

METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT FINANCE REPORT



February 2021

The Council's mission is to foster efficient and economic growth for a prosperous metropolitan region

Metropolitan Council Members

Charlie Zelle	Chair	Raymond Zeran	District 9
Judy Johnson	District 1	Peter Lindstrom	District 10
Reva Chamblis	District 2	Susan Vento	District 11
Christopher Ferguson	District 3	Francisco J. Gonzalez	District 12
Deb Barber	District 4	Chai Lee	District 13
Molly Cummings	District 5	Kris Fredson	District 14
Lynnea Atlas-Ingebretson	District 6	Phillip Sterner	District 15
Robert Lilligren	District 7	Wendy Wulff	District 16
Abdirahman Muse	District 8		



The Metropolitan Council is the regional planning organization for the seven-county Twin Cities area. The Council operates the regional bus and rail system, collects and treats wastewater, coordinates regional water resources, plans and helps fund regional parks, and administers federal funds that provide housing opportunities for low- and moderate-income individuals and families. The 17-member Council board is appointed by and serves at the pleasure of the governor.

On request, this publication will be made available in alternative formats to people with disabilities. Call Metropolitan Council information at 651-602-1140 or TTY 651-291-0904.

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

 Transit’s value in a growing region 1

 COVID-19 creates uncertainty for transit operations 1

The Regional Transit System 3

 Transit services 4

 Transit ridership 5

Capacity Analysis 6

 Existing transit system 6

 New dedicated transitways 6

 Arterial Bus Rapid Transitways 6

 Other transit 7

 Revenue and expenditure assumptions 7

 Capacity analysis summary 11

 Conclusions 31

Route Performance 33

 Introduction 33

 Performance standards 33

 Performance measures 33

Appendix A – Legislative Request 47

Appendix B – Summaries: Transitway and BRT Projects in Operation, Construction or Development 50

 METRO Blue Line (Hiawatha Light Rail Transit) 50

 Northstar Commuter Rail 55

 METRO Red Line Highway Bus Rapid Transit (Cedar Avenue Transitway) 60

 METRO Green Line (Central Corridor) Light Rail Transit 64

 A Line (Snelling Avenue Arterial Bus Rapid Transit) 69

 C Line (Penn Avenue Arterial Bus Rapid Transit) 73

 METRO Orange Line (I-35W South Highway Bus Rapid Transit) 77

 METRO Green Line Extension (Southwest Light Rail Transit) 82

 METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau Light Rail Transit) 86

 METRO Gold Line (Gateway Corridor Dedicated Bus Rapid Transit) 90

 Riverview Corridor Modern Streetcar 98

 D Line (Chicago-Emerson-Fremont Arterial Bus Rapid Transit) 102

Appendix C – Summaries: Corridors with Study Recommendations – Incomplete Funding Plan	106
METRO B Line (Lake / Marshall / Selby Arterial Bus Rapid Transit).....	106
E Line (Hennepin/France Avenue Arterial Bus Rapid Transit)	110
Nicollet-Central Modern Streetcar	114
METRO Red Line Highway Bus Rapid Transit (Cedar Avenue Transitway) – Future Stages	118
Midtown Corridor Rail	122
Red Rock Corridor Highway Bus Rapid Transit.....	125
West Broadway Modern Streetcar	129
Highway 169 Mobility Study (Highway Bus Rapid Transit).....	132
Appendix D – Summaries: Corridors without Study Recommendations	135
Robert Street Corridor.....	135
METRO Orange Line Extension	140
Ford Corridor	143
Appendix E – Intercity Passenger Rail Corridors	145
Northern Lights Express (NLX) - Minneapolis to Duluth High Speed Passenger Rail	145
Twin Cities-Milwaukee-Chicago Intercity Passenger Rail Service Phase 1 Study	149
Twin Cities to Milwaukee Portion - High Speed Rail Corridor to Chicago	153
Appendix F – Other Transit.....	156
University of Minnesota	156
Minnesota Department of Transportation – Team Transit.....	157
Appendix G – Transit System Financial Summary	159
Appendix H – Regional Route Performance Data Summaries	160
2017 Route Performance Detail	160
2018 Route Performance Detail	174
2019 Route Performance Detail	189

Introduction

In 2010, the Minnesota Legislature adopted Minn. Stat. 174.93, which required the Minnesota Department of Transportation to prepare, in collaboration with the Metropolitan Council, a biennial report on the status of “guideway” projects in the state, with an emphasis on funding sources and project progress. MnDOT, with the Council’s assistance, produced four versions of the Guideway Status report in 2012, 2013, 2015, and 2017.

In 2017 (HF3, Ch. 3, Art. 3, Sec. 104), the legislature amended the statute to require that the Council, rather than MnDOT, prepare the report, and that the report take a transit system view as well as a project view. It also required inclusion of comprehensive financial information for the metropolitan area transit system projected out over ten years. The first iteration of this new report was produced in October 2018; this is the second. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the 2020 Legislature extended the report due date from October 2020, to February 15, 2021.

Transit’s value in a growing region

As the population of the Twin Cities metropolitan region prospers and grows, so too does the demand for transit. The region’s long-range plan, *Thrive MSP 2040*, estimates that compared to 2010, the region will have nearly 803,000 additional residents by 2040, plus 472,000 new jobs. That population will be, on average, older and include more people of color. This growth is also expected to increase the demand on transit by 80 percent.

Ongoing investments in highway infrastructure have allowed the region to keep congestion relatively stable in recent years. However, the ability to expand the regional roadway system is limited for financial, environmental, and livability reasons.

Transit provides a sustainable, efficient, and effective option to address increasing roadway congestion, improve air quality, and provide mobility options for those who can’t or choose not to drive. It connects people to jobs, school, services and amenities, recreation, shopping and more. Transit also plays a critical role in economic prosperity and livability. Businesses cite transit as one of the most important assets when looking to attract and retain employees. More and more, people are prioritizing access to transit as one of the factors they consider when choosing where to live and work.

COVID-19 creates uncertainty for transit operations

Before COVID-19 prompted stay-at-home orders and fundamentally changed the way people travel, early 2020 saw transit ridership on an upward trend. In 2019 there were over 91 million transit rides and ridership was growing on many core local routes, light rail, and dramatic growth on the corridors served by the METRO A and C bus rapid transit lines.

However, in March 2020 the world changed dramatically. Collectively the nation, state and region began taking emergency actions like temporarily shuttering businesses, banning large gatherings, reducing business capacity, working from home for workers who are able to complete their work remotely, and social distancing, which ultimately resulted in reduced travel across the region.

COVID-19 has significantly impacted transit ridership and related fare revenues. Ridership has fallen on all transit services – by as much as 60% on local routes, 70% on light rail and 95% on express bus routes and Northstar commuter rail. In keeping with public health guidance, transit customers have been instructed to use transit for essential rides only. At the time this

publication was submitted, two pharmaceutical companies who developed COVID-19 have received emergency approval and the state has begun administering vaccinations. Vaccinations began with health care personnel and long-term care residents, and the state has now moved on to community vaccinations for adults 65 years of age or older and educators (pre-kindergarten through grade 12), school staff, and childcare workers. With these developments and additional vaccine approvals on the horizon, this clears a path for increased community movement and transit use into the summer and fall of 2021. Transit's future remains uncertain with no measurable forecast of how many people will return to riding transit and where that ridership number will stabilize. Additionally, trends like teleworking could continue well into the future.

At the same time, transit operating expenses have not noticeably declined as an impact of COVID-19. This is because transit providers continue to provide basic transit services while limiting onboard capacity to maintain social distancing, and shouldering increased cleaning and other operational costs. The federal government has provided significant one-time financial relief through the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) and Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations (CRRSAA) acts that will stabilize the transit budgets until calendar year 2023. However, after 2023, projections show the regional transit system will face significant, on-going shortfalls.

As the pandemic diminishes and transit system ridership and demand recovers, the lack of ongoing, sustainable, and reliable funding makes planning for the preservation and growth of the transit system extremely difficult. Transit budgeting must be done based on many assumptions laid out in law and based on experience and forecasts; but because of the ongoing volatility of those assumptions, any strategic financial plan bears a high level of uncertainty. The overarching goal is to stabilize funding and create more certainty for all the communities benefited by transit.

Transit revenue lags behind need

Transit funding comes from a variety of sources. For capital projects, funding sources most often include federal formula funds and grants through the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), State General Obligation Bonds, county transportation sales tax revenues for transitways, and Metropolitan Council-levied property taxes. For operating costs, current sources include fare revenues, state general funds, Motor Vehicle Sales Tax (MVST) revenue, county transportation sales tax revenues for transitway operations, and limited federal funds.

In 2019, the legislature made separate, general fund, line item appropriations for Metro Mobility and transit system operations. Growing Metro Mobility ridership demand and cost drove this change. Metro Mobility is the region's shared ride public transportation service for certified Americans with Disabilities Act riders who are unable to use regular, fixed-route buses due to a disability or health condition. This door-through-door federally and state-mandated service is substantially more expensive to operate and has a very low fare recovery. In 2019, the Metro Mobility cost per ride was \$32.98 compared to \$6.25 for core local bus services and \$3.03 for light rail.

Currently, the Council relies on its state general fund appropriation to fully fund Metro Mobility and the state share of rail operating costs. Past forecasts estimated that the state appropriation, specifically to meet Metro Mobility demand, would need to continue to grow. Previously that demand was averaging 6 to 8 percent growth year over year.

However, moving into fiscal year 2022, the annual state appropriation for transit is currently statutorily set to drop – from approximately \$113 million in fiscal year 2020 to \$89 million in fiscal year 2022. This mandated reduction means that even prior to the COVID-19, the regional transit system was facing operating shortfalls.

In 2020, as previously stated, the onset of the pandemic significantly impacted transit – ridership and fare revenues fell significantly, along with motor vehicle sales tax (MVST) revenues. Since that time, the MVST revenues have recovered and are currently nearing previous forecast levels. Transit fare revenues, however, remain down by over 60 percent from 2019 levels.

As the pandemic recedes, ridership is likely to recover slowly over time. The Met Council anticipates that ridership forecasts and fare revenues will not reach 2019 levels until sometime after 2026. Metro Mobility ridership, on the other hand, is expected to recover more quickly and reach 2019 levels by 2023.

Motor Vehicle Sales Tax

MVST is a major source of the transit operating budget, but its volatility makes planning for the future very difficult. MVST revenues are tough to accurately forecast, and actual revenues can vary substantially from forecasts.

- The state’s forecast of MVST revenues, while growing, have regularly fallen short of forecast.
- MVST forecasts are routinely adjusted downward and flattened after transit budgets have been adopted, meaning the Council is left to anticipate lower funding and make late adjustments to its budget and/or planned service levels.
- MVST revenues fell by almost 50 percent at the outset of COVID-19 in March 2020, and while MVST receipts have now recovered and are expected to grow, the total annual projections are starting from a lower base.
- In November of 2020, the state reduced annual MVST forecasts by over \$11 million for the FY22-23 biennium.

With these recent trends in MVST, the Met Council is facing systemwide structural deficits, even in a preserve-and-maintain service approach. Simply put, the revenues the Council was planning for into the near future to cover existing service are not there. As with any organization, business, or household, this creates a hole in the budget that must be filled.

The Met Council has received several one-time appropriations in recent years to fill that gap and ensure that existing service levels could be retained. While these one-time appropriations and actions have filled immediate transit funding gaps and avoided cuts in service, it has done nothing to address the long-term funding stability of the transit system.

The Regional Transit System

The 2040 Transportation Policy Plan lays out the shared regional goals and objectives, which are integrated with land use and other regional infrastructure systems. To be good stewards of public investments, the region must have a strategic plan which invests in the regional transit system and builds toward the regional goals.

Multiple providers operate the public transit system across the region, providing over 90 million rides a year, prior to 2020. The current system includes transit routes, vehicles, support facilities and infrastructure (like operations centers, garages, administration and bus shoulders), and customer facilities (like park-and-rides, bus stops and transit stations).

As of early 2020, there were 211 regular bus routes operating in the region: 96 local and 115 express. Also in service are two light rail lines (METRO Blue Line and Green Line), three bus rapid transit lines (METRO A Line, C Line and Red Line), and one commuter rail line (Northstar).

Transit services

Regular-route service is primarily provided by the Metropolitan Council and the suburban transit providers in the communities within the seven-county region where a property tax is levied to pay for transit capital needs – this is called the Transit Capital Levy District. This district is established in state law but has changed as growing communities desire transit services and request to be included, most recently adding Lakeville, Forest Lake, Columbus, and Maple Plain. The services of each agency, while independent, work together to provide a cohesive, comprehensive regional system.

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requires complementary service for certified riders who want to travel where regular-route transit service is available but are unable to use the regular-route system due to a disability. Metro Mobility is the Council's ADA service for the region. The state through law has also established additional service areas beyond the federal requirements.

Dial-a-ride service is provided for the public in areas of Anoka, Carver, Dakota, Hennepin, Ramsey, Scott and Washington counties where regular-route transit is not available. This service is also available in adjoining urbanized portions of Sherburne and Wright counties. Transit Link is the Council's dial-a-ride service.

Metropolitan Council transit services

The Metropolitan Council provides public transit service through two of its operating divisions: Metro Transit and Metropolitan Transportation Services. Metro Transit, which operates regular-route bus services, light rail and Northstar Commuter Rail provides the bulk of regional rides. In 2019, Metro Transit was the 21st largest transit provider in the United States, based on ridership.

Metropolitan Transportation Services also operates regular-route bus service, Metro Mobility and Transit Link services through private contractors. In addition, the Council offers Metro Vanpool, which provides financial assistance for vanpools of between five and 15 people, including a volunteer driver, commuting to and from work destinations throughout the region in areas not well served by the regular-route transit network.

Regional transit providers

Along with the services described above, several other providers operate transit service in the region. The size, geographic service area, and service types of these providers vary, but the Metropolitan Council works with each provider to ensure the transit system is integrated in addressing the region's needs.

- Minnesota Valley Transit Authority, SouthWest Transit, and the cities of Maple Grove and Plymouth operate regular-route and, in some cases, dial-a-ride service for 12 suburban communities.
- University of Minnesota provides regular-route bus service around and between the Minneapolis and Saint Paul campuses.

- Small transit services or individual routes are occasionally operated by other local communities as unique or demonstration services.

Transit ridership


In 2019, prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, the region provided 91.6 million rides, through Metro Transit, Metro Mobility, Metropolitan Transportation Services (MTS) contract services, the suburban transit providers, and the University of Minnesota. Metro Transit provided 77.2 million or 84 percent of those rides, suburban transit providers provided 5 million or just over five percent, and Metro Mobility provided 2.4 million or about two and a half percent, with the other services providing the remaining rides.

Ridership measures transit system accessibility, quality and system growth. Growth in ridership is an indication that more people can meet their transportation needs using transit. Existing transit ridership, shown below, includes all transit providers in the region.

People have a host of reasons for choosing to take transit. Those choices are often influenced by the demographic, social and economic landscape.

- Those who don't have access or cannot drive a car are more likely to use transit.
- Areas with dense housing or job centers are more likely to have transit access and higher ridership.
- Neighborhoods and business districts with well-maintained sidewalks and pathways make it easier to reach and use transit.
- People who work, or get their schooling, at home are less likely to use transit
- Higher gas prices change the affordability of driving
- Major construction projects can lead to slower, less reliable transit service

Figure 1 – Annual Regional Transit Ridership, 2004-2019



Capacity Analysis

The system capacity analysis consists of six separate tables that seek to aggregate and synthesize 2020 capital and operating financial information and the subsequent 10-year period, 2021 to 2030. The information is separated into four categories of transit services:

- Existing Transit System
- New Dedicated Transitways
- Arterial Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)
- Other Transit

The transit services included in each of the four categories are described below. Appendices B through D contain detailed summary information and a map for each of the transitways.

Existing transit system

Tables 1 and 2 show the capital and operating revenues and expenses of the transit system in operation today. This includes the existing bus services provided by the Council and the Suburban Transit Providers, light rail transit service for the Blue and Green lines, and Northstar commuter rail service.

The Council's bus costs are further divided into Metro Transit bus, Metropolitan Transportation Services (MTS) bus, and Metro Mobility, the region's demand-responsive Americans with Disability Act (ADA) service. The costs of the existing A Line arterial bus rapid transit (ABRT) are included within the Metro Transit bus operations category and are also shown separately within the ABRT on tables 5 and 6. Metropolitan Transportation Services bus operations includes regular routes contracted to private operators, Transit Link dial-a-ride services, Metro Vanpool, Red Line highway BRT operations and multimodal transportation planning.

New dedicated transitways

Tables 3 and 4 show the expected capital and operating revenues and expenses for future dedicated transitways, including potential light rail, dedicated bus rapid transit, and modern streetcar lines. Each of the included corridors are in some stage of development or planning and may potentially be under construction or operation by 2028 and the related costs are included in the tables. The future transitways that fall into this category include the following:

- Orange Line highway bus rapid transit
- Green Line extension light rail transit and new feeder bus services
- Blue Line extension light rail transit and new feeder bus services
- Gold Line dedicated bus rapid transit
- Rush line corridor dedicated bus rapid transit
- Riverview corridor modern streetcar
- Nicollet Central corridor modern streetcar

Arterial Bus Rapid Transitways

Tables 5 and 6 show the expected capital and operating revenues and expenses six additional Arterial BRT corridors that are planned for construction and opening over the next ten years. The planned ABRT corridors include the following (in order of anticipated opening):

- METRO D Line ABRT – Chicago-Emerson-Fremont Avenues corridor
- METRO B Line ABRT – Lake Street-Marshall Avenue corridor

- METRO E Line ABRT – Hennepin Avenue corridor
- METRO F Line, G Line, and H Line BRT – To be identified 2021

F, G, and H Line corridor identification is anticipated by the Metropolitan Council in 2021. Candidate corridors have been identified through Metro Transit’s Network Next study. Potential corridors to be selected for F, G, and H lines include Central Ave NE, Johnson/Lyndale avenues, Rice/Robert streets, and Como/Maryland avenues.

Each of these corridors has high existing ridership and substantial local bus service operating within the corridor. The development of Arterial BRT will provide more frequent, all-day service and improved customer amenities including off-board fare collection, improved stations with heat and light, new vehicles with multiple-door boarding, and traffic management technologies to improve travel time reliability along the corridor. Some existing local services will remain on the corridors. Arterial BRT improvements result in increased ridership (approximately 33 percent in the case of the A Line and C Line corridors) and improved speed and reliability for a service that approaches a dedicated transitway experience for the customer.

Other transit

In addition to the services shown in Tables 1-6, other transit related services may make expenditures within the metro area including:

- University of Minnesota intercampus transit services
- Northern Lights Express passenger rail, Minnesota Department of Transportation
- Ramsey County Union Depot operations and maintenance
- Scott County sales tax expenditures for transit purposes
- Team Transit, Minnesota Department of Transportation, capital expenditures on the state highway system for transit advantages

Revenues and expenses for these services are not shown in detail in this report as they are tangentially related to the other transit services shown in Tables 1-6.

Revenue and expenditure assumptions

The assumptions built into the Capacity Analysis rely on historical experience to forecast future revenues and expenditures. While this is the best guide available to produce an estimate of what to expect in the future, changes are likely to happen over the ten-year timeframe that could cause large shifts away from these estimates. These potential changes are not accounted for in these estimates because their timing, scale and specific impacts are uncertain. The revenue and expenditure assumptions underlying the capacity analysis are outlined below.

Revenue sources and assumptions

Transit revenues are generated by several sources, the majority of which are available only for specific transit operating or capital purposes. The transit revenues are largely used by the Council (Metro Transit, MTS, Metro Mobility and Transit Link) and the suburban transit providers to operate and improve the existing bus and transitway systems. Additional competitive revenues are also available through the federal Capital Investment Grants (e.g. New Starts and Small Starts) program, the Regional Solicitation, and from local county sales tax funds and regional railroad property tax funds to expand the transit system.

State general funds The state has historically provided a general fund appropriation for transit operating purposes. These revenues are in large part allocated to Metro Mobility operations and

for the state's 50 percent share of transitway operations. The assumption in the analysis is the state will continue to provide a general fund appropriation for transit assistance. Due to one-time appropriations, the Council's general fund appropriation is set to reduce from \$113 M in fiscal year 2021, to a base appropriation amount of approximately \$89 million annually beginning in FY 2022. Each of the operating tables indicate an approximate amount of additional general fund revenues that would be needed above the current statutory base to provide the existing or planned services. The state general funds are provided for transit operating purposes.

Minn. Stat. 473.4051, subd. 2(a) states that, "after operating and federal money have been used to pay for light rail operations, 50 percent of the remaining costs must be paid by the state." In line with state law, this capacity analysis assumes that the net operating costs for Blue Line, Green Line and Blue Line Extension will be shared 50 percent by the state general fund and 50 percent by the counties. In the capacity analysis table, these operating revenues are shown as "state (Minn. Stat. 473.4051 obligation)." Any other expectation of state general fund revenues for guideway operations that does not fall under this statutory requirement is shown in the table as "state (additional request)." Minn. Stat. 473.4051, subd. 2(b) requires that operating and maintenance costs for the Green Line Extension be paid for by non-state sources; therefore, the analysis shows local funders to pay the net operating costs for the Green Line Extension.

State general obligation bonds The state also has periodically allocated revenues from state general obligation bonds for transit capital purposes. The Council has received bond appropriations for transitway development, both for projects primarily funded with competitive federal grants and for other transitway projects. Over time, this funding proved to be unreliable, therefore the capacity analysis does not assume any future state bond allocations, though it is anticipated the Metropolitan Council and local partners will continue to make requests for bond funding for major capital projects such as bus garages and arterial bus rapid transit development. The historically assumed 10 percent state bond share of transitways that are otherwise funded 50 percent by the federal Capital Investment Grants program (e.g. New Starts/Small Starts) has been replaced with assumed county sales tax funds.

Motor Vehicle Sales Tax revenues Forty percent of the state's Motor Vehicles Sales Tax (MVST) revenues are dedicated to statewide transit purposes, with the Metropolitan Council receiving 36 percent of the MVST revenues for metropolitan area transit. The 2021 to 2030 figures are based upon the state forecast released in November 2020 and increased at a rate of 5.0 percent annually for years beyond the forecast as recommended by the Department of Revenue. MVST revenues may be used for capital or operating purposes but generally are used for transit operations.

Federal formula funding The Council receives federal formula funds annually based upon the region's size and level of transit operations. There are several specific federal formula funds provided to the region with most of the funding provided through the Urban Area Formula Funding program (49 U.S.C. Section 5307). These funds are primarily limited to capital purposes, though may be used in the region's operating budget for capital maintenance purposes. Federal formula funds are expected to grow at 2 percent annually, consistent with rates used by MnDOT for federal highway funds.

Federal CARES Act funding The Council received \$226.5 M in federal Coronavirus Aid Relief and Economic Security (CARES) Act funding in May of 2020. The funding is being spent across all regional transit services on operations during CY2020 and CY2021. The Council allocated this funding to bus operations, light rail, commuter rail, and Metro Mobility as a share of estimated MVST and fare revenue lost due to the pandemic, with the goal of balancing the CY2020 and CY2021 budgets for all services.

Federal CRRSAA Act funding The Council has received a preliminary allocation of \$185.9 M in federal Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations (CRRSAA) Act funding. The Council is working with the FTA, and a regional grant application will be submitted, with funding anticipated in March-April of 2021. It is anticipated that these funds will be spent on operational expenses in CY2021, CY2022, and CY2023. The Council anticipates using these funds first to balance the budgets of all regional transit services through the State's FY22-23 biennium, as well as support needed improvements to transit safety measures. With CRRSAA funds available for operational expenses, the Council can use other internal funds for required deferred transit capital maintenance.

Federal competitive Capital Investment Grants funding The largest competitive federal transit program is the Capital Investment Grants (CIG) (e.g. New Starts and Small Starts), which can provide a significant share of the capital costs for major transitway projects. In the past, the region has received grants covering 50 percent of the cost for the construction of the Blue Line, Green Line and Northstar Commuter rail. The financial capacity analysis assumes a federal funding contribution to future CIG projects will continue, including the Orange Line (I-35W South BRT), Green Line extension (Southwest LRT), Blue Line extension (Bottineau LRT), Gold Line (Gateway BRT), Rush Line and Riverview corridor projects, although the federal share may vary by project.

Federal flexible funding The region also receives federal funds that are distributed by the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB) and Metropolitan Council through the locally competitive Regional Solicitation. Federal flexible funds can be allocated locally to a variety of transportation projects including roads, bridges, multiuse trails and transit. In 2020, the TAB and Council allocated \$25 M of the Regional Solicitation federal funds for the F line arterial BRT project, with the corridor to be selected in the spring of 2021. The capacity analysis assumes this allocation of federal flexible funds to arterial BRT projects through the Regional Solicitation will continue for the G and H lines and that, like other federal revenue, these funds grow at a rate of 2 percent annually.

Passenger fares and ridership Transit fare revenues are used primarily for transit operating purposes. The recovery of transit ridership and fare revenues post-pandemic is difficult to forecast. Indications are that services such as local bus, light rail and arterial BRT will likely recover more quickly than will commuter-based services such as express bus and commuter rail. The capacity analysis assumes that overall, bus and rail ridership will be at 90 percent of 2019 ridership levels by 2025.

Metro Mobility fares and ridership Metro Mobility is a shared-ride public transportation service for certified riders who are unable to use regular fixed-route buses due to a disability or health condition. Trips are provided for any purpose. Under federal law, there must be a trip denial rate that is essentially zero, meaning the region is required by law to accommodate all qualifying trips. As mentioned in the introduction, this mandated service is substantially more expensive to provide, and before the pandemic, ridership increases had been trending at 6 to 8 percent year

over year. The capacity analysis assumes that Metro Mobility ridership will return to 2019 levels by 2023 and increase at 5 to 6 percent annually thereafter.

Regional Transit Capital bond revenues Regional Transit Capital (RTC) funds are used to pay the capital expenses of maintaining the existing system and often to provide the required match to federal formula and flexible funds. RTC bond revenues are assumed to grow at 3.3 percent annually, based upon historical increases in bus purchase costs, which is the largest use of RTC funds.

County transportation sales tax revenues The Counties Transit Improvement Board (CTIB) disbanded in 2017 allowing the CTIB counties to implement a local transportation sales tax of up to one-half percent. Hennepin and Ramsey counties chose to implement a half cent sales tax primarily for transitway purposes, Scott and Carver counties implemented a half cent sales tax and Anoka, Dakota and Washington counties implemented a quarter cent sales tax for all transportation purposes. This funding is assumed for capital and operating purposes for those dedicated transitway being developed in the individual counties.

Revenues shown for county sales tax are based upon the amounts needed to pay 40 percent of the capital costs of constructing new dedicated transitways, as shown in Table 3, and 50 percent of the net costs (after fares) of operating the existing and new dedicated transitways included in Table 2 and Table 4. The exception being the Green Line extension, where the net operating cost is required by statute to be funded 100 percent by Hennepin County. In addition, Scott County has indicated that up to one million of its sales tax revenues each year will be dedicated to transit purposes.

County Regional Railroad Authority funds County Regional Railroad Authorities (RRA) are authorized to levy a property tax for developing regional transitways. Typically, RRA funds provide capital costs for constructing transitways. RRA amounts in the capacity analysis are based upon the amount required to fund 10 percent of the new dedicated transitway costs shown in Table 3.

Other local funds Other local revenues are provided by Minnesota Department of Transportation and Sherburne county to pay the share of Northstar operating expenses for the portion of the service operating outside of the seven-county metropolitan area (8.05 percent of net costs).

Other revenues Other revenues include advertising revenues, investment income and other miscellaneous earnings and are assumed to grow at 1 percent annually.

Expenditure assumptions

Capital expenditures The capital costs shown in Table 1 for the existing system are from the Council's adopted Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for 2020 to 2030. The remaining years are based upon bus replacement needs and other known facility needs. The balance of the funds will be programmed in future CIPs. Capital costs for the future New Dedicated Transitways (Table 3) and Arterial BRT corridors (Table 5) are derived from capital cost information submitted by the project sponsors.

Operating expenditures The operating costs shown in Table 2 for the existing bus and rail system are the adopted budget amounts for each service for 2020 or, if available, for 2021. All transit providers and services are provided a general inflationary cost of 3.15 percent annually, except for Metro Mobility services, which is described below. Operating cost estimates for New

Dedicated Transitways are based upon forecasts that use existing costs of operating light rail and bus rapid transit corridors, and ridership forecasts to develop estimates for the corridor. Operating cost estimates are provided by the project sponsors.

