# BayArea Call

**March 2013** 

Strategy for a Sustainable Region

Mano

Pacific Ocear



Association of Bay Area
Governments



Metropolitan
Transportation
Commission

Transit Operating and Capital Needs and Revenue Assessment

#### Metropolitan **Transportation Commission**

Amy Rein Worth, Chair Cities of Contra Costa County

Dave Cortese, Vice Chair Santa Clara County

Alicia C. Aguirre Cities of San Mateo County

**Tom Azumbrado** U.S. Department of Housing

and Urban Development Tom Bates Cities of Alameda County

**David Campos** 

City and County of San Francisco

Bill Dodd

Napa County and Cities

Dorene M. Giacopini

U.S. Department of Transportation

Federal D. Glover Contra Costa County

**Scott Haggerty** 

Alameda County Anne W. Halsted

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

Steve Kinsey

Marin County and Cities Sam Liccardo

San Jose Mayor's Appointee

Association of Bay Area Governments

Jake Mackenzie Sonoma County and Cities

Joe Pirzynski

Cities of Santa Clara County

Oakland Mayor's Appointee Bijan Sartipi

State Business, Transportation and Housing Agency

James P. Spering Solano County and Cities

Adrienne J. Tissier San Mateo County

Scott Wiener

San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

#### **Association of Bay Area** Governments

Supervisor Mark Luce, County of Napa President

Mayor Julie Pierce, City of Clayton Vice President

#### Representatives **From Each County**

**Supervisor Richard Valle** 

**Supervisor Scott Haggerty** 

Supervisor Karen Mitchoff

Contra Costa

Supervisor John Gioia

Contra Costa

**Supervisor Katie Rice** Marin

**Supervisor Mark Luce** 

Napa

**Supervisor Eric Mar** San Francisco

Supervisor Warren Slocum San Mateo

**Supervisor Dave Pine** San Mateo

Supervisor Mike Wasserman Santa Clara

**Supervisor David Cortese** Santa Clara

Supervisor Linda Seifert Solano

**Supervisor David Rabbitt** Sonoma

#### **Representatives From Cities In Each County**

Mayor Bill Harrison, City of Fremont Alameda

Mayor Tim Sbranti, City of Dublin Alameda

Mayor Julie Pierce, City of Clayton Contra Costa

Councilmember Dave Hudson, City of San Ramon Contra Costa

Mayor Pat Eklund, City of Novato Marin

Mayor Leon Garcia, City of American Canyon Napa

Mayor Edwin Lee City And County of San Francisco

Jason Elliott, Director, Legislative/ Government Affairs, Office of the Mayor City And County of San Francisco

Joaquin Torres, Office of the Mayor City And County of San Francisco

Councilmember Pedro Gonzalez, City of South San Francisco San Mateo

Vice Mayor Richard Garbarino, City of South San Francisco San Mateo

Councilmember Joe Pirzynski, City of Los Gatos Santa Clara

Councilmember Ronit Bryant, City of Mountain View Santa Clara

Mayor Harry Price, City of Fairfield Solano

Mayor Jean Quan City of Oakland

Councilmember Libby Schaaf City of Oakland

**Councilmember Desley Brooks** City of Oakland

Councilmember Sam Liccardo

City of San Jose Councilmember Kansen Chu

City of San Jose Councilmember Ash Kalra City of San Jose

#### **Advisory Members**

William Kissinger

Regional Water Quality Control Board

#### **Transit Operating and Capital Needs and Revenue Assessment**

MTC analyzed how much funding is needed to operate and maintain existing transit services over the 28-year plan period from FY2012-13 to FY2039-40. On the cost side, the analysis has two components: (a) operating and maintenance costs, and (b) capital replacement and rehabilitation costs. On the revenue side, the analysis also has two components: (a) revenues that are committed to transit operating or capital costs by law or MTC or transit agency policy, and (b) discretionary funds that are allocated to transit operating or capital needs by MTC or Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs).

