

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

Minutes of Budget Hearing

June 4, 1975

Upon notice duly given, the Board of Directors of the Southern California Rapid Transit District met in the District Board Room, 1060 South Broadway, Los Angeles, California, at 1:00 p.m. on June 4, 1975, for the purpose of conducting a Public Hearing on the District's Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year 1976, at which time President Pro Tempore A. J. Eyraud, Jr. called the meeting to order.

Directors George W. Brewster, Victor M. Carter, A. J. Eyraud, Jr., Jay B. Price, Pete Schabarum and George Takei were present. Directors Byron E. Cook, Donald H. Gibbs, Adelina Gregory, Thomas G. Neusom and Baxter Ward were absent from the meeting.

Also present were General Manager Jack R. Gilstrap; Manager of Operations George W. Heinle; Assistant General Counsel Suzanne Gifford; Manager of Planning & Marketing George L. McDonald; Controller-Treasurer-Auditor Joe B. Scatchard; Chief Engineer Richard Gallagher; Assistant Secretary Helen M. Bolen, and the public.

President Pro Tempore Eyraud announced that the Public Hearing had been called with respect to the District's Proposed 1976 Fiscal Year Budget; that the Hearing would proceed as outlined on the Agenda, and that copies of the Budget were available for anyone who desired a copy.

He further stated that the purpose of the Hearing was to receive comments or suggestions regarding the proposed budget, that no action would be taken today, but that the Board of Directors will adopt the 1976 Fiscal Year Budget on or before June 30, 1975.

General Manager Gilstrap started to present his report regarding the budget, but after discussion and on motion of Director Price, seconded and carried, the reading of the General Manager's report was dispensed with, and the message, a copy of which is attached to these Minutes as Exhibit 1 was ordered to be entered into the record, with copies distributed to persons in the audience requesting them. A summary of the Proposed Budget is also attached to these Minutes as Exhibit 2.

General Manager Gilstrap briefly summarized his message by stating that the budget is based upon the revenue likely to be available for the next year; it is a budget that provides for the current level of service, i.e., the number of buses operating at this point in time; it further provides the funds necessary to expand the fleet by 50 buses ear-marked for the Santa Monica Preferential Freeway Lane Project, and the 100 buses which would arrive in October of 1975. The fare proposed is an increase from the present 25¢ flat fare to a 35¢ fare plus two zones at 20 cents per zone. Board policy is that we are in favor of a continuation of the 25¢ flat fare and expansion of our system, if possible. The County has informed us that their subsidy assistance is

proposed at a level of \$12.1 million. We were asked to submit alternate plans to the county. We submitted four alternates, 1) 25¢ flat fare, 2) 25¢ fare plus zones, 3) 35¢ flat fare, and 4) 35¢ fare plus zones. The lesser of the evils is Alternate 4.

The County is currently holding budget sessions and might decide to give us more funds than the \$12.1 million. If more funding is available, it is estimated that with \$25.7 million we could maintain the 25¢ fare and expand the system. \$17 million would permit a 25¢ fare with two zones and operation of 50 additional buses. The main impact of the budget is on the revenue side, not the expense side. The Staff feels that in the contract with the County this next year, we should do our utmost to have a sum set aside of up to 5% of the federal operating money, which money can be spent on services at the sole discretion of the District. It seems improper that on a budget of \$150 million, for a contribution of \$12.1 million, you are delegating just about full say-so for the operation of the District. This Board should retain the prerogative of at least 5% of the budget, which is \$1.3 million.

President Pro Tempore Eyraud stated that he did not realize that the County had that kind of stranglehold on the District.

Director Carter commented that the 25¢ fare is, in his opinion, the proper thing for the citizens of the community, and the Board of Directors should approach the Board of Supervisors to retain the 25¢ fare. General Manager Gilstrap

reported that in the District's transmittal to the County on May 22, the opening statement was that the District is firmly committed to the 25¢ flat fare.