Metro Mobility program costs Metro Mobility cost increases are driven by a combination of both inflationary cost growth and ridership increases. In previous years, Metro Mobility had experienced annual ridership increases around 6 to 8 percent. However, the COVID-19 dramatically reduced ridership demand. During the pandemic some Metro Mobility services were redirected to provide rides to and from work for essential health care workers and food shelf deliveries to Metro Mobility customers. The capacity analysis assumes Metro Mobility expenditures will return to pre-pandemic levels by 2023 and grow at approximately 5 to 6 percent thereafter.

Capacity analysis summary

The capacity analysis looks at regional funding needs and sources related to capital and operating costs for the next 10 years. Costs in each category are shown in the anticipated year of expenditure. Since funding requests precede anticipated project expenditures, some of the funds shown in 2020 and future years, while not yet expended, have already been secured through previous funding requests and are “committed” to the project(s). In other instances, funds shown in the future years are anticipated funding requests from the identified funding sources but are not yet committed. The individual transitway corridor summaries in Appendices B through E also provide information about funds committed to a given project, and total estimated project costs.

For future expenditures, although the numbers shown are the best estimates currently available, they should still be viewed as estimates that may change over time.

As mentioned previously, the Capacity Analysis is broken into a series of tables that aggregate financial information for similar groups of transit and transitway services. The tables are:

- Table 1, Existing Bus and Rail System Capital Revenues and Expenditures
- Table 2, Existing Bus and Rail System Operating Revenues and Expenditures
- Table 3, New Dedicated Transitways Capital Revenues and Expenditures
- Table 4, New Dedicated Transitways Operating Revenues and Expenditures
- Table 5, Arterial BRT Capital Revenues and Expenditures
- Table 6, Arterial BRT Operating Revenues and Expenditures

Table 1, Existing Bus and Rail System Capital

The capital revenues shown in Table 1 are provided from three primary sources – federal formula funds, federal flexible funds awarded through the Regional Solicitation process, and Regional Transit Capital bond funds backed by the Council’s transit property tax levy as authorized by the Legislature.

The expenditures reflect planned preservation and modernization projects for the existing bus and rail system as contained in the region’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP). For years beyond the CIP, the estimates are based on the needs for future bus replacement and known preservation projects.

Capital costs for the existing system include bus and rail vehicle replacement, facility energy enhancements, improvements to accessibility for people with disabilities, signage

enhancements, technology upgrades, rail infrastructure repair and replacement, as well as costs for subsequent major, one-time capital improvements such as park and rides, station improvements and other facility construction. Suburban Transit Provider fleet preservation and modernization expenses are included in the table within Metropolitan Transportation Services (MTS).

New Dedicated Transitway expansion capital costs are not included in this table. The table does include capital spending allocated to arterial BRT corridors for planned bus replacement for existing service in the corridor and federal flexible funding awards. These expenditures are planned and will happen regardless of whether the arterial BRT corridor project becomes fully funded or not. The additional expansion capital costs of the arterial BRT corridors are shown in Table 5.

No future state bond requests are currently anticipated for the preservation and modernization of the existing transit system and many of the needed capital investments are not bond eligible due to having an estimated life of less than 20 years (i.e. transit buses are typically replaced on a 12-15 year cycle).

Table 2 shows a significant level of unfunded transit capital needs currently not able to be included in the CIP. These unfunded needs range from \$40 million in 2021, to \$100 million in 2022 and 2023, to a high of over \$123 million in 2026. Over the ten-year period of 2021 to 2030 the Council has identified an unfunded transit capital need of almost \$800 million. At this time, it is planned that existing Council funds, made available as a result federal CARES and CRSSA allocations to transit operations, will be used to cover \$95 million of the bus and rail critical capital maintenance shortfall.

Table 1: Existing Bus and Rail Capital (Dollars in Millions)

Sources of Capital Funds	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2021-2030 TOTALS
Federal Formula	136.84	82.27	118.72	138.95	133.26	114.98	120.46	110.16	114.64	117.06	121.61	1,172.11
Federal CMAQ	14	-	10.1	15.14	11.52	7.06	7.74	14.18	14.49	14.81	15.14	110.18
Regional Transit Capital Bonds	46.9	58.66	58.07	49.17	43.94	46.51	67.23	58.87	60.81	62.82	64.89	570.97
Capital Preservation Revenue	\$197.74	\$140.93	\$186.89	\$203.26	\$188.72	\$168.56	\$195.43	\$183.21	\$189.94	\$194.69	\$201.64	\$1,853.27
Uses of Capital Funds												
Metro Transit Bus Preservation & Modernization	117.94	48.72	114.08	148.72	117.72	82.33	84.97	81.89	84.35	86.88	89.48	939.14
MTS/STP Bus Preservation & Modernization	62.58	49.92	41.52	39.85	62.55	76.14	105.54	35.91	10.79	87.05	49.86	559.13
LRT Rehabilitation & Replacement	16.04	41.74	28.05	12.04	6.09	9.49	3.06	41.77	35.58	30.7	45.46	253.98
Northstar Rehabilitation & Replacement	1.18	1.05	3.25	2.65	2.35	0.6	1.85	1.93	1.99	2.05	3.09	20.81
Capital Preservation Expenses	\$197.74	\$141.43	\$186.89	\$203.26	\$188.72	\$168.56	\$195.43	\$161.50	\$132.71	\$206.68	\$187.89	\$1,773.07
Additional Preservation Projects to Be Determined:	\$ -	(\$0.50)	\$0.00	\$ -	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$21.71	\$57.23	(\$11.99)	\$13.75	\$80.20
Needs not included in current CIP												
Bus		32.5	78.79	85.21	39.19	75.58	87.3	66.43	68.42	70.48	72.59	676.48
Rail		3	18	15.34	28.85	4.05	35.4	17.44	17.96	18.5	19.06	177.6
Other		4	4		1	1	1	2.2	2.27	2.33	2.4	20.2
Total needs not included in current CIP		39.5	100.79	100.55	69.04	80.63	123.7	86.07	88.65	91.31	94.05	874.29
Net surplus / (Shortfall)	\$ -	(\$40.00)	(\$100.79)	(\$100.55)	(\$69.04)	(\$80.63)	(\$123.70)	(\$64.36)	(\$31.42)	(\$103.30)	(\$80.30)	(\$794.09)

Table 2, Existing Bus and Rail System Operating

Transit operating costs include annual vehicle operator salaries and benefits, fuel, vehicle cleaning and other administrative costs. Operating costs are typically paid first through fares and any operating revenue generated by the system, such as advertising revenue. The other major sources of operating revenues anticipated for the existing bus and rail system from 2020 to 2030 are Motor Vehicle Sales Tax (MVST), state general fund appropriations, county transportation sales tax for operation of the Blue and Green Line and Northstar and federal funds provided through formula appropriations and in calendar years 2020-2023 federal COVID-19 relief transit funding.

MVST revenues provide the most significant share of the existing operating revenues, approximately 49 percent in 2020, causing the transit system to be very reliant on the annual growth and performance of MVST revenues. Historically, from 2010 to 2015, MVST was growing above the assumed 3.4 percent growth rate, allowing for a shift of the state general funds from regular route bus operations to cover the growing Metro Mobility expenses. During that same time, general fund revenues for bus operations went down from over \$40 million in 2010 to \$9 million in 2015, with the balance shifting to fund Metro Mobility. Between 2016 to 2020 MVST revenues have been growing at an average rate of approximately 3.4%, at times not keeping pace with the rate of operations inflation.

As described earlier, state statute (Minn. Stat. 473.4051, subd. 2(a)) requires the state to pay 50 percent of the net costs of operating light rail transit. In addition, Northstar commuter rail opened in 2009, and state funds from both the Council and MnDOT have been used to pay 50 percent of the net costs of operating this service. Federal law also requires the Council to operate Metro Mobility ADA service with a zero-denial rate and within a state defined service area. Within the capacity analysis tables these required services are referred to as Mandatory and Committed Services.

In the previous report, the necessary state general fund request to maintain the Mandatory and Committed service levels was shown separately from any general fund amounts needed to maintain existing bus operations. However, with the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic, all transit services are facing structural deficits due to the loss of significant fare revenue. The on-going structural shortfalls shown in Table 2 are shared across all regional transit operations.

In order to help with these expected deficits, the region received federal transit funds through the CARES and CRRSA relief acts. This report was being completed in early January, as the final 2020 drawdown schedule for CARES and budgets for CRRSA funds was being developed. The region will rely on the federal CARES and CRRSA funds through 2023 to help solve the operating deficits of Metro Mobility and rail and bus and operations, using the federal funds to replace the lost fare revenue as well as supporting the incremental new expenses caused by the pandemic. The federal funds will also make other Council funds available to be used as previously described to offset the Council's transit capital deficit (shown in Table 1).

As shown in Table 2, once the federal COVID-19 relief funds have been spent down, the Council has a significant structural deficit for the existing transit services beyond 2023, with an estimated shortfall of \$105 million in 2024 and growing into the future. By 2030, the Council is projected to need just over \$135 million above the \$89 million base (\$224 million total appropriation) to fund the existing operations of Metro Mobility and the rail and bus regional transit services.

Table 2: Existing Bus and Rail Operating (Dollars in Millions)

Existing Operating Revenue	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2021-2030 TOTALS
Fares												
Metro Transit Bus Fares	31,576	28,623	38,132	47,394	50,488	59,750	72,130	75,626	76,383	77,147	77,918	635,167
MTS Fares	1,511	991	1,281	1,375	1,375	1,375	1,513	1,528	1,543	1,558	1,574	15,623
Metro Mobility Fares	3,987	5,773	8,487	8,742	9,004	9,274	10,405	10,614	10,826	11,042	11,263	99,417
Suburban Transit Providers Fares												0
Blue and Green Line Fares	11,214	10,878	17,754	21,010	23,547	26,444	30,494	31,977	32,309	32,644	32,983	271,254
Northstar Fares	631	403	909	375	2,204	2,479	2,865	3,005	3,035	3,065	3,096	22,067
Total Fares	48,919	46,668	66,563	78,896	86,618	99,322	117,407	122,750	124,095	125,456	126,834	1,043,528
Counties Sales Tax/Local	37,223	32,872	37,493	42,686	43,940	45,234	43,354	44,720	46,129	47,582	49,081	470,314
MVST	265,575	290,583	305,737	305,821	322,365	336,624	353,455	371,128	389,684	409,169	429,627	3,779,768
MVST - Suburban Transit Providers	31,921	38,679	40,011	41,699	43,980	45,902	48,197	50,607	53,137	55,794	58,584	508,511
Total MVST	297,496	329,262	345,748	347,520	366,345	382,526	401,652	421,735	442,822	464,963	488,211	4,288,279
Federal formula, CARES & CRSSA relief funds	118,495	93,872	107,551	40,227	11,111	11,152	11,264	11,376	11,490	11,605	11,721	439,863
Council Other	4,478	5,027	5,596	6,347	6,400	6,534	6,599	6,665	6,732	6,799	6,867	68,045
Other Suburban Transit Providers	0	0	0	0	0	0						0
State Existing Appropriation/Base	106,423	96,020	88,850	88,630	88,630	88,630	88,630	88,630	88,630	88,630	88,630	1,000,333
State Suburban Transit Providers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Existing Revenues	613,034	603,721	651,801	604,306	603,044	633,398	668,906	695,876	719,898	745,035	771,344	6,697,329

Existing Operating Expenditures	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2021-2030 TOTALS
Metro Transit Bus	338,722	348,598	371,785	385,994	391,274	422,659	448,311	462,433	476,999	492,025	507,524	4,307,602
Metro Mobility	80,556	93,261	98,733	104,576	110,771	117,340	123,232	129,420	135,924	142,758	149,938	1,205,953
MTS	33,337	37,573	38,755	38,332	41,235	42,535	43,875	45,257	46,683	48,153	49,670	432,067
Suburban Transit Providers	44,477	49,649	40,011	41,699	43,980	45,902	48,197	50,607	53,137	55,794	58,584	487,560
Blue & Green Lines	83,610	87,802	88,870	91,669	94,557	97,535	100,607	103,777	107,045	110,417	113,896	996,175
Northstar	18,134	11,743	16,135	23,959	24,714	25,492	26,295	27,124	27,978	28,859	25,068	237,367
Total Existing Expenditures	598,836	628,626	654,289	686,229	706,531	751,463	790,518	818,617	847,767	878,007	904,679	7,666,725
Balance/(Shortfall)	14,198	(24,905)	(2,488)	(81,923)	(103,487)	(118,065)	(121,611)	(122,740)	(127,869)	(132,972)	(133,335)	(955,198)
Use/(Build) Reserves to Policy Level	(14,198)	24,905	2,488	64,420	(1,797)	(3,778)	(3,249)	(2,334)	(2,420)	(2,509)	(2,211)	59,318
New State for Mandatory & Committed Services and Bus Operations	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$17,503	\$105,284	\$121,843	\$124,860	\$125,075	\$130,289	\$135,480	\$135,546	\$895,880
Net	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	

Table 3, New Dedicated Transitway Capital

The largest single funding source for the development of new dedicated transitways is the competitive federal transit program known as the Capital Investment Grants (CIG) (e.g. New Starts/Small Starts), which can provide a significant share of the capital costs for major transitway projects. This report assumes a 45 to 50 percent federal funding contribution to future CIG projects, including the Orange Line (I-35W South BRT), Green Line extension (Southwest light rail), Blue Line extension (Bottineau light rail), Gold Line dedicated BRT (Gateway corridor), Rush Line dedicated BRT and Riverview modern streetcar. There is a level of risk associated with the ongoing refinement of each project, whether CIG funding will be available nationally, and whether the project will successfully compete for the funding.

Federal payments for CIG projects often do not begin until after construction has started, and payments often continue for a few years after the project has been completed. To meet cash flow needs, this requires heavy front-end funding by the counties and local funding sources along with borrowing by the Council against future federal payments once the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) issues a full funding grant agreement. The financing costs required for this kind of borrowing are accounted for in project capital cost estimates. The associated cash flow adjustments are shown in the capacity analyses for the Green and Blue Line Extensions.

From 2020 to 2030, county sales tax revenue and Regional Railroad Authority (RRA) funds are projected to fund 50 to 55 percent of the capital dollars required to expand the New Dedicated Transitway system to include Orange Line BRT, Green and Blue Line light rail extensions, Gold Line BRT, Rush Line BRT, Riverview modern streetcar, Red Line future stages and Orange Line Extension. Currently, there are no county dollars allocated for the Nicollet Central modern streetcar

Nicollet Central modern streetcar and Red Line future stages have a total of \$68 million of capital funding needs where revenue sources have not yet been identified.

Table 3: New Dedicated Transitway Capital (Dollars in Millions)

Sources of Capital Funds	Pre-2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2021-2030 TOTALS
Capital Expansion Revenue	\$980.85	\$664.75	\$915.26	\$926.08	\$680.22	\$440.04	\$468.39	\$531.22	\$476.19	\$249.06	\$457.60	\$428.74	\$5,572.80
Orange Line	\$55.69	\$94.65	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
Federal New Starts/Small Starts	\$18.00	\$56.08	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
Federal Other	\$1.80	\$7.00	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
Counties Transit Improvement Board	\$8.58	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
State GO Bonds	\$10.96	\$4.14	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
Hennepin County RRA	\$6.97	\$11.95	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
Local Other	\$9.03	\$15.48	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
Local Metropolitan Council	\$0.35	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
Green Line Extension	\$746.27	\$347.51	\$180.57	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$28.84	\$-	\$909.41
Federal New Starts/Small Starts	\$-	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$28.84	\$-	\$828.84
Federal Other	\$-	\$6.14	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
Counties Transit Improvement Board	\$218.98	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
State GO Bonds	\$30.31	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
Hennepin County RRA	\$148.41	\$32.99	\$18.16	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$18.16
Hennepin County Sales Tax	\$340.98	\$197.81	\$52.61	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$52.61
Local Other	\$7.59	\$10.57	\$9.80	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$9.80
Metro Blue Line Extension	\$134.66	\$25.80	\$278.91	\$349.69	\$248.78	\$145.62	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$52.73	\$-	\$-	\$1,375.72
Federal New Starts/Small Starts	\$-	\$-	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$100.00	\$52.73	\$-	\$-	\$752.73
Counties Transit Improvement Board	\$79.36	\$2.90	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
State GO Bonds	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
Hennepin County RRA	\$47.37	\$3.74	\$27.55	\$39.55	\$24.02	\$7.37	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$98.49

Sources of Capital Funds	Pre-2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2021-2030 TOTALS
Hennepin County Sales Tax	\$3.52	\$19.17	\$143.10	\$205.42	\$124.76	\$38.25	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$511.53
Local Other	\$3.40	\$-	\$8.25	\$4.72	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$12.97
Local State of Minnesota	\$1.00	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
Gold Line	\$18.19	\$21.56	\$71.43	\$109.63	\$227.98	\$75.84	\$7.26	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$492.14
Federal New Starts/Small Starts	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$97.70	\$141.64	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$239.34
Federal Other	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
Counties Transit Improvement Board	\$5.98	\$0.02	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
State GO Bonds	\$1.87	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
Ramsey & Washington Counties Sales Tax/RRA	\$10.34	\$21.54	\$71.43	\$11.93	\$86.34	\$75.84	\$7.26	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$252.80
Local Metropolitan Council	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
Rush Line Corridor	\$-	\$-	\$23.00	\$37.00	\$25.00	\$56.66	\$138.33	\$138.34	\$81.67	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$500.00
Federal New Starts/Small Starts	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$81.67	\$81.67	\$81.67	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$245.01
Ramsey County Sales Tax	\$-	\$-	\$21.00	\$33.00	\$22.50	\$42.83	\$42.83	\$42.83	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$204.99
Ramsey County RRA	\$-	\$-	\$2.00	\$4.00	\$2.50	\$13.83	\$13.83	\$13.84	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$50.00
Riverview Corridor	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$29.84	\$29.84	\$96.00	\$96.00	\$96.00	\$428.74	\$428.74	\$1,205.17
Federal New Starts/Small Starts	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$252.67	\$252.67	\$505.34
Ramsey County RRA	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$2.09	\$2.09	\$6.72	\$6.72	\$6.72	\$30.01	\$30.01	\$84.37
Ramsey County Sales Tax	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$18.80	\$18.80	\$60.48	\$60.48	\$60.48	\$93.24	\$93.24	\$405.52
Hennepin County Sales Tax	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$8.95	\$8.95	\$28.80	\$28.80	\$28.80	\$52.82	\$52.82	\$209.94
Metropolitan Council Grant Cash Flow Financing	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
Nicollet Central Corridor	\$3.10	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$90.00	\$91.00	\$92.00	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$273.00
Federal New Starts/Small Starts	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$33.00	\$33.00	\$34.00	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$100.00
Federal Other	\$0.90	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-

Sources of Capital Funds	Pre-2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2021-2030 TOTALS
Minneapolis Value Capture District	\$2.20	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$37.00	\$37.00	\$37.00	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$111.00
To Be Determined	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$20.00	\$21.00	\$21.00	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$62.00
Red Line Future Stages	\$21.65	\$-	\$0.43	\$3.91	\$2.36	\$29.51	\$-	\$4.10	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$40.32
Federal Other	\$5.71	\$-	\$-	\$2.17	\$-	\$7.00	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$9.17
State GO Bonds	\$2.73	\$-	\$-	\$1.05	\$1.05	\$12.30	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$14.39
Counties Transit Improvement Board	\$10.40	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
Dakota County RRA/Sales Tax	\$2.14	\$-	\$0.43	\$0.70	\$0.94	\$6.67	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$8.74
Local Other	\$0.03	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.37	\$1.40	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1.77
Local Metropolitan Council	\$0.64	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
To Be Determined	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$2.14	\$-	\$4.10	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$6.24
Orange Line Extension	\$0.41	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.31	\$-	\$5.61	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$5.92
Federal Other	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$4.49	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$4.49
Dakota County RRA	\$0.41	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.31	\$-	\$1.12	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1.43
Financing Program	\$0.89	\$175.22	\$360.92	\$325.85	\$76.11	\$2.57	\$2.65	\$1.78	\$0.91	\$0.33	\$0.01	\$-	\$771.13
Revenue Bond - Green Line Extension	\$0.00	\$167.56	\$268.13	\$141.89	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$410.03
Revenue Bond - Blue Line Extension	\$-	\$6.96	\$91.90	\$182.60	\$74.49	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$348.99
Interest on Capital Balance - 1%	\$0.89	\$0.70	\$0.88	\$1.36	\$1.62	\$2.57	\$2.65	\$1.78	\$0.91	\$0.33	\$0.01	\$-	\$12.11
Total Sources of Capital Funds	\$980.85	\$664.75	\$915.26	\$926.08	\$680.22	\$440.04	\$468.39	\$531.22	\$476.19	\$249.06	\$457.60	\$428.74	\$5,572.80

Uses of Capital Funds	Pre-2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2021-2030 TOTALS
Capital Expansion	\$972.98	\$656.68	\$901.75	\$909.23	\$594.70	\$283.07	\$299.87	\$329.44	\$275.28	\$96.00	\$428.74	\$428.74	\$4546.83
Orange Line	\$55.70	\$95.01	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
Green Line Extension	\$746.23	\$507.35	\$437.77	\$232.10	\$24.69	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$694.57
Blue Line Extension LRT	\$127.70	\$32.76	\$369.11	\$526.59	\$314.67	\$91.22	\$34.13	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1,335.72
Gold Line	\$18.19	\$21.56	\$71.43	\$109.63	\$227.98	\$75.84	\$7.26	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$492.14
Rush Line	\$-	\$-	\$23.00	\$37.00	\$25.00	\$56.66	\$138.33	\$138.34	\$81.67	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$500.00
Riverview	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$29.84	\$29.84	\$96.00	\$96.00	\$96.00	\$428.74	\$428.74	\$1,205.17
Nicollet Central	\$3.10	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$90.00	\$91.00	\$92.00	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$273.00
Red Line Extension	\$21.65	\$-	\$0.43	\$3.91	\$2.36	\$29.51	\$-	\$4.10	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$40.32
Orange Line Extension	\$0.41	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.31	\$-	\$5.61	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$5.92
Total Financing Programs	\$-	\$7.73	\$12.63	\$15.49	\$83.91	\$154.40	\$165.87	\$200.00	\$200.00	\$159.41	\$28.84	\$-	\$1,020.54
Revenue Bond Principle Repayment - Green Line Extension	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$67.14	\$93.50	\$95.19	\$96.89	\$97.64	\$98.39	\$28.84	\$-	\$577.59
Revenue Bond Interest Payments - Green Line Extension	\$-	\$7.73	\$10.93	\$9.79	\$8.17	\$6.51	\$4.81	\$3.11	\$2.36	\$1.61	\$-	\$-	\$47.27
Revenue Bond Principle Repayment - Blue Line Extension	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$46.50	\$58.77	\$95.40	\$96.50	\$58.51	\$-	\$-	\$355.68
Revenue Bond Interest Payments - Blue Line Extension	\$-	\$-	\$1.70	\$5.70	\$8.60	\$7.90	\$7.10	\$4.60	\$3.50	\$0.90	\$-	\$-	\$40.00
Total Uses of Capital Funds	\$972.98	\$664.41	\$914.37	\$924.72	\$678.61	\$437.47	\$465.74	\$529.44	\$475.28	\$255.41	\$457.58	\$428.74	\$5,567.37
Net Capital Cash Flow	\$(7.88)	\$(0.34)	\$(0.89)	\$(1.36)	\$(1.62)	\$(2.57)	\$(2.65)	\$(1.78)	\$(0.91)	\$6.36	\$(0.01)	\$-	\$(5.43)
State GO Bonds	\$48.15	\$4.14	\$-	\$1.05	\$1.05	\$12.30	\$0.31	\$-	\$1.12	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$15.82

Table 4, New Dedicated Transitways Operating

Like the existing system, the primary sources of operating revenues anticipated for the expansion of the new transitways are passenger fares, new state general fund appropriations and county transportation sales tax revenues.

New state dollars will be required to fund 50 percent of the new transitway operating costs after accounting for fare revenue. County sales tax revenues are expected to fund the remaining 50 percent of the net cost of new transitway operations, except the Green Line Extension where the net operating costs will be funded 100 percent by Hennepin County. New feeder bus operations costs for the Blue and Green Line extensions will be funded with fares and new state general fund requests. If all new transitways are developed on their currently planned schedules, by 2030 the new state general fund needed to operate the transitways would be approximately \$32.5 million annually.

The Nicollet Central modern streetcar would have an additional approximate \$14 million of annual operating funding needs by 2030 where revenue sources have not yet been identified.

Table 4, New Dedicated Transitways Operating (Dollars in Millions)

	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2021-2030 Total
Orange Line BRT												
Fares	\$-	\$0.34	\$4.11	\$4.15	\$4.19	\$4.55	\$4.64	\$4.78	\$4.83	\$5.25	\$5.36	\$42.20
Dakota & Hennepin Counties Sales Tax	\$-	\$0.21	\$2.60	\$2.72	\$2.85	\$2.83	\$2.94	\$3.04	\$3.19	\$3.15	\$3.28	\$26.81
New State	\$-	\$0.21	\$2.60	\$2.72	\$2.85	\$2.83	\$2.94	\$3.04	\$3.19	\$3.15	\$3.28	\$26.81
Total Orange Line BRT Revenues/Expenses	\$-	\$0.75	\$9.30	\$9.59	\$9.90	\$10.21	\$10.53	\$10.86	\$11.20	\$11.56	\$11.92	\$95.81
Green Line Extension												
Fares	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$2.41	\$9.64	\$10.55	\$10.85	\$11.26	\$11.45	\$12.53	\$12.89	\$81.58
Hennepin County Sales Tax*	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$6.17	\$28.26	\$28.56	\$29.51	\$30.39	\$31.52	\$31.82	\$32.88	\$219.11
Other	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1.59	\$3.24	\$0.92	\$0.94	\$0.94	\$0.97	\$0.96	\$0.98	\$10.54
Total Green Line Extension Revenues/Expenses	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$10.16	\$41.14	\$40.03	\$41.30	\$42.59	\$43.94	\$45.31	\$46.75	\$311.23

	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2021-2030 Total
Green Line Extension Feeder Bus												
Fares	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.36	\$0.80	\$0.81	\$0.82	\$0.83	\$0.84	\$0.84	\$5.30
New State	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1.45	\$3.11	\$2.62	\$2.72	\$2.82	\$2.93	\$3.03	\$3.13	\$21.80
Total Green Line Feeder Bus	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1.45	\$3.47	\$3.42	\$3.53	\$3.64	\$3.75	\$3.87	\$3.98	\$27.10
Blue Line Extension												
Fares	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$4.05	\$9.71	\$9.88	\$10.04	\$10.98	\$11.29	\$55.95
New State*	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$5.66	\$13.61	\$12.46	\$12.94	\$13.03	\$13.48	\$71.18
Hennepin County Sales Tax*	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$4.51	\$11.91	\$12.37	\$12.84	\$12.94	\$13.38	\$67.95
Other	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.82	\$0.83	\$0.84	\$0.85	\$0.85	\$0.86	\$5.05
Total Blue Line Extension Revenues/Expenses	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$15.04	\$36.06	\$35.54	\$36.67	\$37.81	\$39.01	\$200.13
Blue Line Feeder Bus												
Fares	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.36	\$0.80	\$0.81	\$0.82	\$0.83	\$0.84	\$4.46
New State	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1.07	\$2.04	\$2.00	\$2.09	\$2.17	\$2.25	\$11.61
Total Blue Line Feeder Bus	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1.43	\$2.84	\$2.82	\$2.90	\$3.00	\$3.09	\$16.07
Gold Line BRT												
Fares	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1.52	\$3.37	\$3.39	\$3.40	\$3.41	\$3.79	\$3.81	\$22.69
Ramsey & Washington Counties Sales Tax	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1.51	\$2.99	\$3.13	\$3.28	\$3.43	\$3.40	\$3.56	\$21.31
New State	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1.60	\$3.07	\$3.13	\$3.29	\$3.43	\$3.40	\$3.56	\$21.49
Total Gold Line BRT Revenues/Expenses	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$4.63	\$9.44	\$9.65	\$9.97	\$10.27	\$10.60	\$10.93	\$65.48

	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2021-2030 Total
Rush Line												
Farebox	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$1.70	\$3.40	\$3.41	\$3.79	\$3.81	\$14.41
Ramsey County Sales Tax	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$3.00	\$6.23	\$6.47	\$6.54	\$6.80	\$26.04
New State	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$3.00	\$6.23	\$6.47	\$6.54	\$6.80	\$26.04
Total Rush Line Revenues/Expenses	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$7.70	\$15.86	\$16.35	\$16.87	\$17.41	\$66.49
Nicollet Central Corridor												
TBD	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$13.10	\$13.50	\$14.00	\$40.60
Total Nicollet Central Corridor	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$13.10	\$13.50	\$14.00	\$40.60
Total New State	\$-	\$0.21	\$2.60	\$4.17	\$7.56	\$15.25	\$27.44	\$29.84	\$31.04	\$31.32	\$32.51	\$178.93
Total TBD	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$13.10	\$13.50	\$14.00	\$40.60

*** Includes funding for pre-revenue operations**

Table 5, Arterial Bus Rapid Transit Capital

Arterial Bus Rapid Transit offers riders fast and frequent service in busy local transit corridors. BRT vehicles make fewer stops than local buses, significantly speeding up travel time. Ticket machines at stations allow customers to purchase tickets in advance for faster boarding. Low-floor buses and raised curbs at stations, plus wider and additional bus doors and boarding from the front and back, also speed up boarding. Traffic signal synchronization allows BRT buses to get more green light time. These improvements can add up to a service that can be as much as 20 percent faster than local bus service.

