20 | 70\% |
| Golden Gate | \$100.41 | \$106.17 | \$112.29 | \$121.30 | \$128.88 | \$134.12 | \$150.40 | \$155.78 | \$167.85 | \$169.96 | \$176.91 | \$179.78 | 69\% |



Operating Costs


Revenue Vehicle Hours

Figure 4. Aggregate Percentage Change in Big 7 Operating Cost, Service and Passenger Increases (1997-2008)
Source: NTD (1997-2008)

|  | Large Operator Totals |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Operating Costs | Revenue Vehicle Hours | Unlinked Passenger Trips |
| All Bus | 26.7\% | 4.0\% | -8.2\% |
| Heavy Rail | 34.0\% | 37.9\% | 43.2\% |
| Commuter Rail | 40.0\% | 62.8\% | 55.0\% |
| Light Rail | 79.5\% | 74.5\% | 39.8\% |
| Total Change | 180.2\% | 179.2\% | 129.8\% |


AC Transit

| Operating Costs |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Percent Change } \\ & 97-08 \text { (c) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Average Annual Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1997 | 2008 |  |  |
| Motor Bus | \$142,921.03 | \$204,315.61 | 43.0\% | 3.3\% |


| Revenue Vehicle Miles |  | 2008 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Percent Change } \\ 97-08 \text { (c) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Average Annual Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mode | 1997 |  |  |  |
| Motor Bus | 19,428.19 | 21,995.90 | 13.2\% | 1.1\% |


| Revenue Vehicle Hours |  | 2008 | Percent Change | Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mode | 1997 |  | 97-08 (c) | Annual Change |
| Motor Bus | 1,620.81 | 1,870.20 | 15.4\% | 1.3\% |


bART


## Caltrain

| Operating Costs |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Percent Change } \\ & 97-08 \text { (c) } \end{aligned}$ | AverageAnnual Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1997 | 2008 |  |  |
| Motor Bus | \$0.00 | \$2,897.01 | -- | -- |
| Commuter Rail | \$43,141.34 | \$60,417.19 | 40.0\% | 3.1\% |



## SamTrans




## Santa Clara VTA


Figure 5
Source: NTD (2009)
Cost per Vehicle Service Hour - Actual \$

| Golden Gate | $\$ 185$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Sam Trans directly operates $\sim 75 \%$ of service | $\$ 171$ |
| SFMTA | $\$ 166$ |
| AC Transit | $\$ 156$ |
| VTA | $\$ 154$ |
| SamTrans contracted $\sim 25 \%$ of service | $\$ 111$ |
| Santa Rosa | $\$ 107$ |
| CCCTA | $\$ 100$ |
| FAST | $\$ 99$ |
| LAVTA | $\$ 92$ |

Figure 6
Source: $\operatorname{NTD}$ (1997-2008)

| $\stackrel{\square}{\circ}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ลิํํ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 竞 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\square}{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\square}{\text { ¢ }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{9}{2}$ |  |  |  | స <br>  |  |  |
| \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Percentage of Systemwide Operating Costs by Object Class (000's)

Systemwide Operating Costs by Object Class (000's)

| \% |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% |  |  |
| \% |  |  |
| \% |  |  |
| $\stackrel{8}{8}$ |  |  |
| \% |  |  |
| \% |  |  |
| \% |  |  |
| \% |  |  |
| \% |  |  |
| \% |  |  |
| \% |  |  |
|  |  |  |


| Obiext class | 1997 | 198 | 1999 | 200 | 201 | 202 | 203 | 209 | 200 | 206 | 200 | 208 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ${ }_{\text {sis3,5122 }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | S27, 526,76 |  | 529266 |
|  |  |  |  | ${ }_{534}$ |  |  | S461, |  |  |  |  |  |
| Seseses |  |  |  | S9,717, | Sios, 39 | S118,20 | 598,38 |  |  | S110,3 | coill |  |
|  |  | S602 |  | 588,954 | 50,272 | 58,38 | S6, 518 |  | 5566120 | S6, | S88,29 |  |
|  |  |  | ${ }_{5} 529$ | ¢4, |  | 39,3, | cose |  |  | Stion |  | 为 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Storase |  |  | St, 512.414 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {S19,998, }}$ | 22,48883 | S1, 8 ST, 4 |  | 526,7 | ${ }_{5}^{56,03,48}$ | 529,170000 | 22572 |
| Stion |  | , | , |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

##  <br> 


Percentage of Systemwide Operating Costs by Object Class (000's)

| $\begin{array}{\|c} \mid \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | \% \% |
| ัล |  | $\stackrel{\otimes x}{P}$ |
| - |  |  |
| \% |  |  |
| ${ }^{\circ}$ |  |  |
| \% |  |  |
| \% |  | 遃菏 |
| สั |  |  |
| ธ |  |  |
| ¿ั |  | \% \% \% ¢ ¢ |
|  |  |  |
| \% |  |  |
| § |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Figure 7
Source: Bureau of Labor \& Statistics and DASH \& Associates

|  | National | California | Regional | AC Transit | SFMTA | VTA | Golden Gate | SamTrans | BART |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| May. 2001 | 16.35 | 18.14 | 22.12 | 19.34 | 22.44 | 22.55 | 18.43 | 20.95 | 23.84 |
| May. 2002 | 17.10 | 19.06 | 23.71 | 20.07 | 23.99 | 23.64 | 20.00 | 21.58 |  |
| May. 2003 | 17.41 | 19.54 | 24.15 | 22.29 | 24.56 | 24.84 | 20.90 | 21.58 |  |
| May. 2004 | 17.80 | 19.96 | 24.79 | 23.04 | 25.45 | 25.15 | 21.74 | 22.44 |  |
| May. 2005 | 18.21 | 20.44 | 25.28 | 23.04 | 25.83 | 26.12 | 21.74 | 23.79 |  |
| May. 2006 | 18.84 | 21.24 | 26.33 | 23.73 | 26.50 | 26.45 | 22.17 | 24.27 |  |
| May. 2007 | 19.56 | 22.11 | 27.79 | 24.56 | 26.77 | 26.99 | 22.61 | 24.87 |  |
| May. 2008 | 20.32 | 23.12 | 29.05 | 24.93 | 27.31 | 27.61 | 23.29 | 25.62 |  |
| May. 2009 | 20.90 | 23.82 | 29.78 | 25.30 | 27.92 | 28.44 | 23.99 | 26.45 | 30.22 |
| Agency | 28\% | 31\% | 35\% | 31\% | 24\% | 26\% | 30\% | 26\% | 27\% |
| National |  |  |  | 28\% | 28\% | 28\% | 28\% | 28\% | 28\% |
| California |  |  |  | 31\% | 31\% | 31\% | 31\% | 31\% | 31\% |
| Regional |  |  |  | 35\% | 35\% | 35\% | 35\% | 35\% | 35\% |
| CPI |  |  |  | 18\% | 18\% | 18\% | 18\% | 18\% | 18\% |

2008 NTD Non-Operator Wages Excluding Paratansit, Cable Car, Ferry Boat, and Motorbus (for BART and Caltrain only). DO type of service only.