#### Transit Operating Needs and Revenues

The cost to operate and maintain existing service levels was projected by the transit operators. MTC requested a cost breakdown of expenses by mode (bus, paratransit, rail, etc.) and systemwide non-operating expenses including debt service by year-ofexpenditure. All projections were checked for consistency against cost projections provided in operators' Transportation Development Act (TDA) claims, which cover an audited historical year, as well as budgeted projections for the current and approaching fiscal years. Projections also were checked for reasonableness and consistency against cost projections included in Transportation 2035 Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area. Inflation assumptions were checked for reasonableness across similar expense categories. The cost impact of projected changes in service levels during the plan period was accounted for only in instances where those changes are a result of the transit operators' policy directives. The operating cost projections include existing service levels and cost projections for committed expansion projects. Where there were questions on the assumptions, MTC generally worked with the transit operator to get clarification and used information deemed most accurate by the transit operator. Estimates of transit operators' annual costs to operate the Clipper® system, were added to operators' annual projected costs. Lastly, beginning in FY 2017-18, a five-percent cost savings reduced annual cost projections for the seven largest transit operators, consistent with the MTC's Transit Sustainability Project (TSP) performance measure implementation.

Dedicated local funds that are controlled by the operators include fares, non-fare revenue (such as general fund contributions or revenue from advertising), other revenue (such as those from charter service), and county sales tax for operating and maintenance needs. Operating revenues were projected by the transit operators, and were again checked for consistency with revenue projections provided in the operators' most recently submitted TDA claim. The 28-year fare revenue projections were used as provided by the operators, with most projected to keep pace with inflation. Revenues from county sales tax measures were projected only up to the sunset date of the measure, and were projected to increase consistently with growth rates estimated by the county sales tax authorities. Revenues from Alameda County's proposed sales tax

measure, a ½-cent augmentation to an existing measure, was included in the revenue projections beginning in FY 2017-18.

Revenues that pass through or are typically estimated by MTC include federal grants, State Transit Assistance (STA) funds, Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds, and bridge tolls for operating and maintenance needs (refer to the Financial Assumptions supplemental report for information on the projections for these sources). The revenues were assigned to each of the operators on an annual basis using MTC adopted formulas and any other applicable restrictions on the use of those funds. Some fund sources are restricted by either statute or policy to either operations or capital uses, while some fund sources are flexible. MTC staff generally assumed that all flexible transit revenues would first cover operating expenses; and then additional revenue, if any, were assigned to capital replacement if there was an identified need.

The projections resulted in 28-year total operating expenses for all operators combined of \$114.3 billion, and operating revenues of \$110.4 billion, leaving \$3.9 billion of operating costs remaining to be funded. The remaining operating costs were addressed with \$2.1 billion in regional discretionary funds and \$1.7 billion in CMA discretionary funds (numbers do not add to \$3.9 billion due to rounding). Projected operating service levels, expenses, and revenues are summarized in Table 1, and projected operating revenues are presented in greater detail in Table 2.

#### Transit Capital Replacement and Rehabilitation Needs and Revenues

The transit capital replacement and rehabilitation need projections are based on data in the Regional Transit Capital Inventory (RTCI), a database of all of the region's transit capital assets, such as buses, railcars, ferries, track, bridges, tunnels, train control and traction power systems, stations, maintenance facilities, and communications systems. The objective of the RTCI is to collect consistent and comparable data on the region's transit capital assets and replacement and rehabilitation costs for each transit operator.

In addition to an inventory of assets, the RTCI includes replacement and rehabilitation lifecycle costs for each type of asset. Asset data for the RTCI was developed by each operator, using multiple sources, such as maintenance management systems, fleet plans, condition assessments, and fixed asset accounting systems. Industry standard replacement and rehabilitation cycles and costs for each asset type were developed based on a national inventory maintained by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and other sources. The industry standard costs and lifecycles were used for assets for which the operator did not have complete data. The RTCI data was initially collected in 2007, and updated with data on new and retired assets, as well as refined cost and lifecycle information, in 2011.

Transit capital needs were defined as the cost of replacing all assets at the end of their useful lives, and performing all capital rehabilitation work in accordance with the recommended rehabilitation cycle for the asset type. This includes eliminating the existing \$5.0 billion backlog of deferred replacement and rehabilitation projects over the first ten years of the planning period. In some cases, particularly for long-lived assets such as stations or tunnels, major components were assumed to be replaced, rather than the entire asset. Clipper® equipment replacement and upgrade costs were projected by Clipper® staff and included in a centralized Clipper® line item.

Transit revenues that are currently committed to capital replacement and rehabilitation by statute or policy were assumed to continue to be dedicated to capital over the 28-year planning period. These sources include FTA Urbanized Area Formula (Section 5307), and Fixed Guideway Modernization (Section 5309 FG) funds, AB 664 and 2 percent bridge tolls, certain county transportation sales taxes, local and state bond proceeds for seismic work, and, as noted above, projected operating surpluses, if any. The MAP-21 federal transportation authorization made several changes to FTA funding programs, including replacing the Fixed Guideway Modernization with a new State of Good Repair (Section 5337) program, and creating a new Bus & Bus Facilities (Section 5339) program. However, the total FTA funding for the region under MAP-21 remains generally consistent with the projections used for Plan Bay Area, so the projections were not revised based on MAP-21's program changes.