Like the capital revenues for the existing system and the new transitways, the build out of the arterial BRT system will primarily use federal formula funds, federal flexible funds awarded through the Regional Solicitation process, awarded state bonds and Regional Transit Capital bond funds.

State bond requests ranging from \$34 to \$39 million are currently anticipated for the build out of the F Line, G Line, and H Line.

Table 5, Arterial Bus Rapid Transit Capital (Dollars in Millions)

	Pre-2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2021-2030 TOTALS
D Line	\$37.50	\$37.50	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.00
Federal CMAQ	\$21.60	\$7.00	\$7.00										\$7.00
Federal	\$8.30	\$-	\$-										\$-
Regional Transit Capital	\$6.20	\$10.50	(\$7.00)										(\$7.00)
State MVST	\$1.40	\$-	\$-										\$-
State Bonds (Existing)	\$-	\$20.00	\$-										\$-
B Line	\$2.90	\$30.20	\$-	\$32.00	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$32.00
Federal CMAQ				\$14.00									\$14.00
Federal	\$2.00			\$12.30									\$12.30
Regional Transit Capital	\$0.90	\$0.20		\$0.70									\$0.70
State Bonds (Existing)		\$30.00		\$5.00									\$5.00

	Pre-2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2021-2030 TOTALS
E Line	\$-	\$0.30	\$-	\$42.20	\$17.50	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$59.70
Federal CMAQ					\$13.00								\$13.00
Federal				\$1.20									\$1.20
Regional Transit Capital		\$0.30		\$0.30	\$4.50								\$4.80
New State GO Bonds				\$40.70									\$40.70
F Line	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.50	\$6.60	\$49.20	\$31.30	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$87.60
Federal CMAQ				\$-	\$-	\$-	\$25.00						\$25.00
Federal				\$0.40	\$5.30	\$11.90	\$-						\$17.60
Regional Transit Capital				\$0.10	\$1.30	\$2.50	\$6.30						\$10.20
New State GO Bonds				\$-	\$-	\$34.80	\$-						\$34.80
G Line	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.53	\$7.02	\$52.35	\$33.30	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$93.21
Federal CMAQ						\$-	\$-	\$-	\$26.60				\$26.60
Federal						\$0.43	\$5.64	\$12.66	\$-				\$18.73
Regional Transit Capital						\$0.11	\$1.38	\$2.66	\$6.70				\$10.85
New State GO Bonds						\$-	\$-	\$37.03	\$-				\$37.03
H Line	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$0.57	\$7.47	\$55.70	\$35.43	\$-	\$99.17
Federal CMAQ								\$-	\$-	\$-	\$28.30		\$28.30
Federal								\$0.45	\$6.00	\$13.47	\$-		\$19.92
Regional Transit Capital								\$0.11	\$1.47	\$2.83	\$7.13		\$11.55
New State GO Bonds								\$-	\$-	\$39.40	\$-		\$39.40

Summary	Pre-2020	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2020-2030 TOTALS
Federal CMAQ	\$-	\$7.00	\$7.00	\$14.00	\$13.00	\$-	\$25.00	\$-	\$26.60	\$-	\$28.30	\$-	\$113.90
Federal	\$10.30	\$-	\$-	\$13.90	\$5.30	\$12.33	\$5.64	\$13.11	\$6.00	\$13.47	\$-	\$-	\$69.75
Regional Transit Capital	\$7.10	\$11.00	(\$7.00)	\$1.10	\$5.80	\$2.61	\$7.68	\$2.77	\$8.17	\$2.83	\$7.13	\$-	\$31.09
State Bonds (Existing)	\$-	\$50.00	\$-	\$5.00	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$5.00
New State GO Bonds	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$40.70	\$-	\$34.80	\$-	\$37.03	\$-	\$39.40	\$-	\$-	\$151.92
Total ABRT	\$17.40	\$68.00	\$-	\$74.70	\$24.10	\$49.73	\$38.32	\$52.91	\$40.77	\$55.70	\$35.43	\$-	\$371.67

Table 6, Arterial Bus Rapid Transit Operating

The primary sources of operating revenues anticipated for the new Arterial BRT corridors are passenger fare revenues and non-fare revenues, existing and new. Upcoming lines will substantially replace Metro Transit’s busiest local bus routes, significantly offsetting the increased cost to provide BRT service in these corridors. Future lines may include routes with less significant existing service or ridership and in these cases a greater proportion of new revenues will be required for these lines.

New state dollars will be required for operations with the build out of the arterial BRT lines, beginning with D Line operations in 2023. New funds range from around \$4 million in the first year of D Line operations to around \$40 million annually with six new lines and inflationary effects estimated by 2030. Ongoing corridor and service plans will determine actual operating resources for each line.

Assumptions used in estimating resource needs below include 25 percent fare recovery, current projected service costs based on buses, hours, and miles of new service added with BRT implementation, and 3.15 percent annual inflation. Resources for D, B, and E lines are based on current concept service plans. F, G, and H line corridors have not been determined and are each displayed as the average of candidate corridors for these improved services as of late 2020. Except for D Line with a first full year in 2023, the first year of operations for each line reflects a half year of revenue service beginning midyear before a first full year of operations the following year. An additional seven lines are planned for implementation by 2040 but are not reflected in the operating table below.

Table 6: Arterial Bus Rapid Transit Operating (Dollars in Millions)

	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2021-2030 Totals
D Line												
Existing Metro Transit Fares	0	0	0	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.9	4	4.2	4.3	4.4	31.9
Existing Metro Transit Non-Fares	0	0	0	10.7	11	11.3	11.7	12.1	12.5	12.8	13.3	95.4
New Fares - incremental	0	0	0	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.6	11.7
New State	0	0	0	3.9	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.5	4.6	4.8	4.9	35.3
Total D Line Revenues/Expenses	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$19.50	\$20.20	\$20.70	\$21.30	\$22.10	\$22.80	\$23.50	\$24.20	\$174.30

	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2021-2030 Totals
B Line												
Existing Metro Transit Fares	0	0	0	0	1.45	3	3.1	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.5	20.95
Existing Metro Transit Non-Fares	0	0	0	0	4.35	9	9.3	9.6	9.9	10.2	10.5	62.85
New Fares - incremental	0	0	0	0	0.45	0.9	1	1	1	1.1	1.1	6.55
New State	0	0	0	0	1.35	2.8	2.9	3	3.1	3.2	3.3	19.65
Total B Line Revenues/Expenses	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$7.60	\$15.70	\$16.30	\$16.80	\$17.30	\$17.90	\$18.40	\$110.00
E Line												
Existing Metro Transit Fares	0	0	0	0	0	1.55	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.6	3.7	18.75
Existing Metro Transit Non-Fares	0	0	0	0	0	4.7	9.7	10	10.3	10.7	11	56.4
New Fares - incremental	0	0	0	0	0	0.75	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.7	8.85
New State	0	0	0	0	0	2.25	4.6	4.8	4.9	5.1	5.2	26.85
Total E Line Revenues/Expenses	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$9.25	\$19.00	\$19.70	\$20.20	\$21.10	\$21.60	\$110.85
F Line												
Existing Metro Transit Fares	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.35	2.8	2.9	3	3.1	13.15
Existing Metro Transit Non-Fares	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.1	8.5	8.7	9	9.3	39.6
New Fares - incremental	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.3	2.6	2.7	2.8	2.9	12.3
New State	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.85	7.9	8.2	8.4	8.7	37.05
Total F Line Revenues/Expenses	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$10.60	\$21.80	\$22.50	\$23.20	\$24.00	\$102.10
G Line												
Existing Metro Transit Fares	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.4	2.9	3	3.1	10.4
Existing Metro Transit Non-Fares	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.25	8.7	9	9.3	31.25
New Fares - incremental		0	0	0	0	0	0	1.3	2.7	2.8	2.9	9.7
New State	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.95	8.2	8.4	8.7	29.25
Total G Line Revenues/Expenses	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$10.90	\$22.50	\$23.20	\$24.00	\$80.60

	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2021-2030 Totals
H Line												
Existing Metro Transit Fares	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.45	3	3.1	7.55
Existing Metro Transit Non-Fares	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.35	9	9.3	22.65
New Fares - incremental	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.35	2.8	2.9	7.05
New State	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.1	8.4	8.7	21.2
Total H Line Revenues/Expenses	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$11.25	\$23.20	\$24.00	\$58.45

Summary	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	Totals
Existing Metro Transit Fares	0	0	0	3.6	5.15	8.35	11.55	14.7	18.15	20.3	20.9	\$102.70
Existing Metro Transit Non-Fares	0	0	0	10.7	15.35	25	34.8	44.45	54.45	60.7	62.7	\$308.15
New Fares - incremental	0	0	0	1.3	1.85	3.05	5.2	8	10.85	12.8	13.1	\$56.15
New State	0	0	0	3.9	5.45	9.25	15.65	24.15	33.1	38.3	39.5	\$169.30
Total ABRT Operating	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$19.50	\$27.80	\$45.65	\$67.20	\$91.30	\$116.55	\$132.10	\$136.20	\$636.30

Assumptions

- Based on current concept service plans as of early 2021- baseline local and future corridor total (local + BRT)
- Costs reported for miles, platform hours, and buses
- Unit cost derived from Gold Line Financial Management plan cost drivers as submitted to FTA December 2020
- Estimated costs reflect first half-year of operation followed by full year totals. D Line reflects full year only
- Fare revenue estimated at 25% of current and future total costs
- Costs inflated at 3.15% annually through reporting period
- F, G, H lines not determined at this time. Each line is reported as an average of likely top 3 corridors.
- A Line and C Line excluded from this table because they're included in base operations reported elsewhere.

Other Transit Capital and Operating

There are a few other minor transit capital and operating transit uses in the region that originate from five distinct situations:

- University of Minnesota Transit collects revenue through parking to replace buses in their system, which is supplemented by federal formula funds for transit earned for the service they operate. University of Minnesota Transit system is funded by a mix of University parking revenues and student fees.
- Scott County has targeted a portion of their half cent transportation sales tax revenue for transit and much of this is planned for transit capital purposes, primarily to purchase buses and transit operations such as expanded hours for dial-a-ride services.
- Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority funds the operation of the Union Depot transportation hub that serves local bus and rail as well as Amtrak and intercity bus services through their Regional Railroad property tax levy.
- The Minnesota Department of Transportation is charged with developing intercity passenger rail systems which may also be partially located in the metropolitan region. Currently planning is underway for a potential line from Minneapolis to Duluth known as the Northern Lights Express or NLX.
- Team Transit, Minnesota Department of Transportation, capital expenditures on the state highway system for transit advantages.

Conclusions

The transit system will continue to rely on state general fund appropriations for Metro Mobility and the existing rail and bus operations, along with new general funds required for operations of new dedicated transitways and arterial BRT transitways. The state general fund appropriation is assumed to grow over time to meet these changing needs.


The state's past use of one-time appropriations will not fix the Council's on-going structural problem of a base budget need. In calendar years 2021-2022, federal CARES and CRSSA one-time relief transit funds will continue to shore-up the regional transit budgets. As shown in the chart below, beginning in 2023 the region again faces an operating shortfall for existing Metro Mobility and rail and bus services of over \$17 million in 2023, that grows to \$105 million in 2024 as the federal stimulus funds are spent down, and to over \$135 million annually by 2030.

In addition, the opening of new dedicated transitways and arterial BRT lines will also require new state general funds for operations. Beginning with the opening of the METRO Orange Line in late 2021, dedicated transitways will be added to the system and will require state operating funds totaling over \$32 million annually by 2030. In addition, the development of arterial bus rapid transit transitways, the METRO B, D, E, F, H and G lines will require state funds for operations. The arterial BRT operating requests will total almost \$4 million in 2023 and grow to \$39.5 million in 2030.

In summary, as shown in Figure 3 below, for the existing Metro Mobility, rail and bus operations and the new transitway operations, the Council will require a significant commitment of general funds above its \$89 million base appropriation. The one-time federal coronavirus relief funds have provided funding in the short term for both the transit operating and capital deficits. However, beginning in 2023, in total the Council faces a shortfall of almost \$26 million, growing

to \$118 million in 2024 and reaching almost \$208 million annually in 2030 needed above the current general fund base.

Figure 2 - State General Fund Need Above \$89 M Base



Route Performance

Introduction

The route performance section of the Transit Finance Report analyzes how transit in the Twin Cities region is performing at the route level. This report uses passengers per in service hour, subsidy per passenger and farebox recovery ratio as measures for transit performance. These performance measures are used to measure the relative productivity and efficiency of transit routes provided in the region.

Aside from productivity performance standards, there are some routes in the region that continue to operate because they are meeting a specific need in the community, such as serving a designated population, feeding a more productive route, or pilots of new services.

Transit service providers in the region may use other or additional metrics to analyze transit performance. The measures included in this analysis provide a regional context for route performance throughout the Twin Cities transit network, but they are not the only possible indicators evaluating and refining transit performance.

Performance standards

Performance standards are established in the Transportation Policy Plan for passengers per in service hour and subsidy per passenger. Standards included in the Transportation Policy Plan serve as indicators of route performance and identify routes that may require service adjustments. In addition to existing performance standards utilized by the Transportation Policy Plan, this report also establishes performance standards for farebox recovery ratios, as required by Minnesota Statute.

Since different types of routes are expected to have different levels of performance, each route type, as defined in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan (TPP), has its own performance standard. Routes are also compared by day of service, since weekdays, Saturdays, and Sundays all have different expectations for demand but are all still important travel days. Subsidy per passenger and farebox recovery measures are compared relative to averages for the type of service and, thus, standards change over time. Passengers per in-service hour is compared against static standards not relative to the service type average.

Farebox recovery ratio standards are not adopted in the Transportation Policy Plan and have not undergone the public review process. While farebox recovery is a valuable tool for analyzing the transit system, it is not typically used by regional transit providers to analyze specific route performance. Other measures, such as subsidy per passenger, are more commonly used to evaluate route efficiency.

Performance measures

The following sections describe the performance of the transit system for the last three years compared against performance standards. The tables show the standards that routes were compared against, by route type and day of the week, and the number of routes in each category that meet or do not meet performance standards. For route types arterial bus rapid transit, highway bus rapid transit, light rail and commuter rail, there are only one or two routes in operation, so the standards that use a route average are not helpful in evaluating these routes. The figures, however, can still be used as an approximate comparison against route types that operate in a similar environment, such as arterial bus rapid transit against core local, or highway bus rapid transit against suburban local.

For some route types, data is broken out by weekday, Saturday and Sunday. For other route types, data is only available as a total and not by day of the week. This is either a result of limited weekend service on a route type not warranting a separate analysis or lack of verifiable data by day of the week.

Passengers per in-service hour

Passengers per in-service hour serves as a measure of a route’s productivity. It is calculated by dividing the total number of passengers carried by a route by its in-service time (time a vehicle is traveling on routes and available for passenger pickups). The higher the number of passengers per in-service hour, the more people a route is serving given the resources provided.

The 2040 TPP establishes average and minimum passenger per in-service hour standards for light rail transit and commuter rail, fixed-route bus service including bus rapid transit, and general public dial-a-ride service. The standard for each route type is shown in the table below. Standards vary by route type, recognizing that route types serve different roles that come with different expectations for performance.

Table 7 – Productivity Performance Standards

Route Type	Average Passengers per In-Service Hour Standard
Core Local Bus	≥20
Supporting Local Bus	≥15
Suburban Local Bus	≥10
Arterial BRT	≥25
Highway BRT	≥25
Light Rail Transit	≤70
Commuter & Express Bus	Peak ≥20; Off-peak ≥10
Commuter Rail	≥70
General Public Dial-a-Ride	≥2

Table 8 shows the number of routes, by service type and day of the week, that met standards for passengers per in-service hour for 2017, 2018 and 2019. Passengers per in-service hour data for each route can be found in Appendix H.

Overall, the number of routes meeting productivity performance standards on weekdays was stable between 2017 and 2019. The number of routes meeting productivity performance standards on weekends has seen a decline since 2017; the number of routes meeting productivity performance standards on weekends declined among all non-BRT bus route types

Several new suburban local routes were introduced between 2017 and 2019; new routes are more likely to perform beneath productivity standards as their market matures. For highway bus rapid transit, service was reduced on the one route halfway through 2017 to increase productivity on the line, which resulted in Saturday service meeting standards for the year, since the route has failed to meet productivity performance standards.

Table 8 – Number of Routes Meeting Productivity Standards, by Service Type and Day of Service, 2017-2019

Routes Meeting Passengers per in- Service Hour Standard by Route Type	2017						2018						2019					
	Weekday		Saturday		Sunday		Weekday		Saturday		Sunday		Weekday		Saturday		Sunday	
	Meets	Below	Meets	Below	Meets	Below	Meets	Below	Meets	Below	Meets	Below	Meets	Below	Meets	Below	Meets	Below
Core Local Bus	31	2	22	5	20	5	32	1	21	5	18	6	30	3	18	8	17	7
Supporting Local Bus	12	2	5	5	2	8	12	4	5	7	3	9	8	5	3	7	3	7
Suburban Local Bus	25	14	12	7	9	4	26	18	11	9	10	4	25	20	12	8	9	5
Commuter & Express Bus	88	39	0	5	0	4	85	33	0	6	0	5	83	34	0	5	0	4
Arterial BRT	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	2	0
Highway BRT	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
Light Rail Transit ¹	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0
Commuter Rail	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
General Public DAR ²	4	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	0	NA	NA	NA	NA

¹ The Green Line and Blue Line were reported separately only in 2017, despite being in operation for all three years analyzed

² Data for Dial-A-Ride is aggregated and is not separated out by day of week

Subsidy per passenger

The subsidy per passenger serves as a measure of the cost effectiveness of any particular route. Subsidy per passenger for each route is calculated by dividing the net subsidy by the number of passenger trips served, with net subsidy being equal to total costs minus passenger fares collected. Certain other revenue may be collected by a provider for items such as advertising and shared use rentals to reduce the taxpayer burden for the service. Those revenues do not reduce the net subsidy of service but are considered sources for funding the subsidy.

Routes were considered to meet subsidy standards if their subsidy per passenger was at least 80 percent of their route type average. Routes that did not meet performance standards were placed into one of three threshold levels based on how far their subsidy per passenger was below the route type average. Table 9 illustrates the various threshold levels for evaluation.

Table 9 – Performance Standards for Subsidy per Passenger and Farebox Recovery Ratio

Threshold Level	Subsidy/Farebox Recovery Range
Meets Standard	80% of Route Type Average and Above
Level 1	Within 65% - 80% of Route Type Average
Level 2	Within 40% - 65% of Route Type Average
Level 3	Under 40% of Route Type Average

Table 10 shows the average subsidy per passenger by route type and day of the week for 2017, 2018 and 2019. The route-level average is determined by calculating the subsidy per passenger per route and then creating an average of those average values, so it is not a systemwide average performance. Subsidy per passenger data for each route can be found in Appendix H.

Overall subsidy per passenger trip systemwide was \$4.57 per passenger in 2019³. Table 10 shows that the lowest subsidies per passenger are required for light rail transit, vanpool, arterial BRT and core local service. The highest subsidies per passenger are required for dial-a-ride, commuter rail and suburban local service.

Since 2017, subsidies per passenger have increased for all service types except for Suburban Local Bus, Light Rail and Highway BRT. Increases in subsidies per passenger are in part due to decreased ridership since 2017, but cost inflation is also a factor as general inflation is expected to increase subsidies over time. Highway bus rapid transit saw a decrease in subsidy per passenger from 2017 following service changes designed for efficiency.

³ This figure does not account for dial-a-ride, Metro Mobility, or vanpool; the subsidy per passenger taking these modes into account is \$5.32

Farebox recovery ratio

Minnesota Statute 473.4485 requires that the Metropolitan Council identify farebox recovery ratios for each route and line in revenue operation and identify performance standards for farebox recovery and compare each route and line to these standards. This report analyzes both recent trends in farebox recovery in the region and how regional routes and lines have performed with respect to farebox recovery standards.

Farebox recovery is the percentage of operating expenses that are covered by farebox revenue. In this report, farebox recovery ratios are calculated by dividing each route's annual fare revenue by its annual operating expenses. Since different types of routes are expected to have different levels of performance, each route type, as defined in the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan, has its own performance standard. Each route and day of service was compared against the route-level farebox recovery ratio for its peer group; Commuter and Express performance was not broken down into weekday and weekend standards as there is very limited weekend commuter service. A farebox recovery ratio performance standard was developed for each route type in collaboration with all regional transit providers.

Providing subsidies for a significant portion of transit operating is not unique to the Twin Cities region and nearly every transit system in the country has similar farebox recovery ratios. When looking at the performance of peer region transit systems for the *2020 Transportation System Performance Evaluation*, 2018 data show the Twin Cities region's farebox recovery ratio is around the region's peer group average. The peer group includes 12 similar-sized metropolitan area transit systems. The Twin Cities region has traditionally been among the highest performers in the peer group but has seen an 18.1 percent increase in the subsidies provided per passenger from 2014 to 2018.

Table 11 shows the farebox recovery ratio by route type and day of the week for 2017, 2018 and 2019. The farebox recovery ratio for the overall transit network was 21.3%⁴. For fixed-route services, farebox recovery ratio is generally highest for light rail transit, followed by express and commuter bus routes and core local bus routes. Supporting local and suburban local bus routes generally have lower farebox recovery ratio because more of the routes operate in lower-demand areas to provide basic transit coverage for the region. Highway bus rapid transit, arterial bus rapid transit, and commuter rail are difficult to assess as each service type only has one route currently in operation.

Routes were considered to meet farebox recovery standards if their annual farebox recovery ratio was at least 80 percent of their route type average. Routes that did not meet performance standards were placed into one of three threshold levels based on how far below the route type average their farebox recovery ratio was. Farebox recovery ratio performance standards are found in Table 9.

⁴ This figure does not account for dial-a-ride, Metro Mobility, or vanpool; the farebox recovery ratio taking these modes into account is 19.8%

Table 10 – Subsidy per Passenger, by Route Type and Day of Service, 2017-2019

Subsidy Per Passenger by Route Type	2017				2018				2019			
	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Total	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Total	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Total
Core Local Bus	\$4.51	\$6.22	\$6.35		\$5.14	\$7.24	\$7.31		\$6.04	\$8.33	\$8.46	
Supporting Local Bus	\$6.75	\$8.35	\$10.38		\$7.49	\$9.11	\$11.86		\$7.26	\$9.39	\$11.86	
Suburban Local Bus	\$14.82	\$10.18	\$11.17		\$11.04	\$11.46	\$16.69		\$11.71	\$11.10	\$14.83	
Commuter and Express Bus	\$6.91	\$30.32	\$30.32		\$7.23	\$37.82	\$37.82		\$12.50	\$46.22	\$46.22	
Arterial BRT	\$3.40	\$4.06	\$5.40		\$3.64	\$4.57	\$5.79		\$3.53	\$4.30	\$5.26	
Highway BRT	\$11.05	\$7.45	\$9.93		\$9.21	\$7.96	\$9.89		\$10.04	\$8.82	\$10.76	
Light Rail Transit				\$1.97				\$1.86				\$1.96
Commuter Rail				\$16.15				\$17.25				\$19.41
Vanpool				\$2.26				\$2.30				\$6.25
General Public Dial-A-Ride				\$20.88				\$20.71				\$21.22
Metro Mobility/ADA				\$25.92				\$27.94				\$29.61

Table 11 – Average Farebox Recovery Ratio, by Route Type and Day of Service, 2017-2019

Farebox Recovery by Route Type	2017				2018				2019			
	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Total	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Total	Weekday	Saturday	Sunday	Total
Commuter and Express Bus				28.6%				29.8%				29.4%
Core Local Bus	19.4%	12.4%	12.5%		19.0%	11.4%	12.0%		16.7%	9.9%	10.0%	
Supporting Local Bus	15.8%	12.9%	10.6%		13.1%	9.5%	8.3%		14.5%	10.1%	8.4%	
Suburban Local Bus	14.5%	15.0%	12.1%		13.3%	11.5%	10.2%		10.9%	12.1%	9.6%	
Arterial BRT				19.9%				18.0%				17.4%
Highway BRT				7.3%				8.7%				8.2%
Light Rail Transit				34.1%				36.6%				35.4%
Commuter Rail				16.4%				16.2%				14.9%
Vanpool				65.6%				67.6%				43.8%
General Public Dial-A-Ride				11.8%				12.1%				11.5%
Metro Mobility/ADA				8.9%				10.7%				10.2%

Tables 12 and 13 show the number of routes, by service type, that are meeting performance standards for subsidy per passenger and farebox recovery ratio. The number of routes meeting subsidy standards has been generally stable since 2017. The biggest shift in routes meeting standards can be seen in Commuter and Express bus routes, with the number of routes meeting standards increasing. This may be the result in a contraction in the number of Commuter and Express bus routes since 2017, which has led to more routes with subsidies that are closer to the route type average.

Fare rates were increased in October 2017 and the full effect of this change will take years to materialize, but it could have a positive effect on fare recovery standards if demand stabilizes or increases following the increase. There were also several new routes added to the system in 2017, particularly suburban local routes, and these may take time (typically three years) to mature before they can be evaluated against standards.

Many of the routes not meeting cost effectiveness standards have been the target of past or upcoming service adjustments and/or elimination of service. Continuing service on several routes not meeting cost effectiveness standards is justified since their role is to extend the coverage area of the transit network, and to strike a geographic balance in the allocation of transit resources in the region. Several commuter and express bus routes not meeting cost effectiveness standards are applying return trips to their origins, meaning that there would little financial benefit to reducing or eliminating their service. Subsidy per passenger and farebox recovery ratios for each route level can be found in Appendix H.