| Relevant Information Only <br> (Appropriate Modes and TOS Excluded) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agency Name | Mode | Service_C | Expense Category | Other_Sal_Wage_Amt |
| BART | HR | DO | Vehicle Operations | \$60,060,687 |
| BART | HR | DO | Vehicle Maintenance | \$40,467,406 |
| BART | HR | DO | Non-Vehicle Maintenance | \$50,574,506 |
| BART | HR | DO | General Administration | \$44,817,047 |
| SamTrans | MB | DO | Vehicle Operations | \$1,810,828 |
| SamTrans | MB | DO | Vehicle Maintenance | \$5,380,993 |
| SamTrans | MB | DO | Non-Vehicle Maintenance | \$374,274 |
| SamTrans | MB | DO | General Administration | \$9,027,973 |
| VTA | LR | DO | Vehicle Operations | \$2,273,896 |
| VTA | LR | DO | Vehicle Maintenance | \$6,514,623 |
| VTA | LR | DO | Non-Vehicle Maintenance | \$5,539,329 |
| VTA | LR | DO | General Administration | \$2,139,921 |
| VTA | MB | DO | Vehicle Operations | \$9,890,710 |
| VTA | MB | DO | Vehicle Maintenance | \$20,219,818 |
| VTA | MB | DO | Non-Vehicle Maintenance | \$2,104,356 |
| VTA | MB | DO | General Administration | \$7,083,093 |
| AC Transit | MB | DO | Vehicle Operations | \$10,830,002 |
| AC Transit | MB | DO | Vehicle Maintenance | \$21,644,824 |
| AC Transit | MB | DO | Non-Vehicle Maintenance | \$2,484,345 |
| AC Transit | MB | DO | General Administration | \$18,934,233 |
| SFMTA | LR | DO | Vehicle Operations | \$10,623,737 |
| SFMTA | LR | DO | Vehicle Maintenance | \$27,664,213 |
| SFMTA | LR | DO | Non-Vehicle Maintenance | \$8,493,266 |
| SFMTA | LR | DO | General Administration | \$7,790,987 |
| SFMTA | MB | DO | Vehicle Operations | \$10,785,339 |
| SFMTA | MB | DO | Vehicle Maintenance | \$20,442,322 |
| SFMTA | MB | DO | Non-Vehicle Maintenance | \$305,980 |
| SFMTA | MB | DO | General Administration | \$10,766,242 |
| SFMTA | TB | DO | Vehicle Operations | \$7,184,874 |
| SFMTA | TB | DO | Vehicle Maintenance | \$9,312,548 |
| SFMTA | TB | DO | Non-Vehicle Maintenance | \$4,920,118 |
| SFMTA | TB | DO | General Administration | \$6,437,075 |
| Golden Gate | MB | DO | Vehicle Operations | \$2,110,122 |
| Golden Gate | MB | DO | Vehicle Maintenance | \$3,677,968 |
| Golden Gate | MB | DO | Non-Vehicle Maintenance | \$684,393 |
| Golden Gate | MB | DO | General Administration | \$3,810,804 |


| Total | Vehicle Operations | $\$ 115,570,195$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Vehicle Maintenance | $\$ 155,324,715$ |
|  | Non-Vehicle Maintenance | $\$ 75,480,567$ |
|  | General Administration | $\$ 110,807,375$ |


| Total with maintenance combined | Vehicle Operations | $\$ 115,570,195$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Vehicle and Non-Vehicle Ma | $\$ 230,805,282$ |
|  | General Administration | $\$ 110,807,375$ |




Figure 9
Source: NTD (1997-2008)


Figures 10 \& 11
Sources: Agency Combined Annual Financial Reports (CAFRs);
Pew Center on the States report entitled "Trillion Dollar Gap" dated February 2010




| Entity | \% of OPEB Liabilities <br> Funded |
| :--- | :---: |
| Alameda County | $76 \%$ |
| San Mateo County | $50 \%$ |
| VTA | $46 \%$ |
| Private Industry [1] | $22 \%$ |
| BART | $11 \%$ |
| City of San Jose | $11 \%$ |
| AC Transit | $8 \%$ |
| Average of U.S. State |  |
| Governments [2] | $7 \%$ |
| Santa Clara County | $5 \%$ |
| Golden Gate | $4 \%$ |
| Samtrans | $2 \%$ |
| City of Oakland | $0 \%$ |
| SFMTA | $0 \%$ |
| Marin County | $0 \%$ |
| State of California [3] | $0 \%$ |


| Peak to Base Ratio by Agency | Data Source | 2008 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| BART | NTD - HR | 2.12 |
| Samtrans | NTD - MB | 1.52 |
| Santa Clara VTA | NTD - MB \& LR | 1.48 |
| AC Transit | NTD - MB | 1.17 |
| SFMTA | NTD - MB, TB, \& LR | 1.46 |
| Golden Gate | NTD - MB | 4.00 |
| Caltrain | NTD - CR | 1.55 |


Figure 13
Source: NTD (2008)


Pay to Platform Ratio (2008)

Tables 1, 2,4,7
Source: NTD (1997-2008)

| CP1- Adiusted for 1997 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 160.38 | 165.55 | ${ }_{172.47}$ | ${ }_{180.18}$ | ${ }_{189.93}$ | 192.98 | ${ }^{196.45}$ | 198.81 | 202.70 | 209.24 | 216.05 | 222.77 |
|  | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.08 | 1.12 | 1.18 | 1.20 | 1.22 | 1.24 | 1.26 | 1.30 | 1.35 | 1.39 |
| AC Transit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1997 | 1988 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| Operator's Wage | \$39,337.96 | \$39,590,78 | \$41,527.96 | \$46,062,03 | \$53,996,91 | \$57,116.06 | \$59,68, 17 | \$58,31.25 | \$56,040.38 | \$58,210.58 | \$61,279,20 | \$63,017.80 |
| Other Wages | \$31,566.36 | \$34,673.38 | \$35,638.94 | \$39,447,74 | \$43,195.00 | \$46,604.41 | \$49,26.49 | \$45,31.08 | \$45,529.35 | \$48,391.80 | \$51,73,40 | \$53,98.70 |
| Fringe Benefits | \$40,316.74 | \$44,402.07 | \$51,630.79 | \$57,23,62 | \$60,466.10 | \$71,755.41 | \$92,091.93 | \$80,176.28 | \$82,243,17 | 599,249,7 | \$95,730.80 | \$101, 486.00 |
| Serices | \$9,035.98 | \$10,599.04 | \$11,386.55 | \$13,710.50 | \$15,704.91 | \$15,73.46 | \$14,50.98 | \$15,58,54 | \$16,27.64 | \$18,25.61 | \$20,08,20 | \$17,707,2 |
| Fuel and Lube | \$4,892.90 | \$4,190.24 | \$3,708.61 | \$5,602.48 | \$7,801.46 | \$6,612.34 | 57,881.54 | \$7,952.39 | 510,088.43 | \$13,86, 3 | \$14,596.40 | \$18,20.70 |
| Tries and Others | \$10,789.19 | \$8,436,33 | 57,88.50 | \$8,832.20 | \$9,733.98 | \$9,653.97 | \$9,956.54 | 57,727.68 | \$9,629.61 | \$9,798.28 | \$11,732.20 | \$12,379.30 |
| Utilities | \$1,916.99 | \$2,164.65 | \$2,134,25 | \$2,253.73 | \$2,722.07 | \$3,148.48 | \$3,224,99 | \$3,005.56 | \$2,748.15 | \$2,983.44 | \$2,861.70 | \$3,117.90 |
| Casualty and Labilities | \$2,982.61 | \$2,536.15 | \$3,100.92 | \$1,944.08 | \$1,083,77 | \$4,331.63 | \$6,839.71 | 54,893.69 | \$4,315.65 | \$7,086.76 | \$6,76,80 | \$8,893.70 |
| Purch. Trans. in Report | \$524.83 | 5718.84 | \$598.05 | 5634.76 | \$683,22 | \$1,026.33 | \$1,190.99 | \$1,235.66 | \$1,062.15 | \$0.00 | \$17,857.00 | \$25,976.10 |
| PT Filing Separate Report | \$5,712.62 | \$9,299, 34 | \$8,39,33 | \$11,281.29 | \$13,998.69 | \$16,141.12 | \$16,378.17 | \$16,954.84 | \$16,859.94 | \$16,802.20 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Other | \$2,50.58 | \$2,108.86 | \$2,327.78 | .046.83 |  | \$2,796.17 | 53,035.98 | \$2,521.69 |  | 53,542.57 | S5,308.00 | \$5,613.80 |
| Expense Transerse |  | \$555.03 | -5494.87 | -5713.65 | -5692.31 | -5833.84 | -582.64 | S1,052.12 | \$882.71 | -5893.22 | 5966.40 | S51,183.90 |
| Total | \$149, 588.47 | \$158,07.66 | \$167,84,.81 | \$190,35.61 | \$211,288.36] | \$234,083.54 | \$262,60,86] | \$242,64,52] | \$247,324.51 | \$270,40.13 | 5286,95,39 | \$309,927.30 |