FTA revenue projections were based on actual apportionments with assumed 3.0 percent annual growth. The FTA and bridge toll revenues for each operator were projected by using the current programming policies for those sources applied to the projected needs. The 10 percent ADA Operating Set-Aside funds in the FTA 5307 program were assumed to be used as operating revenues. The remaining 90 percent of projected 5307 funds, as well as the other FTA formula funds, were assigned to operators using the Transit Capital Priorities Project Apportionment Model used for annual programming of the FTA funds. The FTA funds come into the region through 12 urbanized areas, and each operator is eligible for funding from one or more urbanized area eligibility and project score. Refer to the Financial Assumptions supplemental report for information on projections of other revenue sources.

Projected committed capital revenues totaled \$20.9 billion before the assignment of Plan Bay Area discretionary revenues. The projected capital needs totaled \$46.5 billion, resulting in \$25.6 billion of remaining needs before adding the discretionary revenues. For projects that are high-scoring (Score 16) under the region's Transit Capital Priorities policy – revenue vehicle replacement, fixed guideway rehabilitation, and major systems – projected needs totaled \$32.7 billion, with \$13.3 billion of the Score 16 needs remaining unfunded after applying the eligible committed funds.

The Commission directed \$8.3 billion of the region's projected discretionary revenues to address transit capital rehabilitation and replacement shortfalls, and CMAs contributed another \$950 million. These actions reduced the amount of remaining transit maintenance needs to achieve the Plan Bay Area performance target to \$16.4 billion.

Plan Bay Area prioritizes the region's revenue vehicle replacement needs, followed by other Score 16 needs, such as fixed guideway and major systems. Of the \$9.3 billion total discretionary revenues (Commission and CMA), approximately \$700 million was directed to meet the remaining revenue vehicle needs, and \$8.6 billion for other Score 16 needs. The \$8.6 billion for other Score 16 needs was allocated to individual transit operators in proportion to each operator's share of the remaining other Score 16 needs.

The \$30.2 billion total project revenues for transit capital rehabilitation – committed, Commission discretionary and CMA discretionary – are sufficient to cover 100% of projected vehicle replacement needs, 76% of other Score 16 needs, and 65% of all capital needs.

It is important to note that these Plan Bay Area funding assignments are based on projections of aggregate need over 28 years; actual programming will vary year to year and will take into account actual project eligibility and readiness. Projected transit capital rehabilitation and replacement needs and revenues for all projects are summarized in Table 3. The distribution of Plan Bay Area discretionary revenues for transit capital rehabilitation and replacement is detailed in Table 4. Projected revenues for transit capital rehabilitation and replacement, including committed revenues and the discretionary revenues assigned to these needs, are summarized in Table 5.

Table 1. Plan Bay Area 28-Year Transit Operating Needs & Revenues for Existing and Committed Service Levels (In Escalated \$ Millions)

Operator	FY 2013 Revenue Vehicle Hours (1,000s)	Operating Expenses	Committed Operations Funds	Regional Discretionary Funds	CMA Discretionary Funds	Total Operating Revenue	Remaining Needs
Large Operators							
AC Transit	1,624	\$12,572	\$11,080	0\$	\$1,491	\$12,572	\$0
BART	2,000	27,044	26,948	0	96	27,044	0
Caltrain	30	4,325	3,896	429	0	4,325	0
GGBHTD	406	3,010	2,470		0	3,010	0
SamTrans	880	290'9	299'5	402	0	290'9	0
SFMTA	3,439	36,285	36,110	175	0	36,285	0
VTA	1,803	16,356	16,356	0	0	16,356	0
Subtotal	10,182	\$105,659	\$102,524	\$1,547	\$1,587	\$105,659	0\$
Small Operators							
ACE	20	\$635	\$571	0\$	\$64	983	0\$
CCCTA	306	1,029	1,029	0	0	1,029	0
ECCTA	86	470	432	38	0	470	0
Fairfield	149	299	623	96	35	299	0
LAVTA	188	326	326	0	0	326	0
Marin County	94	302	305	0	0	302	0
Napa	23	84	84	0	0	84	0
Petaluma	9	32	32	0	0	35	0
Rio Vista	112	621	353	269	0	621	0
Santa Rosa	26	368	368	0	0	968	0
SMART	105	220	496	74	0	029	0
SolTrans	0	817	6//	38	0	817	0
Sonoma County	203	730	730	0	0	730	0
Union City	49	154	138	0	16	154	0
Vacaville	30	62	62	0	0	62	0
Westcat	93	446	377	69	0	446	0
WETA	13	1,133	1,101	0	32	1,133	0
Subtotal	1,585	\$8,522	\$7,794	\$584	\$144	\$8,522	\$0
Clipper <sup>®</sup>	N/A	96	96	0	0	96	0
Total	11,767	\$114,277	\$110,415	\$2,131	\$1,731	\$114,277	0\$
NILLE							

### Notes:

- The total available revenues may exceed the revenues needed for operations. In that case, the additional revenues were assumed to be available to capital replacement and rehabilitation. See Table 2 for details.
- Costs and revenues listed under Clipper® are for central, systemwide costs. Clipper® operating costs and revenues attributable to individual operators are included under each operator. 7
  - Included in the projected operating costs are Caltrain's service frequency improvements with electrification, and BART's service expansion to San Jose. ω.

Table 2. Plan Bay Area Transit Operations 28-Year Cost and Revenue Projections Detail (In Escalated \$ Millions)

				Committe	Committed Transit Operating Revenues	erating Re	venues				Plan Bay	Plan Bay		Operating
Operators	Fares	Non-Fare/ Other Revenues	County Sales Taxes	TDA Revenues	STA Revenues	AB 1107 Sales Taxes	Bridge Tolls	FTA ADA Operating	County Reg. Fees	Total Committed Revenues	Area Regional Disc. Revenues	Area CMA Disc. Revenues	Total Operating Revenues	Revenue Available for Capital Replacement*
Large Operators														
AC Transit	\$2,203		\$271	\$1,925	\$854	\$1,243	\$273	\$193	\$18	\$11,465	\$0	\$1,491	\$12,572	\$384
BART	17,586	2,693	0	0	1,253	7,456	0	143	0	29,132	0	96	7	2,184
Caltrain	2,221		0	0	295	0	0	49	0	3,896	429	0	4,325	0
GGBHTD	778	999	0	549	334	0	20	22	19	2,470	540	0	3,010	0
SamTrans	781	258	2,687	1,271	254	0	6	49	99	5,665	402	0	6,067	0
SFMTA	7,933	23	96	1,339	2,150	1,243	75	183	37	36,242	175	0	36,285	132
VTA	3,065	1,821	9,376	4,041	606	0	0	168	0	19,380	0	0		3,024
Subtotal	\$34,567	\$34,681	\$12,431	\$9,126	\$6,047	\$9,942	\$427	\$839	\$190	\$108,249	\$1,547	\$1,587	\$105,659	\$5,724
Small Operators														
ACE	\$170	\$389	\$0	\$0	\$33	\$0	\$0	\$24	\$0	\$616	\$0	\$64	\$635	\$44
CCCTA	159	69	152	809	201	0	4	32	0	1,215	0	0	1,029	186
ECCTA	131	ε	37	320	177	0	15	22	0	735	0	0	730	2
Fairfield	6/	121	0	133	20	0	20	0	0	432	38	0	470	0
LAVTA	63	58	35	258	82	0	16	14	12	539	96	32		)
Marin County	26	161	141	0	0	0	0	0	0	363	0	0		1
Napa	41	1	0	262	44	0	11	1	0	361	0	0	302	69
Petaluma	6	1	8	99	17	0	0	0	0	102	0	0		17
Rio Vista	2	19	0	10	3	0	0	0	0	34	0	0	32	1
Santa Rosa	29	0	35	194	25	0	0	0	0	353	269	0	621	)
SMART	176	19	542	0	0	0	0	0	0	779	38	0	817	0
SolTrans	105	6	0	188	80	0	34	30	0	446	0	0	396	20
Sonoma County	69	0	30	308	88	0	0	0	0	496	74	0	220	)
Union City	21	0	24	87	23	0	0	0	2	159	0	16	154	21
Vacaville	13	1	0	123	30	0	0	0	0	166	0	0	62	87
Westcat	95	2	52	94	108	0	16	2	0	377	69		446	)
WETA	398	295	34	0	0	0	219	0	0	1,307	0	32	1,133	206
Subtotal	\$1,653	\$1,220	\$1,090	\$2,682	\$992	\$0	\$695	\$129	\$17	\$8,479	\$584	\$144	\$8,522	\$685
Clipper <sup>®</sup>	0	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	0	0	96	כ
Total	\$36,220	\$32,998	\$13,521	\$11,807	\$7,040	\$9,942	\$1,122	896\$	\$207	\$116,824	\$2,131	\$1,731	\$114,277	\$6,409
	ı		,				-							

<sup>\*</sup> Additional operating revenue available for Capital Replacement or to support other Plan Bay Area projects.

Table 3. Plan Bay Area 28-Year Capital Needs and Revenues Summary for All Projects (All Scores) (In Escalated \$ Millions)

Operators	All Scores Capital Need	Total Committed Revenues	Plan Bay Area Regional Discretionary Revenues	Plan Bay Area CMA Discretionary Revenues	Total Capital Revenues	Remaining Needs* After Discretionary Revenues*
Large Operators						
AC Transit	\$3,354	\$1,324	\$267	\$0	\$1,591	\$1,763
BART	16,473	6,349	3,982	114	10,444	6,028
Caltrain	3,342	358	731	0	1,090	2,252
GGBHTD	1,230	949	132	0	778	452
SamTrans	1,468	461	337	0	797	671
SFMTA	12,712	5,194	2,366	835	8,395	4,317
VTA	4,313	4,313	0	0	4,313	0
Subtotal	\$42,891	\$18,644	\$7,815	\$949	\$27,408	\$15,483
Small Operators						
ACE	\$155	\$102	\$17	\$0	\$119	\$36
CCCTA	415	372	0	0	372	43
Dixon	7	1	2	0	4	0
ECCTA	197	112	19	0	172	25
Fairfield	184	110	0	0	110	74
LAVTA	218	112	67	0	178	40
Marin County	43	32	6	0	41	2
Napa	145	125	0	0	125	21
Petaluma	34	27	0	0	27	7
Rio Vista	10	3	0	0	3	7
Santa Rosa	127	111	0	0	111	16
SMART	241	64	85	0	149	92
SolTrans	409	199	0	0	199	211
Sonoma County	592	78	48	0	126	143
Union City	94	24	5	0	29	4
Vacaville	89	89	0	0	89	0
Westcat	157	09	47	0	107	51
WETA	324	324	0	0	324	0
Subtotal	\$3,065	\$1,953	\$341	\$0	\$2,293	\$772
Clipper <sup>®</sup>	584	316	157	0	473	111
Total	\$46,540	\$20,913	\$8,313	\$949	\$30,175	\$16,365

<sup>\*</sup> Remaining needs to meet performance target of 0% of assets in service past useful life.

Table 4. Distribution of Regional Discretionary Revenues for Transit Capital Needs (In Escalated \$ Millions)

Operators	Based on Vehicle Remaining Need*	emaining Need*	Based on Other Score 16 Remaining Need*	16 Remaining Need*	Total
Large Operators	Vehicle Remaining Need	Discretionary Funding	Other 16 Remaining Need	Discretionary Funding	· Discretionary Funding
AC Transit	\$155	\$155	\$186	\$112	\$267
BART	0	0	109'9	3,982	3,982
Caltrain		_	1,210	730	731
GGBHTD	32	32	166	100	132
SamTrans	283	283	68	54	337
SFMTA	0	0	3,923	2,366	2,366
VTA	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal	\$471	\$471	\$12,176	\$7,344	\$7,815
Small Operators					
ACE	\$16	\$16	\$1	\$1	\$17
CCCTA	0	0	0	0	0
Dixon	2	2	0	0	2
ECCTA	09	09	2	1	19
Fairfield	0	0	0	0	0
LAVTA	63	63	9	3	29
Marin County	6	6	0	0	6
Napa	0	0	0	0	0
Petaluma	0	0	0	0	0
Rio Vista	0	0	0	0	0
Santa Rosa	0	0	0	0	0
SMART	0	0	140	85	82
SolTrans	0	0	0	0	0
Sonoma County	37	37	18	11	48
Union City	4	4	1	1	5
Vacaville	0	0	0	0	0
Westcat	46	46	1	1	47
WETA	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal	\$238	\$238	\$169	\$102	\$341
Clipper®	0	0	261	157	157
Total	602\$	602\$	\$12,606	\$7,604	\$8,313

 $<sup>^{</sup>st}$  Remaining needs to meet performance target of 0% of assets in service past useful life.