Director Carter commented that we should go back to the County and ask for more money.

At the request of President Pro Tempore Eyraud, Assistant Secretary Helen M. Bolen stated that she had in her possession affidavits of publication from the Los Angeles Herald Examiner and La Opinion showing publication of Notice of Budget Hearing on May 26, 1975.

Director Schabarum commented in all of his legislative career he had never seen a budget like this in terms of make up. It does not say what the focus of effort is for the forthcoming year. His analysis of the budget contains the apparent fact that adoption by this Board would carry with it the authority to employ some 338 additional persons over and above the positions presently authorized. The number of additional employees is not broken down by various departments. He asked the following questions:

- 1) What are the numbers of activities that are performed by a department?
- 2) What kinds of resources are currently being devoted to the activity?
- 3) What is the complete justification for the need for additional personnel?

The Board should focus greater attention to the delay in response to criticisms and requests for information from the constituency of this entire District.

General Manager Gilstrap commented that Director Schabarum's basic questions were answered in the General Manager's budget and budget statement; that in the near future we will be bringing before the Board a set of criteria that will be the basis for determining the appropriateness of continuing certain lines or establishing new routes.

Director Schabarum commented that these kinds of priorities are not in the budget or implied. He further stated that the Board of Directors would not be taking advantage of the responsibility and authority available if we do not speak out and request the staff to provide as a part of the budget those kinds of lists of priorities, lists of personnel to be approved, etc.

General Manager Gilstrap responded that within the next Board meeting, the Directors will have specific criteria and cost benefit information which will enable them to eliminate bus lines. The process of adoption of the budget does not authorize the filling of these new non-contract positions. The program or budget that is before the Board today is, in fact, a financial plan. Its adoption does not authorize any new programs. These come before the Board individually during the year.

President Pro Tempore Eyraud commented that this is a preliminary budget. Each one of these items Director Schabarum has mentioned becomes a matter for Board action.


Director Schabarum responded that this budget has been characterized as a financial plan only and this puts it in proper context.

President Pro Tempore Eyraud explained that it is essential under the terms of the Trust Agreement that the Board of Directors adopt a budget before June 30, of each year.

A telegram dated June 3, 1975 from Coverdale & Colpitts, Consulting Engineers for the District, was presented to the Meeting. A copy of that telegram is attached to these Minutes as Exhibit 3.

President Pro Tempore Eyraud inquired if there was anyone in the audience who would like to comment on the proposed Budget. There being no persons present who wished to speak regarding the Budget, President Pro Tempore Eyraud announced that the Public Hearing was concluded and that the 1976 Fiscal Year Budget of the Southern California Rapid Transit District would be adopted by the Board of Directors on or before June 30, 1975.

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, the Hearing was adjourned at 1:37 p.m.


Assistant Secretary

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

General Manager's Proposed Fiscal Year 1976
Operating, Capital and Debt Service Budgets
Presented to the District Board of Directors
in a Public Hearing on June 4, 1975

Mr. President and Members of the Board:

At this time each year the District establishes its budget for the year ahead. It's a time when we must rededicate the organization to the provision of the best available public transportation for our current and prospective riders. To put next year's budget and the service it will provide in perspective I would like to dwell briefly on how we got to our present position which is the take off point for next year.

The District is the descendant of private industry and the Metropolitan Transit Authority, both of which came to grief trying to break the vicious cycle of rising costs, fare hikes, declining ridership and service cutbacks. Helping this cycle along was the introduction of the freeways and the accompanying subsidization of the private automobile.

When the RTD was established in 1964 the transit industry nationally was suffering a continuing steady decline in ridership which had started after World War II. The District was expected to do something about reversing this trend and to do it with only the fares it could generate, getting no tax support. The task proved impossible to accomplish. The downward cycle referred to earlier continued as before. By keeping

costs to the minimum and getting rid of marginal services the District ran a break even business until 1969 and in so doing was the only major transit system to operate so long without a tax subsidy. This fact is a tribute to the effectiveness of the District's entire organization.

In late 1969, the State voted a 1/2¢ sales tax in the County for RTD for a six month period as an emergency measure. This let us hold the line on fares but little else.

It wasn't until 1971 that Senate Bill 325 introduced a 1/4¢ sales tax State wide to help public transportation on an ongoing basis. With the SB 325 funds and UMTA at the Federal level helping out with capital costs we were finally able to expand our service.

In the period from April of 1973 to April of 1974 we increased our revenue miles by 14%, our buses by 16% and our employees by 12%. In April of last year the County provided an added subsidy to support a 25¢ flat fare and increased service. The District responded to the challenge with vigor. In the past year the District, with the financial help of the County, accomplished one of the greatest expansions ever undertaken in the industry. The major part of the expansion was the creation of two grid systems, one in South Central Los Angeles, the other in the San Fernando Valley. Over 200 additional buses were placed in service to permit a maximum of 15 to 20 minute service during the day and a maximum of hourly

service at night and thus provide a service within convenient walking distance of hundreds of thousands of people in these two areas. And this was only the frosting on the cake. The District, in the same period, in addition to the grids, added 10 new lines, extended service on a dozen lines, established seven park and ride lots, introduced a saturation service test on Fairfax Avenue, carried out a successful summer beach program, supported a special Hollywood Bowl service, extended the service hours on the highly successful Minibus project in downtown Los Angeles and opened two new stations on the El Monte to Los Angeles Busway. We increased revenue miles a remarkable 33%, put 22% more buses in service and added 1,152 people to the District's work force. The expansion accomplished by the District was greater than the entire bus operation in several sizeable cities in the country, including San Diego and Sacramento in our own state.

Two new operating divisions were put in operation, the hiring and training of personnel went on at a frantic clip, our equal opportunity program was more active than ever before, more small businesses and minority business shared in our purchasing program and our information service doubled its capability to serve the public. It was an amazing year of activity and accomplishment for the District.

What do we foresee in fiscal year 1976? The answer is, a "leveling off." The reason is financial reality.

The expansion of service was not without substantial cost. And inflation is still a significant factor. In one year our monthly costs went up 40%! At the same time our income from passenger revenue did not increase at all.

A word about inflation. Here's what has happened to the prices of things we all buy. Time and Newsweek magazines up 50%, a roll of film up 22%, McDonald's cheeseburger up 35%, cigarettes up 32%, airport bus up 67% and a dog license up 33%. Obviously everything RTD buys has gone up as well. Our fuel, our spare parts, our tires, etc. The settlement with our labor unions in 1974 was very expensive, averaging over 12% a year for wages and fringes. We now pay a bus driver 30% more than we did in 1972. Our buses cost 37% more than they did two years ago.

In the same period, however, our bus fare in Los Angeles has gone down about 33%. Our passenger revenue has not made any offsetting contribution to our increased cost for a couple of additional highly significant reasons. The strike in 1974 decreased our ridership 15% and it took six months to get the riders back. More importantly, and influencing our future plans, we must accept the fact that the new service we introduced, while attractive to the riders, is not cost effective. While putting 22% more buses in service in the past 12 months, our revenue per mile has declined from 64¢ to 48¢. This means that the added service has not been as productive of revenue

as the service which existed before the expansion. To put it another way, the District and its predecessor private companies tapped the richest transit routes years ago and the pattern of travel hasn't changed significantly. New services like park and ride lots, service to universities and shopping centers, night service and summer beach service are appreciated by the public but don't come near yielding the revenue per mile of our established routes. With this background, let's look at the proposed budget for fiscal year 1976.

The District's proposed budget for the coming fiscal year is \$181,500,000 made up grossly as follows:

For bus operations	\$159,100,000
For bus capital	18,000,000
For rapid transit	1,400,000
For debt service	<u>3,000,000</u>
	<u>\$181,500,000</u>

The funds to cover this budget should be available from the following sources:

From passenger revenue	\$ 58,800,000
From sales taxes	59,520,000
From UMTA	41,490,000
From Los Angeles County	12,190,000
From various other sources	<u>9,500,000</u>
	<u>\$181,500,000</u>

This proposed budget is influenced heavily by the availability of funds. It does not provide the level of service the area needs and wants, it does not provide the level of service the District would like to provide. It does utilize all funds known to be available and in addition anticipates an increase in fares to a base fare of 35¢ and zone fares of 20¢ based on four zones covering the entire service areas. Zone fares would apply only after a rider crosses into the third zone. Senior citizens, the handicapped and students would continue to ride at reduced rates. The blind would continue to ride free.

This budget would permit the District to operate its entire bus fleet in being at June 30, 1975 and in addition, operate 100 new buses scheduled for delivery in the fall of 1975. In other words, we would continue to operate the following major categories of service:

- ... the regularly scheduled core bus system
- ... the grid systems
- ... the park and ride lots
- ... the minibus service (if the current subsidy provided by the City of Los Angeles, the County and the Community Redevelopment Agency continues)
- ... the El Monte-Los Angeles Busway
- ... subscription service

This budget has funds in it necessary to implement the Santa Monica Freeway project (50 buses) and to expand the fleet by the 100 new buses scheduled to arrive in October of 1975. The manner in which these 100 additional buses will be used, i. e. where they will be placed in service is not as yet determined by the Board of Directors, although the District has a number of local service improvement plans thoroughly prepared, and ready and waiting only the availability of buses and funding for implementation. It is anticipated that the commitment of these 100 buses will be a matter addressed in the RTD-L.A.County contract covering County financial support of District operations this coming year.

As indicated earlier in this report, we introduced massive amounts of new service this fiscal year and are now in the process of evaluation of these new services. We can expect to make adjustments in service in the coming fiscal year based on a continuous review of our system.

Our budget also provides for a continuation of discussions with representatives of the County of Los Angeles, the City of Los Angeles, Cal Trans, UMTA, SCAG and other interested parties on the subject of a rail rapid transit system for Los Angeles. We hope to make progress in selecting a starter line and the type of equipment to be utilized so that we can move ahead with discussions with UMTA on funding rapid transit for Los Angeles. The budget contains only

limited funds to pursue these activities. However, if solid progress can be made, additional funds from the gasoline tax and from UMTA may well be available.

The subject of commuter rail is also under consideration, currently spearheaded by the Board of Supervisors. There are no funds in this budget for the project, however.

It should be noted at this point that the overall financial and operating plan set forth above is one of over twenty general programs developed by the staff in recent weeks and reviewed by the Board of Directors. All of these plans depend to a large extent upon the level of Los Angeles County funding we might receive next fiscal year. Since no decision has been made as yet by the Board of Supervisors, there is no way of knowing with certainty at this time what our financial picture will be. We have proceeded on the assumption of receiving \$12,100,000 County assistance since this is the amount the County CAO's proposed budget has in it for the District. As we have indicated to the County, the District does believe this financial and operating plan is not the best. The RTD Board is on record in favor of maintaining the 25¢ flat fare if at all possible and expanding our system next year as new buses arrive. The operating plan as presented here would handle such a program on the expense side. However, the District would need approximately \$25.7 million from the County as opposed to \$12.1 million. We have submitted proposals

to accomplish this as well as a compromise which calls for raising the fare to a 25¢ base fare with two 20¢ zone charges. This plan calls for a County subsidy of \$17 million versus the \$12.1 million contained in this proposed budget. Under this plan the 100 buses to be received in the fall would be used as replacements. The District could adjust its operating budget downward to \$153,380,000 if this higher subsidy were provided.

Schedule 2 is a breakdown of the proposed budget by organizational element. There are no comparisons shown to this year's budget since the District accomplished a major organization change in mid-year as a result of Board and staff discussions and the recommendations of Cresap, McCormick and Paget, a nationally known management consulting firm. The organizational changes distorted the budgets originally established. Some gross comparisons are shown on Schedule 3.

The Legal Department provides general legal advice to all parts of the organization, participates heavily in procurement matters, administers the District's workers' compensation program, procures all general insurance coverage and oversees an outside company's administration of the personal liability and property damage program. Next fiscal year an additional attorney is contemplated with a reduction of the use of outside legal service. The present staff totals 11 persons.

The Equal Employment Administrator is responsible for the development and administration of our equal employment

opportunity program. We are giving this part of our business more attention all the time.

Operations, General is the top management and top support staff portion of Operations. This group sets the goals for Operations, reviews progress, works on technical programs of general interest to Operations, and develops procurement specifications for equipment. It also evaluates new materials and processes of interest to bus operations as they come on the market.

Building and Services handles the administration and supervision of our activities relating to the general offices. This includes janitorial services, the print shop and the mail room. The rental for our new building is in this budget. Eight additional people will be required in the coming fiscal year over the 36 jobs now authorized.

The Transportation Department runs the bus fleet. Supporting these operations are the instructor group, the radio dispatch center, stops and zones establishment and ticket sales facilities. This Department also handles commission agency arrangements. About 260 drivers will be hired early in FY 1976 to man buses now being received plus the 100 new buses arriving in the fall. There are 4,393 authorized positions currently.

Maintenance has a wide assortment of responsibilities including the servicing and repair of buses, cars and trucks; maintenance of grounds and buildings; maintenance of radios

and base stations; and inspection and readying for service all new buses, cars and trucks. We are planning to add 35 people to the 1,095 now authorized next year to do a better job of bus cleaning and to accomplish overhauls of many old buses plus the 19 minibuses now in service. We have 300 buses over 20 years old, many of which will be overhauled in the coming year since only 100 new buses, representing less than 5% of our fleet, will be purchased in the next twelve months. An operational study will be conducted by an outside consultant during the year.

The Schedules Department has been hard pressed to keep up with the massive build up of our bus service over the past year. In addition the emphasis on better passenger information has demanded an increase in checkers. The expansion is just about complete. The Department collects passenger data, prepares bus schedules and prepares driver work runs. It is a key part of District operations. This organization along with an outside contractor will set up a computer based RUCUS program for the District in the next year or so.

Our Special Agents are responsible for personnel and bus security and the liaison with various law enforcement agencies. They also patrol the busway and its stations, the headquarters building and the cash counting operation. Two additional personnel are scheduled over the 65 now on board for the security of our new headquarters building.

Planning handles advance planning in conjunction with other interested agencies, of which there are many. It also does all the planning for new or expanded bus service and is developing a data bank which will include a mass of data on all of our lines. In these endeavors it is assisted at times by outside consultants. Because of the widespread interest in the bus system it has been under intense workload pressure for many months. With the expectation that planning demands will not decrease next year, seven additional personnel over 49 now authorized are programmed. During the coming fiscal period, cost and revenue data is scheduled to be completed on all RTD lines as part of the on-going evaluation program. With this data, the Board will be able to make service changes on a cost-effective analysis basis.

Marketing and Communications is responsible for sales promotion, news stories and information teams distributing promotional material in our operating area. It employs an advertising agency for the placement of radio and newspaper advertising. There are 59 personnel slots approved. Two additional people to assist with marketing are planned for next year.

Customer Relations is big business at the District. We have 168 authorized personnel to man the telephone answering service 'round the clock, to answer all kinds of mail from elected officials, our customers and the general public and to

evaluate the information service provided. Eight additional personnel are planned for next year to handle the ever increasing workload in this area.

Employee Relations oversees labor relations, personnel, employment, safety and training activities. Major efforts will be required next year in preparing for contract negotiations (which will commence in the spring), improving District hiring procedures and improving our training program. One additional employee is anticipated over the 58 currently on board.

Accounting and Fiscal handles general accounting, cost accounting, payables and receivables, payroll, statistics accumulation, cash receipts, disbursements and grant accounting and budgeting with a staff of 75. One added job in payroll is planned for next year.

Data Processing is busy working on the movement of its computer programs from an IBM 1401 computer to a new Univac 1106 computer. This organization is also charged with the development and implementation of a new management information system for the District. Its staff numbers 36 currently, with four new slots programmed.

Purchasing has been extremely busy in the past year responding to the needs of an increase in bus miles driven of over 30% and the start-up of two new divisions. This organization handles receiving, shipping, surplus disposal and stores

control as well as its purchasing function. One additional Buyer is scheduled for next year. There are now 81 persons in the organization.

Rapid Transit/Commuter Rail has a descriptive label. The organization has 11 persons authorized to help select a starter line and system type as a part of a joint effort with several other interested groups. If the District is involved in the commuter rail project, this organization will handle the job. Additions to the staff will be made if and when funding is made available.

The Administration Department has 26 employees and is active in liaison with cities, counties, the State and Federal agencies. It oversees our important UMTA and FAU grant programs. Next year it will administer the Community Youth Corps and Operation Team Work projects recently authorized by the Board of Directors. Bus Facilities Engineering is a part of Administration. This group does much of the work on capital grant proposals, handles bus facility design problems, employs design consultants and contractors to build District facilities and oversees their work. There are 44 jobs authorized currently and 7 more jobs are planned for next year when much work will be done on bus facilities throughout our service area.

The credit at the bottom of the Schedule for \$1 million represents work done by District staff with related overhead costs which will be charged to capital grants or to the stores inventory account.

Schedule 3 is a breakdown of our budget by type of expense.

Wages and Salaries budgeted at \$109 million continue to be of overriding importance in our budget. This sum will finance a work force of 6,659 at the expected level of compensation. This work force relates to the operation of our entire bus fleet in being at June 30, 1975 plus 100 new buses to be received in the fall.

Employee Benefits of \$22.6 million include pension costs, group life insurance, medical insurance, workers' compensation, social security taxes and uniform allowances. When wages and salaries and fringes are added together they represent over 80% of our operating budget.

Supplies are for the buses and support facilities and are projected at \$5.4 million.

Fuel, tires and lubricants are budgeted at \$7.7 million, up substantially from previous levels due to the great expansion in miles to be operated and the constant price increases, especially in the cost of diesel fuel.

Liability and other insurance is budgeted at \$7.7 million. Most of this is for PL & PD insurance and reflects the service increase plus the escalation of medical and legal expenses.

Rents, telephone and utilities will be much higher next year. We will be moving to a new headquarters building and paying rent. The present building is owned by the District. Also, we have contracted for a new Centrex telephone system which should be more efficient, but more costly as well.

Purchased services at \$4.3 million cover a wide variety of things including consultant services, advertising, ticket agency commissions and travel. All told it runs under 3% of the total budget.

Schedule 4 indicates where we expect to get the funds to cover the proposed budget. The passenger revenue is based on a 12% reduction in ridership resulting from the fare increase to 35¢ plus zone charges. This rate is based on historic patterns and may be too high when subsidies are so great. The reduction would come from a projected annual rate of 215 million fares.

Please note that the proposed budget anticipates funding of an expanded minibus system in downtown Los Angeles. The County part of the minibus subsidy is not included in the County support figure of \$12.1 million.

The CETA and COD programs are part of the federally sponsored hiring programs to help the unemployment problem. We anticipate these programs continuing for the entire fiscal year. If they do not continue some manpower reductions would have to be made.

CETA operating funds are a new source of revenue for the District. You are aware of the continuing efforts to handle

the staff work in this area and to solve the designated recipient problem.

Sales tax revenue comes from the Senate Bill 325 program. These funds support operating costs and provide the local share for Federal programs.

The FAU funds are also a new source of revenue. This is the Federal Aid to Urbanized Areas program which funds capital programs. We plan to purchase some park and ride lots with these funds next year.

Schedule 5 is our capital budget. Significant improvements to various operating divisions are planned. The Board has approved or will be asked to approve each project as it develops. Improvements include new and improved operating and maintenance facilities, improved employee parking, new fuel stations and new bus cleaning stations. We will also complete work on the two new divisions, 15 and 18.

The 100 bus procurement has been discussed earlier as have the park and ride lots.

The RUCUS program is an effort to get computer capability applied to the complex task of cutting bus runs and fixing schedules.

The balance of the items appear to be self explanatory.

A full report of our facility plans was submitted to the Board on March 14, 1975.

Schedule 6 shows the requirements to fund our bonded debt of about \$20 million which was incurred years ago when MTA purchased the bus system from private operators. This is being reduced regularly and will be fully paid off in 1983.

This concludes an overview of our budget for the coming fiscal year. As indicated at the start, this budget doesn't permit the District to provide the service needed or the service we would like to provide. It represents our best effort at providing the best service within the financial constraints. Despite the limitations it will permit the District to provide the highest level of bus service this area has ever had at a reasonable cost to the patrons of the system.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jack R. Gilstrap", written in a cursive style.

Jack R. Gilstrap
General Manager

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA RAPID
TRANSIT DISTRICT

PROPOSED BUDGET
FISCAL YEAR 1976

PROPOSED BUDGET
FISCAL YEAR 1976
OVERVIEW
Thousands of Dollars

Fund Requirements -

For bus operations (Schedules 1 and 2)	\$159,500
For bus capital (Schedule 5)	18,000
For rapid transit capital (Schedule 5)	1,000
For debt service (Schedule 6)	<u>3,000</u>
Total	<u>\$181,500</u>

Sources of Funds -

From passenger revenue	\$ 58,800
From the sales tax	59,520
From UMTA	41,490
From Los Angeles County	12,190
From various other sources	<u>9,500</u>
Total	<u>\$181,500</u>

PROPOSED BUDGET
TOTALS BY DEPARTMENT
FISCAL YEAR 1976
Thousands of Dollars

	<u>Wages & Salaries</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
Board & Executive Office	\$ 180	\$ 162	\$ 342
Legal	201	7,749	7,950
Equal Employment Administrator	59	9	68
Operations, General	475	77	552
Building & Services	625	1,429	2,054
Transportation	75,369	1,304	76,673
Maintenance	19,147	14,222	33,369
Schedules	2,228	95	2,323
Special Agents	950	113	1,063
Planning	1,139	743	1,882
Marketing & Communications	915	1,657	2,572
Customer Relations	2,175	570	2,745
Employee Relations	1,066	22,619	23,685
Accounting & Fiscal	1,137	231	1,368
Data Processing	649	223	872
Purchasing & Stores	1,305	65	1,370
Rapid Transit/Commuter Rail	225	175	400
Administration	456	172	628
Bus Facilities Engineering	<u>530</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>584</u>
Total	<u>\$108,831</u>	<u>\$51,669</u>	\$160,500
Less credits for capital costs and Stores inventory costs			<u>(1,000)</u>
Total			<u>\$159,500</u>

PROPOSED BUDGET
 COST BY MAJOR CATEGORY
 FISCAL YEAR 1976
 Dollars in Thousands

	<u>FY 76 Budget</u>	<u>Feb-Mar Rate</u>	<u>FY 75 Budget</u>
Wages and salaries	\$108,831	\$ 86,453	\$ 76,151
Employee benefits	22,559	18,513	16,614
Supplies	5,435	4,307	4,135
Fuel, tires, lubricants	9,369	8,028	5,550
Liability and other insurance	7,650	5,010	5,875
Rents, telephone, utilities	2,317	1,093	1,435
Purchased services	4,339	5,572	2,745
Reserve for new services	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>4,000</u>
Total	<u>\$160,500</u>	<u>\$128,976</u>	<u>\$116,505</u>