Table 12 – Routes Meeting Subsidy Standards, by Route Type, 2017-2019

Service Type	Day of Service	Routes Meeting Subsidy Threshold Information				
		Level Number	Description	2017	2018	2019
Core Local	Weekday	Meets	Less than 20% over peer average	26	26	26
		1	> 20% to 35% over peer average	0	0	0
		2	> 35% to 60% over peer average	5	5	5
		3	> 60 % over peer average	2	2	2
Core Local	Saturday	Meets	Less than 20% over peer average	22	21	20
		1	> 20% to 35% over peer average	1	0	1
		2	> 35% to 60% over peer average	1	2	1
		3	> 60 % over peer average	3	3	4
Core Local	Sunday	Meets	Less than 20% over peer average	19	19	20
		1	> 20% to 35% over peer average	2	2	1
		2	> 35% to 60% over peer average	1	0	0
		3	> 60 % over peer average	3	3	3
Supporting Local	Weekday	Meets	Less than 20% over peer average	9	10	8
		1	> 20% to 35% over peer average	2	2	2
		2	> 35% to 60% over peer average	2	3	2
		3	> 60 % over peer average	1	1	1
Supporting Local	Saturday	Meets	Less than 20% over peer average	5	8	7
		1	> 20% to 35% over peer average	3	1	1
		2	> 35% to 60% over peer average	2	1	1
		3	> 60 % over peer average	0	2	1
Supporting Local	Sunday	Meets	Less than 20% over peer average	6	8	7
		1	> 20% to 35% over peer average	2	0	1
		2	> 35% to 60% over peer average	2	3	1
		3	> 60 % over peer average	0	1	1
Suburban Local	Weekday	Meets	Less than 20% over peer average	30	29	31
		1	> 20% to 35% over peer average	3	2	0
		2	> 35% to 60% over peer average	4	2	7
		3	> 60 % over peer average	2	11	7
Suburban Local	Saturday	Meets	Less than 20% over peer average	14	15	14
		1	> 20% to 35% over peer average	2	2	2
		2	> 35% to 60% over peer average	1	0	2

Service Type	Day of Service	Routes Meeting Subsidy Threshold Information				
		Level Number	Description	2017	2018	2019
		3	> 60 % over peer average	2	3	2
Suburban Local	Sunday	Meets	Less than 20% over peer average	11	11	11
		1	> 20% to 35% over peer average	0	0	0
		2	> 35% to 60% over peer average	0	0	1
		3	> 60 % over peer average	2	3	2
Commuter and Express	Weekday	Meets	Less than 20% over peer average	97	90	109
		1	> 20% to 35% over peer average	7	8	2
		2	> 35% to 60% over peer average	4	7	2
		3	> 60 % over peer average	19	13	4
Commuter and Express	Saturday	Meets	Less than 20% over peer average	4	5	4
		1	> 20% to 35% over peer average	0	0	0
		2	> 35% to 60% over peer average	0	0	0
		3	> 60 % over peer average	1	1	1
Commuter and Express	Sunday	Meets	Less than 20% over peer average	3	3	2
		1	> 20% to 35% over peer average	0	1	1
		2	> 35% to 60% over peer average	0	0	0
		3	> 60 % over peer average	1	1	1
Arterial BRT	Weekday	Meets	Less than 20% over peer average	1	1	2
		1	> 20% to 35% over peer average	0	0	0
		2	> 35% to 60% over peer average	0	0	0
		3	> 60 % over peer average	0	0	0
Arterial BRT	Saturday	Meets	Less than 20% over peer average	1	1	2
		1	> 20% to 35% over peer average	0	0	0
		2	> 35% to 60% over peer average	0	0	0
		3	> 60 % over peer average	0	0	0
Arterial BRT	Sunday	Meets	Less than 20% over peer average	1	1	2
		1	> 20% to 35% over peer average	0	0	0
		2	> 35% to 60% over peer average	0	0	0
		3	> 60 % over peer average	0	0	0
Highway BRT	Weekday	Meets	Less than 20% over peer average	1	1	1
		1	> 20% to 35% over peer average	0	0	0
		2	> 35% to 60% over peer average	0	0	0
		3	> 60 % over peer average	0	0	0

Service Type	Day of Service	Routes Meeting Subsidy Threshold Information				
		Level Number	Description	2017	2018	2019
Highway BRT	Saturday	Meets	Less than 20% over peer average	1	1	1
		1	> 20% to 35% over peer average	0	0	0
		2	> 35% to 60% over peer average	0	0	0
		3	> 60 % over peer average	0	0	0
Highway BRT	Sunday	Meets	Less than 20% over peer average	1	1	1
		1	> 20% to 35% over peer average	0	0	0
		2	> 35% to 60% over peer average	0	0	0
		3	> 60 % over peer average	0	0	0
Light Rail	Weekday	Meets	Less than 20% over peer average	1	1	1
		1	> 20% to 35% over peer average	1	1	1
		2	> 35% to 60% over peer average	0	0	0
		3	> 60 % over peer average	0	0	0
Light Rail	Saturday	Meets	Less than 20% over peer average	2	2	2
		1	> 20% to 35% over peer average	0	0	0
		2	> 35% to 60% over peer average	0	0	0
		3	> 60 % over peer average	0	0	0
Light Rail	Sunday	Meets	Less than 20% over peer average	2	2	2
		1	> 20% to 35% over peer average	0	0	0
		2	> 35% to 60% over peer average	0	0	0
		3	> 60 % over peer average	0	0	0
Commuter Rail	Weekday	Meets	Less than 20% over peer average	1	1	1
		1	> 20% to 35% over peer average	0	0	0
		2	> 35% to 60% over peer average	0	0	0
		3	> 60 % over peer average	0	0	0
Commuter Rail	Saturday	Meets	Less than 20% over peer average	1	1	1
		1	> 20% to 35% over peer average	0	0	0
		2	> 35% to 60% over peer average	0	0	0
		3	> 60 % over peer average	0	0	0
Commuter Rail	Sunday	Meets	Less than 20% over peer average	1	1	1
		1	> 20% to 35% over peer average	0	0	0
		2	> 35% to 60% over peer average	0	0	0
		3	> 60 % over peer average	0	0	0
General Public Dial-a-Ride	All Days	Meets	Less than 20% over peer average	3	3	3

Service Type	Day of Service	Routes Meeting Subsidy Threshold Information				
		Level Number	Description	2017	2018	2019
		1	> 20% to 35% over peer average	0	0	1
		2	> 35% to 60% over peer average	0	0	0
		3	> 60 % over peer average	1	1	1

Table 13 – Routes Meeting Farebox Recovery Standards, by Route Type, 2017-2019

Service Type	Day of Service	Routes Meeting Farebox Threshold Information				
		Level Number	Description	2017	2018	2019
Core Local	Weekday	Meets	Less than 20% under peer average	26	23	25
		1	> 20% to 35% under peer average	4	4	5
		2	> 35% to 60% under peer average	3	3	3
		3	> 60 % under peer average	0	0	0
Core Local	Saturday	Meets	Less than 20% under peer average	20	17	20
		1	> 20% to 35% under peer average	3	1	1
		2	> 35% to 60% under peer average	3	4	5
		3	> 60 % under peer average	1	0	0
Core Local	Sunday	Meets	Less than 20% under peer average	19	16	19
		1	> 20% to 35% under peer average	3	2	2
		2	> 35% to 60% under peer average	2	2	2
		3	> 60 % under peer average	1	1	1
Supporting Local	Weekday	Meets	Less than 20% under peer average	6	8	8
		1	> 20% to 35% under peer average	2	2	1
		2	> 35% to 60% under peer average	4	4	3
		3	> 60 % under peer average	2	2	1
Supporting Local	Saturday	Meets	Less than 20% under peer average	4	7	5
		1	> 20% to 35% under peer average	1	2	2
		2	> 35% to 60% under peer average	4	2	3
		3	> 60 % under peer average	1	1	0
Supporting Local	Sunday	Meets	Less than 20% under peer average	5	6	6
		1	> 20% to 35% under peer average	0	2	1
		2	> 35% to 60% under peer average	3	3	3
		3	> 60 % under peer average	2	1	0
Suburban Local	Weekday	Meets	Less than 20% under peer average	21	27	26
		1	> 20% to 35% under peer average	5	3	5
		2	> 35% to 60% under peer average	5	7	5
		3	> 60 % under peer average	8	7	9
Suburban Local	Saturday	Meets	Less than 20% under peer average	9	12	11
		1	> 20% to 35% under peer average	5	2	2
		2	> 35% to 60% under peer average	3	3	5
		3	> 60 % under peer average	2	3	2

Suburban Local	Sunday	Meets	Less than 20% under peer average	7	9	9
		1	> 20% to 35% under peer average	3	1	0
		2	> 35% to 60% under peer average	1	1	3
		3	> 60 % under peer average	2	3	2
Commuter and Express	All Days	Meets	Less than 20% under peer average	80	73	73
		1	> 20% to 35% under peer average	16	19	18
		2	> 35% to 60% under peer average	18	15	19
		3	> 60 % under peer average	13	9	7
Arterial BRT	All Days	Meets	Less than 20% under peer average	1	1	1
		1	> 20% to 35% under peer average	0	0	1
		2	> 35% to 60% under peer average	0	0	0
		3	> 60 % under peer average	0	0	0
Highway BRT	All Days	Meets	Less than 20% under peer average	1	1	1
		1	> 20% to 35% under peer average	0	0	0
		2	> 35% to 60% under peer average	0	0	0
		3	> 60 % under peer average	0	0	0
Light Rail	All Days	Meets	Less than 20% under peer average	2	2	2
		1	> 20% to 35% under peer average	0	0	0
		2	> 35% to 60% under peer average	0	0	0
		3	> 60 % under peer average	0	0	0
Commuter Rail	All Days	Meets	Less than 20% under peer average	1	1	1
		1	> 20% to 35% under peer average	0	0	0
		2	> 35% to 60% under peer average	0	0	0
		3	> 60 % under peer average	0	0	0
General Public Dial-a-Ride	All Days	Meets	Less than 20% under peer average	2	2	2
		1	> 20% to 35% under peer average	0	1	0
		2	> 35% to 60% under peer average	2	1	2
		3	> 60 % under peer average	0	0	0

Appendix A – Legislative Request

This report was completed to comply with 2017 Minnesota Statute **473.4485 METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT INVESTMENT**.

Subdivision 1. **Definitions.**

(a) For purposes of this section, the following terms have the meanings given.

(b) "Busway" means a form of bus service provided to the public on a regular and ongoing basis, including arterial or highway bus rapid transit, that (1) compared to other regular route bus service, provides reduced travel time and uses distinct bus stop or station amenities, and (2) does not primarily or substantially operate within separated rights-of-way.

(c) "Commissioner" means the commissioner of transportation.

(d) "Guideway" means a form of transportation service provided to the public on a regular and ongoing basis that primarily or substantially operates within separated rights-of-way or operates on rails, and includes:

(1) each line for intercity passenger rail, commuter rail, light rail transit, and streetcars;

(2) as applicable, each line for dedicated bus service, which may include arterial or highway bus rapid transit, limited stop bus service, and express bus service; and

(3) any intermodal facility serving two or more lines identified in clauses (1) and (2).

Guideway does not include a busway.

(e) "Local unit of government" means a county, statutory or home rule charter city, town, or other political subdivision including, but not limited to, a regional railroad authority or joint powers board.

(f) "Separated rights-of-way" includes exclusive, dedicated, or primary use of a right-of-way by the public transportation service. Separated rights-of-way does not include a shoulder, dynamic shoulder lane, or priced lane under section [160.93](#).

(g) "Sources of funds" includes, but is not limited to, money from federal aid, state appropriations, the Metropolitan Council, special taxing districts, local units of government, farebox recovery, and nonpublic sources.

(h) "Budget activity" includes, but is not limited to, environmental analysis, land acquisition, easements, design, preliminary and final engineering, acquisition of vehicles and rolling stock, track improvement and rehabilitation, and construction.

Subd. 1a. **Guideway capital project requests to legislature.**

A state agency or local unit of government that submits a request to the legislature to obtain state funds for a guideway project shall, as part of the request, provide a summary financial plan for the project that presents the following information as reflected by the data and level of detail available in the latest phase of project development:

(1) capital expenditures and funding sources for the project, including expenditures to date and total projected or estimated expenditures, with a breakdown by committed and proposed sources of funds; and

(2) estimated annual operations and maintenance expenditures for the project, with a breakdown by committed and proposed sources of funds.

Subd. 2. Legislative report.

(a) By October 15 in every even-numbered year, the council must prepare, in collaboration with the commissioner, a report on comprehensive transit finance in the metropolitan area. The council must submit the report electronically to the chairs and ranking minority members of the legislative committees with jurisdiction over transportation policy and finance.

(b) The report must be structured to provide financial information in six-month increments corresponding to state and local fiscal years, and must use consistent assumptions and methodologies. The report must comprehensively identify all funding sources and expenditures related to transit in the metropolitan area, including but not limited to:

(1) sources and uses of funds from regional railroad authorities, joint powers agreements, counties, and cities;

(2) expenditures for transit planning, feasibility studies, alternatives analysis, and other transit project development; and

(3) expenditures for guideways, busways, regular route bus service, demand-response service, and special transportation service under section [473.386](#).

(c) The report must include a section that summarizes the status of (1) guideways in revenue operation, and (2) guideway projects (i) currently in study, planning, development, or construction; (ii) identified in the transportation policy plan under section [473.146](#); or (iii) identified in the comprehensive statewide freight and passenger rail plan under section [174.03, subdivision 1b](#).

(d) At a minimum, the guideways status section of the report must provide for each guideway project wholly or partially in the metropolitan area:

(1) a brief description of the project, including projected ridership;

(2) a summary of the overall status and current phase of the project;

(3) a timeline that includes (i) project phases or milestones, including any federal approvals; (ii) expected and known dates of commencement of each phase or milestone; and (iii) expected and known dates of completion of each phase or milestone;

(4) a brief progress update on specific project phases or milestones completed since the last previous submission of a report under this subdivision; and

(5) a summary financial plan that identifies, as reflected by the data and level of detail available in the latest phase of project development and to the extent available:

(i) capital expenditures, including expenditures to date and total projected expenditures, with a breakdown by committed and proposed sources of funds for the project;

(ii) estimated annual operations and maintenance expenditures reflecting the level of detail available in the current phase of the project development, with a breakdown by committed and proposed sources of funds for the project; and

(iii) if feasible, project expenditures by budget activity.

(e) The report must include a section that summarizes the status of (1) busways in revenue operation, and (2) busway projects currently in study, planning, development, or construction.

(f) The report must include a section that identifies the total ridership, farebox recovery ratio, and per-passenger operating subsidy for (1) each route and line in revenue operation by a transit provider, including guideways, busways, and regular route bus service; and (2) demand-response service and special transportation service. The section must provide data, as available on a per-passenger mile basis and must provide information for at least the previous three years. The section must identify performance standards for farebox recovery and identify each route and line that does not meet the standards.

(g) The report must also include a systemwide capacity analysis for transit operations and investment in expansion and maintenance that:

(1) provides a funding projection, annually over the ensuing ten years, and with a breakdown by committed and proposed sources of funds, of:

(i) total capital expenditures for guideways and for busways;

(ii) total operations and maintenance expenditures for guideways and for busways;

(iii) total funding available for guideways and for busways, including from projected or estimated farebox recovery; and

(iv) total funding available for transit service in the metropolitan area; and

(2) evaluates the availability of funds and distribution of sources of funds for guideway and for busway investments.

(h) The capacity analysis under paragraph (g) must include all guideway and busway lines for which public funds are reasonably expected to be expended in planning, development, construction, revenue operation, or capital maintenance during the ensuing ten years.

(i) Local units of government must provide assistance and information in a timely manner as requested by the commissioner or council for completion of the report.

History:

[1Sp2017 c 3 art 3 s 104, 143](#)

NOTE: The amendment to this section by Laws 2017, First Special Session chapter 3, article 3, section 104, applies beginning with the report due by October 15, 2018, in the counties of Anoka, Carver, Dakota, Hennepin, Ramsey, Scott, and Washington. Laws 2017, First Special Session chapter 3, article 3, section 104, the effective date.

Appendix B – Summaries: Transitway and BRT Projects in Operation, Construction or Development

METRO Blue Line (Hiawatha Light Rail Transit)

Corridor Description

The METRO Blue Line is a 12-mile light rail transit line linking downtown Minneapolis and the Mall of America via the Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport. The corridor travels through Minneapolis and Bloomington with 19 stations, including five stations shared with METRO Green Line in downtown Minneapolis.

The METRO Blue Line opened for service in 2004. It operates 24 hours a day with train frequencies every 10 minutes during rush hours and midday, every 15 minutes in the early morning and early evening hours, and less frequent service overnight. There are park-and-ride facilities at Fort Snelling and 28th Avenue Stations. Connecting bus service is available at most other stations.

In 2019, the METRO Blue Line carried 11.0 million rides, an average of 32,973 riders per weekday. The Blue Line connects directly to the Mall of America, U.S. Bank Stadium, and Target Field, with connections to Northstar at the Target Field Station. The METRO Blue Line also provides special event service.

Project Status and Timeline

The METRO Blue Line opened in two separate phases in 2004 and was extended to Target Field in 2009 to provide service to Target Field and the Northstar commuter rail line. This extension was funded as part of the Northstar project.

Table 1: Project Status and Timeline

Milestone	Date(s)
Environmental Impact Statement	1985
Engineering/Design	1985- 2001
Federal Transit Administration Full Funding Grant Agreement	January 2001
Construction	2001-2004
Revenue Operations Launched	June 2004

Progress Update

Target Field Station opened in 2014 and provides multimodal connections between the METRO Blue Line, METRO Green Line, and the Northstar Commuter Rail. Target Field Station will accommodate a future METRO Green Line Extension, METRO Blue Line Extension, and potentially high-speed passenger rail service.

Summary Financial Plan – METRO Blue Line

Capital Cost, Funding and Budget Activities

The METRO Blue Line cost \$715.3 million to construct. Due in part to higher-than-anticipated demand, the following large capital improvements were made since construction was completed:

- 31st Street park-and-ride (Lake Street Station) (no longer active as of March 2015)
- 28th Avenue park-and-ride
- American Boulevard Station
- Operating and maintenance facility expansion
- Rail systems facility building
- Three-car train station extensions
- Interlocking Replacements
- Facility Energy Conservation
- Three-car train sub-stations at Mall of America and Target Field
- Three-car light-rail trains
- Light rail vehicle storage building
- Light rail positive train control technology
- Automatic passenger counters “APC’s”
- Rail interlockings
- Five additional light rail vehicles
- Downtown Traffic Control Upgrades
- Light Rail Overhauls

The cost of these improvements totals approximately \$186.4 million, all of which has been committed, with \$168.5 million spent to date and the remainder to be spent in 2020. After combining these subsequent improvements with initial construction, the total capital cost for the METRO Blue Line project is \$868.7 million.

Table 2: METRO Blue Line Capital Funding Sources

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Federal	414.1		414.1	46
State General Obligation Bonds	100.0		100.0	11
State Trunk Highway Bonds	20.1		20.1	2
Metropolitan Airports Commission	87.0		87.0	10
Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority	84.2		84.2	9
Mall of America (in-kind)	9.9		9.9	1
Total for the Initial Construction Costs	715.3		715.3	79
Federal	133.3		133.3	15
State General Obligation Bonds	1.0		1.0	<1
Metropolitan Council	45.7		45.7	5
Other	6.4		6.4	<1
Total for Subsequent Improvements	186.4		186.4	21
TOTALS	901.7		901.7	100

Note: Spent as of May 2020

Table 3: METRO Blue Line Capital Funding Uses

Budget Activity	Spent to Date (\$M)	Projected (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)
Light Rail Vehicles	74.7		74.7
Transitway Design-Build	269.4		269.4
Fare Collection Equipment	3.6		3.6
Capital and Equipment	162.3		162.3
Project Contingency	12.0		12.0
Airport Segment	143.5		143.5
Corridor Improvements	49.8		49.8
Subsequent Capital Improvements	168.5	17.9	186.4
TOTAL	883.8	17.9	901.7

Annual Operating and Maintenance Costs

When the METRO Blue Line opened, after farebox revenue, the net operating funding was provided through a state general fund appropriation and by the Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority (RRA). When the CTIB was formed in 2008, the Hennepin County RRA's share was shifted to CTIB. In addition, Minn. Stat. 473.4051 passed in 2008 requiring that "after operating and federal money have been used to pay for light rail operations, 50 percent of the remaining costs must be paid by the state." From 2009 to 2013, due to state budget deficits, the state general fund appropriation has been held constant and did not increase to cover additional operating costs. In fiscal year 2011 the base state general fund appropriation for the METRO Blue Line was \$5.2 million annually, or approximately 33 percent of net operating costs. Beginning in fiscal year 2014, the state provided a general fund appropriation to cover the full 50 percent of the net operating costs, as reflected in the table below.

In 2020, the operating budget for the METRO Blue Line is \$40.6 million. With anticipated farebox and other revenues of \$14.0 million, the net operating cost is expected to be \$26.6 million.

Table 4: 2020 METRO Blue Line Proposed Operating Budget

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Fare Revenue	13.2		13.2	33
State	13.3		13.3	33
County Sales Tax	13.3		13.3	33
Other Revenues*	0.8		0.8	1
TOTAL	40.6		40.6	100

Note that percentages in the table above are based on total operating cost, not net operating cost.

*Primarily from advertising

Note that percentages in the table above are based on total operating cost, not net operating cost. Capital maintenance costs are different from operating costs. Operating costs include vehicle operator salary and benefits, fuel, vehicle cleaning and maintenance and other administrative costs. Annual capital maintenance includes track maintenance, periodic vehicle overhauls, signal work and other smaller-scale capital improvements. Because such costs vary significantly year-to-year, this report takes a multi-year view.

The METRO Blue Line's average capital maintenance costs are approximately \$5.0 million per year. Due to continued heavy use of system equipment, the age of the equipment and periodic vehicle overhauls, the average annual average amount is estimated to increase to over \$5.0 million per year for after 2020. Maintenance costs will continue to rise as equipment ages and vehicle and equipment overhauls are necessary. For more information about capital maintenance costs by year, see the capacity analysis portion of this report.

Other Project Information

Lead Agency

Metropolitan Council (Metro Transit)

Project Contact

John Humphrey
Deputy Chief Operating Officer, Rail
560 6th Ave N
Minneapolis, MN 55411
612-349-5601
john.humphrey@metrocouncil.org

Figure 1: METRO Blue Line Map



Northstar Commuter Rail

Corridor Description

The Northstar commuter rail line travels 40 miles and serves seven stations from Big Lake in Sherburne County to downtown Minneapolis, where it connects with the METRO Blue Line and the METRO Green Line at the Target Field Station.

The Northstar line provides 14 weekday trips. This breaks down to six inbound trips, six outbound trips, and one reverse commute trip each morning and afternoon peak hour. The line serves six park-and-ride stations at Big Lake, Elk River, Ramsey, Anoka, Coon Rapids, and Fridley. Three round trips are also offered on weekends.

The Northstar line carried nearly 768,000 riders in 2019, an average of 2,739 riders per weekday. It also provides event rides to Target Field Station for Twins and Vikings games and other special events.

Project Status and Timeline

The Northstar line was completed in 2009. The project included an extension of the METRO Blue Line from the Warehouse District Station to Target Field Station, where the Northstar, METRO Blue Line and METRO Green Line all connect.

Table 5: Project Status and Timeline

Milestone	Date(s)
Corridor Planning	1997- 2000
Engineering/Design	2000 - 2007
Construction	2007 - 2009
Full Funding Grant Agreement	December 2007
Revenue Operations Launched	Late 2009

Progress Update

Target Field Station provides multimodal connections between the METRO Blue Line, the METRO Green Line, and the Northstar commuter rail. Target Field Station was built to accommodate future extensions of the METRO Green Line, the Blue Line, and potentially high-speed passenger rail service.

Summary Financial Plan – Northstar Commuter Rail

Capital Cost, Funding Sources and Budget Activities

The Northstar line was constructed as a part of the FTA's program called New Starts. The initial budget was \$320 million, including \$2.6 million provided by the Minnesota Twins outside the full funding grant agreement. The Fridley station was built concurrently with the overall project but funded separately at a cost of \$14.4 million.

Additionally, the Ramsey station was funded separately and completed in 2012 at a cost of \$13.4 million. This brings the total budgeted capital cost for the Northstar line to \$347.7 million, as shown in the Capital Funding Sources table below.

A revised budget was submitted to the FTA in November 2016 and was accepted by the FTA in January 2017. The revision included the de-obligation of \$1,000,000 of Federal Funds and corresponding local funds for a project reduction of \$2.4M, reducing the overall project budget to \$317.6M, and the total budgeted capital cost for the Northstar Line to \$345.3M as show in the Capital Funding Sources table below.

Table 6: Northstar Capital Funding Sources

Source	Committed (\$M)	FFGA Budget Adjustment	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
FTA New Starts	161.9	-1.0	160.9	46
State of Minnesota	102.6		102.6	29
Northstar Corridor Development Authority	51.0	-.4	50.6	15
Metropolitan Council	7.4	-1.0	6.4	2
Other (Minnesota Twins)	2.6		2.6	1
CTIB	12.9		12.9	4
Anoka County RRA	1.9		1.9	<1
City of Fridley	3.8		3.8	1
City of Ramsey	3.6		3.6	1
TOTAL	347.7	-2.4	345.3	100

Table 7: Northstar Capital Funding Uses

Budget Activity	Spent to date (\$M)*	Projected (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)
Initial Cost of Northstar			
Construction	85.6		85.6
ROW & existing improvements	110.9		110.9
Vehicles	67.7		67.7
Professional services	49.3		49.3
Unallocated contingency	0		0
Finance charges	4.1		4.1
Total Initial Cost	317.6		317.6
Fridley Station			
Construction	8.3		8.3
ROW & existing improvements.	4.5		4.5
Vehicles			
Professional services	1.3		1.3
Unallocated contingency			
Finance charges			
Total Initial Cost	14.3	0	14.3
Ramsey Station			
Construction	6.5		6.5
ROW & existing improvements.	5.0		5.0
Vehicles			
Professional services	1.2		1.2
Unallocated. contingency	0.7		0.7
Finance Charges			
TOTAL	13.4	0	13.4

Annual Operating and Maintenance Costs

Throughout the planning, construction and applications for federal funding of the Northstar, it was assumed that the Northstar net operating costs would be funded similarly to the METRO Blue Line. It was planned that the local entities – Anoka, Sherburne and Hennepin counties – would fund half of the cost while the state would fund the other half. With the creation of the CTIB in 2008, the Anoka County and Hennepin County shares were transferred to the CTIB to be paid using metropolitan area sales tax revenues. Due to state budget deficits since 2008, no state funding for the Northstar operating costs were appropriated and the states’ share was paid by the Met Council (41.95 percent) and MnDOT (8.05 percent) using motor vehicle sales tax funds. The local share of net operating costs was shared by the CTIB (41.95 percent) and Sherburne County (8.05 percent).

Beginning, January 1, 2018, the CTIB Share of Operating Funding, as defined by CTIB Resolution #32-2017 will be provided by the respective counties.

In 2020, the budget for the Northstar line is \$20.8 million. With anticipated farebox revenues of \$2.8 million, the expected net operating cost for the line is \$18.0 million.

Table 8: 2020 Northstar Proposed Operating Budget

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Fare Revenue	2.8		2.8	14
Metropolitan Council (MVST)	7.6		7.6	36
County Sales Tax	7.6		7.6	36
MnDOT (MVST)	1.4		1.4	7
Local (Sherburne County)	1.4		1.4	7
TOTAL	20.8	0	20.8	100

Note that the percentages in the table above are based on total operating cost, not net operating cost.

Capital maintenance costs are different from operating costs. Operating costs include vehicle operator salary and benefits, fuel, vehicle cleaning and maintenance, and other administrative costs. Annual capital maintenance includes periodic vehicle overhauls, systems upgrades, passenger stations, vehicle maintenance facility improvements and other smaller-scale capital improvements. Because such costs vary significantly year-to-year, this report takes a multi-year view.

For years 2020 to 2030, the average annual capital maintenance cost for the Northstar is expected to be approximately \$2.7 million per year. These costs will continue to increase as the system ages and vehicle and equipment overhauls are necessary. For more information about capital maintenance costs by year, see the capacity analysis portion of this report.

Other Project Information


Lead Agency

Metropolitan Council (Metro Transit)

Project Contact

John Humphrey
 Deputy Chief Operating Officer, Rail
 560 6th Ave N
 Minneapolis, MN 55411
 612-349-5601
john.humphrey@metro council.org

Figure 2: Northstar Line Map



METRO Red Line Highway Bus Rapid Transit (Cedar Avenue Transitway)

Corridor Description

The METRO Red Line (Cedar Avenue Transitway) is an existing bus rapid transit line that extends from the Mall of America in Bloomington to Apple Valley Transit Station, connecting Bloomington, Eagan, and Apple Valley. The Red Line includes five stations. Two stations have park-and-ride facilities and are located at the Cedar Grove Transit Station and Apple Valley Transit Station. In addition to the park-and-ride stations, there are three walk-up stations located near 140th and 147th streets in Apple Valley and at the Mall of America. Some of the corridor park-and-rides and stations also serve a substantial number of express bus trips directly to downtown Minneapolis, primarily during peak periods.

In 2019, ridership was nearly 240,000.

Project Status and Timeline

Stage 1 work is complete and the Red Line launched service in June 2013.

Table 9: Stage 1 METRO Red Line Project Status and Timeline

Milestone	Date(s)
Locally Preferred Alternative	2004
Project Development and Engineering	2006-2010
Initial Park-and-Ride and Express Bus Investments	2008-2010
Bus Shoulder Lane and Station Construction	2011-2013
Launch of BRT station-to-station service	June 2013

Progress Update

The Red Line began operations in June 2013.

The new Cedar Grove on-line station opened May 22, 2017 and this, along with transit signal priority on Lindau Lane approaching the Mall of America, allowed for a shorter bus travel time between Apple Valley and Mall of America. At the same time, weekday frequencies were reduced from every 15 to every 20 minutes between 6:30 a.m. and 6:30 p.m. to support more sustainable performance compared to regional standards. This change also significantly improved connections with the METRO Blue Line at the Mall of America based on the compatibility of the schedules.

The existing line represents stage 1 of a larger bus rapid transit project. Additional information on future stages of the METRO Red Line can be found in a separate status report.

Summary Financial Plan – METRO Red Line

Capital Cost, Funding Sources and Budget Activities

Stage I of the transitway was completed at a total cost of approximately \$110 million.

Table 10: METRO Red Line Stage 1 Capital Funding Sources

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Federal (Flexible and Other)	43.2		43.2	39
State General Obligation Bonds and State Other	25.3		25.3	23
Counties Transit Improvement Board	28.6		28.6	26
Local (Counties/RRAs)	8.4		8.4	8
Metropolitan Council	2.3		2.3	2
Local (Other)	1.9		1.9	2
TOTAL	109.7		109.7	100

Table 11: METRO Red Line Future Stages Capital Funding Uses

Budget Activity	Spent to date (\$M)	Projected (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)
Runningway	55.9		55.9
Stations	31.9		31.9
Vehicles	6.1		6.1
Vehicle Storage and Maintenance Facility	4.6		4.6
Technology	8.7		8.7
Project Development / Administration	2.4		2.4
TOTAL	109.7		109.7

*Annual Operating and Maintenance Costs***Table 12: METRO Red Line 2018 Operating Budget**

Source	*Committed	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Fare Revenue	0.2		0.2	6%
Motor Vehicle Sales Tax	2.99		2.99	93.4%
Advertising Revenue	0.01		0.01	<1%
TOTAL	3.2		3.2	100%

Other Project Information

Lead Agency

Metropolitan Council

Project Contact

Heather Aagesen-Huebner

Director, Finance and Administration, Metropolitan Transportation Services

390 Robert Street North

St. Paul, MN 55101

651-602-1728

heather.aagesen-huebner@metc.state.mn.us

Figure 3: METRO Red Line Map



METRO Green Line (Central Corridor) Light Rail Transit

Corridor Description

The METRO Green Line is 11 miles long and connects downtown St. Paul and downtown Minneapolis via University Avenue and the University of Minnesota. The corridor also travels through the State Capitol complex and the Midway area. The line has 18 stations and shares five stations with the METRO Blue Line in downtown Minneapolis, connecting to the Northstar commuter rail line at Target Field Station. The METRO Green Line makes three stops in downtown St. Paul.

The METRO Green Line opened for service in 2014. It operates 24 hours a day with train frequencies every 10 minutes during rush hours and midday, every 15 minutes in the early morning and early evening hours, and less frequent service overnight.

In 2019, the METRO Green Line carried 14.3 million riders, an average of 44,004 rides per weekday. The METRO Green Line connects directly to the U.S. Bank Stadium Station and Target Field with connections to Northstar at the Target Field Station.

Project Status and Timeline

The METRO Green Line was completed in June 2014.

Table 13: Project Status and Timeline

Milestone	Date(s)
Pre-Planning	1981-2001
Alternatives Analysis and Draft Environmental Impact Statement	2001-2006
Locally Preferred Alternative	June 2006
Engineering/Design	2006 - 2010
Construction	2010 - 2014
Federal Transit Administration Full Funding Grant Agreement	April 2011
Revenue Operations Launched	June 2014

Progress Update

Target Field Station provides multimodal connections between the METRO Blue Line, METRO Green Line and the Northstar commuter rail. Target Field Station will accommodate a future METRO Green Line Extension, METRO Blue Line Extension, and potentially high-speed passenger rail service.

Summary Financial Plan – METRO Green Line

Capital Cost, Funding Sources and Budget Activities

The METRO Green Line budget was \$956.8 million to construct. Due in part to higher-than-anticipated demand, the following large capital improvement projects were made since construction was complete:

- Light rail diagnostics and technology system enhancements
- Operating and maintenance facility data control system modifications
- Right-of-way improvements
- Traffic controller upgrades and signal improvements
- Rail interlockings
- Traffic Signal Improvements
- Light Rail Overhauls
- Safety Improvements
- Diagnostic and Monitoring Systems

The cost of these improvements totals approximately \$26.4 million, all of which has been committed, with \$16.2 million spent to date and the remainder to be spent in 2020. After combining these subsequent improvements with initial construction, the budgeted capital cost for the METRO Green Line is \$983.2 million. As of October 8, 2020, the METRO Green Line has expended \$973 million, with an additional \$10.2 million forecasted for the remainder of the project, for a total of \$983.2 million.

Table 14: METRO Green Line Capital Funding Sources

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Federal (New Starts and Flexible)	478.4		478.4	49
CTIB	284.0		284.0	29
State of Minnesota	91.5		91.5	9
Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority	66.4		66.4	7
Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority	28.2		28.2	3
City of St. Paul	5.2		5.2	<1
Central Corridor Funders Collaborative	0.5		0.5	<1
Metropolitan Council	2.6		2.6	<1
Total for Initial Construction Costs	956.8	0	956.8	98+
Federal (Other)	20.5		20.5	2
Metropolitan Council	5.9		5.9	<1
Total for Subsequent Improvements	26.4	0	26.4	2
TOTALS	983.2	0	983.2	100

Table 15: METRO Green Line Capital Funding Uses

Budget Activity	Spent to-date (\$M)	Projected (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)
Construction	515.9	0.3	516.2
ROW, Land, Existing Improvements	40.1	3.9	44.0
Vehicles	178.7	0	178.7
Professional Services	202.3	0.4	202.7
Unallocated Contingency	0	3.2	3.2
Finance Charges	12.0	0	12.0
Subsequent Capital Improvements	16.2	10.2	26.4
TOTAL	965.2	18.0	983.2

Annual Operating and Maintenance Costs

Revenue service started June 14, 2014 with the State of Minnesota, as required under Minn. Stat. 473.4051, and the CTIB each expected to provide 50 percent of net operating costs.

Beginning, January 1, 2018, the CTIB Share of Operating Funding, as defined by CTIB Resolution #32-2017 will be provided by the respective counties.

In 2020, the budget for the METRO Green Line is \$43.5 million. With anticipated farebox and other revenues of \$16.8 million, the net operating cost is expected to be \$26.7 million.

Table 16: METRO Green Line 2020 Proposed Operating Budget

Budget Activity	Spent to-date (\$M)	Projected (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Fare Revenue	16.1		16.1	36
State (General Fund)	13.3		13.3	31
County Sales Tax	13.3		13.3	31
Other (Advertising)	0.8		0.8	2
TOTAL	43.5	0	43.5	100

Note that the percentages in the table above are based on total operating costs, not net operating costs

Capital maintenance costs are different from operating costs. Operating costs include vehicle operator salary and benefits, fuel, vehicle cleaning and maintenance, and other administrative costs. Annual capital maintenance includes track maintenance, periodic vehicle overhauls, signal work and other smaller-scale capital improvements. Because such costs vary significantly year-to-year, this report takes a multi-year view.

For years 2020 to 2030, the average annual capital maintenance cost for the Green Line is expected to be approximately \$6.8 million per year. These costs will continue to increase as the system ages and vehicle and equipment overhauls are necessary. For detailed information about annual capital maintenance costs, see the capacity analysis portion of this report.

Other Project Information

Lead Agency

Metropolitan Council (Metro Transit)

Project Contact

John Humphrey

Deputy Chief Operating Officer, Rail

560 6th Ave N

Minneapolis, MN 55411

612-349-5601

john.humphrey@metro council.org

Figure 4: METRO Green Line Map



A Line (Snelling Avenue Arterial Bus Rapid Transit)

Corridor Description

The A Line is a bus rapid transit line that travels on Snelling Avenue, Ford Parkway, and 46th Street in the cities of Roseville, Falcon Heights, St. Paul, and Minneapolis. The A Line is the region's first arterial bus rapid transit line, featuring a package of transit enhancements that adds up to a faster

trip and an improved customer experience. Enhancements include more frequent service, pre-boarding fare payment for faster stops, neighborhood-scale stations with amenities, enhanced security features, and larger and specialized vehicles. Buses travel using existing travel lanes in mixed traffic, making limited stops at 20 improved stations roughly every half mile.

The A Line connects the METRO Blue & Green lines with the Snelling Avenue corridor and several popular destinations, including Hamline University, Macalester College, Highland Village, Rosedale Center, Har Mar Mall, Minnehaha Park, and the Midway area.

In 2019, the A Line carried nearly 1.7 million rides, with about 5,000 average weekday rides. When combined with local bus service in the corridor, ridership is up over 33 percent in the corridor after the opening of A Line.

Project Status and Timeline

The A Line opened on June 11, 2016 following construction in 2015-2016.

Table 17: Project Status and Timeline

Milestone	Date(s)
Study and Pre-Planning	2011-2012
Corridor Planning	2013
Engineering/Design	2014-2015
Construction	2015-2016
Revenue Operations Launched	June 11, 2016

Progress Update

Buses travel 25 percent faster than the service it replaced, thanks to delay reduction from rapid bus features. With anticipated corridor development, by 2030 ridership is anticipated to grow up to 8,700 average weekday rides. The A Line carries this passenger volume during peak State Fair days.

Summary Financial Plan – A Line

Capital Cost, Funding Sources, and Budget Activities

Table 18: A Line Capital Funding Sources

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Federal (Regional Solicitation)	3.0		3.0	11
State Trunk Highway Bonds	6.0		6.0	23
State General Obligation Bonds and General Fund	9.3		9.3	36
Federal (Other)	5.2		5.2	20
Metropolitan Council	2.6		2.6	10
TOTAL	26.1		26.1	100

Table 19: A Line Capital Funding Uses

Budget Activity	Spent to date (\$M)	Projected (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)
Vehicles	6.2		6.2
Construction	16.3		16.3
Fare Equipment	1.6		1.6
Professional Services	2.0		2.0
TOTAL	26.1		26.1

Annual Operating and Maintenance Costs

Estimated 2018 operating costs and revenues are shown below. Costs reflect estimated A Line operating expenses. Most A Line operating funds came from replacement of local bus service on Route 84, which operates at reduced frequency following A Line implementation. In 2015, estimated Route 84 costs were \$7.8 million, compared to \$2.7 million in 2017. These operating cost savings were applied to A Line operating costs.

Table 20: A Line Estimated Operating and Maintenance Costs

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Fare Revenue	1.6		1.6	21%
Metropolitan Council/Motor Vehicle Sales Tax	6.2		6.2	79%
TOTAL	7.8		7.8	100%

Other Project Information

Lead Agency

Metropolitan Council (Metro Transit)

Project Contact

Charles Carlson

Director, Bus Rapid Transit Projects

Metro Transit

560 6th Ave N

Minneapolis, MN 55411


612-349-7639

Charles.carlson@metrotransit.org

Figure 5: A Line Map



	A Line (Rapid Bus Line)
	METRO Green Line (Light Rail)
	METRO Blue Line (Light Rail)
	Shared Station



C Line (Penn Avenue Arterial Bus Rapid Transit)

Corridor Description

The C Line is a bus rapid transit line that travels from downtown Minneapolis to Brooklyn Center via 7th Street, Olson Highway, Penn Avenue, Osseo Road, and Brooklyn Boulevard. The C Line is the region's second arterial bus rapid transit line, featuring a package of transit enhancements that adds up to a faster trip and an improved customer experience. Enhancements include more frequent service, pre-boarding fare payment for faster stops, neighborhood-scale stations with amenities, enhanced security features, and larger and specialized vehicles. Buses travel using existing travel lanes in mixed traffic, making limited stops at 23 improved stations roughly every half mile. The C Line features Metro Transit's first battery electric buses.

Project Status and Timeline

The C Line opened for service in June 2019, following construction in 2018-2019.

Table 21: Project Status and Timeline

Milestone	Date(s)
Initial Corridor Development with Penn Avenue Community Works	2012-2014
Corridor Planning	2015-2016
Design and Engineering	2017-2018
Station Construction and Bus Manufacturing	2018-2019
Revenue Service	June 2019

Progress Update

After opening in June, ridership on the C Line corridor grew by more than 30% in the second half of 2019. From July through December, buses in the corridor carried an average of nearly 8,000 rides each weekday.

In a future second phase of project construction, the C Line will move from Olson Highway to Glenwood Avenue when METRO Blue Line Extension opens at a yet-to-be-determined time.

Summary Financial Plan – C Line

The C Line was funded primarily through federal funds. Federal funds include use of formula funds, regionally competitive solicitation funds awarded by the Transportation Advisory Board (TAB), and federal competitive funds awarded by the Federal Transit Administration. Matching funds were provided primarily by the Metropolitan Council.

Capital Cost, Funding Sources, and Budget Activities

Table 22: C Line Capital Funding Sources

Table 22: C Line Capital Funding Sources

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Federal (Other)	11.2		11.2	33
Federal (Regional Solicitation)	13.7		13.7	41
Federal Low/No Emission Grant	1.8		1.8	5
Metropolitan Council	6.9		6.9	21
State General Fund	0.1		0.1	0.3
TOTAL	33.7	0	33.7	100

Table 23: C Line Capital Funding Uses

Budget Activity	Spent to date (\$M)	Projected (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)
Vehicles	17.7	0.4	18.1
Construction	9.8	1.7	11.5
Fare Equipment	1.3		1.3
Professional Services	2.3	0.5	2.8
TOTAL	31.1	2.6	33.7

Annual Operating and Maintenance Costs

Estimated operating costs are listed below, reflecting the estimated annual service costs of the C Line. In 2017, existing route 19 estimated expenses were \$7.8 million with fare revenue of \$1.8 million.

Table 24: C Line Estimated Operating and Maintenance Costs

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Fare Revenue	\$2.9	\$0	\$2.9	39% (est)
Metropolitan Council/Motor Vehicle Sales Tax	\$4.6	\$0	\$4.6	61%
TOTAL	\$7.5	\$0	\$7.5	100%

Other Project Information


Lead Agency

Metropolitan Council (Metro Transit)

Project Contact

Charles Carlson
Director, Bus Rapid Transit Projects
Metro Transit
560 6th Ave N
Minneapolis, MN 55411
612-349-7639
Charles.carlson@metrotransit.org

Figure 6: C Line Map



METRO Orange Line (I-35W South Highway Bus Rapid Transit)

Corridor Description

The 17-mile METRO Orange Line bus rapid transit (BRT) project will use roadway improvements, upgraded transit stations and improved bus service to provide fast, frequent and reliable all-day transit service along I-35W. Buses will travel on Marquette and 2nd Avenues in downtown Minneapolis, using congestion-free, transit-only lanes. South of downtown, the Orange Line will provide service to upgraded stations at Lake Street and 46th Street in Minneapolis, 66th Street and 76th Street in Richfield, American Boulevard and 98th Street in Bloomington, and Nicollet Avenue and Burnsville Parkway in Burnsville.

Major infrastructure improvements are under construction for the I-35W & Lake St Station and the Knox Avenue area. All Orange Line stations will have upgrades in platform ticketing, information technology and passenger amenities. Numerous investments in the I-35W South corridor have helped to establish strong transit markets for both station-to-station and express BRT, while also providing major station improvements that are critical to opening Orange Line service. The suite of corridor transit services will continue to benefit from shared capital improvements and complementary service planning.

The Orange Line is the product of a significant partnership between federal and local agencies. Large portions of the project are being made possible by highway projects advanced by the Minnesota Department of Transportation and improvements on local streets in collaboration with local governments.

Express and limited stop services in the corridor currently carry about 14,000 daily rides. Orange Line service is forecast to carry around 11,000 rides each weekday by 2040, for a corridor total of 26,000 daily rides between transitway and express service.

Project Status and Timeline

As of 2020 the project is fully funded and is currently under construction. Metro Transit began design and engineering in 2016 and reached 100% design in 2019. Project construction began in 2018 and will continue through 2021. The Orange Line will continue to engage partner agencies, community members, transit riders, employers, institutions, and other stakeholders, as the project completes design and initiates construction. Revenue service will begin following the completion of MnDOT's I-35W construction project, in 2021.

Table 25: METRO Orange Line Project Status and Timeline

Milestone	Date(s)
MnDOT BRT Study	2005
UPA/Managed lane construction	2008 – 2010
Project Plan Update	2014
Project Development	2015 – 2017
Station Design & Engineering	2016 – 2019
Land Acquisition	2018 – 2020
Small Starts Grant Agreement	June 2019
Construction	2017 – 2021
Revenue Service	Est. 2021

Progress Update

Bus investment in the 35W corridor began in the 1970s. In 2005 MnDOT completed a 35W Bus Rapid Transit Study, and in 2014 the Metropolitan Council adopted the Orange Line Project Plan Update. This plan summarized planned components of the BRT project to date, detailing preferred station locations, routing and right of way needs, frequency of service and technology recommendations. The Project Plan also served as the basis for entry into the Federal Transit Administration Small Starts Project Development program in November 2014.

The Orange Line received NEPA clearance in January 2017. Early construction began under pre-award authority (LONP) from the FTA in 2017, and FTA awarded a single-year funding grant for the project in June 2019 for \$74.1 million. This enabled full construction to begin in 2019. In early 2020, the Council is anticipated to award a stations construction package, the third of three major construction packages comprising the Orange Line. In 2020 decisions on fare collection systems and vehicles will be determined and these systems will be delivered in 2021.

A second phase of the project is under planning development by Dakota County. The County considered options to extend the Orange Line to Burnsville and/or Lakeville, and recommends continued consideration of the extension project as Orange Line operations begin, as MVTA services expand, and as Burnsville conducts planning for development near Burnsville Center.

Summary Financial Plan – METRO Orange Line

Capital Cost, Funding Sources and Budget Activities

Including potential transit-related costs of corridor roadway improvements, the Orange Line’s estimated project cost is \$150.7 million. Funding is comprised of local, state and federal sources. Cost estimates have remained stable as the project has progressed to 100 percent design of the I-35W MnDOT road/transit scope and 60 percent to 100 percent design of the remaining project elements.

Table 26: Orange Line Capital Funding Sources

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	Total (\$M)	Share (%)
Federal (Small Starts)	74.1		74.1	49
Federal (Flexible and Other)	8.8		8.8	6
CTIB (2015-2017)	8.6		8.6	6
Hennepin County and HCRRA	37.7		37.7	25
Dakota County and DCRRA	6.1		6.1	4
State General Obligation Bonds	15.1		15.1	10
Metropolitan Council	0.35		0.35	<1
TOTAL	150.7		150.7	100

Table 27: Orange Line Capital Funding Uses (as of Jan 31, 2020)

Budget Activity	Spent to date (\$M)	Projected (\$M)	Total (\$M)
Construction	36.4	58.2	94.6
ROW, Land, Existing Improvements	3.5	2.2	5.7
Vehicles	0	13.9	13.9
Professional Services	13.3	6.7	20.0
Unallocated Contingency/Other Costs		16.4	16.4
TOTAL	53.2	97.4	150.7

Annual Operating and Maintenance Costs

A significant amount of express and limited bus service existed in the I-35W corridor prior to the UPA improvements, estimated in 2010 dollars at approximately \$15.5 million annually. This service is funded through fares and the Met Council's general transit operating revenues. It is anticipated that most of this service and base funding will continue after full implementation of the METRO Orange Line.

Orange Line service is expected to begin in 2021, with its first full year of operations in 2022. After fare revenue the net operating costs of this service are expected to be shared equally between the state and project partner counties. The total operating costs of the METRO Orange Line service in 2022 are estimated at \$9.3 million. In 2020 funding partners and the Metropolitan Council are beginning discussions of incorporating Orange Line in the counties' master funding agreements for transit operations.

Table 28: METRO Orange Line 2022 Estimated Operations Costs (first full year of operation)
Other Project Information

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Metropolitan Council/MVST	0	2.6	2.6	28
Fare Revenues	0	4.1	4.1	44
Hennepin and Dakota Counties	0	2.6	2.6	28
TOTAL	0	9.3	9.3	100

Other Project Information

Lead Agency

Metropolitan Council (Metro Transit)

Project Contact

Charles Carlson

Director, Bus Rapid Transit Projects

560 6th Ave N

Minneapolis, MN 55411


612-349-7639

Charles.carlson@metrotransit.org

Figure 7: METRO Orange Line Map



-  METRO Orange Line (Bus Rapid Transit)
-  METRO Blue Line (Light Rail)
-  METRO Green Line (Light Rail)



METRO Green Line Extension (Southwest Light Rail Transit)

Corridor Description

The METRO Green Line Extension, also known as the Southwest Light Rail Transit Project, will operate from downtown Minneapolis through the communities of St. Louis Park, Hopkins, Minnetonka, and Eden Prairie, passing near the city of Edina. The alignment is primarily at-grade and includes 16 new stations and approximately 14.5 miles of double track.

The line will connect major activity centers in the region including downtown Minneapolis, the Opus/Golden Triangle employment area in Minnetonka and Eden Prairie, downtown Hopkins, Park Nicollet Methodist Hospital in St. Louis Park, the Eden Prairie Center, and the Chain of Lakes. As an extension of the METRO Green Line, it will provide a one-seat ride from Eden Prairie to downtown St. Paul. It will be part of an integrated system of transitways, including connections to the METRO Blue Line, the Northstar Commuter Rail line, major bus routes, and proposed future transitways. An additional 27 light rail vehicles will be added to the Green Line fleet for the operation of the METRO Green Line Extension. The additional vehicles will be stored and maintained in existing facilities on the Blue and Green Lines. A Rail Support Facility will be centrally located in Hopkins.

Ridership is projected at about 29,000 weekday boardings in 2035.

Project Status and Timeline

On September 2, 2011, the FTA approved the Southwest LRT Project to enter Project Development. On August 19, 2016, the Southwest Project Office (SPO) transmitted the Project's 2016 New Starts submittal for FFY 2018 and documented its completion of the Project Development phase. On December 21, 2016, the FTA approved the Project to enter Engineering based on an overall medium-high rating.

Table 29: METRO Green Line Extension Project Status and Timeline

Project Milestone	Date(s)
Locally Preferred Alternative	May 2010
Preliminary Engineering	Sept. 2011 – Dec. 2016
Record of Decision	July 2016
Engineering	Dec. 2016 - 2018
Construction	2018-2023
Full Funding Grant Agreement	2020
Revenue Service	2023

Progress Update

The Project received approval under Minnesota's municipal consent law from all cities along the proposed route and Hennepin County in August 2014. In May 2015, the Council published the Green Line Extension Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), which evaluated potential impacts in three segments of the proposed route resulting from adjustments to the design of the Project since publication of the Draft EIS in 2012. In September 2015, Hennepin County and municipalities along the route provided approval for the Project in a second municipal consent process, covering changes in Project scope described in the Supplemental Draft EIS. In May 2016, the FTA and Council published the Final EIS followed by the FTA's issuance of the Record of Decision in July 2016. In August 2016, the Project secured local funding to apply for the federal match and the Council approved

the final Project scope and budget. In December 2016, the Council awarded the Light Rail Vehicle contract to Siemens.

The civil construction contract Invitation for Bids was issued in February 2017. The Council rejected all four bids in September 2017 and reissued a second Invitation for Bids on October 10, 2017. In late 2017, the Council worked with the FTA to prepare a Supplemental Environmental Assessment (SEA) that assessed 10 changes to the Project. The SEA was published on February 23, 2018. The FTA issued the Amended Record of Decision on May 15, 2018. On May 30, 2018, the Council updated the Project budget and on May 31, 2018, Hennepin County approved additional local funding.

On August 29, 2018, the Project submitted a request for a Letter of No Prejudice (LONP) to the FTA for work under the civil construction contract. In November 2018, the FTA issued the LONP and the Civil Construction contract was awarded to Lunda / C.S. McCrossan Joint Venture. On November 15, 2018, Hennepin County passed a resolution approving addition funding for the Project in the amount of 10 percent of the Project budget. A Limited Notice to Proceed for the civil construction contract was issued on December 27, 2018.

In June 2019, a request for a second LONP (LONP 2) for work under the Civil Construction and Systems contracts was submitted to the FTA and on August 30, 2019, the FTA issued LONP 2. On the same day, the Project submitted its application for a Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) to the FTA. In September 2019, the Systems contract was awarded to Aldridge-Parsons, A Joint Venture. In March 2020, a request for a third LONP (LONP 3) was submitted to the FTA for work under the Civil Construction, Systems, and Franklin O&M Facility Modifications (Franklin) contracts. On April 10, 2020 the FTA issued LONP 3 and on April 16, 2020, the Council awarded the Franklin contract to LS Black Constructors.

As of May 2020, the property rights for all 191 public and private parcels needed to construct the project have been acquired and construction is in progress along all areas of the alignment. The FFGA was executed in Sept 2020.

Summary Financial Plan – METRO Green Line Extension

Capital Cost, Funding Sources and Budget Activities

The current overall cost estimate for the project is \$2.003 billion.

Table 30: METRO Green Line Extension Capital Funding Sources

Source	Committed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Federal (New Starts)	928.8	928.8	46.4
Federal (other)	9.8	9.8	.5
Hennepin County	591.4	591.4	29.5
Counties Transit Improvement Board (CTIB)	218.9	218.9	10.9
State General Obligation Bonds or Other	30.3	30.3	1.5
Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority (HCRRA)	199.5	199.5	10.0
Local (Other)	24.3	24.3	1.2
Total	2,003.1	2,003.1	100

Table 31: METRO Green Line Extension Capital Funding Uses

Budget Activity	Spent to date (\$M)*	Projected (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)
Construction	176.3	992	1,168.3
ROW, Land, Existing Improvements	149.2	69.7	218.9
Vehicles	48	74.3	122.3
Professional Services	251	126.9	377.9
Unallocated Contingency		60.7	60.7
Finance Charges		55.0	55.0
TOTAL	624.5	1,378.6	2,003.1

*Spent as of July 31, 2020

Annual Operating and Maintenance Costs

The Green Line Extension is forecasted to begin revenue service in 2023. Operating costs for 2024, the first full year of operation, are estimated at \$39.1 million. With anticipated farebox and other operating revenues of \$10.3 million, the net annual operating costs to be covered by Hennepin County and other local sources are estimated to be \$28.9 million.

Table 32: METRO Green Line Extension 2024 Proposed Operating Budget (first full year of operation)

Budget Activity	Spent to date (\$M)*	Projected (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Budget Activity
Fare Revenue		9.5	9.5	24
State (General Fund)				
County Sales Tax and Other Local		28.8	28.8	74
Other (Advertising)		0.8	0.8	2
TOTAL	0	39.1	39.1	100

Capital maintenance costs are different from operating costs. Operating costs include vehicle operator salary and benefits, fuel, vehicle cleaning and maintenance, and other administrative costs. Annual capital maintenance includes track maintenance, periodic vehicle overhauls, signal work and other small-scale capital improvements. For more information about capital maintenance costs, see the capacity analysis portion of this report.

Other Project Information


Lead Agency

Metropolitan Council (Metro Transit)

Project Contact

Jim Alexander, P.E.
 Project Director, Southwest LRT
 Southwest LRT Project Office
 612-373-3880
Jim.alexander@metrotransit.org

Figure 8: METRO Green Line Extension Map



METRO Blue Line Extension (Bottineau Light Rail Transit)

Corridor Description

The METRO Blue Line Extension, also known as the Bottineau light rail transit (LRT), is an approximately 13.5-mile light rail line from downtown Minneapolis to the northwest serving the communities of Minneapolis, Golden Valley, Robbinsdale, Crystal, and Brooklyn Park. The line is anticipated to serve a broader area to the northwest, including the communities of New Hope, Brooklyn Center, Plymouth, Maple Grove, Osseo, Champlin, and Dayton. When complete, the Blue Line Extension will serve 11 new stations and connect to the existing Blue Line at Target Field Station from the northern terminus at Oak Grove Parkway Station in Brooklyn Park.

The line will connect major activity centers, including downtown Minneapolis, Theodore Wirth Regional Park, downtown Robbinsdale, the Crystal Shopping Center, the Brooklyn Park commercial strip, North Hennepin Community College, and the Target North Corporate Campus. The line will provide a one-seat ride to activity centers on the METRO Blue Line, including the VA Medical Center, Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport and the Mall of America. It will be part of an integrated system of transitways, including connections to the METRO Green Line, the Northstar Commuter Rail line, major bus routes, and proposed future transitways. An additional 28 light rail vehicles will be added to Metro Transit's fleet for the operation of the Blue Line Extension. These vehicles will be stored and maintained in a new Operations and Maintenance Facility to be in Brooklyn Park.

The line is expected to have an average of 27,000 weekday riders by 2040.

Project Status and Timeline

On August 22, 2014, the FTA approved the Blue Line Extension Project to enter the Project Development phase. On August 19, 2016, the Council transmitted the Project's 2016 New Starts submittal for FFY 2018 and documented its completion of the Project Development phase. On January 19, 2017, the FTA approved the Project to enter Engineering based on an overall medium-high rating.

Table 33: METRO Blue Line Extension Project Status and Timeline

Project Milestone	Date(s)
Locally Preferred Alternative	May 2013
Project Development	Aug. 2014 – Aug. 2016
Municipal Consent	Sept. 2016
Engineering Phase	Jan. 2017 - 2020
Heavy Construction	TBD
Revenue Service	TBD

Progress Update

The Project received approval under Minnesota's municipal consent law from all cities along the proposed route and Hennepin County in March 2016. In July 2016, the FTA and Council published the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). In August 2016, the Council submitted its first New Starts application. In September 2016, the FTA issued the Record of Decision and the Council submitted its application to enter the Engineering phase of the FTA's New Starts funding process. The request to enter the Engineering phase was approved by the FTA in January 2017.

In December 2016, the Council awarded the Light Rail Vehicle contract for the Southwest LRT Project to Siemens with the option to purchase additional vehicles for the Blue Line Extension.

The Blue Line Extension Project has completed 90 percent design plans for civil construction, systems construction, and the operations and maintenance facility. The plans were sent to Hennepin County, the cities along the alignment, and other stakeholders for review.

The Council has secured 100 percent of the local funding necessary for the Project and submitted an updated New Starts application in late summer 2017. The Project continues to be ranked medium-high in the FTA New Starts program.

In late 2017-early 2018, advanced utility relocation work was completed in cooperation with the City of Minneapolis and the Minnesota Department of Transportation. As of May 2020, design work has been completed for a project to remove an old section of the Bassett Creek Tunnel as an advanced utility project. At this time, tunnel removal project construction has been put on hold for 2020. The Council is coordinating with the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT), the City of Minneapolis, and the County on next steps for the tunnel removal project.

Summary Financial Plan – METRO Blue Line Extension

Capital Cost, Funding Sources and Budget Activities

The current overall cost estimate for the project is \$1.536 billion.

Table 34: METRO Blue Line Extension Capital Funding Sources

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Federal (New Starts)		752.7	752.7	49.0
Hennepin County	534.2		534.2	34.8
Counties Transit Improvement Board	82.3		82.3	5.3
State General Obligation Bonds	1.0		1.0	0.1
Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority	149.6		149.6	9.7
Local (Other)	16.4		16.4	1.1
TOTAL	783.4	752.7	1,536.1	100

Table 35: METRO Blue Line Extension Capital Funding Uses

Budget Activity	Spent to date (\$M)*	Projected (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)
Construction	2.6	975.2	977.8
ROW, Land, Existing Improvements	0.06	69.44	69.5
Vehicles		139.5	139.5
Professional Services	122.8	154.1	276.9
Unallocated Contingency		32.4	32.4
Finance Charges		40.0	40.0
TOTAL	125.5	1,410.6	1,536.1

*Spent as of January 31, 2020

Annual Operating and Maintenance Costs

Operating costs for the first full year of operation in 2026 are estimated at \$34.4 million. With anticipated farebox and other operating revenues of \$10.5 million, the net annual operating costs to be covered by the state is estimated at \$13.6 million and Hennepin County or other local sources is estimated to be \$11.9 million.

Table 36: METRO Blue Line Extension Proposed Operating Budget (first full year of operation)

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)
Fare Revenue		9.7	9.7
State (General Fund)		13.6	13.6
Hennepin County		11.9	11.9
Other (Advertising)		0.8	0.8
TOTAL	0	36	36

Other Project Information

Lead Agency


Metropolitan Council (Metro Transit)

Project Contacts

Nick Landwer
 Director of Design and Engineering, METRO Blue Line Extension
 Blue Line Extension Project Office
 612-373-3820

Nick.Landwer@metrotransit.org

Figure 9: METRO Blue Line Extension Map



METRO Gold Line (Gateway Corridor Dedicated Bus Rapid Transit)

Corridor Description

The METRO Gold Line, formerly known as the Gateway Corridor, is a 10-mile long dedicated bus rapid transit line located in Ramsey and Washington counties. The corridor generally runs parallel to I-94, connecting downtown St. Paul, including the Union Depot multimodal transportation hub, with its east side neighborhoods and the suburbs of Maplewood, Landfall, Oakdale and Woodbury. The corridor will feature new all-day service primarily within roadway lanes dedicated to transit, a specialized bus rapid transit vehicle fleet, and robust stations and technology improvements.

The purpose of the Gold Line project is to provide transit service to meet the existing and long-term regional mobility and local accessibility needs for businesses and the traveling public within the project area.

Project Status and Timeline

Table 37: METRO Gold Line Project Status and Timeline

Milestone	Date(s)
Locally Preferred Alternative	Dec 2016
Project Development	Jan 2018 – Jan 2020
Engineering	2020 – 2021
Full Funding Grant Agreement	2021
Construction	2021 – 2024
Revenue Service	2024

Progress Update

The Gold Line project completed the Project Development phase requirements in January 2020. Some of the requirements of that two-year phase were to complete the environmental review process, complete at least 30 percent design, obtain at least 30 percent of the non-CIG (Capital Investment Grant) funding, and select a locally preferred alternative.

In 2020-2021, Gold Line will work with the Federal Transit Administration on the process to enter the Engineering Phase, complete 60 percent design, and begin right-of-way acquisition.

Summary Financial Plan – METRO Gold Line

Capital Cost, Funding Sources, and Budget Activities

Table 38: METRO Gold Line Capital Funding Sources

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Federal (New Starts)		239.3	239.3	45
State General Obligation Bonds	1.87*		1.87*	0.4
Counties Transit Improvement Board	6.0		6.0	1.1
Ramsey County/Regional Railroad Authority	127.8		127.8	24
Washington County/Regional Railroad Authority	145.4		145.4	27.3
Surface Transportation Block Grants	11.4		11.4	1.3
TOTAL	292.5	239.3	531.9	100.0

*Does not include \$133K of pre-project development expenditures. Total State General Obligation Bonds is \$2M.

Table 39: METRO Gold Line Capital Funding Uses

Budget Activity	Spent to date (\$M)	Projected (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)
Construction		313	313
ROW, Land, Existing Improvements		53.5	53.5
Vehicles		14.5	14.5
Professional Services	21.5	68.4	89.9
Unallocated Contingency		52.0	52.0
Finance Charges		9.1	9.1
TOTAL	21.5	510.5	510.5

Annual Operating and Maintenance Costs

Table 40: METRO Gold Line Estimated Operating Costs (2026\$)

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Fare Revenue		3.39	3.39	35
State (General Fund)		3.13	3.13	32.5
Ramsey/Washington County		3.13	3.13	32.5
TOTAL		9.65	9.65	100

Other Project Information


Lead Agency

Metropolitan Council (Metro Transit)

Project Contact

Charles Carlson
Director, BRT Projects
560 6th Ave N
Minneapolis, MN 55411
612-349-7639
Charles.carlson@metrotransit.org

Figure 10: METRO Gold Line Map



Rush Line Bus Rapid Transit Project

Corridor Description

The Rush Line is a 15-mile long dedicated bus rapid transit line located in Ramsey County. The route generally runs along Robert Street, Phalen Boulevard, Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority right-of-way and Trunk Highway 61, connecting Union Depot in Lowertown, Saint Paul to east side neighborhoods of Saint Paul and the cities of Maplewood, Vadnais Heights, Gem Lake and White Bear Lake. The corridor will feature new all-day service primarily within a dedicated guideway, which will be co-located with the Bruce Vento Regional Trail through the portion of the route utilizing the Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority right-of-way.

The purpose of the Rush Line BRT Project is to provide transit service that satisfies the long-term regional mobility and accessibility needs for businesses and the traveling public and supports sustainable development within the project area.

Project Status and Timeline

Table 41: Rush Line Corridor Project Status and Timeline

Milestone	Date(s)
Transit Feasibility Study	2001
Alternatives Analysis Study	Nov. 2009
Demonstration Commuter Bus	Oct. 2010 – Dec. 2012
Pre-project Development Study	March 2014 – Aug. 2017
Locally Preferred Alternative	May 2017
Environmental Analysis	Jan. 2018 – April 2021
Project Development	2021-2022
Engineering	2023-2024
Construction	2024-2026

Progress Update

The Rush Line locally preferred alternative route and transit mode of dedicated bus rapid transit were selected through the Pre-Project Development Study (2014-2017) that consisted of extensive technical analysis, public engagement and coordination with interested local and state government entities.

The locally preferred alternative was adopted by the Metropolitan Council during its TPP update in 2018.

The current phase of the project, the environmental analysis phase, began in January 2018 and is expected to conclude in April 2021. This phase includes environmental analysis under the federal and state environmental review processes to avoid, minimize and mitigate potential impacts while maximizing mobility, accessibility and surrounding economic development opportunities. An Environmental Assessment (EA) is being completed to comply with the federal environmental review process, and an Environmental Assessment Worksheet (EAW) is being completed to comply with state law.

The public is continuing to be engaged throughout the environmental analysis phase to ensure that the project is reflective of the needs of the diverse communities along the route. A Policy Advisory

Committee, consisting of elected and appointed officials and business and nonprofit representatives along the project route, was formed in March 2018 to advise Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority throughout the environmental analysis phase of the project. A Community Advisory Committee, consisting of residents, business owners and representatives of organizations with an interest in the project, was also formed in early 2018 to advise project staff and the Policy Advisory Committee.

Summary Financial Plan – Rush Line Corridor

Capital Cost, Funding Sources, and Budget Activities

The estimated capital cost for the design, engineering and construction of the Rush Line project will be refined through the completion of the Environmental Assessment and engineering. The current planning level estimate is approximately \$500 million in year-of-expenditure dollars. These figures reflect the total federal project and do not include local planning ahead of New Starts Project Development.

Table 42: Rush Line Capital Funding Sources

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Federal (New Starts)		245	245	49
Ramsey County/RRA		255	255	51
TOTAL		500	500	100

Table 43: Rush Line Capital Funding Uses

Budget Activity	Spent to date (\$M)	Projected (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)
Construction		330	330
ROW, Land, Existing Improvements		30	30
Vehicles		20	20
Professional Services		80	80
Unallocated Contingency		40	40
Finance Charges		TBD	TBD
TOTAL		500	500

Annual Operating and Maintenance Costs

Estimated operating and maintenance costs are around \$14 million in 2027 dollars

Table 44: Rush Line Estimated Operating Costs

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Fare Revenue		3.4	3.4	21
State (General Fund)		6.2	6.2	39
Ramsey County		6.2	6.2	39
TOTAL		15.9	15.8	100

Other Project Information

Lead Agency


Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority

Project Contact

Michael Rogers, Transit Project Manager
Ramsey County – Economic Growth and Community Investment Service Team
Public Works Department - Multimodal Planning
15 West Kellogg Boulevard Suite 210
St. Paul MN 55102
651-266-2773

Michael.rogers@co.ramsey.mn.us

Figure 11: Rush Line BRT Project Route Map



Riverview Corridor Modern Streetcar

Corridor Description

The Riverview Corridor is an 11.7-mile transportation corridor that connects downtown St. Paul to the Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport, Mall of America and the neighborhoods in between. It is generally defined by the Mississippi River on the south, I-35E and the river valley bluff on the north, with termini at Union Depot and the Mall of America. The Riverview Corridor is identified as a future transitway under the increased revenue scenario in the Metropolitan Council's 2040 Transportation Policy Plan. The Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority leading the Pre-Project Development Study, a study to analyze both bus and rail transit vehicle options along multiple routes that generally follow W. 7th Street and then cross the Mississippi River using either the Hwy 5 bridge or a new bridge adjacent to it.

The result of the Pre-Project Development Study was the selection of the corridor's Locally Preferred Alternative, Modern Streetcar generally along W. 7th Street and the existing Blue and Green lines from Union Depot in downtown Saint Paul to the Mall of America in Bloomington. The 11.7-mile corridor includes approximately 7 miles of new track and 10 of the 20 stations are new. Major destinations along the corridor include the Mall of America, Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport, Highland Park, the W. 7th neighborhood, Seven Corners including Xcel Energy Center, Children's Hospital, United Hospital and downtown Saint Paul. The corridor will serve to connect the region's second and third largest job markets as well as downtown St. Paul to the airport by transit.

Project Status and Timeline

Table 45: Riverview Corridor Project Status and Timeline

Milestone	Date(s)
Major Investment study	2000
Pre-project development study/LPA	Feb. 2014 - Dec. 2017
Draft Environmental Impact Statement	2019 - 2021
Project Development	2022 - 2024
Engineering	2025 - 2027
Construction	2028 - 2031

Progress Update

The pre-project development study was completed in December 2017 when the Riverview Corridor Policy Advisory Committee chose modern streetcar on a route generally along W. 7th Street from downtown Saint Paul to Historic Fort Snelling as the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). Modern streetcar would interline with the Green Line at Central Station in downtown Saint Paul and continue service to Union Depot. It will also interline with the Blue Line at Fort Snelling Station and continue service to the MSP Airport, Bloomington South Loop and the Mall of America. Affected local governments passed resolutions of support for the LPA in 2018 and the Metropolitan Council adopted the LPA into the region's Transportation Policy Plan in 2019. In 2020, The Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority will begin the Engineering and Pre-Environmental Phase for the corridor. This phase will complete the initial engineering and environmental data gathering necessary to complete an Environmental Impact Statement as part of a future phase.

Summary Financial Plan – Riverview Corridor

Capital Cost, Funding Sources, and Budget Activities

The capital cost to construct a modern streetcar route on the W. 7th Street alignment will be determined during the Engineering and Pre-Environmental and Environmental Impact Statement phases when the impacts of the project will be evaluated and measures to mitigate, minimize or avoid will be determined. At this time, a capital cost range is estimated from \$1.4 billion to \$2.0 billion in 2025 dollars. The charts below reflect a cost estimate of \$1.8 billion in 2025 dollars inflated to the revised midpoint of construction in 2029.

Table 46: Riverview Corridor Capital Funding Sources

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Federal New Starts		1,012	1,012	49
Hennepin and Ramsey Counties/RRAs		1,055	1,055	51
TOTAL		2,066	2,066	100

Table 47: Riverview Corridor Capital Funding Uses

Budget Activity	Spent to date (\$M)	Projected (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)
Construction		1,219	1,219
ROW, Land, Existing Improvements		6	6
Vehicles		160	160
Professional Services		444	444
Unallocated Contingency		186	186
Finance Charges		51	51
TOTAL		2,066	2,066

Annual Operating and Maintenance Costs

Operating and maintenance costs depend on refinements to the LPA route that will be determined during the Engineering and Pre-Environmental and Environmental Impact Statement phases. Modern streetcar is a transit mode that is not in operation in the Twin Cities, so local operation and maintenance data is not available. Using unit costs for Metro Transit Light Rail Transit operations, the estimated annual operating cost is \$35 million (2027 dollars). This amount in the tables below has been inflated to reflect a revised year of opening estimate (2032). Potential funding sources include counties and Metropolitan Council transit operating funds.

Table 48: Riverview Corridor Estimated Operating Costs

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Fare Revenue		10.8	10.8	30.0
State (General Fund)		12.6	12.6	35.0
Hennepin and Ramsey Counties		12.6	12.6	35.0
TOTAL		36.0	36.0	100

Other Project Information


Lead Agency

Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority

Project Contact

Michael Rogers, Transit Project Manager
Ramsey County – Economic Growth and Community Investment Service Team
Public Works Department - Multimodal Planning
15 West Kellogg Boulevard Suite 200
Saint Paul, MN 55102
651-266-2773
Michael.rogers@co.ramsey.mn.us

Figure 12: Riverview Corridor Map



D Line (Chicago-Emerson-Fremont Arterial Bus Rapid Transit)

Corridor Description

The D Line is a planned bus rapid transit line that will upgrade and substantially replace Route 5, Metro Transit's highest ridership bus route with around 16,000 average weekday rides in 2019. The D Line corridor stretches approximately 18 miles from the Brooklyn Center Transit Center to the Mall of America Transit Center, serving Fremont/Emerson Avenues in north Minneapolis, 7th/8th Streets in downtown Minneapolis, Chicago Avenue and Portland Avenue in south Minneapolis, Portland Avenue in Richfield, and American Boulevard in Bloomington.

Arterial bus rapid transit (BRT) is a package of transit enhancements that produces a faster trip and an improved experience for customers in the Twin Cities' busiest bus corridors. It runs on urban corridors in mixed traffic.

Project Status and Timeline

Corridor planning began in 2016, and station planning began in 2017 in close coordination with local partners. The Final Station Plan was adopted in July 2018. Engineering began in December 2018 and continued through the end of 2020. Major construction will occur in 2021-2022 and operations are planned to begin following construction in late 2022.

Table 49: Project Status and Timeline

Milestone	Date(s)
Corridor Pre-Planning	2016
Station Plan Development, Input, Review, and Approval	2017-2018
Environmental Review	2017-2019
Design and Engineering	2018-2020
Construction and Bus Manufacturing	2020-2022
Revenue Operations	2022

Progress Update

The project was fully funded following the Legislature's passage of a bonding bill in October 2020.

Summary Financial Plan – D Line

The D Line is fully funded through a combination of Regional Solicitation awards, other Federal grants, committed match to these funds, and State bonds.

Capital Cost, Funding Sources, and Budget Activities

Table 50: D Line Capital Funding Sources (does not include replacement bus budget)

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Federal (Regional Solicitation)	35.6		35.6	47%
Federal (Other)	8.3		8.3	11%
Metropolitan Council	9.7		9.7	13%
State MVST	1.4		1.4	2%
State Bonds	20.0		20.0	27%
TOTAL	75.0	0	75.0	100%

Table 51: D Line Capital Funding Uses (as of May 2020, does not include replacement bus budget)

Budget Activity	Spent to date (\$M)*	Projected (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)
Buses		11.8	11.8
Construction		43.4	43.4
Real estate		0.9	0.9
Fare Collection Equipment		2.8	2.8
Professional/Technical Services, Project Administration	3.4	7.9	11.3
Unallocated Contingency/Other Costs		4.8	4.8
TOTAL	3.4	71.6	75

Annual Operating and Maintenance Costs

Most of the service resources for the D Line will come through replacement of existing local service on Route 5. Ongoing service planning will determine available resources for D Line operations. In combination with continued local service, current estimates assume annual operating costs of \$19.5 million in 2023, the first full year of operations, with about 25 percent coming from new fare and non-fare revenues. Estimates and service planning will continue in 2021-2022 and will determine final projected costs.

Table 52: D Line Estimated Operating and Maintenance Costs (estimated 2023)

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Existing Metro Transit Fares	3.6	0	3.6	18%
Existing Metro Transit – Non-fares	10.7	0	10.7	55%
New Fares- incremental	0	1.3	1.3	7%
New State	0	3.9	3.9	20%
TOTAL	14.3	5.2	19.5	100

Other Project Information


Lead Agency

Metropolitan Council (Metro Transit)

Project Contact

Charles Carlson
Director, Bus Rapid Transit Projects
560 6th Ave N
Minneapolis, MN 55411
612-349-7639
Charles.carlson@metrotransit.org

Figure 13: D Line Map



Appendix C – Summaries: Corridors with Study Recommendations – Incomplete Funding Plan

METRO B Line (Lake / Marshall / Selby Arterial Bus Rapid Transit)

Corridor Description

The METRO B Line is a planned bus rapid transit line that will upgrade and substantially replace Route 21, Metro Transit’s second-highest ridership bus route. The B Line corridor will serve Lake Street, Marshall Avenue, and Selby Avenue between Bde Maka Ska, south Minneapolis, and downtown St. Paul. In 2019, Route 21 buses in this corridor served approximately 10,000 existing daily transit riders.

The B Line would provide improved connections between the METRO Green Line and A Line on the east end to the METRO Green Line Extension on the west end. Connections would also be made to the METRO Blue Line, METRO Orange Line, and several planned or potential arterial bus rapid lines in south Minneapolis. The B Line would also serve dense residential neighborhoods, several thriving commercial districts, and several major employers.

Arterial bus rapid transit (BRT) is a package of transit enhancements that produces a faster trip and an improved experience for customers in the Twin Cities’ busiest bus corridors. It runs on urban corridors, primarily in mixed traffic.

Project Status and Timeline

B Line station planning began in 2018 and continues into 2021 in close coordination with local partners, and informed by community engagement and feedback. Metro Transit plans to start detailed engineering on the B Line in 2021 through the end of 2022. Major construction will occur in 2023-2024 and operations are planned to begin following construction in 2024.

Table 53: Project Status and Timeline

Milestone	Date(s)
Corridor Plan Development, Input, Review, and Approval	2018-2021
Environmental Review	2020-2021
Design and Engineering	2021-2022
Construction and Bus Manufacturing	2023-2024
Revenue Service	2024

Progress Update

In early 2020, Metro Transit released a staff recommendation for the B Line to continue to downtown St. Paul via Selby Avenue, from an initial terminal of Snelling & University. This alignment, along with stations on the corridor, will be addressed through Metropolitan Council action on the B Line Corridor Plan in 2021. Based on the preliminary budget, the project was fully funded following the Legislature’s passage of a bonding bill in October 2020.

Summary Financial Plan – B Line

The preliminary budget for the B Line is \$65 million. The B Line is funded through a combination of Regional Solicitation awards, other Federal grants, committed match to these funds, and State bonds.

Capital Cost, Funding Sources, and Budget Activities

Table 54: B Line Capital Funding Sources

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Federal (Regional Solicitation)	14		14	22%
Federal (Other)	2	12.3	14.3	22%
Metropolitan Council	4.5	2.2	6.7	10%
State MVST	0		0	0%
State Bonds	30		30	46%
TOTAL	50.5	14.5	65	100%

Table 55: B Line Capital Funding Uses

Budget Activity	Spent to date (\$M)*	Projected (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)
Buses		22.2	22.2
Construction		26.6	26.6
Real estate		0.5	0.5
Fare Collection Equipment		2.8	2.8
Professional/Technical Services, Project Administration	0.5	6.5	7
Unallocated Contingency/Other Costs		5.9	5.9
TOTAL	0.5	64.5	65

Annual Operating and Maintenance Costs

Most of the service resources for the B Line will come through replacement of existing local service on Route 21. Ongoing service planning will determine needed resources for B Line operations. In combination with continued local service, current estimates assume annual operating costs of \$15.7 million in 2025, the first full year of operations, with about 25 percent coming from new fare and non-fare revenues. Estimates and service planning will continue through 2023 to determine final projected costs.

Table 56: B Line Estimated Operating and Maintenance Costs

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Existing Fare Revenue	3.0	0	6.0	19%
Existing Non-fare revenue	9.0	0	9.0	57%
New Fares- Incremental	0	0.9	0.9	6%
New State	0	2.8	2.8	18%
TOTAL	12.0	3.7	15.7	100

Other Project Information


Lead Agency

Metropolitan Council (Metro Transit)

Project Contact

Charles Carlson
Director, Bus Rapid Transit Projects
Metro Transit
560 6th Ave N
Minneapolis, MN 55411
612-349-7639
Charles.carlson@metrotransit.org

Figure 14: B Line Corridor Map



E Line (Hennepin/France Avenue Arterial Bus Rapid Transit)

Corridor Description

Metro Transit is planning improvements to the Route 6 corridor with the E Line arterial bus rapid transit project. The E Line will substantially replace parts of Route 6 in the Hennepin Avenue corridor, serving uptown Minneapolis. Arterial bus rapid transit brings better amenities, faster service and a more comfortable ride.

The METRO E Line is a planned bus rapid transit line that will upgrade and substantially replace Route 6, one of Metro Transit’s highest ridership bus routes. The E Line corridor will connect the University of Minnesota, downtown Minneapolis, uptown Minneapolis, and Southdale via 4th Street and University Avenue SE, Hennepin Avenue, and France Avenue. In 2019, Route 6 buses in this corridor carried approximately 6,000 existing daily transit riders.

Arterial bus rapid transit (BRT) is a package of transit enhancements that produces a faster trip and an improved experience for customers in the Twin Cities’ busiest bus corridors. It runs on urban corridors, primarily in mixed traffic.

Project Status and Timeline

The E Line project is currently in the planning phase. Metro Transit plans to start detailed engineering on the E Line in late 2021, continuing through 2023. Major construction will begin in 2023, in coordination with other major street reconstruction projects on the corridors. Operations are planned to begin following construction in 2024-2025. This schedule is subject to change pending identification of full project funding.

Table 57: Project Status and Timeline

Milestone	Date(s)
Corridor Study and Alignment Definition	2018-2019
Corridor Plan Development, Input, Review, and Approval	2020-2021
Environmental Review	2021-2022
Design and Engineering	2021-2023
Construction and Bus Manufacturing	2023-2025
Revenue Service	2024-2025

Progress Update

A study of the E Line corridor was completed in late 2019 to identify a preferred alignment for the line. Based on technical analysis, coordination with local governments, and community input, an alignment to Southdale via France Avenue was adopted by the Metropolitan Council in early 2020. Corridor planning to identify stations and other improvements along this alignment began in 2020 and continues into 2021 in close coordination with local partners, and informed by community engagement and feedback.

Summary Financial Plan – E Line

The E Line is partially funded by Federal grants awarded through the Regional Solicitation, along with Metropolitan Council funds to match these grants and advance preliminary project development activities.

Capital Cost, Funding Sources, and Budget Activities

Table 58: E Line Capital Funding Sources (does not include replacement bus budget)

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Federal (Regional Solicitation)	13		13	22%
Federal (Other)			0	0%
Metropolitan Council	4.8		4.8	8%
State MVST			0	0%
State Bonds		40.7	40.7	68%
Other / Unidentified		1.5	1.5	3%
TOTAL	17.8	42.2	60	100%

Table 59: E Line Capital Funding Uses (does not include replacement bus budget)

Budget Activity	Spent to date (\$M)*	Projected (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)
Buses		8.0	8.0
Construction		33.2	33.2
Real estate		0.4	0.4
Fare Collection Equipment		2.9	2.9
Professional/Technical Services, Project Administration		7.7	7.7
Unallocated Contingency/Other Costs		7.8	7.8
TOTAL	0	60	60

Annual Operating and Maintenance Costs

Most of the service resources for the E Line will come through replacement of existing local service on Route 6. Ongoing service planning will determine available resources for E Line operations. In combination with continued local service, current estimates assume annual operating costs of \$19 million in 2026, the first full year of operations, with about 32 percent coming from new fare and non-fare revenues. Estimates and service planning will continue through 2024 to determine projected costs.

Table 60: E Line Estimated Operating and Maintenance Costs

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Existing Metro Transit Fare	3.2	0	3.2	17%
Existing Metro Transit Non-Fares	9.7	0	9.7	39%
New Fares- Incremental	0	1.5	1.5	8%
New State	0	4.6	4.6	24%
TOTAL	12.9	6.1	19.0	100

Other Project Information


Lead Agency

Metropolitan Council (Metro Transit)

Project Contact

Charles Carlson
 Director, Bus Rapid Transit Projects
 Metro Transit
 560 6th Ave N
 Minneapolis, MN 55411
 612-349-7639
Charles.carlson@metrotransit.org

Figure 15: E Line Corridor Map



Nicollet-Central Modern Streetcar

Corridor Description

The Nicollet-Central Modern Streetcar is a planned 3.7-mile modern streetcar line running between Lake Street and 8th Street SE on Nicollet Avenue S, Nicollet Mall, Hennepin Avenue NE, Central Avenue NE and 1st Avenue NE. The streetcar is planned to operate as a high-frequency service with quarter-mile stop spacing, providing level boarding and station amenities like light rail and bus rapid transit service while running in mixed-traffic using modern streetcar vehicles.

Streetcar service will serve a corridor experiencing significant residential and employment growth, with strong connections to numerous regional transitways (e.g. Blue Line, Green Line, Orange Line, B Line, C Line, and D Line). It will further improve regional and local transit connectivity, as well as last mile connections, between downtown and adjacent neighborhoods north of the Mississippi River and south of I-94. This new service will also provide improved downtown circulation along Nicollet Mall for employees, visitors and shoppers.

The 3.7-mile modern streetcar starter line is projected to generate over 10,200 regular weekday riders in 2040, an increase of 1,400 riders over the no-build condition.

Project Status and Timeline

An initial alternatives analysis for the 9-mile study corridor was completed in September 2013. The 3.7-mile Nicollet-Central Modern Streetcar was recommended as the first step for streetcar construction by the Minneapolis City Council as the Locally Preferred Alternative, with the support of an interagency policy advisory committee in October 2013. In late 2013, Minneapolis initiated the preparation of an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the corridor in accordance with FTA regulations and requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act. The EA centers on a slightly modified LPA and will document the short-term and long-term effects of the project, including social and economic factors, physical factors, and indirect and cumulative effects.

Table 61: Nicollet-Central Modern Streetcar Project Status and Timeline

Milestone	Date(s)
Corridor Planning and Feasibility Studies	2005 - 2012
Alternatives Analysis	2012 - 2013
Locally Preferred Alternative	October 2013
Environmental Assessment	Fall 2013 – 2022
Engineering	2023 - 2024
Construction	2025 - 2027
Revenue Service	2028

Progress Update

Most of the EA technical studies and documentation are completed, with the historical and archaeological resource (Section 106) analysis nearing completion. The draft Environmental Assessment has been reviewed internally and by agency stakeholders, such that the document is ready for FTA review. Capital costs and Operations and Maintenance costs have also been updated to reflect updates to the design concept and proposed construction schedule.

Summary Financial Plan – Nicollet Central

Capital Cost, Funding Sources, and Budget Activities

Capital costs to complete the Nicollet-Central Modern Streetcar are estimated at \$276 million (in 2024 dollars). Professional services for the work initiated to date (the alternatives analysis and environmental assessment) are funded through a \$900,000 grant through the FTA Alternatives Analysis program and \$110 million from Minneapolis through the Value Capture District, established for the Nicollet-Central streetcar project.

Funding for the remaining \$166 million in capital costs has not been identified or secured. However, Minneapolis is working with regional partners to pursue the following funding sources: federal sources appropriate for streetcar projects, such as the FTA Capital Improvement Grants (CIG) program and/or the discretionary BUILD grant program; and other local and regional sources.

Table 62: Nicollet-Central Capital Funding Sources

Source	Existing (\$M)	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
City of Minneapolis – Value Capture District	6.0	104		110	40%
Federal (Alternatives Analysis Grant)	0.9			0.9	<1%
Federal (New/Small Starts or Other)			100 - 135	100 - 135	35-48%
Unidentified			31 - 66	31 - 66	11-23%
TOTAL	6.9	104	166	276	100%

Table 63: Nicollet-Central Capital Funding Uses

Budget Activity	Spent to date (\$M)*	Projected (\$M)**	TOTAL (\$M)
Construction		135.0	135.0
Right-of-Way		5.4	5.4
Vehicles		70.9	70.9
Professional Services	3.1	35.4	38.5
Unallocated Contingency		23.3	23.3
Finance Charges		3.0	3.0
TOTAL	3.1	273.0	276.1

*Spent as of January 2021 **Projected costs are estimated in 2018 dollars inflated to YOY dollars

Annual Operating and Maintenance Costs

The estimated annual operating and maintenance cost for the 3.7-mile streetcar is \$14 million in 2018 dollars, excluding an anticipated reduction of \$900,000 in bus operating costs in 2018 dollars. The source of funding for annual operating and maintenance costs has not been identified.

Other Project Information

Lead Agency

City of Minneapolis

Project Contact


Nathan Koster

City of Minneapolis (Public Works)

612-673-3638

nathan.koster@minneapolismn.gov

Figure 16: Nicollet-Central Modern Streetcar Map



METRO Red Line Highway Bus Rapid Transit (Cedar Avenue Transitway) – Future Stages

Corridor Description

The METRO Red Line (Cedar Avenue Transitway) is a bus rapid transit line that extends from the Mall of America in Bloomington to 155th Street in Apple Valley, connecting Bloomington, Eagan and Apple Valley. The METRO Red Line presently includes five stations. Two stations, Cedar Grove Transit Station and Apple Valley Transit Station include park and ride facilities. In addition to the park-and-ride stations, there are three walk-up stations located near 140th and 147th streets in Apple Valley and at the Mall of America.

Future service and capital improvements for the Cedar Avenue Transitway and METRO Red Line include service extension to Lakeville, additional stations, improvements to existing stations, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, park and ride facilities and replacement vehicles.

Project Status and Timeline

The Cedar Avenue Transitway Implementation Plan Update (IPU) was completed in 2015. This update identified service and facility improvements that address changing needs and conditions in the corridor in the coming years. Improvements to the transitway were classified as near-term projects that were justified by IPU evaluation criteria (stages 2-3), and longer-term improvements that do not presently meet performance criteria (stages 4-5) but may be recommended later. Projects identified in the Summary Financial Plan are those programmed in the capital improvement plans of Dakota County and the Dakota County Regional Railroad Authority.

Table 64: METRO Red Line Future Stages Project Status and Timeline

Milestone	Date(s)
Stage 1: Launch of BRT station-to-station service	June 2013
Stage 2: Cedar Grove Online Station, Apple Valley Transit Station Expansion, Bicycle and Pedestrian Network Improvements, Corridor-wide Station Area Planning, Palomino and Cliff Road Station Concepts, TH 77 Managed Lane Concept, Northern Park and Ride Needs Analysis	2015-2020
Stage 3: Cliff Road Inline Station, Palomino Online Station and Park and Ride, Bicycle and Pedestrian Network Improvements, METRO Red Line Vehicle Replacement, Update Cedar Transitway IPU	2021-2025
Stage 4: Lakeville Cedar Station Improvements, Northern Apple Valley/Eagan Park and Ride Expansion, Fiber and Traffic Signal Priority Expansion, Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements	To be determined
Stage 5: 251st Street Station and Layover, 147th Street Station Pedestrian Bridge, METRO Red Line Vehicle Fleet Expansion, Fiber and Traffic Signal Priority Expansion, Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements	To be determined

Progress Update

In early 2020, the Minnesota Valley Transit Authority (MVTA) completed an expansion of the Apple Valley Transit Station, the southern terminus of the METRO Red Line. The expansion added an additional 370 spaces to the facility. Preliminary planning for stations near Cliff Road and Palomino Drive will begin later this year in conjunction with broader scoping of future improvements to Highway 77 in this area.

Summary Financial Plan – METRO Red Line Future Stages

Capital Cost, Funding Sources and Budget Activities

Stage I of the transitway was completed in 2013 at a total cost of approximately \$110 million. The following tables show costs related to stages 2 and 3 (through 2025) of the Cedar Avenue Transitway.

Table 65: METRO Red Line Future Stages 2 and 3 Capital Funding Sources

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Other Federal	5.7	8.7	14.4	23
State of Minnesota	2.7	14.4	17.1	27
CTIB	10.4		10.4	17
Local (Counties/RRAs)	11		11	18
Local (Other)	0.7	8.6	9.3	15
TOTAL	30.5	31.7	62.2	100

Table 66: METRO Red Line Stages 2 and 3 Projects and Activities

Transitway Element	Spent to date (\$M)*	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)
Cedar Grove Transit Station Expansion	13.0			13.0
Eagan Station Area Planning	0.1			0.1
Apple Valley Transit Station Expansion	8.5			8.5
Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements	0.1	0.1		0.2
Palomino Station Project Development		1.2	2.6	3.8
Palomino Station		6.7	22.8	29.5
Cliff Road Station Project Development		0.4		0.4
Cliff Road Station			2.2	2.2
Implementation Plan Update		0.5		0.5
Vehicles			4.1	4.1
TOTAL	21.7	8.9	31.7	62.3

*Spent as of June 30, 2020

In addition to the above costs, total capital costs of improvements identified in Stages 4 and 5 of the IPU are \$14.3 million and \$11.6 million, respectively.

Annual Operating and Maintenance Costs

Table 56 represents the additional operating costs of improvements identified in Stages 2 and 3 of the IPU. The costs include operations of the Cliff Road and Palomino Stations, additional ticket vending machines and additional traffic signal priority equipment. Operating costs for improvements identified in Stages 4 and 5 are not determined and contingent on the timing and extent of their implementation.

Table 67: METRO Red Line Future Stages 2 and 3 Annual Operating and Maintenance Costs

Source	Committed (\$M)*	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Fare Revenue	0.031		0.031	8
Metropolitan Council (Motor Vehicle Sales Tax)		0.349	0.349	92
Other (Advertising)				
TOTAL	0.031	0.349	0.380	100

Other Project Information

Lead Agency

Dakota County Regional Railroad Authority

Project Contact

Mark Krebsbach

Transportation Director/County Engineer, Physical Development Division


14955 Galaxie Avenue

Apple Valley, MN 55124

952-891-7102

mark.krebsbach@co.dakota.mn.us

Figure 17: Red Line Future Stages Map



Midtown Corridor Rail

Corridor Description

The Midtown Corridor travels 4.4 miles through the heart of south Minneapolis along the Lake Street and Midtown Greenway alignments. The corridor features dense residential neighborhoods, a thriving commercial district, several major employers and multiple connections to the regional transit network.

While the corridor is currently served by high frequency local and limited-stop bus routes, traffic congestion and high ridership make transit service speeds slow. An alternatives analysis completed in 2014 explored a broad range of options for transit improvements in the corridor. A combination of bus and rail improvements is recommended to meet the travel needs of the Midtown corridor.

The project Alternatives Analysis concluded with a recommended Locally Preferred Alternative for arterial bus rapid transit improvements along Lake Street and double/single track rail along the Midtown Greenway. The combined ridership of these improvements is 26,000 per weekday, with corridor ridership of 32,000 rides per weekday. The rail alternative travels along a 4.4-mile segment of former freight rail and includes ten station locations about every half-mile apart. When constructed, the project would be parallel to the existing Midtown Greenway trail. Major corridor destinations include connections to METRO light rail lines, the Lake Street commercial corridor with shopping districts and destinations throughout, the Allina hospitals headquarters, central laboratory, and hospitals, and additional destinations such as Midtown Global Market, educational campuses, and more.

Rail ridership is estimated at 9,500 per weekday in 2030.

The Midtown Corridor rail alignment status, progress, and budget is detailed below. The arterial bus rapid transit project on Lake Street is described in the B Line status report.

Project Status and Timeline

Table 68: Midtown Corridor Rail Project Status and Timeline

Milestone	Date(s)
Alternatives Analysis Study	Complete April 2014
Adopt Locally Preferred Alternative	TBD - Not in the Council's TPP Current Revenue Scenario
Environmental and Engineering	TBD
Full Funding Grant Agreement	TBD
Construction	TBD
Revenue Service	TBD

Progress Update

The Midtown Alternatives Analysis study is complete, and bus improvements are planned through the partially funded B Line rapid bus project detailed separately in this report. Future rail corridor progress including adoption of a Locally Preferred Alternative is dependent on the following:

- Resolutions of local support for the recommended LPA
- Additional transit funding to enable additional projects to be funded
- Increased definition of Midtown rail vehicle as streetcar or single-vehicle light rail

Summary Financial Plan – Midtown Corridor Rail

Planning-phase cost estimates were generated for the Midtown Corridor Alternatives Analysis for the recommended improvements. These preliminary assessments estimated the costs for this project at approximately \$185-200 million for rail project improvements. Potential sources of funding and greater definition of uses will be defined in future project phases.

Capital Cost, Funding Sources, and Budget Activities

Table 69: Midtown Corridor Rail Capital Funding Sources (2013\$)

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Unidentified		200.0	200.0	100
TOTAL		200.0	200.0	100

Table 70: Midtown Corridor Rail Capital Funding Uses (2013\$)

Budget Activity	Spent to date (\$M)	Projected (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)
Rail Improvements		200.0	200.0
TOTAL		200.0	200.0

The Alternatives Analysis study was funded with federal planning assistance (\$600,000) matched by Metropolitan Council funding (\$150,000). These activities are considered pre-project development and are not included in capital budget activities or previous expenditures above.

Annual Operating and Maintenance Costs

The project's Alternatives Analysis estimated annual operating and maintenance costs are in 2012 dollars. Rail operations were estimated at \$8 million annually. No proposed or committed sources have been identified.

Table 71: Midtown Corridor Estimated Operating and Maintenance Costs

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Unidentified		8.0	8.0	100
TOTAL		8.0	8.0	100

Other Project Information

Lead Agency

Metropolitan Council (Metro Transit)

Project Contact

Charles Carlson
Director, Bus Rapid Transit Projects
560 6th Ave N
Minneapolis, MN 55411
612-349-7639

Charles.carlson@metrotransit.org

Figure 18: Midtown Alternatives Analysis Locally Preferred Alternative Map




Figure 19: Midtown Rail Corridor Map



Red Rock Corridor Highway Bus Rapid Transit

Corridor Description

The Red Rock Corridor is a proposed 20-mile bus rapid transitway, connecting the Twin Cities' southeastern suburbs to Saint Paul. The transitway will originate in Hastings and stop in Cottage Grove, St. Paul Park, Newport and Saint Paul's Battle Creek neighborhood before connecting to the Saint Paul Union Depot. The route will travel generally along Highway 61 with proposed stations at:

- Dakota County Service Center (Hastings)
- Hastings Depot (Hastings)
- East Point Douglas Road South at Jamaica Avenue (Cottage Grove)
- East Point Douglas Road South at 80th Street South (Cottage Grove)
- Broadway Avenue and Portland Ave (St. Paul Park)
- Newport Transit Station (Newport)
- Highway 61 and Lower Afton Road (Saint Paul)
- Union Depot (Saint Paul)

Riders can access many destinations from Union Depot using other transit service like express buses, local buses, and METRO Green Line.

Ridership projections from the Implementation Plan estimated total corridor ridership to be 3,800 with 2,200 daily BRT and 1,600 express bus riders by 2040.

Project Status and Timeline

In 2007, Washington, Dakota, Ramsey, and Hennepin Counties performed an Alternatives Analysis Study (AA) on the Red Rock Corridor, which originally concluded that commuter rail was the most optimal long-term transit option for the corridor. The study also provided near-term recommendations like building transit ridership through expanded bus service along the corridor and helping to promote economic development throughout the corridor. Additional work was then completed on station area plans to help achieve that long-term vision towards commuter rail.

In 2014, the Red Rock Corridor underwent an Alternatives Analysis Update (AAU) that reviewed the findings from the 2007 study. While much of the AA recommendations were confirmed to still be optimal, the AAU identified shorter-range implementation strategies that would help improve transit service in the corridor. Bus rapid transit (BRT) was identified as the alternative best able to improve accessibility and connectivity for corridor residents and businesses through all-day, bi-directional service.

Most recently, the Red Rock Corridor Implementation Plan was completed in 2017. It built upon previous work and outlined near- and long-term recommendations for supporting transit ridership in the Red Rock Corridor.

Near-term:

- Work with Metro Transit to implement all-day 30-minute local service to Cottage Grove (Route 363)
- Work with Metro Transit to maintain existing express service
- Work with Metro Transit and Hastings to determine if express bus service (such as Route 367) or local service within Hastings is a viable option
- Work with Corridor cities and counties to update Comprehensive Plans, consideration should be given to increasing population density and employment within station areas

Long-term:

- Implement comprehensive plans by focusing development within and around station areas
- If Route 363 is implemented, monitor ridership; work with Metro Transit to identify potential service improvements to reach 1,200 passengers per day
- Assess comprehensive plan updates, demographic changes, and performance of Route 363 to determine if the Implementation Plan could be updated
- Replace Route 363 with BRT service when estimated BRT Passengers Per in Service Hour reaches 25 passengers per in-service hour (timing subject to reevaluation with updated ridership model)
- Explore extensions of BRT to Hastings and within Hastings when forecasted Hastings ridership exceeds 450 passengers per day

Guided by the 2017 Red Rock Corridor Implementation Plan recommendations, the Red Rock Corridor Commission continues to advocate for the all- day bi-directional service between Cottage Grove and downtown Saint Paul known as the Route 363 as well as other transit service improvements. The implementation of local bus service will help the corridor to grow ridership to the performance levels necessary to implement full BRT.

Table 72: Project Status and Timeline

Milestone	Date(s)
Alternatives Analysis Study (AA)	2007
Station Area Planning	2009 - 2011
Alternatives Analysis Update (AAU)	2013 - 2014
Red Rock Corridor Implementation Plan	2015 - 2017
Small Area Plans	2017 - 2018

Progress Update

In 2018, small area plans were completed for the proposed station areas in Cottage Grove and St. Paul Park. The small area plans looked at land use, economic development, and redevelopment opportunities in the station areas to make them more transit friendly. The plans document specific strategies to support improved transit service and capitalize on investments, and both cities incorporated the small area plan details in their 2040 comprehensive plans.

Per the Red Rock Corridor Implementation Plan, funding Route 363 continues to be a top priority for the Red Rock Corridor Commission. Washington County has collaborated with Metro Transit to submit Regional Solicitation Transit Expansion application in 2014 and 2016, and the county, with support from the Red Rock Corridor Commission, Metro Transit, and other corridor partners, has included funding for Route 363 in its annual state legislative agendas since 2017. All funding requests have so far been unsuccessful.

Route 365 service between Cottage Grove and Minneapolis was added at Newport Transit Station in 2017.

Summary Financial Plan

Preliminary cost estimates for the Red Rock Corridor preferred BRT alternative, as described in the Implementation Plan, are estimated to be \$44 million in 2015 dollars. Operating and maintenance (O&M) costs are estimated to be \$7.9 million in 2015 dollars. The cost estimates provided here are

based on a full build-out of the system. However, BRT service in this corridor will likely be phased, and as the phasing plan is developed and refined, these costs will be updated to reflect updated assumptions and year of expenditure dollars. Funding sources were not specified during the Implementation Plan. Investing in improvements toward full BRT build out over time would leverage funds from multiple sources.

Table 73: Red Rock BRT Estimated Capital & Operating Costs

Costs	Highway Bus Rapid Transit Preferred Alternative
Capital Cost (2015\$)	\$44 million
Annual Operating Cost (2015\$)	\$7.9 million

Other Project Information


Lead Agency

Washington County Regional Railroad Authority on behalf of the Red Rock Corridor Commission

Project Contact

Joe Ayers-Johnson
 Planner, Washington County Public Works Department
 651-430-4332
Joseph.ayers-johnson@co.washington.mn.us

Figure 20: Red Rock Corridor Map



West Broadway Modern Streetcar

Corridor Description

Metro Transit, in partnership with Hennepin County and the City of Minneapolis, completed a transit study of West Broadway Avenue in Minneapolis and Robbinsdale. The West Broadway Transit Study engaged corridor businesses and community members, evaluated transit improvements including bus rapid transit and modern streetcar and evaluated the corridor's market potential for transit-oriented development.

The project resulted in Locally Preferred Alternative recommendation in February 2017 for transit service improvements in the corridor. The locally preferred alternative recommendation was for modern streetcar along the corridor from downtown Minneapolis to North Memorial Medical Center and improved bus transit service and facilities along the study corridor. The 4.9-mile corridor would travel along Nicollet Mall, Washington Avenue, and West Broadway Avenue with 19 station spaced one-quarter to one-half mile apart. Corridor destinations include North Loop job and shopping destinations, the North Washington Jobs Park, the West Broadway commercial corridor, and North Memorial Medical Center.

Projected streetcar ridership in year 2040 is 3,900 rides per average weekday. In addition, the study identified that streetcar investment could generate between \$480-640 million of incremental real estate value over a 25-year investment period, generating up to 2,600 added jobs in the corridor above baseline conditions.

Project Status and Timeline

Table 74: West Broadway Modern Streetcar Project Status and Timeline

Milestone	Date(s)
West Broadway Transit Study	Completed February 2017
Adopt Locally Preferred Alternative	Unknown - dependent on future funding availability and further evaluation
Environmental and Engineering	Unknown
Construction	Unknown
Revenue Service	Unknown

Progress Update

The West Broadway Transit Study concluded in early 2017 with a locally preferred alternative recommendation for modern streetcar and for bus service and facility improvements. Incorporating the recommendation into long-range plans will require additional funding capacity, resolutions supporting the LPA from corridor cities and county, and further technical evaluation of the corridor.

No further work is currently planned to develop or implement the project.

Summary Financial Plan – West Broadway Modern Streetcar

The study phase contract of \$615,000 was funded by the Metropolitan Council, City of Minneapolis, and Hennepin County. The table below summarizes the estimated capital and operating costs of the transit alternatives studied in the project.

Table 75: West Broadway Modern Streetcar Estimated Capital & Operating Costs Comparison

	Modern Streetcar (LPA Recommendation)	Arterial Bus Rapid Transit
Capital Cost (2015\$)	\$239 - 256 million	\$40 million
Annual Operating Cost (2015\$)	\$9.6 million	\$5.5 million

No sources of funding have been identified for the capital or operating costs of the modern streetcar project.

Other Project Information

Lead Agency

Metropolitan Council (Metro Transit)

Project Contact

Charles Carlson
Director, Bus Rapid Transit Projects
560 6th Ave N
Minneapolis, MN 55411
612-349-7639
Charles.carlson@metrotransit.org

Figure 21: West Broadway Modern Streetcar- Recommended Locally Preferred Alternative Map



Highway 169 Mobility Study (Highway Bus Rapid Transit)

Corridor Description

The Highway 169 Mobility Study evaluated the potential for bus rapid transit along Highway 169 between Shakopee and downtown Minneapolis. In addition to the transit analysis, MnPASS Express Lanes were also evaluated.

The study was led through a partnership between MnDOT, the Metropolitan Council and Scott County. Numerous stakeholders were engaged in the study including Hennepin County; the cities of Shakopee, Prior Lake, Savage, Bloomington, Eden Prairie, Edina, Minnetonka, Hopkins, St. Louis Park, Golden Valley, Plymouth and Minneapolis; SouthWest Transit; Minnesota Valley Transit Authority; Metro Transit; the Federal Highway Administration; the Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community; and the Highway 169 Corridor Coalition.

The study initially screened several BRT alternatives and then conducted detailed analysis on two alternatives before making a final recommendation. The final recommendation is for Highway BRT along Highway 169 between Marshall Road in Shakopee and Betty Crocker Drive in Golden Valley, continuing to downtown Minneapolis via Highway 55. The recommended BRT would serve 15 stations, including five stations in downtown Minneapolis. The Study also recommended interim recommendations for testing out the transit market with a limited stop, all-day transit service that mimics much of the BRT corridor. An important connection for this service (and the BRT service) would be the Green Line Extension light rail, so implementation is not recommended before that project opens.

The estimated average weekday ridership for the BRT is forecasted to be 5,600 by 2040.

Project Status and Timeline

The Metropolitan Council's Highway Transitway Corridor Study (2014) examined bus rapid transit (BRT) on nine highway corridors in the Twin Cities, including Highway 169. Highway 169 was found to be a comparatively strong candidate for highway bus rapid transit. Based on that, the Highway 169 Mobility Study evaluated the corridor in more detail.

The Highway 169 Mobility Study was completed in June 2018 resulting in the recommendations reflected in this update.

Table 76: Highway 169 BRT Project Status and Timeline

Milestone	Date(s)
Prioritized concept in regional Highway Transitway Corridor Study	May 2014
Highway 169 Mobility Study complete with recommendations	Late 2017
Testing interim transit service option recommendations	Not prior to Green Line Extension light rail opening
Draft Environmental Review	TBD

Progress Update

More detailed alignment and station location analysis occurred through the Highway 169 Mobility Study, which resulted in Alternative 2 - Highway 55 being recommended as the preferred alignment.

Summary Financial Plan – Highway 169 BRT

The following tables are summaries of the estimated capital and operating costs for the Highway 169 BRT project from the Highway 169 Mobility Study (2018), provided in 2018 dollars. The sources for operating costs and capital costs have not yet been identified.

Table 77: Highway 169 BRT Project Capital Costs

Budget Activity	Spent to date (\$M)	Projected (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)
Construction		21.8	21.8
ROW, Land, Existing Improvements			
Vehicles		11.6	11.6
Professional Services		3.1	3.2
Unallocated Contingency		8.9	8.9
Finance Charges			
TOTAL		45.5	45.5

Table 78: Highway 169 BRT Project Operating Costs

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Unidentified		13.6	13.6	100
TOTAL		13.6	13.6	100

Other Project Information


Lead Agency

MnDOT Metro District

Project Contact

Brad Larsen
MnPASS Policy & Planning Program Director, MnDOT Metro District
1500 West County Road B2
Roseville, MN 55113
651-234-7024
Brad.larsen@state.mn.us

Figure 22: Highway 169 BRT Corridor Map



Appendix D – Summaries: Corridors without Study Recommendations

Robert Street Corridor

Corridor Description

The Robert Street Transitway, as defined by the 2040 Transportation Policy Plan, extends from downtown St. Paul, generally along the alignment of Robert Street. However, the transitway study area included areas bounded on the north by downtown St. Paul/I-94, the Mississippi River to the east, I-35E to the west and County Road 42 to the south. The transitway study area included St. Paul, West St. Paul, South St. Paul, Sunfish Lake, Mendota, Lilydale, Mendota Heights, Inver Grove Heights, Eagan and Rosemount. The Robert Street Transitway Alternatives Analysis narrowed the potential projects to two alternatives that would operate along Robert Street.

Project Status and Timeline

The Dakota County Regional Railroad Authority completed a transit feasibility study in November 2008. In April 2012, the DCRRA and the Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority began an Alternatives Analysis. The Alternatives Analysis defined two alternatives- arterial bus rapid transit on Robert Street between downtown St. Paul and Mendota Road in West St. Paul or streetcar lines on Robert Street between downtown St. Paul and Mendota Road in West St. Paul-as the most able to achieve the goals defined through the AA process. In April 2015, this process concluded without the selection of a Locally Preferred Alternative. This decision was made to allow time for cities on the route to consider a transitway in their comprehensive plans and allow for a more informed LPA decision later.

Table 79: Robert St. Arterial BRT Project Status and Timeline

Milestone	Date(s)
LPA Process, Preliminary Engineering, Environmental Documentation	2022 - 2024
Final Design and Letter of No Prejudice	2025
Construction	2026 - 2027
Opening Year	2028

Table 80: Robert St. Streetcar Project Status and Timeline (Not programmed in County capital improvement program)

Milestone	Date(s)
LPA Process, EA, Preliminary Engineering	2022 - 2023
Final Design and Letter of No Prejudice	2024 - 2025
Construction	2026 - 2028
Opening Year	2029

Progress Update

In April 2015, the Alternatives Analysis process concluded without the selection of a Locally Preferred Alternative. This decision was made to allow time for cities on the route to consider a transitway in their comprehensive plans and allow for a more informed LPA decision later. No discussion or reassessment of the corridor has occurred following the conclusion of the Alternatives Analysis. Both counties expect to address the decision in the coming year to work towards a decision on a preferred alternative.

Summary Financial Plan – Robert Street

Capital Cost, Funding Sources, and Budget Activities

Table 81: Robert St. BRT Capital Funding Sources

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Other Federal		14.7	14.7	48
State of Minnesota		3.6	3.6	12
Local (Counties/RRAs)		12	12	39
Local (Other)		0.3	0.3	1
TOTAL		30.6	30.6	100

Table 82: Robert St. BRT Capital Funding Uses

Budget Activity	Spent to date (\$M)	Projected (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)
Construction		17.4	17.4
ROW, Land, Existing Improvements		0.1	0.1
Vehicles		3.8	3.8
Professional Services		3.9	3.9
Unallocated Contingency		5.4	5.4
TOTAL		30.6	30.6

Table 83: Robert St. Streetcar Capital Funding Sources

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
FTA New Starts		208.2	208.2	49
State of Minnesota		42.5	42.5	10
Local (Counties/RRAs)		153.0	153.0	36
Local (Other)		21.2	21.2	5
TOTAL		424.9	424.9	100

Table 84: Robert St. Streetcar Capital Funding Uses

Budget Activity	Spent to date (\$M)	Projected (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)
Construction		260.6	260.6
ROW, Land, Existing Improvements		3.5	3.5
Vehicles		32.0	32.0
Professional Services		66.8	66.8
Unallocated Contingency		62.1	62.1
TOTAL		425	425

*Annual Operating and Maintenance Costs***Table 85: Robert St. Arterial Bus Rapid Transit Estimated Operating Costs (in 2020 Dollars)**

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Fare Revenue		1.1	1.1	22
State (General fund, MVST)		4.1	4.1	78
Other (Counties)				
TOTAL		5.2	5.2	100

Table 86: Robert St. Streetcar Estimated Operating Costs

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Fare Revenue		1.2	1.2	11
State (General Fund)		4.2	4.2	40
Other (Counties)		5.2	5.2	49
TOTAL		10.6	10.6	100

Other Project Information

Lead Agency

Dakota County Regional Railroad Authority

Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority

Project Contact

Joseph Morneau

Senior Transit Specialist, Dakota County Physical Development Division


14955 Galaxie Avenue

Apple Valley, MN 55124

952-891-7986

joe.morneau@co.dakota.mn.us

Figure 23: Robert Street Corridor Map



METRO Orange Line Extension

Corridor Description

The METRO Orange Line Extension runs approximately 5 miles from the southern terminus of the METRO Orange Line along the I-35W/I-35 corridor between Burnsville Parkway and the Kenrick Avenue Park-and-Ride in Lakeville.

Project Status and Timeline

The METRO Orange Line Extension Study concluded in 2019 with a recommendation to extend service with an additional station near the Burnsville Center Mall contingent on expected redevelopment of the area over the next several years. Project development work, including environmental review and preliminary design is currently programmed in the Dakota County Regional Railroad Authority (DCRRA) Capital Improvement Program for mid-decade.

Table 87: Orange Line Extension

Milestone	Date(s)
Station Concepts and Extension Study	2018 – 2020
Preliminary Design and Environmental Documentation	2024
Final Design	2025
Construction	2026
Opening Year	2027

Progress Update

The METRO Orange Line Study was recently adopted by the DCRRA. The Study identified operations, stations, capital needs and cost for an extension to the Burnsville Center Mall area. The County and the City of Burnsville will monitor private land redevelopment activity in the area to understand when transitway-level service is justified.

Table 88: Orange Line Extension Capital Funding Sources

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Federal		4.5	4.5	71
Local (Counties/RRAs)	0.4	1.4	1.8	29
TOTAL	0.4	5.9	6.3	100%

Table 89: Orange Line Extension Estimated Operating Costs (YOE 2022, Farebox revenue not yet estimated)

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	TOTAL (\$M)	Share (%)
Fare Revenue				
County	1.7		1.7	100
TOTAL	1.7	0	1.7	100

Other Project Information


Lead Agency

Dakota County Regional Railroad Authority

Project Contact

Joseph Morneau
 Senior Transit Specialist, Dakota County Physical Development Division
 14955 Galaxie Avenue
 Apple Valley, MN 55124
 952-891-7986
joe.morneau@co.dakota.mn.us

Figure 24: Orange Line Extension Map



Ford Corridor

Corridor Description

The Ford Corridor is an approximately 5-mile corridor connecting the Blue Line in south Minneapolis with the Riverview Corridor along W. 7th Street in Saint Paul. The corridor was initially studied as part of the Riverview Corridor Pre-Project Development Study from 2014-2017. Through this study it was determined that the Ford Corridor served a separate market from the Riverview Corridor and was therefore not the best route for Riverview. However, the Ford Corridor did show promise for increased transit service. Public comments during the Riverview study also showed support for improved public transit in the Ford Corridor.

Project Status and Timeline

The future study will determine station location, routing, cost, ridership, benefits and impacts and is anticipated to begin in 2020/2021 and take two years to complete.

Progress Update

The City of Saint Paul, Metro Transit, and Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority are committed to working in consultation with the City of Minneapolis and the Hennepin County Regional Railroad Authority to study transit needs in the Ford Corridor. This study will evaluate how best to serve and connect the Ford Corridor, including the future redeveloped Ford site, to a future potential Riverview Corridor, the existing Blue and A Lines, and the existing transit system with new transit options (such as regular route transit, arterial bus rapid transit, and rail transit) or restructured existing regular route bus service.

Other Project Information

Lead Agency


Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority

Project Contact

Michael Rogers, Transit Project Manager
Ramsey County – Economic Growth and Community Investment Service Team
Public Works Department - Multimodal Planning
15 West Kellogg Boulevard Suite 210
Saint Paul, MN 55102
651-266-2773

Michael.rogers@co.ramsey.mn.us

Figure 25: Ford Corridor Potential Study Area



Appendix E – Intercity Passenger Rail Corridors

Northern Lights Express (NLX) - Minneapolis to Duluth High Speed Passenger Rail

Corridor Description

The Northern Lights Express (NLX) is a proposed higher speed intercity passenger rail service that would operate between Minneapolis and Duluth. Terminal stations would be in Minneapolis at Target Field Station and in Duluth at the historic downtown station known as the Depot. In Minnesota, intermediate stations are planned in Coon Rapids, Cambridge and Hinckley. There is one station proposed in Superior, WI.

The NLX Project includes planning, environmental review, engineering design and construction of the infrastructure required to implement daily intercity passenger train service at speeds up to 90 mph along a 152-mile corridor on track owned by the BNSF Railway. Also included in the project will be procurement of intercity passenger rail equipment, construction of layover and maintenance facilities, development of a system safety plan, and completion of all agreements necessary to operate over BNSF tracks.

The 2015 Minnesota Comprehensive Statewide Freight and Passenger Rail Plan identifies this corridor as a 'Phase I Project in Advanced Planning' for high-speed intercity passenger rail service. The NLX corridor meets the definition of 'emerging HSR' as defined in the FRA HSR Strategic Plan.

Project Status and Timeline

The NLX Service Development Plan and Tier 1 Service Level Environmental Assessment were completed in March 2013. A Finding of No Significant Impact and state Negative Declaration were issued in August 2013. The NLX Project completed the Preliminary Engineering/NEPA phase, which includes preliminary engineering, ridership forecasts, identification of station and facility locations, a financial plan and completion of the Tier 2 Environmental Assessment as of June 30, 2017. A FONSI was issued by the Federal Railroad Administration in March 2018. A Minnesota Negative Declaration was issued in April 2018. The following table summarizes the actual dates of key milestones.

Table 90: Northern Lights Express (NLX) Project Status and Timeline

Milestone	Date(s)	Milestone	Date(s)
Earlier Project Phases		Current PE/NEPA Phase	
Feasibility Studies	2000 - 2007	Preliminary Engineering / Tier 2 NEPA	Aug. 2013 - June 2017
Preferred Route Concurrence (FRA)	July 2011	Ridership Analysis/Forecast/BCA/Financial Plan	Aug. 2013 - Dec. 2015
Final Tier 1 EA	March 2013	Station and Layover Facility Selection and Concept Design	Dec. 2013 - Aug. 2015
Service Development Plan (SDP)	March 2013	Tier 2 Project Level NEPA	Aug. 2015 - June 2017
FRA Tier 1 EA Determination / Minnesota Negative Declaration	Aug. 2013	FRA Tier 2 EA FONSI / Minnesota Negative Declaration	Feb/March - 2018

Note: If enough funding is secured, final design, construction and vehicle procurement would take place upon completion of preliminary engineering and Tier 2 project level environmental review. Operations could begin in 2020

Progress Update

As part of the completed PE/NEPA phase, MnDOT examined several alternative operating plans to optimize ridership, revenue and benefit-cost. Variables included the number of round trips (four, five, six and eight), maximum speed (90 or 110 mph), station locations and facility locations. Each alternative operating plan was associated with a set of infrastructure improvements necessary to ensure schedule reliability and minimize the impact on freight operations. MnDOT determined that an operating plan of four round trips per day at speeds up to 90 mph is the most cost-effective operating plan.

Capital cost estimates, operating costs estimates, ridership forecasts and revenue projections have been prepared for the preferred alternative of four round trips at 90 mph maximum speed. Capital cost estimates include station and facility construction, vehicle procurement and track improvements that are related to upgrading track and supporting signal infrastructure from Class 4 to Class 5 to accommodate higher speeds, extension of sidings to allow freight trains to pull off the main track for passenger trains, special track work such as crossovers to improve operational flexibility and in some locations new track. In addition, all grade crossings would be provided with warning devices including flashers and gates. Operating cost estimates include labor, fuel, maintenance, access fees and cyclic capital costs. Benefit cost and economic impact analyses were prepared for the recommended operating plan.

Concept designs were completed for modifications to the existing Target Field Station and Union Depot in Duluth as well as for new stations in intermediate cities and layover/maintenance facilities. MnDOT completed all preliminary engineering and environmental analysis associated with the NLX Project by June 30, 2017. The Federal Railroad Administration issued a Finding of No Significant Impact and Section 4(f) Determination for the Tier 2 EA on February 2, 2018. A State of Minnesota Negative Declaration was issued on March 2, 2018.

Northern Lights Express is expected to be in operation 2½ years from the time that it begins to receive funding. The first steps, assumed to occur in 2019, would be to complete all necessary agreements with the railroads, order equipment and proceed to final design for track, signal and facility improvements. The following two years (2020-2021) would involve the construction of track improvements, signal and communications, grade crossings, stations and maintenance facilities. The final year (2021) would also include start up and testing.

Since FRA issued the Tier 2 FONSI in February 2018, there have been several initiatives to obtain funding for final design, construction and implementation but no further planning has occurred on the project.

Summary Financial Plan – Northern Lights Express

The PE/NEPA phase of the NLX project was funded by a federal grant administered by the Federal Railroad Administration. A related study, called the Hinckley Loop, was funded by an earlier federal earmark.

The projected cost to implement NLX as reported in the FRA approved Service Development Plan is \$573.2 million. A breakdown by FRA Standard Cost Category is shown in the following table.

Table 91: NLX Capital Cost

FRA Standard Cost Categories	Capital Costs, Millions 2017\$
10 Track Structures & Track	107.7
20 Stations, Terminals, Intermodal	25.9
30 Support Facilities: Yards, Shops, Admin.	67.1
40 Sitework, Right of Way, Land	1.5
50 Communications & Signaling	176.1
60 Electric Traction	
70 Vehicles	111.7
80 Professional Services	61.4
90 Unallocated Contingency	22.0
100 Finance Charges	
Total Capital Cost	573.2

(This cost is calculated in 2017 dollars and does not reflect any inflation adjustments to current dollars.)

Funding for final design, construction, vehicle procurement and other implementation costs has not been identified.

Other Project Information

Partnering Agencies

Minnesota Department of Transportation
Federal Railroad Administration
Minneapolis/Duluth Passenger Rail Alliance
Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Project Contact

Dan Krom
Director, Passenger Rail Program, OFCVO
Minnesota Department of Transportation
395 John Ireland Boulevard, MS 470
St. Paul, MN 55155-1800
651-366-3193
daniel.krom@state.mn.us

Figure 26: Northern Lights Express Corridor Map



Twin Cities-Milwaukee-Chicago Intercity Passenger Rail Service Phase 1 Study

Corridor Description

The Twin Cities-Milwaukee-Chicago (TCMC) intercity passenger rail project seeks to improve passenger rail service between the Twin Cities and Chicago, and station communities in between, through the implementation of a second daily round trip passenger train on the Empire Builder route. The result will be improved mobility and increased reliable travel options, while minimizing capital investment. The proposed service would follow Amtrak's existing long-distance Empire Builder route with termini at Chicago Union Station and Union Depot in Saint Paul. This project is based on recommendations of Amtrak's 2015 feasibility report on the proposed service.

The favorable ridership and revenue projections identified in the feasibility report supported a more detailed study of the proposed service. MnDOT and its partners are completing the detailed study of the service in two phases. The Phase 1 study evaluated alternatives for track and other infrastructure improvements required for a second-round trip, along with anticipated costs. Phase 2 is completing environmental analysis and generating a service development plan.

When Congress passed the Passenger Rail Improvement and Investment Act of 2008 it changed the way that passenger rail service is funded. Services that are not "long distance" trains (500 plus miles and not part of Amtrak's core network) are the states' responsibility to capitalize and to provide operating subsidies. Minnesota, Wisconsin and Illinois will be responsible for a portion of capital costs and operations costs not generated by revenue.

Project Status and Timeline

The TCMC Phase 1 Study started in summer 2016. Primary funding for Phase 1 study was provided by WisDOT and Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority. In addition, Minnesota High Speed Rail Commission and La Crosse Area Planning Committee provided contingency funding for the study.

Table 92: TCMC Intercity Passenger Rail Service Phase 1 and Phase 2 Study Milestones

Project Phase	Date(s)
Amtrak completed feasibility study	2015
Phase 1 Study started	Summer 2016
Phase 1 Study completion date	Fall 2018
Phase 2 Study started	Spring 2019
Phase 2 Anticipated Completion	Fall 2020

Progress Update

The scope of work for the TCMC Phase 1 Study included:

- Pre-NEPA tasks to prepare a Purpose and Need Statement and an Alternatives Analysis that fulfills state and federal environmental requirements
- An operations analysis to evaluate and determine how the TCMC frequency can be operated most efficiently with freight trains on the Saint Paul to Chicago corridor and integrate with the Hiawatha schedule between Milwaukee and Chicago
- Evaluation of railroad infrastructure improvements needs and conceptual engineering of those improvements to ensure the states become eligible for federal funding and allowing the project to advance toward implementation

- Development of capital cost estimates for approved infrastructure improvements based on the conceptual designs
- Stakeholder and public agency involvement initiated in the fall of 2017
- Completion of all necessary environmental review documentation
- Completion of an FRA compliant Service Development Plan

In connection with the Phase 2 study, Amtrak provided MnDOT and WisDOT with an updated ridership and revenue forecast for the two remaining alternative schedules as shown in the following table:

Table 93: Twin Cities-Milwaukee-Chicago Intercity Passenger Rail Service Operating Characteristics

	Alternative 1B	Alternative 4A
Forecast Annual Ticket Revenue	\$4.5 million	\$5.7 Million
Forecast Annual State Payment	\$7.6 Million	\$7.8 Million
Forecast Annual Ridership	124,000	158,000

The Annual State Payment would be divided among the three states through which the service would operate, Minnesota, Wisconsin and Illinois.

All planning and environmental review activities for the TCMC project are expected to be complete by the end of 2020.

Summary Financial Plan – Twin Cities-Milwaukee-Chicago

Below is a breakdown of funding sources used for the TCMC Phase 1 Study.

Table 94: Twin Cities-Milwaukee-Chicago Intercity Passenger Rail Service Phase 1 Study Funding Sources

Source	Committed (\$M)	Total (\$M)
Minnesota – Ramsey County RRA	0.30	0.30
Wisconsin - WisDOT	0.30	0.30
MnHSR Commission (Contingency Funds)	0.05	0.05
La Crosse Area APO	0.05	0.05
TOTAL	0.7	0.7

The funding for the Phase 2 study is shown in the following table.

Table 95: Twin Cities-Milwaukee-Chicago Intercity Passenger Rail Service Phase 2 Study Funding Sources

Source	Committed (\$M)	Total (\$M)
Minnesota – MnDOT	0.037	0.037
Wisconsin - WisDOT	0.322	0.322
TOTAL	0.359	0.359

Funding

In April 2020, the TCMC Project was awarded an FRA Restoration and Enhancement grant for \$12,569,200. This funding can be used for supporting the first three years of operating costs for the TCMC service and has no sunset date.

In June 2020, MnDOT and WisDOT submitted a joint application for an FRA Consolidated Railroad Infrastructure and Safety Improvement (CRISI) grant. The total estimated capital cost for the track and signal and station improvements is \$53 million, \$41 million of which would be spent in Minnesota and \$12 million of which would be spent in Wisconsin. The proposed funding for the project as outlined in the grant application, and shown in the table below, anticipates a 60% contribution from the federal government. Minnesota would pay 25% of the cost of projects in Minnesota; Wisconsin would pay 50% of the cost of projects in Wisconsin.

Table 96: Twin Cities-Milwaukee-Chicago Intercity Passenger Rail Service Capital Cost

	Cost (\$M)	Percent of Total
State of Minnesota	10.0	19%
State of Wisconsin	6.1	12%
Amtrak	5.0	9%
Federal Grant	31.6	60%
TOTAL	52.7	

The Minnesota State contribution would need to be approved by the Minnesota legislature. A proposal to fund the \$10 million Minnesota share is being considered during the 2020 legislative session.

Other Project Information


Partnering Agencies

Minnesota Department of Transportation
Wisconsin Department of Transportation
Federal Railroad Administration
La Crosse Area Planning Organization
Great River Rail Commission

Project Contact

Dan Krom, Director, Passenger Rail Program, OFCVO
Passenger Rail Office
Minnesota Department of Transportation
395 John Ireland Boulevard, MS 470
St. Paul, MN 55155-1800
651-366-3193
daniel.krom@state.mn.us

Figure 27: Map of the Route from the Twin Cities to Chicago with Possible Stations



Twin Cities to Milwaukee Portion - High Speed Rail Corridor to Chicago

Corridor Description

The Twin Cities to Milwaukee corridor is a segment of the approximately 435-mile high-speed passenger rail corridor between Minneapolis-St. Paul and Chicago, which in turn is part of the Chicago Hub Network. The Twin Cities to Chicago corridor is one of several major branches in the hub-and-spoke passenger rail system centered in Chicago as identified in the Midwest Regional Rail Initiative plan.

Project Status and Timeline

As part of broader MWRRRI studies, the Twin Cities to Milwaukee project completed an Alternatives Analysis in 2012 to identify one route – the existing Amtrak route servicing Minneapolis, St. Paul, Hastings, Red Wing, Winona, La Crosse, Tomah, Portage, Watertown and Milwaukee – as the reasonable and feasible passenger rail alternative. A Tier 1 Environmental Impact Study and Service Development Plan started in October 2012. The study was re-scoped in 2016 to refine the Purpose & Need statement for the study and complete a Service Alternatives Report with updated ridership forecasts, rail capacity modeling and cost estimates for infrastructure improvements. Work on this project was suspended in the fall of 2017 due to lack of project funding. If funding becomes available, and the decision is made to move forward, the next activities will include completion of the Tier 1 EIS and SDP studies. The following table summarizes actual and projected timing of key project milestones.

Table 97: High Speed Rail Corridor to Chicago from the Twin Cities to Milwaukee Project Status and Timeline

Milestone	Date(s)
Alternatives Analysis (MWRRRI Phase 7)	2009 – 2011
Reasonable and Feasible Passenger Rail Alternative Concurrence (FRA)	Nov. 2012
Minnesota Scoping and RTC Modeling	June 2012 - Dec. 2015
Union Depot to MTI AA/RTC Modeling	Oct. 2013 - Dec. 2015
Re-Scoping	2016
Updated Ridership Forecasts and RTC Modeling	2016 - 2017
Service Alternatives Analysis & Refine Purpose & Need Completion	TBD

Note: If enough funding can be secured and the decision is made to continue project development, final design, construction, and vehicle procurement will take place upon completion of the Tier 1 and Tier 2 EIS. Operations could commence late 2025.

Progress Update

Since the last report, ridership forecasts were updated and Rail Traffic Controller Modeling between Union Depot, St. Paul and Milwaukee are being updated based on requirements by the Federal Railroad Administration. The results of the updated modeling have been shared with FRA and Canadian Pacific Railroad. Work on the refinement of Purpose & Need statement for the study and the Service Alternatives analysis report have been suspended at this time.

Summary Financial Plan – High-Speed Rail from Twin Cities to Milwaukee

Below is a breakdown of funding sources used for the study. Funding for all the phases of Tier 1 EIS, Preliminary Engineering and the Tier 2 EIS has not been identified, and they have an estimated a full cost of \$50 million. Work will occur if funding is identified, made available and the decision to move forward with the project is made.

Table 98: HSR from Twin Cities to Milwaukee-Funding Sources for EIS and SDP

Source	Committed (\$M)	Proposed (\$M)	Total (\$M)
FRA (Tier 1 EIS Grant)	0.6		0.6
State of Minnesota (Tier 1 EIS Grant match)	0.6		0.6
State of Minnesota (MN Scoping)	0.09		0.09
State of Minnesota (RTC Modeling)	0.22		0.22
State of Minnesota (Union Depot to MTI Alt. Analysis/RTC Modeling)	0.73		0.73
Updated ridership forecasts, RTC modeling, Service Alternatives Analysis*			
TOTAL	2.24		2.24

*Remaining budget from the above tasks was used to initiate this work but not adequate for completion.

Other Project Information


Partnering Agencies

Minnesota Department of Transportation
 Federal Railroad Administration

Project Contact

Dan Krom
 Director, Passenger Rail Office
 Minnesota Department of Transportation
 395 John Ireland Boulevard, MS 470
 St. Paul, MN 55155-1800
 651-366-3193
daniel.krom@state.mn.us

Figure 28: Map of Twin Cities to Milwaukee Portion, High Speed Rail to Chicago



Appendix F – Other Transit

University of Minnesota

The University of Minnesota intercampus bus system provides comprehensive campus transportation service to over 80,000 daily campus visitors, including faculty, staff and students. The system has been designed to concentrate service based on campus class schedules and the necessity of transferring riders through long distances on campus during limited class break times. During the 2016-2017 academic year, the University intercampus system provided just over 4 million campus trips through a contracted service provider, First Transit.

The University's system operates on and among the three main campus areas of the Twin Cities, including the West Bank, East Bank and St. Paul campuses. Five (5) routes operate during the regular academic year on Mondays through Fridays between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 5:30/6:00/6:30 p.m. depending on the route. These are identified as regional routes #120, #121, #122, #123 and #124 and operate as follows:

- Route #120 (East Bank Circulator) - This route operates on the East Bank exclusively from 6:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Monday through Friday. Service frequency is 10 minutes during the peak AM and PM hours and 20 minutes between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m.
- Route #121 (Campus Connector) - The Campus Connector is the backbone, limited stop express route that connects the West Bank, East Bank and St. Paul campus, using Washington Avenue and the University's Transitway. It operates between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 12:15 a.m. Monday through Friday (and Sunday) during the academic year, and between 9:30 a.m. and 2:00 a.m. on Saturday. There are reduced service hours on Monday through Friday during break and summer periods. Service frequency on this route during the academic year is every 5 minutes during the day, 15-minute service between 6:30 and 10:00 pm and 20 minutes between 10:00pm and end of route each evening.
- Route #122 (University Avenue Circulator) - This route operates between the West Bank and East Bank between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 6:30 p.m. Monday through Friday during the academic year, with night service between 6:30 pm and 12:15 am on Mon/Tues/Wed evenings and on Sunday nights. On weekends (Thurs/Fri/Sat) this route operates between 9:00 am and 2:00 am. There are reduced service hours on Monday through Friday during break and summer periods (7:00 am to 6:00 pm or 9:30 pm if during summer session). Service frequency on this route is 10 minutes during the day until 6:30 pm, and 15 minutes between 6:30 pm and end of schedule each day.
- Route #123 (4th Street Circulator) - The 4th Street Circulator operates between the hours of 7:00 am and 6:00 p.m. Monday through Friday year-round on the East Bank campus. There is always 15-minute frequency on this route and it does not operate on weekends.
- Route #124 (St. Paul Circulator) - This route operates only on the St. Paul campus of the University. Hours of service are Monday through Friday between 7:00 am and 6:00 pm. There is no evening or weekend service. The service frequency is always 15 minutes.

Figure 29: University of Minnesota Transportation Services




Minnesota Department of Transportation – Team Transit

The goal is to move more people through congested highways by:

- Investing in highway transit improvements that will support and encourage transit use in congested highways
- Interacting with local agencies involved in transit for a seamless system of information sharing and project coordination
- Preserving more than 334 miles of bus shoulders in the Twin Cities Metro Area
- Informing other state DOTs on the cost-effective transit advantages of bus shoulder use

The Metro District typically allocates approximately \$500,000/year annually to the Team Transit. This funding goes toward things like bus only shoulders, HOV bypass lanes, park and pool lots, and improving the ADA accessibility of transit stops on THs.

Figure 30: Current and Planned Bus-Only Shoulders



Appendix G – Transit System Financial Summary

Because the Capacity Analysis six-month increment tables are too large to incorporate into this document, they are attached in a separate document.

Appendix H – Regional Route Performance Data Summaries

2017 Route Performance Detail

Performance Review Legend	
<i>Subsidy per Passenger and Farebox Recovery</i>	<i>Passengers per In-Service Hour</i>
Meets Standards	Meets Standards
Level 1 Review	Does not Meet Standards
Level 2 Review	
Level 3 Review	

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenue	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Commuter & Express	53	Weekday	\$785,414.19	\$223,803.12	186,462	4,280	\$3.01	43.6	28.5%
Commuter & Express	94	Weekday	\$2,340,781.61	\$618,706.46	529,114	12,516	\$3.25	42.3	26.4%
Commuter & Express	111	Weekday	\$110,798.93	\$23,948.76	17,106	556	\$5.08	30.8	21.6%
Commuter & Express	113	Weekday	\$438,081.12	\$107,677.45	93,787	1,825	\$3.52	51.4	24.6%
Commuter & Express	114	Weekday	\$552,648.70	\$137,681.67	121,901	1,984	\$3.40	61.4	24.9%
Commuter & Express	115	Weekday	\$98,930.91	\$8,899.26	13,756	385	\$6.55	35.7	9.0%
Commuter & Express	118	Weekday	\$146,421.68	\$25,778.49	18,480	600	\$6.53	30.8	17.6%
Commuter & Express	133	Weekday	\$309,960.58	\$103,773.53	58,087	1,506	\$3.55	38.6	33.5%
Commuter & Express	134	Weekday	\$768,796.72	\$243,488.46	140,634	3,536	\$3.74	39.8	31.7%
Commuter & Express	135	Weekday	\$306,811.32	\$124,298.65	65,383	1,351	\$2.79	48.4	40.5%
Commuter & Express	146	Weekday	\$589,237.30	\$186,816.97	101,759	2,629	\$3.95	38.7	31.7%
Commuter & Express	156	Weekday	\$724,137.42	\$288,217.26	124,442	3,765	\$3.50	33.1	39.8%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenue	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Commuter & Express	250	Weekday	\$2,545,970.12	\$1,079,458.40	441,951	10,421	\$3.32	42.4	42.4%
Commuter & Express	252	Weekday	\$156,584.84	\$46,031.08	25,515	507	\$4.33	50.3	29.4%
Commuter & Express	261	Weekday	\$580,448.75	\$239,778.64	93,939	2,286	\$3.63	41.1	41.3%
Commuter & Express	263	Weekday	\$475,427.43	\$193,165.26	76,248	1,745	\$3.70	43.7	40.6%
Commuter & Express	264	Weekday	\$1,054,730.88	\$337,933.99	151,344	4,577	\$4.74	33.1	32.0%
Commuter & Express	265	Weekday	\$410,296.02	\$128,181.75	58,399	1,983	\$4.83	29.4	31.2%
Commuter & Express	270	Weekday	\$1,932,290.16	\$869,123.61	351,181	7,889	\$3.03	44.5	45.0%
Commuter & Express	272	Weekday	\$141,921.48	\$23,550.92	11,586	650	\$10.22	17.8	16.6%
Commuter & Express	275	Weekday	\$676,811.15	\$242,263.45	102,410	2,776	\$4.24	36.9	35.8%
Commuter & Express	288	Weekday	\$1,050,726.69	\$361,451.03	145,287	4,277	\$4.74	34.0	34.4%
Commuter & Express	294	Weekday	\$725,944.48	\$152,902.60	71,587	4,176	\$8.00	17.1	21.1%
Commuter & Express	350	Weekday	\$356,259.87	\$57,593.95	32,416	1,505	\$9.21	21.5	16.2%
Commuter & Express	351	Weekday	\$395,908.08	\$177,791.76	78,414	1,791	\$2.78	43.8	44.9%
Commuter & Express	353	Weekday	\$58,112.55	\$13,111.51	7,829	234	\$5.75	33.5	22.6%
Commuter & Express	355	Weekday	\$1,258,886.25	\$633,045.36	252,123	5,213	\$2.48	48.4	50.3%
Commuter & Express	361	Weekday	\$418,164.83	\$129,943.59	55,872	1,671	\$5.16	33.4	31.1%
Commuter & Express	364	Weekday	\$77,009.70	\$30,448.36	12,481	1,145	\$3.73	10.9	39.5%
Commuter & Express	365	Weekday	\$1,111,265.68	\$424,126.57	167,538	4,078	\$4.10	41.1	38.2%
Commuter & Express	375	Weekday	\$907,745.90	\$452,999.21	176,459	3,386	\$2.58	52.1	49.9%
Commuter & Express	417	Weekday	\$35,806.43	\$8,800.90	3,612	561	\$7.48	6.4	24.6%
Commuter & Express	452	Weekday	\$250,303.94	\$89,567.68	35,844	1,300	\$4.48	27.6	35.8%
Commuter & Express	460	Weekday	\$2,292,756.30	\$1,028,959.33	408,286	9,215	\$3.10	44.3	44.9%
Commuter & Express	464	Weekday	\$968,292.95	\$128,141.93	53,730	4,820	\$15.64	11.1	13.2%
Commuter & Express	465	Weekday	\$2,160,522.93	\$502,877.12	242,640	11,563	\$6.83	21.0	23.3%
Commuter & Express	467	Weekday	\$1,420,986.99	\$732,202.82	283,946	5,405	\$2.43	52.5	51.5%
Commuter & Express	470	Weekday	\$720,012.98	\$300,393.43	117,652	3,449	\$3.57	34.1	41.7%
Commuter & Express	472	Weekday	\$715,568.42	\$190,582.96	78,338	3,748	\$6.70	20.9	26.6%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenue	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Commuter & Express	475	Weekday	\$789,798.55	\$127,130.75	58,036	4,218	\$11.42	13.8	16.1%
Commuter & Express	476	Weekday	\$939,323.59	\$255,042.33	99,628	5,009	\$6.87	19.9	27.2%
Commuter & Express	477	Weekday	\$1,870,336.57	\$865,247.14	351,536	8,950	\$2.86	39.3	46.3%
Commuter & Express	478	Weekday	\$629,730.27	\$101,140.15	38,744	3,256	\$13.64	11.9	16.1%
Commuter & Express	479	Weekday	\$210,803.09	\$31,880.05	12,133	1,092	\$14.75	11.1	15.1%
Commuter & Express	480	Weekday	\$1,009,109.05	\$331,023.90	134,539	5,026	\$5.04	26.8	32.8%
Commuter & Express	484	Weekday	\$530,044.19	\$129,960.66	57,646	2,627	\$6.94	21.9	24.5%
Commuter & Express	490	Weekday	\$1,136,052.68	\$281,197.00	116,884	6,367	\$7.31	18.4	24.8%
Commuter & Express	491	Weekday	\$263,026.21	\$20,864.63	8,230	1,552	\$29.42	5.3	7.9%
Commuter & Express	492	Weekday	\$132,914.08	\$6,508.36	3,641	957	\$34.72	3.8	4.9%
Commuter & Express	493	Weekday	\$1,146,688.70	\$169,867.91	68,082	5,579	\$14.35	12.2	14.8%
Commuter & Express	495	Weekday	\$1,095,362.47	\$82,732.15	64,163	6,509	\$15.78	9.9	7.6%
Commuter & Express	535	Weekday	\$2,630,751.13	\$519,426.01	381,346	14,479	\$5.54	26.3	19.7%
Commuter & Express	552	Weekday	\$285,648.78	\$99,952.98	41,846	1,219	\$4.44	34.3	35.0%
Commuter & Express	553	Weekday	\$453,609.37	\$133,781.08	55,872	2,039	\$5.72	27.4	29.5%
Commuter & Express	554	Weekday	\$468,913.29	\$150,940.74	75,608	2,586	\$4.21	29.2	32.2%
Commuter & