

CHAPTER 2. Goals, Objectives, Standards Service and System Evaluation Operations Plan and Budget

A. Process

The development of the SRTP is the principal process for creation and modification of GGBHTD transit service goals, objectives, measures and standards. These measures and standards are applied to Golden Gate Transit bus system (including paratransit), Golden Gate ferry system, and individually to all regional bus and ferry routes under GGBHTD control. The GGBHTD Mission Statement provides the context for transit goals, and is as follows:

The mission of the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District is to provide safe and reliable operation, maintenance and enhancement of the Golden Gate Bridge and to provide transportation services, as resources allow, for customers within the U.S. Highway 101 Golden Gate Corridor.

The priority given to the Golden Gate Bridge and US 101 corridor is reflected in the way transit services are defined as regional and partnership services. Regional services are consistent with the mission statement; they serve to relieve the Bridge and the US 101 corridor to the north and south of traffic congestion during peak traffic periods, and provide regional mobility during off-peak periods. Regional services also respond to federal mandates to serve low-income, minority, and disabled passengers traveling between San Francisco, Marin, and Sonoma counties. Partnership transit services include Partnership-Local, which provides MCTD with local bus services in Marin County, Partnership-Basic, which provides MTC with regional bus service between Marin and Contra Costa counties on the I-580 Richmond-San Rafael Bridge corridor, and Partnership-Commuter Regional Express Bus service between Sonoma and Marin counties and Sonoma and San Francisco counties. Operating data on Partnership-Local service is not reported in this Plan.

Staff also considers MTC requirements and guidelines and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Triennial Review comments to develop and revise existing SRTP goals and objectives. This process results in updated and improved goals and objectives. Staff then develops appropriate performance measures and standards, working with the two transit operating divisions that are ultimately responsible for service performance.

The goals, objectives, measures, and standards contained in this chapter also reflect the *Strategic Plan for Achieving Long-Term Financial Stability*, which committed GGBHTD to reducing annual expenditures by \$25 million in FY 2004 and quantified the “as resources allow” condition of the Mission Statement. The 2002 *Strategic Plan* set FY 2003 and 2004 financial targets, and called for a substantial Golden Gate Bridge toll increase and significant transit service reductions and fare increases. In subsequent years, to address remaining fiscal requirements, GGBHTD has continued these policies by, for example, implementing annual transit fare increases and managing service productivity.

B. Current Goals, Objectives, Measures and Standards

CORE GOAL: To provide productive, effective, and cost-efficient regional transit services with available resources

First Core Objective

Productivity of Services and Resources: Strive to enhance annual productivity of transit services, equipment and operating labor to maximize use of available resources.

Primary measure: **Passengers per service (revenue) hour**

Standard: Bus service productivity varies by service type. At least 20 passengers per hour during peak periods and 15 during off-peak are desirable.

For Ferry service, the productivity standards are at least 150 passengers per hour for peak and 100 for off-peak.

The analysis in this document begins with FY 2005 because the significant service reorganization that took place in FY 2004 makes that year unsuitable for comparison purposes. Data for FY 2007 are for the first eight months of that fiscal year, July 2006-February 2007, unless noted otherwise. This comparison is applied to the various service types of GGT bus service and to Golden Gate Ferry. The bus service types are Regional Basic, Regional Commute, Regional Shuttle, and Partnership Basic (East Bay routes) and Partnership Commute (MTC REB routes). Partnership Marin Local is not analyzed in the SRTP. Service types are further described in Chapter 1.

Exhibit 2-1A shows bus passengers per service (revenue) hour for FYs 2005-2007 by bus service type. This measure of productivity has declined slightly but steadily every year for all service types except for Partnership Basic, the Marin-East Bay service. Regional service represents 92% of GGT passengers and 88% of GGT revenue hours over the comparison period. Passengers per service hour declined by 5% for Regional service and by 3.7% for Partnership service. All services are currently operating below their productivity standards with the exception of Regional Basic bus service.

Exhibit 2-1A – Transit Service Productivity

BUS PASSENGERS per REVENUE HOUR

Regional	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007*
Basic	20.9	20.9	20.3
Commute	19.1	18.8	17.8
Commute Shuttle	20.5	19.9	19.1
Partnership			
Basic	12.3	12.1	12.5
Commute	15.2	13.5	12.2
ALL	19.2	19.0	18.3

*July 06-February 07

Another way to consider bus service productivity is to examine passengers per bus trip. In general, GGBHTD desires buses to operate at no less than half seating capacity. Since most GGT buses have about 40 seats, a standard of 20 passengers per bus trip was set for basic and commute bus services. Also, an analysis of **emissions rates for personal vehicles and transit buses** shows that if a bus carries more than 10 passengers per trip, it creates a net decrease in air pollution. So a target of “more than 10 passengers a trip” may also be used as a minimum

productivity standard for shuttle service. **Exhibit 2-1B** demonstrates that productivity measured in terms of passengers per bus trip has remained steady for the last three fiscal years. All services are operating above standard except for Partnership Basic service on the Richmond Bridge.

Exhibit 2-1B – Transit Service Productivity

BUS PASSENGERS per TRIP

(Standard is 20 or more, 10 or more for shuttle)

Regional	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007*
Basic	49.7	50.3	49.3
Commute	28.6	29.4	28.7
Commute Shuttle	13.3	14.2	14.3
Partnership			
Basic	12.2	11.8	11.9
Commute	26.1	27.7	29.7
ALL	32.1	32.6	32.1

*July 06-March 07

Exhibit 2-1C shows ferry passengers per service (revenue) hour for FYs 2005-2007. This measure of productivity has increased steadily throughout the analysis period. A finer analysis shows that this measure has increased individually for all three ferry routes: Larkspur, Sausalito and AT&T ballpark. All ferry services operate above their performance standard except for midday service.

Exhibit 2-1C– Transit Service Productivity

FERRY PASSENGERS per REVENUE HOUR

(Standard is at least 150 passengers/hour for peak, 100 for off-peak)

TIME OF DAY	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007*
AM Peak	194	207	218
Midday	77	80	90
PM Peak	140	147	161
Weekend	137	145	162
Total System	129	136	148

*First 8 months of FY 07

The comparison between peak and non-peak travel is moderated by the inclusion in the peak periods of non-peak direction trips and evening trips that could be considered to occur after the commute travel period. For example, during the current FY, AM Peak productivity is 218 passengers per service hour, but southbound AM Peak trips average 328 passengers/service hour, and northbound AM Peak trips average only 19 passengers/service hour. Individual ferry trips exhibit very high productivity. For example, the 7:10 a.m. and 8:20 a.m. southbound departures each carry an average of more than 400 persons a trip. In the PM Peak period, less productive departures after 7 p.m. are included in the performance statistics.

Secondary measure: **Bus Operator Absences**

Standard: Reduce total absences to 25% of Scheduled Operator Days

“Operator absences as a percentage of total scheduled operator work” is a new measure added to the SRTP from a recommendation by the Triennial Performance Audit. This measure includes Marin Local service because it is not possible to separate out operator or mechanic absences by

service type. Operator absences affect the cost, reliability and dependability of the service. The table shown below demonstrates that, although operator absences are substantial, they have diminished significantly in recent years. The units for absences are operator days. A run is the daily work of one driver, so “absences in days” corresponds as a unit with runs. Scheduled absences include vacation and holidays. Unscheduled absences include sick and other times a worker is absent from the job. It also includes paid time away from driving (non-platform hours), such as training. Staff is in the process of developing means to reduce the rate of operator absences.

Exhibit 2-2A

OPERATOR ABSENCES (in days) (Standard is not more than 25%)

	ABSENCES SCHEDULED	ABSENCES UNSCHEDULED	TOTAL ABSENT OPERATORS	ABSENCES vs. RUNS
FY 2004	9,036	12,692	21,728	39%
FY 2005	7,484	10,485	17,969	35%
FY 2006	7,425	8,498	15,930	32%
FY 2007*	5,022	5,097	10,096	30%

*First 8 months of FY 07

Secondary measure: **Ferry Vessel Master and Deckhand Absences**

Standard: Reduce total absences to 20% of Scheduled Work Days

“Vessel Master and Deckhand absences as a percentage of total scheduled work days” is a new measure corresponding to Bus operator absences. **Exhibit 2-2B** below shows that total absence time as a percentage of total scheduled time increased from about 23% in FY 06 to 25% in FY 07 (*through April).

Exhibit 2-2B

VESSEL MASTER AND DECKHAND ABSENCES (in hours)(Standard is not more than 20%)

	ABSENCES	SCHEDULED	RATE
FY 2006	18,371	80,080	23%
FY 2007*	19,786	80,080	25%

Secondary measure: **Mechanic Absences**

Standard: Reduce total absences to 20% of scheduled work

Mechanic absences impact the cost, reliability and dependability of the service because this affects vehicle availability and frequency of in-service breakdowns. Bus Maintenance is now producing a manpower report that tracks absenteeism among maintenance staff. Accordingly, the absenteeism rate for FY 06 was 23%; for FY 07 (*through April) it was 18%, a substantial improvement which meets the standard of 20%. Staff attributes this improvement to a very active provisional backfill of vacant positions.

Exhibit 2-3

MECHANIC ABSENCE (in hours) (Standard is not more than 20%)

	ABSENCES	SCHEDULED	RATE
FY 2006	16,870	74,880	23%
FY 2007*	11,810	64,880	18%

Second Core Objective:

Service Effectiveness: Provide reliable, safe and effective transit services that attract and retain choice riders and meet the needs of transit-dependent riders.

QUALITY

Measure: **Operated transit services as a percentage of scheduled transit**

Standard: Operate 99% of scheduled bus or ferry trips

Golden Gate Transit has managed to maintain a very low rate of bus service cancellation since the last SRTP, which covered the period through FY 2004. The cancellation rate for the current SRTP period for all bus service (excluding Marin local) is shown below:

Exhibit 2-4A

BUS TRIPS OPERATED (*Standard is to operate at least 99%*)

FY 2005	99.94%
FY 2006	99.96%
FY 2007*	99.96%

*First 8 months of FY 07

Ferry service also maintains a very low incidence of service cancellations. The cancellation rate is shown below:

Exhibit 2-4B

FERRY TRIPS OPERATED (*Standard is to operate at least 99%*)

FY 2005	99.99%
FY 2006	100.00%
FY 2007*(99.99%

*First 8 months of FY 07

Ferry service cancellations are almost entirely due to mechanical failures.

Measure: **Scheduled service times and actual service times at key time points**

Standard: Operate on-schedule (see definition) 90% of the time for bus, 95% of the time for ferry

Bus on-time performance is to operate no more than 5 minutes behind schedule and no more than 1 minute ahead of schedule. For Ferry, it is defined as no more than 5 minutes behind schedule during commute hours and 10 minutes during non-commute hours.

For most of the SRTP period, Bus service continued to miss its on-time performance goal of 90%. But during the last two fiscal-years, on-time performance has improved significantly to the point where it is currently meeting the standard.

Exhibit 2-5A

BUS ON-TIME PERFORMANCE (*Standard is to operate on-time 90%*)

FY 2005	81.1% on-time
FY 2006	85.2% on-time
FY 2007	90.8% on-time

This improvement is likely due to the transit service reorganization that occurred in 2003 and the completion of major highway infrastructure projects, such as the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge seismic retrofit project, which were accompanied by significant traffic congestion.

Ferry service met its standard for on-time performance for FYs 05 and 06 and is on target for FY 07 through February. However, there has been a small but significant decline in on-time performance as compared to earlier years when it approached 100%. This decline may be attributed to various factors, including the aging of the two catamaran vessels and a substantial increase in passengers bringing bicycles aboard the Sausalito ferry. In the first case, these vessels sometimes operate on three rather than four engines and arrive late. In the second case, more tourists are renting bicycles in downtown San Francisco, riding to Sausalito, and returning on the ferry. This may increase boarding time by several minutes, enough to cause a late arrival.

Exhibit 2-5B

FERRY ON-TIME PERFORMANCE (Standard is to operate on-time 95%)

FY 2005	97.6% on-time
FY 2006	96.4% on-time
FY 2007*	94.8% on-time

*First 8 months of FY 07

Measure: Miles between in-service mechanical failures
Standard: Bus: no more frequent than 1 per every 20,000 miles;
 Ferry: no more than 1 per every 10,000 miles

Bus maintains a “Road Failure Report” that incorporates the NTD road failure definition. The following table shows the record of Bus in-service mechanical failures and the failure rate.

Exhibit 2-6A

BUS MECHANICAL FAILURE RATE (Standard is at least 20,000 miles between failures)

	Mechanical Failures	Revenue Miles	Miles/Breakdown
FY 2005	661	5,116,340	7,740
FY 2006	374	5,079,200	13,581
FY 2007*	228	4,745,112	20,812

*First 9 months of FY 07

The data show significant year-to-year improvements in the bus road failure rate. Maintenance staff attributes much of this improvement to replacement of pollution-control devices (PM traps) on the fleet of diesel buses. These traps had a tendency to malfunction, causing a number of breakdowns.

The following table shows the number of Ferry in-service mechanical failures and the mechanical failure rate for the analysis period. Golden Gate Ferry maintains a low mechanical failure rate that exceeds standards.

Exhibit 2-6B

FERRY MECHANICAL FAILURE RATE (Standard is at least 10,000 miles between failures)

	Mechanical Failures	Revenue Miles	Miles/Breakdown
FY 2005	16	184,041	11,503
FY 2006	3	184,147	61,382
FY 2007*	6	183,071	30,512

*First 11 months of FY 07

Measure: Miles between accidents and accidents per year
Standard: Bus: no more frequently than 1 every 400,000 miles;
 Ferry: no accidents

Bus and Ferry accidents are recorded according to the NTD definitions and therefore include passenger trip-and-fall incidents. The bus system continues to maintain a high standard of miles between accidents, even though the rate has slipped somewhat for FY 2007 through March 2007. The ferry system continues to achieve a very high degree of safe operations with no accidents on the ferry system during FYs 2005 and 2006. There have been two in FY 2007 through March, both of which were passenger “trip and fall” incidents and did not involve the vessel’s operation or movement.

Exhibit 2-7A

BUS ACCIDENT RATE (*miles between accidents*)

	Accidents	Revenue Miles	Miles/Accident
FY 2005	9	5,116,340	568,482
FY 2006	9	5,079,100	564,344
FY 2007*	11	3,832,240	348,385

*First 9 months of FY 07

Exhibit 2-7B

FERRY ACCIDENT RATE (*Ferry accidents per year*)

	Accidents	
FY 2005	0	
FY 2006	0	
FY 2007	2	trip-and-fall incidents

UTILITY

Measure: Maintain or increase use of transit and satisfy customers. Retain riders on services operating at capacity, and increase ridership on services with available capacity
Standard: Transbay Commute Transit Mode Share of 25%

The 2000 Census counted 125,555 workers residing in Marin. Of these, 30,838 (24.6%) commuted to San Francisco. Of the San Francisco commuters, 6,574 traveled by Bus and 3,175 by Ferry, or 9,749 total (31.6%). Of the 221,959 workers residing in Sonoma, 8,288 (3.7%) commuted to San Francisco. Of the San Francisco commuters, 2,130 traveled by Bus and 48 by Ferry, or 2,178 total (26%).

The combined Sonoma and Marin-to-San Francisco transit mode share was 30%, well above the 25% standard. Census data would include travel by all transit providers such as Tiburon ferry and private buses and vans.

According to FY 2006 data maintained by GGBHTD, for the four hours 6:00 to 10:00 a.m., southbound traffic to San Francisco over the Golden Gate Bridge averaged 18,123 vehicles, while GGBHTD buses and ferries carried 5,187 passengers to San Francisco. Assuming 1.3 occupants per vehicle, transit’s mode share was about 22%.

Measure: Passenger complaints by type
Standard: 100 complaints per 100,000 boardings (99.9% customer satisfaction)

GGBHTD tracks complaints received regarding transit service by type. The following table shows Bus and Ferry complaints by category for the last three fiscal years measured by a rate of complaints per 100,000 boardings.

Exhibit 2-8A

FERRY COMPLAINTS BY TYPE (*per 100,000 boardings*)

	Service	Admin.	Facilities Maint.	Vessel Maint.	Total
FY 2005	6.0	0.9	0.5	1.4	8.7
FY 2006	10.9	0.8	0.3	0.7	12.7
FY 2007*	13.6	0.4	0.8	1.1	15.9

*First 9 months of FY 07

Ferry passenger complaints have generally increased year to year but remain quite low. High-speed ferry service has been popular and is attracting new customers. This popularity has led to some overcrowding during the commute period. Small numbers of southbound morning commuters are regularly turned away from the most popular departures when the boats reach capacity.

Exhibit 2-8B

BUS COMPLAINTS BY TYPE (*per 100,000 boardings*)

	Service	Facilities Maint.	Vehicle Maint.	No Category	Total
FY 2005	21.7	0.1	0.2	4.5	26.4
FY 2006	20.4	0.0	0.1	4.9	25.5
FY 2007*	22.1	0.0	0.0	15.6	37.8

*First 9 months of FY 07

Bus passenger complaints have generally increased year to year. It is likely that the increasing ease of submitting a complaint via email or through the GGBHTD website, in addition to the perceived deterioration in service, accounts for most of the growth. Service quality measures such as on-time performance or trip cancellations have stayed relatively constant over the same period. The customer service e-address customerservice@goldengate.org is prominently displayed in the GGT *Transit Guide* and this makes it easy to submit a complaint.

EQUITY – MOBILITY FOR TRANSIT DEPENDENTS

Primary measure: **Provide service along US 101 between San Francisco and Santa Rosa with available GGT resources, and along I-580 between San Rafael and Richmond with available RM-2 resources**

Standard: Provide service coverage to low-income, minority communities in the GGBHTD service area

GGT’s primary service area is the US 101 corridor from San Francisco to Santa Rosa. The US 101 corridor links the most populous areas of Marin and Sonoma counties. GGT must concentrate its resources along this corridor to provide effective transit services for the most residents. In conjunction with local bus operators, the following low-income and minority communities receive bus service: Marin City and the San Rafael Canal District in Marin County, and Roseland in Santa Rosa in Sonoma County. In addition, nearly all areas identified by the U.S. Census as low-income and minority in Marin and many in Sonoma are served by GGT bus. GGT bus also provides service to and through several low-income neighborhoods in San Francisco, such as South of Market and the Fillmore.

GGT's two partnership Basic routes are supported by RM-2 funding and operate along I-580 through Richmond, a predominantly low-income, minority community in Contra Costa County.

Primary measure: **Bus service headways and service duration**

Standard: Meet MTC Lifeline standards

GGT is considered a "Suburban Transit Operator" and has the following lifeline service objectives: **service span** objective is weekdays and Saturdays 6 a.m. to 10 p.m., and Sundays 8 a.m. to 10 p.m.; **frequency** objective is every 30 minutes for all time periods.

Current GGT routes covered by Lifeline guidelines are 10, 40/42, and 70/80.

Route 10 does not meet the guidelines. It operates hourly at all times. Its service span begins at about 6:30 a.m. (instead of 6:00) and ends between 8:00 and 8:30 p.m. (instead of 10:00).

Routes 40/42 partially meet the guidelines. Service span exceeds guidelines on weekdays, but only partially on weekends. Routes 40/42 start between 7:00 and 8:00 a.m. on weekends, which meets the Sunday objective but not the Saturday objective. Routes 40/42 meet frequency guidelines during weekday daytime hours, but not during weekday evening hours or on weekends, when the service is hourly.

Routes 70 and 80 within Marin County partially meet the guidelines. All service meets the span objective, and all northbound service meets the frequency objective, but southbound service is hourly after about 8:00 p.m.

Route 80 within Sonoma County meets the span objective at all times but does not meet the frequency objective because service is hourly at all times.

Secondary measure: **Provide transit connectivity throughout service area**

Standard: Connect with other transit operators at MTC-designated regional transfer locations and other regional transfer locations

GGT provides inter-operator connections at several MTC-designated regional transfer locations throughout its service area. These include the San Rafael Transit Center (SRTC), the Santa Rosa Transit Mall, the El Cerrito Del Norte BART station, Richmond BART station and five proximate transfer locations in downtown San Francisco: the Ferry Terminal, Embarcadero BART station, Montgomery BART station, Civic Center BART station and Transbay Transit Terminal. GGT also serves the following non-designated major transfer locations: Marin City, San Anselmo Hub, Sausalito Ferry Terminal, Strawberry (Mill Valley), Golden Gate Bridge toll plaza, Petaluma Depot, and Cotati Hub.

In Marin, GGT provides direct connections with Tiburon Ferry, Blue & Gold Sausalito Ferry, Marin Airporter, Sonoma County Airport Express, Sonoma County Transit, Greyhound and **five** publicly-operated shuttle services – West Marin Stagecoach, EZ Rider (Novato), and the Santa Venetia, Twin Cities, and Marinwood shuttles. In Sonoma County, GGT provides direct connections with Sonoma County Transit, Petaluma Transit, Santa Rosa CityBus, Mendocino Transit, Sonoma County Airport Express, and VINE of Napa. In Contra Costa County, GGT provides direct connections with AC Transit, BART, Amtrak, Vallejo Transit, and WestCAT. In San Francisco, GGT provides direct connections with AC Transit, Muni, BART, SamTrans, Greyhound, Amtrak Shuttle, Presidio Shuttle, and others.

The connecting transit services of GGBHTD – MCTD, Santa Rosa Transit, Petaluma Transit, and SCT – combined with extensive commuter park-and-ride lots, cover all urbanized areas of Marin and Sonoma counties. SCT provides connecting service from areas formerly served by GGT to GGT transfer points in Sonoma and Marin counties.

In San Francisco, the GGBHTD transit system serves the downtown Financial District and Civic Center areas. Service is provided to the Presidio, Marina, Van Ness/Russian Hill, Geary Boulevard, South of Market, and North Beach areas of San Francisco. Connections with Muni provide GGT passengers with access to the entire city.

GGBHTD also participates in the MTC *Transit Connectivity Plan*, which details a comprehensive strategy for easing passengers' movement from one transit system to another by providing more reliable connections, making it easier to pay fares, improving wayfinding signage and reducing overall travel times. By making multi-operator transit trips easier and more convenient, good connectivity can help attract new transit riders — and retain existing riders. Poor connectivity, on the other hand, can make transit unattractive to new customers by rendering travel frustrating, time-consuming and costly.

The plan highlights connectivity improvements at 21 regional transit hubs around the Bay Area and identifies six specific focus areas:

- wayfinding signage
- transit information
- real-time technology
- schedule coordination
- fare coordination
- last-mile connecting services

Primary measure: **Provide required level of paratransit service**

Standard: Deny ADA-mandated paratransit service to no one

GGBHTD has complied with ADA guidelines since December 1994. GGBHTD continues a no-denial policy for intercounty service with no denials of eligible ride requests since December 1994. All requests for service to origins and destinations within the ADA-mandated service area and service hours are provided. Additional service beyond the mandate is provided on a space-available basis. All reservations are accepted and scheduled during normal business hours for the next day of service. GGBHTD paratransit service meets or exceeds ADA standards for days and hours of operation.

As of April 2007, all GGBHTD intercounty paratransit trips continue to be scheduled within one hour of desired departure time. The on-board ride time standard for this service (no more than twice that of comparable fixed-route service) has been met by 96% of trips during FY 2007 year-to-date, by 96.5% of trips during FY 2006, and by 97.7% of trips during FY 2005. On-time performance was 90% during FY 2007 year-to-date, 91% in FY 2006, and 90% in FY 2005.

GGBHTD coordinates its paratransit service with all adjoining transit operators. WSW either provides an extended ride into the adjoining service area or transfers the passenger to an adjoining operator's vehicle at a designated transfer point.

Secondary measure: **Paratransit passenger no-shows and cancellations**

Standard: Not more than 2% for passenger no-shows and late cancellations

When a passenger is not at the scheduled pickup location (a no-show) or cancels a trip on less than 2 hours notice, the vehicle cannot be reassigned, service capacity is wasted and expense is needlessly accrued. GGBHTD, MCTD and WSW have worked with the disabled community to minimize no-shows and cancellations. New procedures were first incorporated into WSW's Paratransit Riders' Consumer Guide in 1998 and updated in April 2004. During the current SRTP period, contractor has met the standard of not more than 2% no-shows and 2% late cancellations. Contractor has further reduced the no-show rate from 1.3% in 2005 to 1.0% FY 2007 YTD. This may reflect a FY 2006 revision in contractor's no-show, late cancellation policy, which penalizes customers for no-shows at 2 times the rate of late cancellations. It also may explain the increase in the late cancellation rate from less than 1% in FY 2005 to 1.6% FY 2007 year-to-date.

Exhibit 2-9

PARATRANSIT NO-SHOWS & LATE CANCELLATIONS

	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007 YTD*
No-shows	1.3%	1.2%	1.0%
Late cancellations	<1.0%	1.3%	1.6%

*First 9 months of FY 07

Secondary measure: **Paratransit service hour productivity**

Standard: Year-to-year increase in service hours not to exceed increase in passengers carried

GGBHTD staff works with MCTD and WSW to review costs and negotiate a paratransit budget and associated agreements that reflect appropriate operating costs and fairly allocate those costs to each agency. Historically, WSW has sought to increase the number of trips provided while holding constant the number of service hours necessary to provide those trips. Intercounty paratransit ridership has generally grown along with increases in service hours provided. A downturn in productivity has occurred during FY 2007, primarily due to the relocation of a school for disabled students, resulting in slower growth in demand (up 1.2%) and a decrease in the number of trips that could be combined.

Exhibit 2-10

CHANGE IN PARATRANSIT RIDERSHIP & HOURS

	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007YTD*
Change in ridership	8.0%	10.0%	2.6%
Change in service hours	8.5%	2.6%	5.5%

*First 9 months of FY 07

Secondary measure: **Do not discriminate in the provision of transit services**

Standard: Submit and receive approval for Title VI Civil Rights report

GGBHTD remains in compliance with Title VI, according to FTA Circular 4702.1. GGBHTD prepares a Title VI report every three years in accordance with FTA guidelines, most recently in September 2006. In 2003, GGBHTD also prepared a special Title VI analysis as part of its *Strategic Plan for Achieving Long-Term Financial Stability*. The major product of this effort was the Modified Service Plan, which resulted in two service reductions – one in March 2003 and a more extensive reduction implemented in November 2003. The special Title VI analysis was undertaken to demonstrate that these significant service reductions would not disproportionately or unfairly affect minority or transit-dependent communities. The September

2006 Title VI update is found in the **Appendix**. GGBHTD will prepare subsequent Title VI updates according to the new FTA guidelines published as FTA Circular 4702.1A.

Third Core Objective:

Fiscal Responsibility: Operate in a fiscally responsible manner that considers the limited availability of tolls, fares and external operating subsidies

Primary measure: **Fare Recovery – fare revenue as percentage of operating expense**

Standard: Fare Recovery Ratio (FRR): 25% for Bus, 40% for Ferry

This primary measure has remained relatively constant for Bus, even showing a slight increase from FY 2006 to FY 2007. This indicates that fare increases are keeping pace with increases in operating costs.

Ferry Fare Recovery Ratio has increased over the SRTP years as both passengers and fare levels have increased, resulting in significant revenue growth. Ferry operating expense actually decreased from FY 05 to FY 06, then increased slightly to FY 07. This has resulted in significant FRR growth. This expense decrease was due to a one-time compensation settlement payment made in FY05, resulting in exceptionally high expenses that year. It is unlikely that the operating cost decrease will be repeated. Rather, slight increases in operating expense are expected.

Exhibit 2-11 FRR (Fare Revenue/Expense)

BUS

Regional	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007 thru March 07
Basic	28.6%	27.2%	27.0%
Commute	30.4%	28.5%	29.1%
Commute shuttle	5.6%	1.1%	1.4%
Partnership			
Basic	16.1%	15.8%	17.4%
Commute	34.9%	29.6%	28.7%
All	28.3%	26.5%	27.0%
FERRY	32.0%	39.0%	44.0%

Secondary measure: **Cost Efficiency – average operating cost per service hour (cost rate)**

Standard: Hold cost rate increases to no more than 5% a year

This measure provides the average operating cost for the different types of GGT bus service, including the contracted basic and commute service.

Exhibit 2-12A OPERATING COST per REVENUE HOUR

BUS

Regional	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007 thru March 07
Basic	\$153	\$162	\$167
Commute	\$204	\$219	\$224
Commute shuttle	\$247	\$295	\$292

Partnership			
Basic	\$153	\$158	\$162
Commute	\$171	\$187	\$189
All	\$177	\$189	\$193

Operating cost per service hour continues to increase, although the rate of increase has declined significantly from 6.7% from FY 05 to FY 06 to 2.4% from FY 06 to FY 07. Commute services are more expensive to operate because operations are concentrated during peak commute periods.

Exhibit 2-12B FERRY OPERATING COST per REVENUE HOUR

	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007 thru March 07
Cost/per revenue hour	\$1,763	\$1,540	\$1,614
Without depreciation	\$1,458	\$1,456	\$1,550

This table shows Ferry operating cost per service hour both with and without depreciation. This was done because of an unusually large depreciation expense in FY 05 that inflated total operating cost. Total cost per service hour declined by 13% from FY 05 to FY 06. Without depreciation, the cost remained the same. Total cost increased by about 5% from FY 06 to FY 07.

Secondary measure: **Toll leverage – % of total transit revenues from internal and external sources**

Standard: Limit tolls to 50%, with 25% from bus fares, 40% from ferry fares and 5% from other operating revenues, and remainder from grants and other external sources

This is a measure of the amount of bridge toll revenue used to support Bus and Ferry transit as a percentage of operating costs.

Exhibit 2-13

**PERCENT OF TOTAL TRANSIT REVENUES
from INTERNAL and EXTERNAL SOURCES**

	FY 2005			FY 2006			FY 2007*		
	Operat'ns	Tolls	External	Operat'ns	Tolls	External	Operat'ns	Tolls	External
BUS	28%	40%	31%	27%	50%	24%	27%	52%	21%
FERRY	32%	55%	13%	39%	46%	15%	44%	47%	12%
TOTAL	30%	44%	26%	31%	48%	21%	33%	49%	18%

*FY 2007 data annualized from 9 months actual

Since the economic recession of 2001, and in response to concern that GGBHTD was relying too heavily on toll revenues to sustain transit services, GGBHTD reduced transit expenses and aggressively sought additional operating revenues and grant funding for transit operating subsidy. **Exhibit 2-12** shows that toll revenues committed to transit operating revenues have declined each year from FY 05 to FY 07. Despite a decline in the proportion of state and federal subventions used to support Bus and Ferry in this period, GGBHTD has secured additional operating revenues to enable a more acceptable contribution of toll revenues to sustain regional bus and ferry transit services.

Secondary measure: **Budget Accuracy – budgeted operating costs compared to actual operating costs for each mode**

Standard: Actual costs within 5% of budgeted costs

Exhibit 2-14

BUS

	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007*
Budget	\$69,136,007	\$66,292,328	\$67,745,100
Actual	\$60,419,000	\$62,243,743	\$64,931,095
	- 13%	- 6%	- 4%

FERRY

Budget	\$17,939,261	\$21,272,333	\$22,024,600
Actual	\$23,880,000	\$21,212,489	\$22,237,750
	33%	0%	1%

*FY 2007 data annualized from 9 months actual

Budget accuracy improved considerably and attained the standard of within 5% for FY 2006, the most recent year for which there are complete records. The annualized costs for FY 2007 also appear to meet the accuracy standard.

Changes in Goals and Related Objectives and Standards from Prior SRTP

The June 2006 MTC Triennial Performance Audit of GGBHTD by Mundle & Associates states “GGBHTD has established a comprehensive and well-integrated set of goals, objectives and performance measures.” However, it notes that several new standards have either no measurable outcomes or vaguely defined outcomes such as “reduce”, “improve”, “lower” or “meet.” Therefore, the principal change from the last SRTP is the development of quantifiable performance standards for the goals and objectives, including specific numerical targets rather than changes in the goals themselves. Planning staff has worked with operating division staff to achieve this. These core measures are summarized in the table below. The development of the TranStat system for compiling, storing and reporting operational and financial data has greatly assisted this process. For example, specific standards have been established for measures such as miles between accidents, service headways, service duration, operator absences and *mechanics’ absences*. This latter measure, mechanics’ absences, is a new measure established upon recommendation in the Triennial Audit. Please see the “Goals, Objectives and Standards” section at the beginning of this chapter.

Exhibit 2-15

Short-Range Transit Plan Core Measures

1. Passengers per service (revenue) hour
2. Operated transit services as a percentage of scheduled transit
3. Scheduled service times and actual service times at key time points (on-time performance)
4. Miles between in-service mechanical failures.
5. Miles between accidents and accidents per year
6. Bus service headways and service duration
7. Provide required level of paratransit service
8. Fare Recovery Ratio – fare revenue as percentage of operating expense

C. Service and System Evaluation

Bus service is evaluated by service type as well as route by route. Since the service restructuring of November 2003, all GGT routes have been functionally classified as “Regional” or “Partnership”. Regional services are the direct responsibility of GGBHTD and include 18 weekday commute period routes, three basic all-day every day routes, and two commute shuttle routes.

Partnership services are so named because they are supported in partnership with an outside entity. These include 36 Marin local routes, one seasonal Marin recreational route, two basic MTC routes operating across the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge, and two MTC Regional Express Bus commute routes. Marin local service is provided under a contract with MCTD; the East Bay basic routes are funded by the Bay Area Toll Authority; and the MTC-supported commute routes are funded through the Regional Express Bus (REB) program. All of these routes are analyzed in this section except for the Marin local and recreational routes. All of these routes are analyzed in this section except for the Marin local and recreational routes. MCTD is responsible for planning and evaluating these local bus routes.

Service Types	No. of Routes	% of Service Provided*
Regional Basic	3	29%
Regional Commute	18	28%
Regional Commute Shuttle	2	1%
Partnership Basic (East Bay routes)	2	6%
Partnership Commute (MTC REB routes)	2	2%
Partnership Marin Local (not analyzed in SRTP)	27	34%

*measured as a proportion of revenue hours operated

Year-to-year performance by service types is found earlier in this chapter. Data from past years are useful in understanding long-term trends for all service and for service types. This section examines data from the current fiscal-year to determine the relative strengths and weaknesses of the service types and individual routes.

The primary measures used are service productivity as measured by passengers/revenue hour and cost effectiveness as measured by fare recovery ratio. **Exhibits 2-16** and **2-17** below show these performance statistics for GGT bus service types and individual routes. Examined together, these measures provide an understanding of route performance that takes into account inherent differences between different service types such as basic versus commute trips.

The standard for passengers/revenue-hour is 20 passengers per hour during peak periods and 15 during off-peak. Currently, GGT basic service meets this standard. Half of the commute routes meet or nearly meet the standard; the remaining half do not. The standard for farebox ratio is 25% for Bus. All bus service meets the standard except for Partnership Basic, Marin-East Bay service, and Shuttle service for which this measure is inapplicable.

Basic service has higher productivity than other types of service since more passengers get on and off a single Basic bus trip. Commute service ridership is generally limited to the seating capacity of the bus. Shuttle riders are transferring to or from another bus and are more likely to pay with transfers. Hence the financial measure farebox ratio is either very low or inapplicable.

Service Type and Route Evaluation

Exhibit 2-16 BUS SERVICE TYPES – Productivity

Passengers per Revenue Hour		Fare Recovery Ratio (FRR)	
Type	Pax/RevHr	Type	FRR
Regional Basic	20.1	Regional Basic	0.27
Regional Commute	17.7	Regional Commute	0.29
Regional Commute Shuttle	18.9	Regional Commute Shuttle	NA
Partnership Basic	12.6	Partnership Basic	0.17
Partnership Commute	12.2	Partnership Commute	0.29
All Routes	18.2	All Routes	0.27

Exhibit 2-17 INDIVIDUAL BUS ROUTES – Productivity (most productive routes in each category listed first)

Passengers per Revenue Hour		Fare Recovery Ratio (FRR)	
Route	Pax/Rev Hr	Route	FRR
Regional Commute			
97	56.6	97	0.78
4	23.7	72	0.40
2	23.1	74	0.37
26	22.0	76	0.37
18	21.7	54	0.35
38	19.7	38	0.30
54	19.1	73	0.30
27	18.8	18	0.28
24	18.8	4	0.27
56	15.8	26	0.27
8	15.3	56	0.27
76	15.1	2	0.25
74	14.9	24	0.25
44	14.4	27	0.24
72	13.2	58	0.22
58	12.3	44	0.19
60	12.1	8	0.16
73	11.7	60	0.15
Regional Basic			
70	24.1	70	0.29
80	18.2	80	0.28
10	16.7	10	0.19
Regional Commute Shuttle			
93	21.9	93	NA
9	13.5	9	NA
Partnership Basic			
40	17.9	40	0.21
42	11.5	42	0.17
Partnership Commute			
72X	16.9	72X	0.55
75	9.9	75	0.16

Comments on Route Evaluation

The Route Evaluation identifies those routes with the lowest performance as candidates for modification, reduction or elimination. The best and worst-performing routes are similar to those identified in the FY 2005 SRTP. Among Regional Commute routes, the shorter routes tend to carry more passengers per hour. The longer routes have a higher fare recovery ratio. Route 97 scores on top because it is a relatively short, single, one-way trip that is usually full. Certain commute routes tend to score poorly throughout all categories. These include:

- Route 60, which provides limited freeway service, duplicating other routes
- Route 58 serving Ignacio and Hamilton in Novato with three round trips
- Route 44 serving Lucas Valley and Marinwood with nine one-way trips
- Route 8, which provides two round trips to Tiburon

In FY 2006, Route 58 was modified to serve the new Hamilton residential neighborhood in Novato, and GGBHTD undertook a special Route 58 outreach campaign. Marketing efforts included working with local homeowners associations and promoting the commute service on weekends in Ignacio and Hamilton. Homeowners associations included articles in their newsletters highlighting the bus route's easy and cost-effective way of commuting. Since its inception, Route 58 ridership continued to grow, and its route performance has been improving.

In the spring of 2007, GGBHTD staff began a special marketing effort to increase ridership on Route 8 and two other commute routes, Route 38 in Terra Linda (San Rafael) and Route 76 in East Petaluma. These latter two routes were included because of recent ridership declines or specific trips with low ridership. A direct mail piece that included a pocket-sized route map and schedule and two free tickets was sent to residences near bus stops on the route. The project's goal was to entice people onto the bus with free tickets so they could experience its convenience. About 4,400 pieces were sent to Tiburon neighborhoods; 5,000 pieces to Terra Linda; and 10,000 to Petaluma. In addition, a flyer was distributed on the targeted routes to inform passengers about the mailer. Initial indications are that this targeted marketing has improved route performance to a modest degree.

Performance among the Regional Basic routes is determined by the nature of the service and long-standing travel patterns in the GGT service area. These routes are considered to be Lifeline service according to MTC, and they are intended to provide at least some service even when demand may be low. The Route 70 is a shorter version of Route 80 that travels over the busiest segment of the entire Santa Rosa-to-San Francisco alignment. It is therefore more productive than the entire Route 80. Route 10 is the only direct transit connection between Marin and the Geary Blvd. corridor in San Francisco. GGBHTD believes it is important to serve this corridor as well as the Van Ness Ave. corridor served by other Basic routes.

The Commute Shuttle routes are provided to close gaps in the overall system. Route 93 is a vital link between the bulk of GGT commute service and the San Francisco Civic Center. It carries a relatively high number of passengers per revenue hour. Route 9 links the Tiburon Ferry to nearby neighborhoods and is a consistently poorly performing route.

The relatively poor performance of three of the four partnership routes is balanced by the special service they provide. Routes 40 and 42 are the only transit link between Marin and the East Bay, providing a way for low-income East Bay residents to reach jobs in Marin and for Marinites to reach the educational institutions in the East Bay. REB Route 75 is the only GGT non-Transbay commute route and it demonstrates that suburb-to-suburb commute transit is a practical alternative. REB Route 72X is the only partnership route that scores near the top of all measures.

It is an attractive service to passengers, making very few stops and providing a relatively fast trip over a long distance.

GGBHTD undertook a traditional print campaign to boost ridership on Routes 40 and 42 by 2% overall as compared to December 2006. This campaign was also intended to help the service achieve RM-2 farebox recovery standards. Bilingual posters and ads displayed in East Bay BART stations and at the SRTC in San Rafael targeted people using alternate means of travel or not making the trip and casual travelers visiting the North Bay. By June 2007, overall ridership on Routes 40 and 42 had increased by 21% and 11%, respectively, as compared to December 2006, surpassing ridership increases on all other GGT routes.

GGBHTD also has an ongoing Route 75 outreach program. Promotion of this unique Sonoma-Marin commute route included working with the larger employers along the route (Fair Isaac, County of Marin, Autodesk), participating in transit fairs, and providing materials for employee newsletters.

Staff examines and considers the relative performance of individual routes, the relative performance of service types, and performance over time to determine candidates for promotion, modification or elimination. Ultimately, financial conditions (“as resources permit”) determine absolute performance standards, since efficient and effective service is always the objective.

Ferry service is evaluated principally by analyzing changes from year to year. Ferry service is provided on three routes, two of which are considered “regular” service, the other being “special events” service. The two regular service routes are Larkspur-to-San Francisco and Sausalito-to-San Francisco. The special events route operates between Larkspur and a docking facility next to AT&T ballpark. Almost all special events trips serve San Francisco Giants home games, but a few serve other events at the ballpark.

Ferry passengers per revenue hour are shown for the entire system at different travel times in **Exhibit 2-1C** above (Page 3). **Exhibit 2-17** below shows Ferry passengers per revenue hour for the two regular service ferry routes, Larkspur and Sausalito.

Ferry Service Evaluation
Exhibit 2-18

PASSENGERS PER REVENUE HOUR

	FY 2005	FY 2006	FY 2007 (8 mos.)
System	129	136	148
AT&T Park	372	337	373
Larkspur	137	141	152
Sausalito	99	112	131

This table demonstrates that Ferry service productivity has been increasing over the past few years, especially from FY 2006 to FY 2007. For the year, Larkspur ridership is up 8% and Sausalito ridership is up 17%. System ridership is up 9%. The special events service ridership remains high without change; it has nowhere to go but down because nearly all trips run at close to capacity.

Summary of Recent Changes in Patronage, Operating Costs and Operating Revenue

Productivity of GGBHTD bus transit services has declined in the past three years. **Exhibits 2-1A** and **2-2** show passengers per service hour for bus service types and for the entire bus system. Other relevant statistics for GGT Bus (excluding Marin Local service) for the FY 2005 to FY 2007 time period include:

- Bus ridership (excluding Marin Local) declined from 4,273,000 unlinked trips in FY 2005 to 4,029,800 (annualized) in FY 2007, or an average decline of 2.9% per year.
- Bus service (revenue) hours have stayed constant with a marginal decline from 222,500 to 219,300, or less than 1% per year.
- Bus operating cost increased from \$39,332,800 to \$42,765,270, or an average increase of about 4.3% per year.
- Bus revenue stayed about the same, changing from \$11,121,360 in FY 05 to \$11,264,060 in FY 07, or an average increase of less than 1% a year.
- The cost per service hour has increased from \$177 to \$193, or an average increase of about 4.6% a year for bus.

Ferry performance has fared better during the same FY 2005 to FY 2007 time period, as follows:

- Ferry ridership has increased from 1,751,945 trips in FY 2005 to 2,107,000 (annualized) in FY 2007, an average increase of almost 10% per year.
- Ferry service (revenue) hours have stayed relatively constant at 13,569 in FY 05 and 13,612 (annualized) in FY 07.
- Ferry operating cost actually declined from \$23,880,000 in FY 05 to \$22,237,750 (annualized) in FY 07, a 7% decrease. This was the result of additional one-time expenses during FY 05. Operating costs are expected to increase slightly from year to year.
- Ferry fare revenue has increased from \$7,570,000 in FY 2005 to \$9,239,400 (annualized) in FY 2007, an average increase of just above 10% per year.
- Ferry cost per service hour decreased from FY 05 to FY 06, then increased in FY 07. There has been an overall decrease from \$1,760 in FY 05 to \$1,634 in FY 07.
- Ferry revenue per service hour increased significantly from \$558 in FY 05 to \$679 in FY 07, an average annual increase of more than 10%.

Equipment and Facility Deficiencies and Proposed Remedies

GGBHTD expects bus transit operations to remain relatively stable in the short term with no large increases or decreases. Therefore, its approach to bus equipment and facilities planning is one of making these elements more effective and efficient. Major bus and paratransit vehicle replacement would occur to maintain a modern fleet of comparable size. The paratransit vehicle fleet may need to increase slightly to keep up with demand. The total active bus fleet is now 196 buses, plus another six leased for Club Bus (January 2007), as compared to 204 in January 2004. However, fleet characteristics are changing to fit needs. GGT intends to acquire several additional 45-foot over-the-road coaches and 60-foot high-floor articulated buses to meet regional service requirements, and several additional 30-foot buses and 60-foot low-floor articulated buses to meet Marin local service requirements. In addition, the fleet requires new fareboxes and a new communication and information system to efficiently manage transit services and serve customers.

No major changes in bus facilities are planned for the near future, with one notable exception. GGBHTD is working with the city of San Francisco to establish a permanent, publicly owned

bus storage lot under the I-80 structure at Third Street in conjunction with the Transbay Transit Terminal project.

With regard to ferry operations, four important equipment and facility deficiencies have been identified: (1) lack of vessel capacity, (2) need to provide more cost-efficient passenger loading/unloading facilities, (3) inadequate fare collection system, and (4) lack of parking at Larkspur Ferry Terminal (LFT).

Golden Gate Ferry has initiated the process to purchase a large-capacity high-speed vessel that could increase capacity by 160 passengers during the morning commute period, when the system is over capacity. All existing vessels would be retained to provide a spare vessel for peak operations. Ferry is also planning to purchase a second large-capacity high-speed replacement vessel farther into the future. Please see the capital improvements chapter for more details.

Ferry is undertaking a replacement and refurbishment project of the passenger boarding/alighting facilities at the Larkspur, San Francisco and Sausalito ferry terminals. This project is intended to improve the speed and ease of boarding and alighting for all passengers, including those with disabilities and those taking bicycles. The investigation and design phase of this project, known as "Concept and Design for Change of Gangways and Piers," is scheduled to begin in FY 2008. The cost for this phase is estimated in excess of \$2 million. Total project cost for Larkspur and San Francisco facilities is estimated at \$10 to \$30 million. This project replaces or rehabilitates ferry terminal facilities necessary to the continuing operation of the Larkspur and San Francisco ferry terminals. The hydraulic gangway/ramp system was installed at two LFT berths and two SFFT berths in 1976 and was developed specifically for a conventional mono-hull vessel design (Spaulding class). Since that time, modifications have been made to accommodate the new high-speed catamaran vessels. Passenger ramps will also be replaced to meet ADA requirements. Project completion date has not yet been determined.

Ferry fare collection lacks the ability to collect fares electronically and to track fare payment categories, e.g., adult fare versus senior discount. GGBHTD has initiated a project to purchase and install integrated faregates that are TransLink- and single ticket-compatible at the San Francisco and Larkspur Ferry Terminals and the Sausalito Ferry Landing. Specifications for new faregates include passenger counters and a reader for TransLink and single-ride tickets. It is anticipated that the single ticket will be a contactless card similar to TransLink. This project has received funding and is in its preliminary phase.

The large parking lot at LFT regularly fills up, leaving no room for midday ferry travelers to park. This diminishes the effectiveness of the ferry system since southbound ferries have excess capacity after the morning commute period. Lack of parking also interferes with service to Giants baseball games at AT&T Park. In 2007, GGF is not providing service to nine weekday day games because there is not enough parking for would-be passengers. GGF is considering several approaches to dealing with the Larkspur parking problem. GGBHTD staff is preparing plans to improve pedestrian access and circulation and add another 100 parking spaces to the 1,600-space surface lot at LFT. In the longer term, GGBHTD is investigating the possibility of adding a parking structure at LFT or nearby. GGBHTD is also interested in diverting ferry passengers to other modes of access. It is participating in the process to build a bicycle-pedestrian path connecting San Rafael directly to LFT through an old railroad tunnel. Other similar efforts are planned, such as the Central Marin Ferry Connector, which would provide a more convenient bike-pedestrian link to LFT from the south. In addition, GGT is initiating a new midday weekday bus route linking LFT and the San Rafael Transit Center and it is seeking

funding to resume service with two shuttle routes timed to meet ferry departures and arrivals during the commute period.

A full description of capital improvements is provided in Chapter 3.

Involvement in MTC's Community-Based Transportation Planning Program and Low-Income Transportation Needs

In 2006, GGBHTD participated in MTC's Community-Based Transportation Planning (CBTP) effort for the San Rafael Canal District led by the Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM). This neighborhood is identified in the decennial census and in the GGBHTD's Title VI Report as the area with the highest minority population in Marin County and the entire GGT service area, both relatively and absolutely. The Canal census tract is 70% Hispanic, with many recent immigrants from Mexico and Central America. GGBHTD staff participated on the study's Technical Advisory Committee and attended the study's planning meetings and outreach events.

The study confirmed that Canal residents are more likely to be transit users than other Marin residents and that MCTD routes operated by GGT serving the Canal are the busiest in the county. One of the study's recommendations was for certain changes in GGT Marin local bus routes. These changes were implemented by MCTD in September 2006 and included bringing MCTD local Route 29 through the Canal District. This route provides hourly all-day service six days a week between SRTC and the San Anselmo Hub via the Ross Valley. It provides a direct link from the Canal to Marin Community College and Marin General Hospital. MTC has also proposed a CBTP effort for the community of Marin City, a low-income community with a high minority population located in southern Marin. A busy GGT bus transfer hub is located in Marin City. GGBHTD expects to participate in this study as it develops.

GGT Routes 40 and 42, also described in Chapter 1, are a regional service linking the SRTC in Marin County with El Cerrito del Norte BART station in Contra Costa County. This service is supported by Regional Measure 2 funds generated by regional bridge tolls. For the three years prior to approval of RM-2, these routes received substantial funding from a Low-Income Flexible Transportation (LIFT) Program grant specifically to address welfare-to-work needs. In 2001, these routes were re-aligned and expanded to carry low-income East Bay residents to jobs in the North Bay. They continue this same alignment and level of service.

ADA Paratransit Services

Intercounty paratransit service is available to complement GGT basic and non-commute bus routes as specified in ADA requirements. GGT's intercounty paratransit service continues to be provided through agreement with MCTD and its paratransit contractor, Whistlestop Wheels. WSW operates local paratransit trips entirely within Marin County on behalf of MCTD and operates intercounty paratransit service between the counties of Marin, San Francisco and Sonoma on behalf of GGBHTD, and to Contra Costa County on behalf of GGT regional service on Routes 40/42. WSW is available to provide early morning, late night and Sunday paratransit service to complement Route 80, when Sonoma County providers do not operate.

The paratransit vehicle fleet is expected to stay at its current size with ongoing replacement of eligible vehicles through FTA Sections 5307 or 5310 programs. WSW, MCTD and GGBHTD will share in providing the local match as an operating expense. A full description of proposed paratransit capital improvements is provided in Chapter 3.

Coordinated Paratransit Services

GGBHTD was the first Bay Area transit operator to coordinate intercounty ADA paratransit trips with adjoining operators. WSW provides an extended ride or transfers the passenger to an adjoining operator's vehicle at a designated transfer point. In doing so, WSW follows guidelines originally developed by the Bay Area Partnership Transit Coordinating Council Accessibility Committee as part of MTC's Transit Coordination Plan.

Proposed Accessibility Improvements to Fixed-Route Services

GGBHTD continues to operate a 100% ramp/lift-equipped fleet of 30- to 60-foot-long buses. During FY 2005 as part of a re-power project, 27 pre-ADA single-wheelchair-position buses were reconfigured with an additional wheelchair position and improved securement area to meet ADA requirements. Early in FY 2008, 10 pre-ADA ramp-equipped 60-foot-long articulated buses will be replaced with new ADA-compliant low-floor articulated buses. All GGBHTD-owned bus transit facilities are accessible, and the Ferry Division has initiated capital projects to address facility access issues at the Larkspur and San Francisco ferry terminals. A full description of proposed Ferry Division capital improvements is provided in Chapter 3. GGBHTD continues to work with local city and county jurisdictions and adjoining transit operators, with "Safe Routes to School", and with other capital available funds to make the bus stops used by GGT accessible to its passengers and all seven varieties of buses operated in the GGT fleet.

Most Recent Federal Title VI Analysis and Report and Process for Complying with FTA Circular C4702.1

The most recent GGBHTD Title VI Report was submitted to FTA in September 2006. It included the preliminary analysis of the November 2003 GGT system restructuring, referred to as Modified Scenario E, which resulted from the *Strategic Plan for Achieving Long-Term Financial Stability*. It also reported on the increased differentiation between GGT regional service and the MCTD local service, both operated by GGT. MCTD has increased its staff size and taken more initiative in setting fares and scheduling local service. MCTD also published its own Short Range Transit Plan in January 2006 to describe current conditions and future plans for Marin local bus service. MCTD and GGBHTD recently established a new agreement for GGT to operate MCTD service for the period from May 2006 through June 2012.

The Title VI analysis showed that service is generally comparable between minority and non-minority areas. GGBHTD and MCTD continue to direct attention to the high transit demand in the Canal area of San Rafael as described above in the section on CBTP. The GGBHTD September 2006 Title VI Report is attached as "**Appendix 1**" to this SRTP.

Most Recent FTA Triennial Review

The most recent FTA Triennial Review was conducted in 2006 with desk review on February 14 and site visit July 24-26. The final report, dated August 2006, includes a two-page Summary of Findings and Corrective Actions (Pages 13-14). The summary identifies eight deficiencies. Following is a list of the identified deficiencies and the GGBHTD response.

REVIEW AREA: Satisfactory Continuing Control

1. *Finding:* Excessive Fixed-Route Bus Spare Ratio. Submit to the FTA Regional office a plan to bring the spare ratio into compliance with the 20% requirement or a justification for the excess spare ratio.
Response: GGBHTD has submitted a justification and request for a higher spare ratio for GGT, based in part on the dispersed service area in which GGT operates and the need to

maintain spares at four different depots. Staff is continuing to develop its revised fleet management plan.

REVIEW AREA: Maintenance

2. *Finding:* Late vehicle preventive maintenance inspections. Develop and implement procedures to conduct timely preventive maintenance inspections of the ferry fleet or revise maintenance plan to reflect current fleet. Submit a copy of the procedures or plan to the FTA regional office. Until further notice, submit quarterly maintenance information to the regional office showing the percentage of maintenance inspections performed on time.

Response: GGBHTD has submitted updated Maintenance Plan and inspection forms for ferry vessels and has submitted quarterly reports on schedule. Item closed out.

3. *Finding:* Late facility/equipment preventive maintenance. Develop and implement procedures to conduct timely preventive maintenance inspections of the bus facilities and equipment. Submit a copy of the procedures or plan to the FTA regional office. Until further notice, submit quarterly maintenance information to the regional office showing the percentage of maintenance inspections performed on time.

Response: GGBHTD has submitted the inspection forms for bus facilities and equipment and has submitted quarterly reports on schedule. Item closed out.

4. *Finding:* Inadequate oversight of contracted maintenance. Work with Whistlestop Wheels (WSW) to develop and implement procedures to conduct timely preventive maintenance inspections. Develop oversight procedures and submit a copy to the FTA regional office. Until further notice, submit quarterly information showing the percentage of on time maintenance inspections performed.

Response: GGBHTD has submitted the WSW Maintenance Plan and inspection forms for paratransit vans. This plan was a cooperative effort developed by GGBHTD and WSW. Quarterly reports have been submitted on schedule. Item closed out.

5. *Finding:* Insufficient maintenance for ferry vessel ADA equipment. Develop and implement a preventive maintenance program for the Spaulding stair lifts and submit a copy to the FTA regional office.

Response: GGBHTD has submitted and updated Maintenance Plan. Item closed out.

REVIEW AREA: Buy America

6. *Finding:* Pre-award and/or post-delivery certifications for paratransit vehicle lacking. Develop and implement procedures to ensure that Marin County Transit District will comply with audit requirements for future FTA-funded revenue rolling stock purchases or decide to conduct the procurements directly. Either submit a copy of the oversight procedures or a letter stating the District's intent to conduct the procurements directly to the FTA regional office.

Response: GGBHTD intends to directly purchase rolling stock for MCTD. Should this change, oversight procedures will be submitted to the FTA regional office prior to the purchase. Item closed out.

REVIEW AREA: Half Fare

7. *Finding:* Information lacking on Medicare cardholder eligibility. Revise information in the Transit Guide and District website to address missing cardholder eligibility. Submit a copy to the FTA regional office.

Response: The Transit Guide and GGBHTD website have been revised to address missing cardholder eligibility. Item closed out.

REVIEW AREA: Drug and Alcohol Program

8. *Finding:* Drug and alcohol policy lacking certain required elements. Revise the District's drug and alcohol policy to reference 49 CFR Part 655. Work with WSW, Coach USA, and Pankey's Radiator Shop, Inc., to revise their policies to include missing elements. Submit the revised policies to the governing board or final authority for approval. Submit a copy of the approved policies to the FTA regional offices.

Response: Updated drug and alcohol programs for GGBHTD, Whistlestop Wheels, Coach USA and Pankey's were submitted. Item closed out.

D. Operations Plan and Budget

1. Operations Plan

GGBHTD plans to operate the same modes and types of transit services over the SRTP period as are now operated. That is, GGBHTD will continue to operate the following types of service:

BUS

- Regional Basic
- Regional Commute
- Regional Commute Shuttle
- Partnership Basic (Marin-East Bay)
- Partnership Commute (MTC Express Bus)
- Partnership Local (Marin Local)

FERRY – the three existing ferry routes:

- Larkspur-San Francisco,
- Sausalito-San Francisco, and
- Larkspur-AT&T ballpark.

No new regional bus services are contemplated during the SRTP planning period, with one exception. GGBHTD intends to seek outside funding to operate two ferry shuttle routes to LFT to meet departing and arriving ferries during the commute period. This service would be contingent upon procuring funding such that it would be self-sustaining by means of fares and/or grants. One route is planned to operate from Novato to LFT via US 101, stopping at all major park-and-ride lots. The other would operate from Fairfax to LFT via Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, replicating the most successful of the discontinued ferry shuttle routes.

GGBHTD is participating in MCTD's Study on Enhanced Taxi Services and is considering the use of taxi programs to provide "last-mile" shuttle service to its fixed-route bus and ferry customers.

GGBHTD does not anticipate any changes in the three partnership services it operates but is prepared to respond to direction from the partner agency. Total bus service provided and total ridership will generally remain unchanged or undergo a slight decrease. Different service types may grow or decline individually. A small growth in ferry ridership is anticipated.

Paratransit

GGBHTD anticipates continuation of past growth trends, resulting in an across-the-board 5% annual increase in paratransit service provided and passengers carried throughout the study period. GGBHTD is participating in MCTD's Study on Enhanced Taxi Services,

which may add accessible taxi programs as a means to serve its ADA paratransit customers in the next three years. Major elements of the paratransit capital budget are shown in the Bus Capital Budget. Service coverage is a function of the extent of fixed-route service offered by GGBHTD and may change if the fixed-route service changes.

Fixed-Route Accessibility

The most significant changes to fixed-route service that would enhance disabled/elderly usage concern Golden Gate Ferry. A between-decks elevator to assist passengers with disabilities has been added to the *M.S. Marin* vessel that recently underwent refurbishment during the spring of 2007. Ferry Division is also undertaking a replacement and refurbishment project of the passenger boarding-alighting facilities at the Larkspur, San Francisco and Sausalito ferry terminals. This project is intended to improve the speed and ease of boarding and alighting for all passengers, including those with disabilities and those taking bicycles on and off vessels. Passenger ramps will also be replaced to meet ADA requirements. Ferry Division is also undertaking a parking lot improvement project that will improve pedestrian access at the LFT.

Following are tables that portray levels of service planned for the period covered by this document, **Exhibit 2-19** for Bus and **Exhibit 2-21** for Ferry. There are no service changes planned in response to the Title VI report or FTA Triennial Review.

Summary of Operations Plan Changes

- Total bus ridership (excluding Marin Local) will decrease by about 3% annually, including consideration of fare changes. These projections are based on trends in evidence over recent years.
- Partnership Commute (MTC Express Bus) ridership is projected to decline by about 4.7% a year.
- Partnership Basic (Marin-East Bay) ridership is projected to increase by about 1.7% a year.
- A 5% annual regional bus and ferry fare increase has been adopted for FYs 2007 through 2011. This SRTP also assumes that the 5% annual increase will continue through FY 2017.
- No fare increase for Marin local service is assumed.

2. Operations Budget

The Operations Budget for GGBHTD Bus transit services for the SRTP planning period is found in **Exhibit 2-20** below. The Operations Budget for GGBHTD Ferry transit service for the SRTP planning period is provided in the Operating Plan table in **Exhibit 2-21**.

GGBHTD financial projections show that the rate of increase for expenses tends to exceed the rate of increase for revenues. This operating deficit is met primarily by Golden Gate Bridge surplus toll revenues. GGBHTD maintains an ongoing effort to update its financial plan to eliminate the deficit. This effort focuses on a mixture of cost reductions and revenue increases from user fees (fares, tolls, contract rates), other operating revenues and subsidies. The Service and System Evaluation section earlier in this chapter identifies the least productive services that would be candidates for reduction or elimination. Although cutting service is inevitably a hardship for riders on the affected routes, all reductions are undertaken after a public notification process and an impact analysis that includes examination of alternate means of travel. Currently, GGBHTD has no plans for major service reduction and is seeking new revenue sources to sustain existing regional bus and ferry services.

Exhibit 2-19 Bus Operations Plan

GOLDEN GATE TRANSIT BUS OPERATING PLAN 10-YEAR PROJECTION BY SERVICE-TYPES

<u>Description</u>	<u>FY 06</u>	<u>FY 07</u>	<u>FY 08</u>	<u>FY 09</u>	<u>FY 10</u>	<u>FY 11</u>	<u>FY 12</u>	<u>FY 13</u>	<u>FY 14</u>	<u>FY 15</u>	<u>FY 16</u>	<u>FY 17</u>
	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Projected</u>	<u>Proposed</u>									
<u>REGIONAL-BASIC</u>												
Ridership	2,003,766	1,965,868	1,926,550	1,888,020	1,850,260	1,813,250	1,776,990	1,741,450	1,706,620	1,672,490	1,639,040	1,606,260
Adjusted Revenue	\$4,230,264	\$4,314,594	\$4,439,716	\$4,568,470	\$4,700,957	\$4,837,272	\$4,977,567	\$5,121,916	\$5,270,448	\$5,423,299	\$5,580,574	\$5,742,413
Average Fare	\$2.11	\$2.19	\$2.30	\$2.42	\$2.54	\$2.67	\$2.80	\$2.94	\$3.09	\$3.24	\$3.40	\$3.58
Revenue Hours	95,997	96,842	100,066	100,100	100,100	100,100	100,100	100,100	100,100	100,100	100,100	100,100
Revenue Miles	1,496,537	1,498,145	1,548,021	1,548,000	1,548,000	1,548,000	1,548,000	1,548,000	1,548,000	1,548,000	1,548,000	1,548,000
<u>REGIONAL-COMMUTE</u>												
Ridership	1,765,737	1,682,123	1,603,060	1,527,720	1,455,920	1,387,490	1,322,280	1,260,130	1,200,900	1,144,460	1,090,670	1,039,410
Adjusted Revenue	\$5,857,703	\$6,026,052	\$6,029,957	\$6,033,891	\$6,037,825	\$6,041,742	\$6,045,678	\$6,049,595	\$6,053,507	\$6,057,454	\$6,061,389	\$6,065,338
Average Fare	\$3.32	\$3.58	\$3.76	\$3.95	\$4.15	\$4.35	\$4.57	\$4.80	\$5.04	\$5.29	\$5.56	\$5.84
Revenue Hours	93,790	94,428	97,213	97,200	97,200	97,200	97,200	97,200	97,200	97,200	97,200	97,200
Revenue Miles	1,831,547	1,842,060	1,896,389	1,896,400	1,896,400	1,896,400	1,896,400	1,896,400	1,896,400	1,896,400	1,896,400	1,896,400
<u>REGIONAL-SHUTTLE</u>												
Ridership	53,985	49,257	46,600	44,080	41,700	39,450	37,320	35,300	33,390	31,590	29,880	28,270
Adjusted Revenue	\$8,671	\$10,175	\$10,107	\$10,039	\$9,972	\$9,905	\$9,839	\$9,772	\$9,705	\$9,641	\$9,575	\$9,512
Average Fare	\$0.16	\$0.21	\$0.22	\$0.23	\$0.24	\$0.25	\$0.26	\$0.28	\$0.29	\$0.31	\$0.32	\$0.34
Revenue Hours	2,710	2,588	2,665	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700	2,700
Revenue Miles	23,622	22,667	23,343	23,300	23,300	23,300	23,300	23,300	23,300	23,300	23,300	23,300
<u>MTC Regional Xpress (Rts 72X, 75)</u>												
Ridership	91,134	85,924	81,970	78,200	74,600	71,170	67,900	64,780	61,800	58,960	56,250	53,660
Adjusted Revenue	\$372,155	\$368,320	\$368,940	\$369,570	\$370,185	\$370,822	\$371,474	\$372,125	\$372,757	\$373,408	\$374,057	\$374,676
Average Fare	\$4.08	\$4.29	\$4.50	\$4.73	\$4.96	\$5.21	\$5.47	\$5.74	\$6.03	\$6.33	\$6.65	\$6.98
Revenue Hours	6,744	7,024	7,227	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200	7,200
Revenue Miles	189,036	187,733	193,172	193,200	193,200	193,200	193,200	193,200	193,200	193,200	193,200	193,200
<u>Regional Connectivity (Rts 40-42)</u>												
Ridership	242,602	246,628	250,720	254,880	259,110	263,410	267,780	272,220	276,740	281,330	286,000	290,750
Adjusted Revenue	\$500,928	\$545,134	\$581,888	\$621,120	\$662,999	\$707,702	\$755,415	\$806,337	\$860,712	\$918,737	\$980,687	\$1,046,824
Average Fare	\$2.06	\$2.21	\$2.32	\$2.44	\$2.56	\$2.69	\$2.82	\$2.96	\$3.11	\$3.27	\$3.43	\$3.60
Revenue Hours	20,079	19,291	20,075	20,100	20,100	20,100	20,100	20,100	20,100	20,100	20,100	20,100
Revenue Miles	279,262	269,396	280,351	280,400	280,400	280,400	280,400	280,400	280,400	280,400	280,400	280,400
<u>TOTAL BUS:</u>												
Ridership	4,157,224	4,029,800	3,908,900	3,792,900	3,681,590	3,574,770	3,472,270	3,373,880	3,279,450	3,188,830	3,101,840	3,018,350
Adjusted Revenue (\$)	10,969,721	11,264,275	11,430,608	11,603,090	11,781,938	11,967,443	12,159,973	12,359,744	12,567,129	12,782,539	13,006,283	13,238,763
Average Fare	\$2.64	\$2.80	\$2.92	\$3.06	\$3.20	\$3.35	\$3.50	\$3.66	\$3.83	\$4.01	\$4.19	\$4.39
Average Fare Increase		5.9%	5%	4.6%	4.6%	4.6%	4.6%	4.6%	4.6%	4.6%	4.6%	4.6%
Adjusted Expense (\$)	51,788,869	54,483,080	55,695,698	57,602,160	59,849,215	61,639,790	64,118,827	66,514,554	69,309,850	71,801,685	74,412,548	76,644,173
Revenue Hours	219,320	220,173	227,248	227,300	227,300	227,300	227,300	227,300	227,300	227,300	227,300	227,300
Revenue Miles	3,820,004	3,820,001	3,941,275	3,941,300	3,941,300	3,941,300	3,941,300	3,941,300	3,941,300	3,941,300	3,941,300	3,941,300

Exhibit 2-20

BUS OPERATING BUDGET PROJECTIONS for SRTP					10-Year Projection							
	<i>Expense (\$000)</i>											
	Year 00	Year 0	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10
	<u>FY06</u>	<u>FY07</u>	<u>FY08</u>	<u>FY09</u>	<u>FY10</u>	<u>FY11</u>	<u>FY12</u>	<u>FY13</u>	<u>FY14</u>	<u>FY15</u>	<u>FY16</u>	<u>FY17</u>
	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Estimate</u>	<u>Estimate</u>	<u>Estimate</u>	<u>Estimate</u>	<u>Estimate</u>	<u>Estimate</u>	<u>Estimate</u>	<u>Estimate</u>	<u>Estimate</u>	<u>Estimate</u>	<u>Estimate</u>
Total Bus Expense (includes Marin Local service)												
Depreciation	\$1,481	\$1,212	\$1,638	\$1,687	\$2,141	\$2,170	\$2,461	\$2,417	\$2,804	\$2,766	\$2,719	\$2,158
Capital Contribution	\$585	\$603	\$700	\$700	\$700	\$700	\$700	\$700	\$700	\$700	\$700	\$700
Operating Expense	\$60,389	\$65,947	\$67,301	\$69,855	\$72,380	\$74,910	\$77,502	\$80,355	\$83,188	\$86,152	\$89,255	\$92,504
Total Bus Div. Expense	\$62,455	\$67,762	\$69,638	\$72,242	\$75,221	\$77,780	\$80,663	\$83,472	\$86,691	\$89,618	\$92,674	\$95,362
MCTD Expense	<u>-\$10,666</u>	<u>-\$13,279</u>	<u>-\$13,943</u>	<u>-\$14,640</u>	<u>-\$15,372</u>	<u>-\$16,140</u>	<u>-\$16,544</u>	<u>-\$16,958</u>	<u>-\$17,382</u>	<u>-\$17,816</u>	<u>-\$18,261</u>	<u>-\$18,718</u>
Net Reg. Bus Expense	\$51,789	\$54,483	\$55,696	\$57,602	\$59,849	\$61,640	\$64,119	\$66,515	\$69,310	\$71,802	\$74,413	\$76,644
Revenues												
Transit Fares	\$10,970	\$11,264	\$11,431	\$11,603	\$11,782	\$11,967	\$12,160	\$12,360	\$12,567	\$12,783	\$13,006	\$13,239
Other Op. Income - RM2	\$2,341	\$2,456	\$2,493	\$2,530	\$2,568	\$2,606	\$2,645	\$2,685	\$2,725	\$2,766	\$2,808	\$2,850
Other Op. Income - Advert.	\$1,271	\$1,169	\$1,197	\$1,227	\$1,257	\$1,288	\$1,319	\$1,352	\$1,385	\$1,419	\$1,453	\$1,489
Other Op. Income - Leases	\$724	\$666	\$683	\$699	\$716	\$734	\$752	\$770	\$789	\$809	\$828	\$849
TDA	\$12,818	\$13,398	\$13,283	\$13,932	\$14,609	\$15,313	\$16,059	\$16,849	\$17,671	\$18,527	\$19,268	\$20,039
STA - Translink	\$7	\$82	\$13	\$10	\$10	\$10						
STA - Revenue Based	\$1,530	\$3,341	\$2,473	\$3,248	\$2,626	\$2,770	\$2,920	\$3,075	\$3,240	\$1,560	\$1,591	\$1,623
STA - Population Based	\$566	\$1,293	\$592	\$604	\$366	\$382	\$399	\$416	\$433	\$2,286	\$2,332	\$2,378
STA - Regional Paratransit	\$69	\$70	\$73	\$76	\$79	\$81	\$84	\$87	\$90	\$93	\$95	\$97
Federal Operating Assistance	\$3,061	\$679	\$633	\$31	\$31	\$31	\$31	\$31	\$31	\$31	\$31	\$31
Total Revenue	\$33,356	\$34,419	\$32,871	\$33,960	\$34,043	\$35,183	\$36,369	\$37,625	\$38,932	\$40,274	\$41,413	\$42,596
Projected Deficit*	-\$18,433	-\$20,064	-\$22,825	-\$23,642	-\$25,806	-\$26,457	-\$27,750	-\$28,889	-\$30,378	-\$31,527	-\$33,000	-\$34,048

*To be funded by available toll revenues

Depreciation is calculated on the straight-line method over the estimated 12- to 16-year useful life for Buses, 25-30 years for Ferry vessels.

Capital Contribution was authorized in 2003 by the Board to fund future capital projects from operations. The annual amount is calculated by taking the sum of the District-funded portion of the capital program, less depreciation, for 10 years divided by 10 years and rounded to the nearest million. The annual amount of Capital Contribution is distributed to each Division according to its percentage share of District-funded capital projects.

Exhibit 2-21

GOLDEN GATE FERRY OPERATING PLAN & OPERATING BUDGET

10-Year Baseline Projection

All dollar amounts in thousands (except average fares)

Description	Year 00	Year 0	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10
	FY05/06	FY06/07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17
	Actual	Est. Actual										
FERRY Regular service:												
Total Ferry Passengers	1,785	1,985	2,025	2,065	2,107	2,149	2,192	2,236	2,280	2,326	2,373	2,420
Total Ferry Revenue (000s)	\$7,722	\$8,674	\$9,290	\$9,950	\$10,656	\$11,413	\$12,223	\$13,091	\$14,020	\$15,016	\$16,082	\$17,224
Average Fare	\$4.33	\$4.37	\$4.59	\$4.82	\$5.06	\$5.31	\$5.58	\$5.86	\$6.15	\$6.46	\$6.78	\$7.12
Service Provided												
Revenue Hours	13,521	13,500	13,500	13,500	13,500	13,500	13,500	13,500	13,500	13,500	13,500	13,500
Revenue Miles	180,572	180,600	180,600	180,600	180,600	180,600	180,600	180,600	180,600	180,600	180,600	180,600
FERRY: AT&T Park												
AT&T Park - Patronage	85,583	78,500	78,500	78,500	78,500	78,500	78,500	78,500	78,500	78,500	78,500	78,500
AT&T Park-Revenue (000s)	\$620	\$565	\$574	\$601	\$620	\$652	\$671	\$691	\$712	\$732	\$752	\$756
Average Fare	\$7.25	\$7.20	\$7.31	\$7.65	\$7.89	\$8.30	\$8.54	\$8.81	\$9.06	\$9.33	\$9.58	\$9.63
Service Provided												
Revenue Hours	254	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250	250
Revenue Miles	2,636	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,601
Other Operating Income	\$1,676.8	\$647	\$340	\$179	\$183	\$188	\$193	\$197	\$202	\$207	\$212	\$217
TDA	\$1,810	\$1,648	\$1,628	\$1,701	\$1,776	\$1,855	\$1,938	\$2,025	\$2,116	\$2,210	\$2,299	\$2,391
STA - Revenue Based	\$453	\$808	\$716	\$925	\$710	\$749	\$789	\$831	\$876	\$919	\$937	\$956
STA - Population Based	\$124	\$173	\$149	\$151	\$69	\$73	\$76	\$79	\$82	\$85	\$87	\$88
Federal Operating Assistance	\$750	\$26.5	\$118	\$10	\$10	\$10	\$10	\$10	\$10	\$10	\$10	\$10
Total FERRY Revenues	\$13,156	\$12,542	\$12,815	\$13,517	\$14,025	\$14,939	\$15,899	\$16,925	\$18,018	\$19,179	\$20,379	\$21,642
Operating Expense	\$19,816	\$20,870	\$21,293	\$22,353	\$23,095	\$24,351	\$25,081	\$25,887	\$26,683	\$27,485	\$28,263	\$28,423
Capital Contribution	\$1,397	\$1,368	\$1,100	\$1,100	\$1,100	\$1,100	\$1,100	\$1,100	\$1,100	\$1,100	\$1,100	\$1,100
Total FERRY Expenses	\$21,212	\$22,238	\$22,393	\$23,453	\$24,195	\$25,451	\$26,181	\$26,987	\$27,783	\$28,585	\$29,363	\$29,523
Projected Deficit*	-\$8,057	-\$9,695	-\$9,578	-\$9,937	-\$10,170	-\$10,512	-\$10,282	-\$10,062	-\$9,766	-\$9,406	-\$8,984	-\$7,881

*To be funded by available toll revenues

PROJECT ASSUMPTIONS

2% growth in annual patronage

New high-speed boat begins service in FY11, 2nd new high-speed boat in FY13.

5% annual fare increase for regular service.

AT&T fares to rise at rate of Expense increase. No change in patronage.

Service provided (i.e., Revenue hours & miles) stays the same over time.

Exhibit 2-22

TRANSIT PROJECTED OPERATING DEFICIT for SRTP								10-Year Projection				
	Expense (\$000)											
	Year 00	Year 0	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10
	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17
	Actual	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate
Net Regional Bus Expense	\$51,789	\$54,483	\$55,696	\$57,602	\$59,849	\$61,640	\$64,119	\$66,515	\$69,310	\$71,802	\$74,413	\$76,644
Total Revenue	\$33,356	\$34,419	\$32,871	\$33,960	\$34,043	\$35,183	\$36,369	\$37,625	\$38,932	\$40,274	\$41,413	\$42,596
Projected Deficit	-\$18,433	-\$20,064	-\$22,825	-\$23,642	-\$25,806	-\$26,457	-\$27,750	-\$28,889	-\$30,378	-\$31,527	-\$33,000	-\$34,048
Total FERRY Expenses	\$21,212	\$22,238	\$22,393	\$23,453	\$24,195	\$25,451	\$26,181	\$26,987	\$27,783	\$28,585	\$29,363	\$29,523
Total FERRY Revenues	\$13,156	\$12,542	\$12,815	\$13,517	\$14,025	\$14,939	\$15,899	\$16,925	\$18,018	\$19,179	\$20,379	\$21,642
Projected Deficit	-\$8,057	-\$9,695	-\$9,578	-\$9,937	-\$10,170	-\$10,512	-\$10,282	-\$10,062	-\$9,766	-\$9,406	-\$8,984	-\$7,881
Total Transit Deficit	-\$26,490	-\$29,760	-\$32,403	-\$33,579	-\$35,976	-\$36,968	-\$38,032	-\$38,952	-\$40,144	-\$40,933	-\$41,984	-\$41,929
Toll Funds Available *			\$33,560	\$31,976	\$27,879	\$26,445	\$24,995	\$23,169	\$21,486	\$19,783	\$17,934	\$16,314
Total Surplus/(Deficit)			\$1,157	-\$1,603	-\$8,098	-\$10,523	-\$13,037	-\$15,783	-\$18,658	-\$21,150	-\$24,050	-\$25,615

Note that after FY2008, there is not sufficient toll revenue to cover the transit deficit. This short-fall is addressed in the "Strategic Plan for Achieving Long-Term Financial Stability". This plan addresses potential transit fare increases, service reductions, toll increases and possible supplemental revenue generated by corporate partnership and additional property leases.