[^9]
Tables 1, 2, 4, 7
Source: NTD (1997-2008)

| BART |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| Operator's Wages | \$14,258.47 | \$15,425.67 | \$15,654.37 | \$17,479.28 | \$18,475.74 | \$19,114.67 | \$20,380.74 | \$22,008.23 | \$24,077.03 | \$23,549.12 | \$23,550.10 | \$26,471.60 |
| Other Wages | \$134,864.42 | \$145,400.63 | \$144,521.29 | \$155,203.07 | \$164,621.10 | \$174,041.43 | \$172,940.35 | \$185,427.38 | \$188,678.62 | \$188,505.15 | \$188,842.10 | \$195,919.60 |
| Fringe Benefits | \$70,647.39 | \$83,127.84 | \$87,867.93 | \$84,907.59 | \$90,932.59 | \$93,994.68 | \$97,740.92 | \$106,125.69 | \$137,440.74 | \$139,605.22 | \$149,249.00 | \$179,008.70 |
| Services | \$18,517.27 | \$23,245.61 | \$25,037.58 | \$27,235.69 | \$32,577.92 | \$26,443.29 | \$23,800.86 | \$29,677.24 | \$29,606.59 | \$28,576.91 | \$35,511.50 | \$36,625.20 |
| Fuel and Lube | \$497.44 | \$525.18 | \$484.52 | \$616.44 | \$776.78 | \$630.11 | \$668.13 | \$805.55 | \$922.54 | \$1,130.74 | \$1,212.10 | \$1,498.70 |
| Tires and Others | \$17,527.21 | \$18,050.10 | \$19,181.02 | \$19,727.61 | \$21,756.26 | \$20,122.19 | \$17,553.25 | \$19,840.18 | \$20,664.07 | \$21,415.95 | \$25,572.70 | \$29,232.50 |
| Utilities | \$19,925.28 | \$19,760.07 | \$19,338.85 | \$22,010.33 | \$21,463.05 | \$22,539.12 | \$24,153.23 | \$28,242.17 | \$22,043.23 | \$24,941.22 | \$38,659.60 | \$39,273.50 |
| Casualty and Liabilities | \$8,799.74 | \$10,898.39 | \$5,305.74 | \$7,949.56 | \$6,590.62 | \$8,499.65 | \$10,058.60 | \$11,932.23 | \$13,063.92 | \$14,766.61 | \$16,777.40 | \$6,417.20 |
| Purch. Transp. in Report | \$7,621.03 | \$2,201.57 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$8,022.70 | \$0.00 |
| PT Filing Separate Report | \$2,745.74 | \$4,282.19 | \$4,651.85 | \$5,192.49 | \$6,339.00 | \$7,251.81 | \$7,309.65 | \$7,572.16 | \$7,590.93 | \$7,548.82 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Other | \$5,633.06 | \$6,506.74 | \$7,068.16 | \$7,600.67 | \$9,589.68 | \$9,115.62 | \$10,134.45 | \$12,694.51 | \$14,545.72 | \$16,322.14 | \$17,250.90 | \$6,540.80 |
| Expense Transfers[] | -\$33,300.05 | -\$33,211.60 | -\$35,019.02 | -\$33,124.08 | -\$39,039.18 | -\$43,383.66 | -\$45,472.89 | -\$41,542.58 | -\$38,983.99 | -\$38,481.09 | -\$37,542.10 | -\$42,000.80 |
| Total | \$267,736.99 | \$296,212.40 | \$294,092.29 | \$314,798.65 | \$334,083.54 | \$338,368.89 | \$339,267.28 | \$382,782.76 | \$419,649.39 | \$427,880.78 | \$467,105.99 | \$478,986.90 |


| BART (2008 \$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| Operator's Wages | \$14,258.47 | \$14,944.25 | \$14,557.24 | \$15,558.52 | \$15,601.61 | \$15,886.38 | \$16,639.35 | \$17,754.56 | \$19,050.19 | \$18,050.35 | \$17,482.19 | \$19,058.25 |
| Other Wages | \$134,864.42 | \$140,862.81 | \$134,392.61 | \$138,148.11 | \$139,012.25 | \$144,647.47 | \$141,192.86 | \$149,588.61 | \$149,286.06 | \$144,488.83 | \$140,185.10 | \$141,052.46 |
| Fringe Benefits | \$70,647.39 | \$80,533.49 | \$81,709.77 | \$75,577.26 | \$76,786.90 | \$78,119.86 | \$79,798.15 | \$85,614.08 | \$108,745.69 | \$107,007.13 | \$110,793.55 | \$128,877.44 |
| Services | \$18,517.27 | \$22,520.13 | \$23,282.84 | \$24,242.81 | \$27,510.02 | \$21,977.27 | \$19,431.62 | \$23,941.32 | \$23,425.29 | \$21,904.15 | \$26,361.62 | \$26,368.34 |
| Fuel and Lube | \$497.44 | \$508.79 | \$450.56 | \$548.70 | \$655.94 | \$523.69 | \$545.48 | \$649.85 | \$729.93 | \$866.71 | \$899.79 | \$1,078.99 |
| Tires and Others | \$17,527.21 | \$17,486.77 | \$17,836.73 | \$17,559.78 | \$18,371.81 | \$16,723.74 | \$14,330.92 | \$16,005.54 | \$16,349.80 | \$16,415.28 | \$18,983.65 | \$21,045.96 |
| Utilities | \$19,925.28 | \$19,143.38 | \$17,983.50 | \$19,591.66 | \$18,124.21 | \$18,732.47 | \$19,719.31 | \$22,783.62 | \$17,441.01 | \$19,117.40 | \$28,698.58 | \$28,274.98 |
| Casualty and Liabilities | \$8,799.74 | \$10,558.26 | \$4,933.89 | \$7,076.00 | \$5,565.36 | \$7,064.14 | \$8,212.09 | \$9,626.01 | \$10,336.42 | \$11,318.58 | \$12,454.54 | \$4,620.07 |
| Purch. Transp. in Report | \$7,621.03 | \$2,132.86 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$5,955.57 | \$0.00 |
| PT Filing Separate Report | \$2,745.74 | \$4,148.54 | \$4,325.83 | \$4,621.89 | \$5,352.89 | \$6,027.05 | \$5,967.78 | \$6,108.64 | \$6,006.09 | \$5,786.15 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Other | \$5,633.06 | \$6,303.67 | \$6,572.79 | \$6,765.44 | \$8,097.89 | \$7,576.07 | \$8,274.02 | \$10,240.96 | \$11,508.85 | \$12,510.89 | \$12,806.04 | \$4,709.05 |
| Expense Transfers[ | -\$33,300.05 | -\$32,175.09 | -\$32,564.73 | -\$29,484.14 | -\$32,966.15 | -\$36,056.57 | -\$37,125.21 | -\$33,513.37 | -\$30,844.87 | -\$29,495.68 | -\$27,869.01 | -\$30,238.51 |
| Total | \$267,736.99 | \$286,967.88 | \$273,481.03 | \$280,206.03 | \$282,112.71 | \$281,221.56 | \$276,986.37 | \$308,799.80 | \$332,034.46 | \$327,969.79 | \$346,751.61 | \$344,847.04 |


Tables 1, 2, 4, 7
Source: NTD (1997-2008)

| Golden Gate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| Operator's Wages | \$15,542.84 | \$15,885.96 | \$16,691.69 | \$18,693.39 | \$20,118.66 | \$22,018.49 | \$22,013.79 | \$19,690.51 | \$17,519.44 | \$17,695.16 | \$18,090.20 | \$19,371.10 |
| Other Wages | \$11,707.84 | \$11,978.24 | \$12,532.82 | \$13,033.43 | \$13,189.28 | \$13,405.92 | \$13,780.66 | \$11,911.80 | \$12,630.09 | \$12,908.17 | \$13,125.30 | \$14,541.40 |
| Fringe Benefits | \$16,983.35 | \$19,204.94 | \$20,910.78 | \$20,423.41 | \$22,553.00 | \$25,252.32 | \$30,195.16 | \$28,848.85 | \$29,074.56 | \$28,251.33 | \$28,518.00 | \$28,367.90 |
| Services | \$2,899.74 | \$3,032.96 | \$3,664.67 | \$3,363.28 | \$4,601.45 | \$4,264.65 | \$3,842.17 | \$3,187.69 | \$3,835.38 | \$3,953.00 | \$4,437.90 | \$5,394.60 |
| Fuel and Lube | \$2,217.70 | \$1,850.70 | \$1,730.07 | \$2,810.99 | \$3,585.79 | \$2,800.35 | \$3,247.05 | \$3,608.49 | \$5,269.68 | \$6,471.78 | \$6,690.10 | \$8,744.40 |
| Tires and Others | \$2,874.43 | \$2,615.46 | \$2,805.24 | \$2,908.45 | \$3,051.41 | \$3,115.14 | \$2,868.55 | \$3,021.51 | \$2,457.64 | \$2,625.97 | \$2,680.90 | \$3,055.50 |
| Utilities | \$508.59 | \$511.40 | \$508.10 | \$551.35 | \$581.18 | \$772.31 | \$790.81 | \$739.54 | \$679.30 | \$692.31 | \$708.50 | \$608.90 |
| Casualty and Liabilities | \$2,673.86 | \$2,402.15 | \$1,973.53 | \$2,073.06 | \$2,128.86 | \$2,450.87 | \$4,208.39 | \$3,685.31 | \$3,297.21 | \$3,122.62 | \$2,815.60 | \$1,970.10 |
| Purch. Transp. in Report | \$2,301.35 | \$2,351.28 | \$2,500.50 | \$2,590.29 | \$2,940.53 | \$3,177.61 | \$3,558.16 | \$3,735.18 | \$4,160.15 | \$4,172.72 | \$4,525.80 | \$4,850.90 |
| PT Filing Separate Report | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Other | \$482.93 | \$437.13 | \$537.73 | \$540.44 | \$709.75 | \$523.80 | \$504.81 | \$788.55 | \$731.66 | \$995.86 | \$1,060.00 | \$1,265.40 |
| Expense Transfers@ | -\$15.43 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Total | \$58,177.19 | \$60,270.23 | \$63,855.13 | \$66,988.09 | \$73,459.92 | \$77,781.47 | \$85,009.55 | \$79,217.42 | \$79,655.11 | \$80,888.91 | \$82,652.10 | \$88,170.10 |


| Golden Gate (2008 \$) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| Operator's Wages | \$15,542.84 | \$15,390.18 | \$15,521.86 | \$16,639.21 | \$16,988.96 | \$18,299.78 | \$17,972.62 | \$15,884.80 | \$13,861.71 | \$13,563.31 | \$13,429.08 | \$13,946.24 |
| Other Wages | \$11,707.84 | \$11,604.41 | \$11,654.47 | \$11,601.21 | \$11,137.52 | \$11,141.79 | \$11,250.88 | \$9,609.53 | \$9,993.17 | \$9,894.08 | \$9,743.44 | \$10,469.09 |
| Fringe Benefits | \$16,983.35 | \$18,605.57 | \$19,445.26 | \$18,179.12 | \$19,044.60 | \$20,987.44 | \$24,652.09 | \$23,273.04 | \$23,004.33 | \$21,654.59 | \$21,170.06 | \$20,423.49 |
| Services | \$2,899.74 | \$2,938.30 | \$3,407.84 | \$2,993.69 | \$3,885.64 | \$3,544.39 | \$3,136.85 | \$2,571.58 | \$3,034.62 | \$3,029.97 | \$3,294.43 | \$3,883.85 |
| Fuel and Lube | \$2,217.70 | \$1,792.94 | \$1,608.82 | \$2,502.10 | \$3,027.97 | \$2,327.40 | \$2,650.97 | \$2,911.05 | \$4,169.47 | \$4,960.61 | \$4,966.33 | \$6,295.54 |
| Tires and Others | \$2,874.43 | \$2,533.83 | \$2,608.63 | \$2,588.85 | \$2,576.73 | \$2,589.02 | \$2,341.95 | \$2,437.53 | \$1,944.53 | \$2,012.80 | \$1,990.14 | \$2,199.81 |
| Utilities | \$508.59 | \$495.44 | \$472.49 | \$490.76 | \$490.77 | \$641.87 | \$645.64 | \$596.60 | \$537.48 | \$530.66 | \$525.95 | \$438.38 |
| Casualty and Liabilities | \$2,673.86 | \$2,327.18 | \$1,835.22 | \$1,845.26 | \$1,797.69 | \$2,036.94 | \$3,435.83 | \$2,973.02 | \$2,608.81 | \$2,393.48 | \$2,090.13 | \$1,418.37 |
| Purch. Transp. in Report | \$2,301.35 | \$2,277.90 | \$2,325.26 | \$2,305.65 | \$2,483.09 | \$2,640.94 | \$2,904.97 | \$3,013.26 | \$3,291.59 | \$3,198.38 | \$3,359.68 | \$3,492.41 |
| PT Filing Separate Report | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Other | \$482.93 | \$423.49 | \$500.04 | \$481.05 | \$599.34 | \$435.34 | \$412.14 | \$636.14 | \$578.90 | \$763.32 | \$786.88 | \$911.03 |
| Expense Transfers] | -\$15.43 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Total | \$58,177.19 | \$58,389.25 | \$59,379.89 | \$59,626.90 | \$62,032.32 | \$64,644.91 | \$69,403.94 | \$63,906.55 | \$63,024.61 | \$62,001.20 | \$61,356.13 | \$63,478.20 |


Tables 1, 2, 4, 7
Source: NTD (1997-2008)

| SFMTA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| Operator's Wages | \$80,392.25 | \$83,026.22 | \$83,666.00 | \$92,583.89 | \$101,963.13 | \$111,562.24 | \$112,468.15 | \$118,204.43 | \$118,089.94 | \$117,595.67 | \$119,504.10 | \$128,841.50 |
| Other Wages | \$67,058.56 | \$74,210.38 | \$84,318.59 | \$95,736.66 | \$103,549.81 | \$110,489.15 | \$111,655.93 | \$109,274.31 | \$103,717.14 | \$107,836.60 | \$131,684.00 | \$141,039.40 |
| Fringe Benefits | \$85,692.63 | \$98,813.54 | \$115,243.28 | \$112,878.93 | \$122,474.51 | \$148,342.44 | \$156,962.23 | \$149,159.00 | \$149,453.75 | \$149,949.72 | \$158,427.10 | \$200,500.60 |
| Services | \$12,753.67 | \$13,767.98 | \$19,693.23 | \$24,054.46 | \$25,636.71 | \$31,559.77 | \$27,348.56 | \$29,153.02 | \$34,727.48 | \$37,176.43 | \$40,943.10 | \$41,878.10 |
| Fuel and Lube | \$4,644.39 | \$3,726.52 | \$3,480.44 | \$5,468.84 | \$6,543.61 | \$5,416.12 | \$6,196.82 | \$7,649.10 | \$10,118.69 | \$13,372.98 | \$12,024.70 | \$17,856.70 |
| Tires and Others | \$13,191.36 | \$23,225.02 | \$24,601.70 | \$36,454.40 | \$37,006.54 | \$34,255.38 | \$22,065.66 | \$16,523.65 | \$22,291.09 | \$20,646.32 | \$29,506.00 | \$35,550.10 |
| Utilities | \$3,009.07 | \$2,906.17 | \$2,810.93 | \$3,928.16 | \$4,363.92 | \$4,449.20 | \$4,390.27 | \$4,463.92 | \$4,346.89 | \$4,381.18 | \$4,344.80 | \$4,685.40 |
| Casualty and Liabilities | \$7,385.33 | \$4,968.08 | \$12,006.72 | \$8,503.16 | \$3,472.49 | \$10,746.79 | \$4,716.80 | \$10,399.96 | \$23,518.21 | \$16,762.45 | \$9,252.20 | \$12,171.60 |
| Purch. Transp. in Report | \$9,857.28 | \$10,234.07 | \$11,285.26 | \$14,093.81 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$19,151.80 |
| PT Filing Separate Report | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$16,623.61 | \$17,888.82 | \$18,581.34 | \$18,202.77 | \$18,630.93 | \$19,152.36 | \$18,700.10 | \$0.00 |
| Other | \$5,299.18 | \$1,877.62 | \$2,139.87 | \$2,569.06 | \$2,622.43 | \$2,664.82 | \$1,875.24 | \$1,630.65 | \$3,592.70 | \$1,481.29 | \$3,195.50 | \$3,988.20 |
| Expense Transfers] | -\$6,732.80 | -\$7,255.90 | -\$8,620.27 | -\$12,158.35 | -\$14,809.01 | -\$16,697.98 | -\$16,977.11 | -\$14,836.08 | -\$15,692.09 | -\$14,781.85 | -\$18,190.50 | -\$21,548.50 |
| Total | \$282,550.92 | \$309,499.69 | \$350,625.75 | \$384,113.01 | \$409,447.74 | \$460,676.73 | \$449,283.89 | \$449,824.72 | \$472,794.75 | \$473,573.16 | \$509,391.29 | \$584,114.70 |


| SFMTA (2008 \$) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| Operator's Wages | \$80,392.25 | \$80,435.05 | \$77,802.33 | \$82,410.03 | \$86,101.50 | \$92,720.42 | \$91,821.84 | \$95,358.28 | \$93,434.97 | \$90,136.86 | \$88,712.71 | \$92,759.53 |
| Other Wages | \$67,058.56 | \$71,894.34 | \$78,409.18 | \$85,216.34 | \$87,441.36 | \$91,828.57 | \$91,158.71 | \$88,154.14 | \$82,062.95 | \$82,656.55 | \$97,754.34 | \$101,541.42 |
| Fringe Benefits | \$85,692.63 | \$95,729.66 | \$107,166.53 | \$100,474.88 | \$103,422.08 | \$123,288.79 | \$128,147.93 | \$120,330.06 | \$118,250.61 | \$114,936.17 | \$117,606.82 | \$144,350.55 |
| Services | \$12,753.67 | \$13,338.29 | \$18,313.05 | \$21,411.16 | \$21,648.60 | \$26,229.62 | \$22,328.06 | \$23,518.42 | \$27,477.03 | \$28,495.66 | \$30,393.71 | \$30,150.17 |
| Fuel and Lube | \$4,644.39 | \$3,610.22 | \$3,236.52 | \$4,867.88 | \$5,525.67 | \$4,501.38 | \$5,059.24 | \$6,170.71 | \$8,006.10 | \$10,250.36 | \$8,926.42 | \$12,855.94 |
| Tires and Others | \$13,191.36 | \$22,500.18 | \$22,877.51 | \$32,448.49 | \$31,249.71 | \$28,469.97 | \$18,014.96 | \$13,330.01 | \$17,637.12 | \$15,825.37 | \$21,903.49 | \$25,594.32 |
| Utilities | \$3,009.07 | \$2,815.47 | \$2,613.93 | \$3,496.50 | \$3,685.05 | \$3,697.77 | \$3,584.33 | \$3,601.15 | \$3,439.34 | \$3,358.17 | \$3,225.32 | \$3,373.26 |
| Casualty and Liabilities | \$7,385.33 | \$4,813.03 | \$11,165.24 | \$7,568.76 | \$2,932.30 | \$8,931.75 | \$3,850.92 | \$8,389.89 | \$18,608.05 | \$12,848.38 | \$6,868.28 | \$8,762.95 |
| Purch. Transp. in Report | \$9,857.28 | \$9,914.67 | \$10,494.34 | \$12,545.07 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$13,788.35 |
| PT Filing Separate Report | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$14,037.60 | \$14,867.56 | \$15,170.27 | \$14,684.60 | \$14,741.14 | \$14,680.25 | \$13,881.84 | \$0.00 |
| Other | \$5,299.18 | \$1,819.02 | \$1,989.90 | \$2,286.75 | \$2,214.48 | \$2,214.75 | \$1,530.99 | \$1,315.48 | \$2,842.61 | \$1,135.41 | \$2,372.15 | \$2,871.31 |
| Expense Transfers] | -\$6,732.80 | -\$7,029.45 | -\$8,016.12 | -\$10,822.29 | -\$12,505.29 | -\$13,877.85 | -\$13,860.54 | -\$11,968.61 | -\$12,415.87 | -\$11,330.26 | -\$13,503.54 | -\$15,513.86 |
| Total | \$282,550.92 | \$299,840.48 | \$326,052.38 | \$341,903.57 | \$345,753.07 | \$382,872.75 | \$366,806.70 | \$362,884.12 | \$374,084.06 | \$362,992.91 | \$378,141.54 | \$420,533.95 |


Tables 1, 2, 4, 7
Source: NTD (1997-2008)

| Caltrain |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| Operator's Wages | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Other Wages | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$2,532.25 | \$2,819.27 | \$2,857.10 | \$2,717.52 | \$2,893.82 | \$3,275.90 | \$3,918.30 |
| Fringe Benefits | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$1,186.11 | \$1,291.79 | \$1,412.55 | \$1,505.78 | \$1,186.13 | \$1,442.80 | \$1,788.70 |
| Services | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$10,937.56 | \$4,318.78 | \$4,309.82 | \$6,335.96 | \$4,224.97 | \$4,934.50 | \$5,798.00 |
| Fuel and Lube | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$3,393.27 | \$3,474.17 | \$4,309.48 | \$6,859.55 | \$9,579.14 | \$10,055.50 | \$13,289.80 |
| Tires and Others | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$107.10 | \$206.78 | \$257.71 | \$171.92 | \$245.97 | \$162.90 | \$216.40 |
| Utilities | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$982.12 | \$986.47 | \$693.05 | \$793.69 | \$682.60 | \$925.50 | \$1,211.40 |
| Casualty and Liabilities | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$3,649.32 | \$2,537.92 | \$3,251.47 | \$3,607.20 | \$3,097.63 | \$4,171.70 | \$4,940.60 |
| Purch. Transp. in Report | \$43,141.34 | \$44,622.47 | \$46,519.37 | \$51,117.31 | \$61,105.59 | \$38,298.48 | \$45,258.61 | \$46,159.33 | \$48,571.89 | \$50,806.04 | \$52,974.10 | \$55,657.70 |
| PT Filing Separate Report | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Other | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$277.65 | \$286.50 | \$353.13 | \$596.07 | \$807.50 | \$853.60 | \$1,121.60 |
| Expense Transfers[] | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Total | \$43,141.34 | \$44,622.47 | \$46,519.37 | \$51,117.31 | \$61,105.59 | \$61,363.86 | \$61,180.29 | \$63,603.63 | \$71,159.57 | \$73,523.80 | \$78,796.50 | \$87,942.40 |



Tables 1, 2, 4, 7
Source: NTD (1997-2008)

| Samtrans |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| Operator's Wages | \$11,427.22 | \$11,874.10 | \$12,294.16 | \$12,628.84 | \$13,232.66 | \$19,129.98 | \$15,424.53 | \$15,622.45 | \$16,462.11 | \$16,603.42 | \$17,063.60 | \$16,064.60 |
| Other Wages | \$8,794.57 | \$8,816.95 | \$9,256.04 | \$8,570.28 | \$11,717.86 | \$7,409.63 | \$15,698.99 | \$16,123.96 | \$15,325.99 | \$16,173.94 | \$15,389.70 | \$17,785.70 |
| Fringe Benefits | \$7,244.91 | \$8,137.70 | \$8,567.66 | \$9,751.36 | \$10,086.44 | \$12,860.14 | \$14,174.39 | \$17,011.64 | \$19,046.35 | \$21,406.52 | \$22,873.10 | \$24,026.90 |
| Services | \$4,829.06 | \$5,196.52 | \$4,341.89 | \$6,003.52 | \$5,839.54 | \$8,088.49 | \$5,954.32 | \$6,355.04 | \$6,906.36 | \$7,448.02 | \$8,324.70 | \$8,769.70 |
| Fuel and Lube | \$1,693.94 | \$1,380.12 | \$1,153.73 | \$2,121.93 | \$2,345.35 | \$1,936.52 | \$2,247.34 | \$2,653.71 | \$3,505.42 | \$4,609.88 | \$4,978.10 | \$6,264.50 |
| Tires and Others | \$2,525.18 | \$2,561.62 | \$2,446.01 | \$2,966.20 | \$3,081.56 | \$3,091.20 | \$2,502.40 | \$2,423.39 | \$2,620.24 | \$2,673.47 | \$3,273.60 | \$3,155.20 |
| Utilities | \$687.51 | \$689.78 | \$681.71 | \$1,345.89 | \$809.93 | \$1,258.25 | \$1,352.96 | \$1,257.87 | \$1,246.72 | \$1,247.37 | \$1,255.50 | \$1,366.50 |
| Casualty and Liabilities | \$1,615.72 | \$1,759.09 | \$1,523.17 | \$3,413.31 | \$1,994.00 | \$3,439.86 | \$3,568.18 | \$4,359.91 | \$3,773.80 | \$4,926.64 | \$6,010.00 | \$6,074.20 |
| Purch. Transp. in Report | \$15,061.86 | \$16,160.14 | \$16,035.70 | \$18,968.43 | \$22,323.17 | \$20,323.23 | \$21,320.71 | \$21,485.26 | \$21,797.83 | \$22,939.03 | \$24,653.00 | \$25,989.60 |
| PT Filing Separate Report | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$131.74 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Other | \$634.45 | \$1,422.82 | \$909.87 | \$1,321.79 | \$1,148.11 | \$2,194.04 | \$331.76 | \$1,617.46 | \$1,865.86 | \$1,708.63 | \$785.00 | \$940.20 |
| Expense Transfers[] | -\$89.12 | -\$105.76 | -\$1,127.22 | -\$856.38 | -\$394.49 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Total | \$54,425.29 | \$57,893.08 | \$56,082.72 | \$66,235.17 | \$72,184.11 | \$79,731.35 | \$82,575.57 | \$89,042.42 | \$92,550.67 | \$99,736.93 | \$104,606.49 | \$110,437.20 |


| Samtrans (2008 \$) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| Operator's Wages | \$11,427.22 | \$11,503.52 | \$11,432.53 | \$11,241.08 | \$11,174.16 | \$15,899.11 | \$12,592.97 | \$12,602.99 | \$13,025.13 | \$12,726.49 | \$12,667.00 | \$11,565.72 |
| Other Wages | \$8,794.57 | \$8,541.78 | \$8,607.34 | \$7,628.51 | \$9,895.00 | \$6,158.21 | \$12,817.05 | \$13,007.57 | \$12,126.21 | \$12,397.29 | \$11,424.39 | \$12,804.83 |
| Fringe Benefits | \$7,244.91 | \$7,883.73 | \$7,967.20 | \$8,679.80 | \$8,517.37 | \$10,688.18 | \$11,572.33 | \$13,723.69 | \$15,069.83 | \$16,408.06 | \$16,979.62 | \$17,298.18 |
| Services | \$4,829.06 | \$5,034.34 | \$4,037.59 | \$5,343.80 | \$4,931.13 | \$6,722.42 | \$4,861.26 | \$5,126.76 | \$5,464.44 | \$5,708.90 | \$6,179.76 | \$6,313.75 |
| Fuel and Lube | \$1,693.94 | \$1,337.05 | \$1,072.88 | \$1,888.76 | \$1,980.50 | \$1,609.46 | \$1,834.78 | \$2,140.81 | \$2,773.56 | \$3,533.46 | \$3,695.44 | \$4,510.13 |
| Tires and Others | \$2,525.18 | \$2,481.67 | \$2,274.58 | \$2,640.25 | \$2,602.18 | \$2,569.13 | \$2,043.02 | \$1,955.01 | \$2,073.18 | \$2,049.21 | \$2,430.13 | \$2,271.59 |
| Utilities | \$687.51 | \$668.25 | \$633.94 | \$1,198.00 | \$683.94 | \$1,045.75 | \$1,104.59 | \$1,014.75 | \$986.43 | \$956.11 | \$932.01 | \$983.81 |
| Casualty and Liabilities | \$1,615.72 | \$1,704.19 | \$1,416.42 | \$3,038.22 | \$1,683.81 | \$2,858.90 | \$2,913.15 | \$3,517.24 | \$2,985.90 | \$3,776.26 | \$4,461.47 | \$4,373.12 |
| Purch. Transp. in Report | \$15,061.86 | \$15,655.80 | \$14,911.85 | \$16,884.02 | \$18,850.52 | \$16,890.83 | \$17,406.76 | \$17,332.66 | \$17,246.85 | \$17,582.72 | \$18,300.92 | \$18,711.23 |
| PT Filing Separate Report | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$106.28 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Other | \$634.45 | \$1,378.42 | \$846.11 | \$1,176.54 | \$969.51 | \$1,823.49 | \$270.86 | \$1,304.85 | \$1,476.30 | \$1,309.66 | \$582.74 | \$676.90 |
| Expense Transfers] | -\$89.12 | -\$102.46 | -\$1,048.22 | -\$762.27 | -\$333.12 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Total | \$54,425.29 | \$56,086.29 | \$52,152.20 | \$58,956.71 | \$60,954.98 | \$66,265.47 | \$67,416.78 | \$71,832.60 | \$73,227.82 | \$76,448.16 | \$77,653.47 | \$79,509.27 |


Tables 1, 2, 4, 7
Source: NTD (1997-2008)

| VTA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| Operator's Wages | \$37,171.13 | \$39,685.33 | \$42,290.51 | \$40,282.51 | \$43,873.32 | \$49,204.00 | \$49,217.61 | \$48,353.09 | \$49,259.85 | \$51,248.40 | \$52,434.10 | \$54,210.60 |
| Other Wages | \$39,956.14 | \$42,143.95 | \$46,488.57 | \$57,782.01 | \$62,622.95 | \$81,786.19 | \$85,306.79 | \$61,165.51 | \$51,955.88 | \$52,750.32 | \$53,297.30 | \$57,066.00 |
| Fringe Benefits | \$42,961.01 | \$48,550.79 | \$53,574.89 | \$75,084.65 | \$61,693.67 | \$80,877.27 | \$92,001.27 | \$87,141.81 | \$94,836.55 | \$99,587.29 | \$101,274.90 | \$93,395.90 |
| Services | \$12,563.94 | \$14,654.08 | \$15,200.21 | \$21,379.30 | \$26,785.82 | \$24,062.50 | \$22,055.31 | \$15,704.93 | \$15,128.00 | \$18,533.11 | \$16,271.80 | \$16,765.40 |
| Fuel and Lube | \$4,476.35 | \$3,653.47 | \$3,043.01 | \$5,743.17 | \$6,922.07 | \$5,113.20 | \$5,999.75 | \$6,744.40 | \$8,912.50 | \$11,875.31 | \$12,371.30 | \$15,942.60 |
| Tires and Others | \$12,429.45 | \$13,381.74 | \$16,603.31 | \$9,796.36 | \$20,489.37 | \$15,356.54 | \$14,698.29 | \$8,844.49 | \$11,411.29 | \$12,570.53 | \$17,445.10 | \$14,575.00 |
| Utilities | \$3,409.41 | \$3,601.20 | \$4,068.41 | \$5,167.03 | \$5,070.34 | \$7,212.10 | \$5,734.60 | \$4,810.37 | \$5,370.12 | \$5,789.79 | \$6,128.40 | \$6,449.20 |
| Casualty and Liabilities | \$2,413.53 | \$3,922.48 | \$3,895.21 | \$2,403.20 | \$1,462.90 | \$3,199.47 | \$4,118.73 | \$3,157.22 | \$2,217.37 | \$2,267.45 | \$2,359.10 | \$3,225.50 |
| Purch. Transp. in Report | \$789.57 | \$736.09 | \$976.63 | \$1,303.61 | \$1,930.45 | \$38,080.26 | \$34,034.98 | \$29,587.65 | \$28,051.77 | \$30,243.35 | \$31,062.80 | \$31,257.70 |
| PT Filing Separate Report | \$9,313.30 | \$12,559.83 | \$14,510.12 | \$18,702.02 | \$24,790.65 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Other | \$1,582.49 | \$1,854.19 | \$1,109.34 | \$2,818.99 | \$3,124.69 | \$6,542.58 | \$4,347.41 | \$3,150.02 | \$2,481.92 | \$1,717.94 | \$1,322.70 | \$3,841.30 |
| Expense Transfers | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | \$0.00 | -\$20,201.41 | -\$3,933.22 | -\$4,618.06 | -\$4,056.77 | -\$4,580.50 | -\$7,768.10 |
| Total | \$167,066.32 | \$184,743.16 | \$201,760.21 | \$240,462.85 | \$258,766.23 | \$311,434.11 | \$297,313.34 | \$264,726.28 | \$265,007.18 | \$282,526.71 | \$289,387.00 | \$288,961.10 |


| $\mid \underset{\sim}{\circ}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\|\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathbf{O}}\|$ |  | On |
| $\|\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}\|$ |  | (1) |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \stackrel{\sim}{\mathrm{O}} \\ \mid \end{gathered}\right.$ |  | \|ch |
| $\|\underset{\sim}{\text { O}}\|$ |  | ( |
| $\left\lvert\,\right.$ |  |  |
| $\|\underset{\sim}{\circ}\|$ |  |  |
| \|o |  |  |
| $\|\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{N}}\|$ |  |  |
| $\left\lvert\,\right.$ |  |  |
| $\stackrel{\circ}{\square}$ |  |  |
| - |  |  |
|  |  | $\left\|\begin{array}{l} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\tilde{\circ}} \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \end{array}\right\|$ |


Tables 1, 2, 4, 7
Source: NTD (1997-2008)

| "Big 7" Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| Operator's Wages | \$198,129.87 | \$205,488.07 | \$212,124.68 | \$227,729.94 | \$251,160.42 | \$278,145.44 | \$279,202.99 | \$282,209.97 | \$281,448.75 | \$284,902.36 | \$291,921.30 | \$307,977.20 |
| Other Wages | \$293,947.88 | \$317,223.54 | \$332,756.25 | \$369,773.19 | \$398,896.00 | \$436,268.99 | \$451,228.48 | \$432,091.13 | \$420,554.60 | \$429,459.80 | \$457,337.70 | \$484,269.10 |
| Fringe Benefits | \$263,846.02 | \$302,236.88 | \$337,795.32 | \$360,279.56 | \$368,206.30 | \$434,268.36 | \$484,457.70 | \$469,875.82 | \$513,600.89 | \$532,235.98 | \$557,515.70 | \$628,574.70 |
| Services | \$60,599.66 | \$70,406.19 | \$79,324.13 | \$95,746.74 | \$111,146.35 | \$121,087.72 | \$101,822.98 | \$103,974.27 | \$112,818.41 | \$118,163.06 | \$130,506.70 | \$132,938.20 |
| Fuel and Lube | \$18,422.72 | \$15,326.24 | \$13,600.39 | \$22,363.85 | \$27,975.05 | \$25,901.90 | \$29,314.80 | \$33,723.11 | \$45,676.81 | \$61,026.15 | \$61,928.20 | \$82,517.40 |
| Tires and Others | \$59,336.80 | \$68,270.26 | \$73,525.78 | \$80,685.22 | \$95,119.12 | \$85,701.51 | \$69,851.47 | \$58,638.62 | \$69,245.85 | \$69,976.49 | \$90,373.40 | \$98,164.00 |
| Utilities | \$29,456.85 | \$29,633.27 | \$29,542.27 | \$35,256.48 | \$35,010.49 | \$40,361.58 | \$40,633.33 | \$43,212.48 | \$37,228.09 | \$40,717.91 | \$54,884.00 | \$56,712.80 |
| Casualty and Liabilities | \$25,870.79 | \$26,486.34 | \$27,805.28 | \$26,286.38 | \$16,732.64 | \$36,317.59 | \$36,048.33 | \$41,679.78 | \$53,793.36 | \$52,030.16 | \$48,149.80 | \$43,692.90 |
| Purch. Transp. in Report | \$79,297.27 | \$77,024.46 | \$77,915.49 | \$88,708.21 | \$88,982.85 | \$100,905.92 | \$105,363.44 | \$102,203.07 | \$103,643.79 | \$108,161.13 | \$139,095.40 | \$162,883.80 |
| PT Filing Separate Report | \$17,771.65 | \$26,141.35 | \$27,555.30 | \$35,175.80 | \$61,751.95 | \$41,281.75 | \$42,269.15 | \$42,861.50 | \$43,117.81 | \$43,503.38 | \$18,700.10 | \$0.00 |
| Other | \$16,172.68 | \$14,207.37 | \$14,092.75 | \$18,897.78 | \$20,249.34 | \$24,114.68 | \$20,516.14 | \$22,756.00 | \$27,189.69 | \$26,575.93 | \$29,775.70 | \$23,311.30 |
| Expense Transfers[] | -\$40,595.66 | -\$41,123.28 | -\$45,261.38 | -\$46,852.46 | -\$54,935.00 | -\$60,915.48 | -\$83,475.04 | -\$61,364.00 | -\$60,176.85 | -\$58,212.92 | -\$61,273.50 | -\$72,501.30 |
| Total | \$1,022,256.52 | \$1,111,320.68 | \$1,180,776.27 | \$1,314,050.68 | \$1,420,295.50 | \$1,563,439.94 | \$1,577,233.76 | \$1,571,861.74 | \$1,648,141.18 | \$1,708,539.42 | \$1,818,914.50 | \$1,948,540.10 |



Tables 1, 2, 4, 7
Source: NTD (1997-2008)

Table 3
Source: NTD (1997-2008)

| Total Operator V |  | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SFMTA | NTD - MB, TB, \& LR | 73,013,851 | 75,263,614 | 76,127,259 | 84,092,025 | 92,978,819 | 101,176,048 | 102,566,009 | 108,162,599 | 107,997,089 | 107,008,095 | 108,666,400 | 116,784,700 |
| BART | NTD - HR | 14,258,474 | 15,425,672 | 15,654,370 | 17,479,283 | 18,475,736 | 19,114,669 | 20,380,738 | 22,008,232 | 24,077,027 | 23,549,120 | 23,550,100 | 26,471,600 |
| AC Transit | NTD - MB | 39,337,958 | 39,590,775 | 41,527,964 | 46,062,029 | 53,496,914 | 57,116,057 | 59,698,167 | 58,331,250 | 56,040,375 | 58,210,577 | 61,279,200 | 63,017,800 |
| Santa Clara VTA | NTD - LR \& MB | 37,171,134 | 39,685,334 | 42,290,505 | 40,282,509 | 43,873,320 | 49,203,997 | 49,217,608 | 48,353,092 | 49,259,852 | 51,248,403 | 52,434,000 | 54,210,600 |
| SamTrans | NTD - MB | 11,427,222 | 11,874,098 | 12,294,155 | 12,628,837 | 13,232,660 | 18,854,411 | 15,424,526 | 15,622,447 | 16,462,110 | 16,603,422 | 17,063,600 | 16,064,600 |
| Golden Gate | NTD - MB | 13,372,576 | 13,668,737 | 13,952,435 | 15,715,545 | 16,837,957 | 18,764,820 | 18,997,933 | 16,867,319 | 14,797,260 | 14,907,141 | 15,432,400 | 16,417,200 |
| Caltrain | NTD - CR | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| FTEs (assumes 2,000 hours/year) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SFMTA | NTD - MB, TB, \& LR | 2062.0 |  |  |  |  | 2,582 |  |  |  |  |  | 2,281 |
| BART | NTD - HR | 1051.8 |  |  |  |  | 1,125 |  |  |  |  |  | 1,112 |
| AC Transit | NTD - MB | 1253.6 |  |  |  |  | 1,417 |  |  |  |  |  | 1,252 |
| Santa Clara VTA | NTD - LR \& MB | 997.7 |  |  |  |  | 1,395 |  |  |  |  |  | 999 |
| SamTrans | NTD - MB | 349.2 |  |  |  |  | 343 |  |  |  |  |  | 315 |
| Golden Gate | NTD - MB | 72.1 |  |  |  |  | 450 |  |  |  |  |  | 371 |
| Caltrain | NTD - CR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |
| Total Wages / FTE (No Inflation Calculations Included) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SFMTA | Calculation | 35,408.60 |  |  |  |  | 39,185.15 |  |  |  |  |  | 51,203.82 |
| BART | Calculation | 13,555.93 |  |  |  |  | 16,990.82 |  |  |  |  |  | 23,801.49 |
| AC Transit | Calculation | 31,379.94 |  |  |  |  | 40,307.73 |  |  |  |  |  | 50,348.57 |
| Santa Clara VTA | Calculation | 37,257.48 |  |  |  |  | 35,271.68 |  |  |  |  |  | 54,253.92 |
| SamTrans | Calculation | 32,728.31 |  |  |  |  | 54,969.13 |  |  |  |  |  | 51,079.57 |
| Golden Gate | Calculation | 185,481.63 |  |  |  |  | 41,699.60 |  |  |  |  |  | 44,281.95 |
| Caltrain | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CPI |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 |
|  | CPI | 160.38 | 165.55 | 172.47 | 180.18 | 189.93 | 192.98 | 196.45 | 198.81 | 202.70 | 209.24 | 216.05 | 222.77 |
|  | CPI for 2008 \$ Calculation | 0.72 | 0.74 | 0.77 | 0.81 | 0.85 | 0.87 | 0.88 | 0.89 | 0.91 | 0.94 | 0.97 | 1.00 |
| Total Wages / FTE (2008 \$ ${ }^{\text {) }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SFMTA | Calculation | 49,181.97 | - | - | - | - | 45,235.24 | - | - | - | - | - | 51,203.82 |
| BART | Calculation | 18,828.97 | - | - | - | - | 19,614.16 | - | - | - | - | - | 23,801.49 |
| AC Transit | Calculation | 43,586.24 | - | - | - | - | 46,531.15 | - | - | - | - | - | 50,348.57 |
| Santa Clara VTA | Calculation | 51,750.04 | - | - | - | - | 40,717.55 | - | - | - | - | - | 54,253.92 |
| SamTrans | Calculation | 45,459.10 | - | - | - | - | 63,456.23 | - | - | - | - | - | 51,079.57 |
| Golden Gate | Calculation | 257,631.00 | - | - | - | - | 48,137.92 | - | - | - | - | - | 44,281.95 |
| Caltrain | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


Table 9
Source: NTD (1997-2008)



[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Note: Operating and maintenance costs cover the cost of the "Big 7's" fixed route service. The costs include paratransit, cable car, and ferry costs.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Between 1997 and 2008, light rail service has expanded significantly; however, there is some explanation for lower ridership. In Santa Clara County, the ridership and density is lower, and in San Francisco, the T Third Line was designed to stimulate revitalization in a less dense area. Additionally, the Embarcadero extension of the F Market Line has limited capacity.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ From a cost perspective, the key fringe benefits are retirement and health insurance. Other costs classified as fringe benefits include sick leave, vacation and holiday pay, workers compensation, life insurance, and dental/vision insurance.
    ${ }^{4}$ Wages for transit operators, i.e., bus drivers and heavy rail or light rail train operators.
    5 "Other wage costs" refer to wages for employees performing maintenance, operations support, administration and other support functions.

[^3]:    ${ }^{6}$ These numbers do not include cable car, ferry, or paratransit costs.

[^4]:    1. In a "defined contribution" plan, the employer contributes a specified amount to a retirement account on behalf of the employee, rather than promising to pay a specified amount to the employee
[^5]:    ${ }^{7}$ The pension projections assume the pension plans will achieve roughly eight percent rate of returns on their investments (which is established by plan administrators). This rate of return may be high. CalPERS recently evaluated changing their rate of return assumption from $7.75 \%$ to $7.50 \%$, but in March 2011, the CalPERS Board voted to retain the current $7.75 \%$ assumed rate of return.
    ${ }^{8}$ The City and County of San Francisco set up a trust, finalizing legal OPEB Trust status.

[^6]:    Appendix I - Inflation Calculations

[^7]:    Appendix II - Case Study (Santa Clara VTA)

[^8]:    ${ }^{9}$ The percentage change figures cited are not adjusted for inflation.

[^9]:    