Table 5. Plan Bay Area 28-Year Transit Capital Maintenance Revenues Summary (In Escalated \$ Millions)

					Committe	d Transit	itted Transit Capital Revenues	venues				Plan Bay	Plan Bay	
Operators	FTA Formula Funds	County Sales Taxes	AB 664 Bridge Tolls	BART Seismic GO Bonds	Prop 1B Rev- Based	STP Transit Capital Rehab	2% Bridge Tolls	Pop 1B Pop- Based	Operating Funds	Reconcile Adjust.*	Total Committed Revenues	Area Regional Disc. Revenues	Area CMA Disc. Revenues	Total Capital Revenues
Large Operators														
AC Transit	\$870	\$0	\$42	0\$	\$21	2\$	\$0	0\$	\$384	0\$	\$1,324	\$267	0\$	\$1,591
BART	3,635	29	175	215	25	28	0	0	2,184	0	6,349	3,982	114	10,444
Caltrain	321	122	16	0	6	6	0	0	0	(119)	898	187	0	1,090
GGBHTD	633	0	0	0	80	4	0	_	0	0	646	132	0	778
SamTrans	437	0	6	0	11	4	0	0	0	0	461	337	0	797
SFMTA	4,091	9//	84	0	69	41	0	0	132	0	5,194	2,366	835	8,395
VTA	2,175	420	0	0	32	14	0	0	3,024	(1,352)	4,313	0	0	4,313
Subtotal	\$12,163	\$1,348	\$326	\$215	\$202	\$137	\$0	\$1	\$5,724	(\$1,471)	\$18,644	\$7,815	\$949	\$27,408
Small Operators														
ACE	\$26	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1	\$1	\$0	\$0	\$44	\$0	\$102	\$17	\$0	\$119
CCCTA	174	0	8	0	1	1	0	1	186	0	372	0	0	372
Dixon	_	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	l	2	0	4
ECCTA	100	0	2	0	0	_	0	_	2	0	112	19	0	172
Fairfield	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	0	0	110
LAVTA	105	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	112	29	0	178
Marin County	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	35	6	0	41
Napa	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	0	125	0	0	125
Petaluma	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	27	0	0	27
Rio Vista	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	ε	0	0	3
Santa Rosa	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	0	0	111
SMART	63	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	85	0	149
SolTrans	139	0	7	0		_	0	_	50	0	199		0	199
Sonoma County	9/	0	0	0	0	_	0	_	0	0	78	48	0	126
Union City	31	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	21	0	54	5	0	59
Vacaville	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	(94)	89		0	68
Westcat	26	0	3	0	_	0	0	0	0	0	90	47	0	107
WETA	222	0	11	0	0	_	29	0	206		324		0	324
Subtotal	\$1,416	\$0	\$40	\$0	\$6	\$10	\$29	\$6	\$685	(\$239)	\$1,953	\$341	\$0	\$2,293
Clipper <sup>®</sup>	313	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	316	157	0	473
Total	\$13,892	\$1,348	\$366	\$215	\$207	\$149	\$29	2\$	\$6,409	(\$1,710)	\$20,913	\$8,313	\$949	\$30,175

<sup>\*</sup> Revenues for operators with projected capital maintenance surpluses adjusted so total revenues equal amount needed to cover capital needs.

#### Metropolitan Transportation Commission

#### **Management Staff**

**Steve Heminger** *Executive Director* 

**Ann Flemer** *Deputy Executive Director, Policy* 

Andrew B. Fremier
Deputy Executive Director,
Operations

Adrienne D. Weil General Counsel

**Brian Mayhew** *Chief Financial Officer* 

**Ken Kirkey** *Director, Planning* 

**Alix Bockelman** *Director, Programming and Allocations* 

## Association of Bay Area Governments

#### **Management Staff**

**Ezra Rapport** *Executive Director* 

**Patricia Jones** Assistant Executive Director

Kenneth K. Moy Legal Counsel

**Miriam Chion** *Planning and Research Director* 



## Association of Bay Area Governments

P.O. Box 2050 Oakland, CA 94604-2050

**510.464.7900** PHONE info@abag.ca.gov EMAIL www.abag.ca.gov WEB



## Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter 101 Eighth Street Oakland, CA 94607-4700

510.817.5700 PHONE 510.817.5769 TDD/TTY info@mtc.ca.gov EMAIL www.mtc.ca.gov WEB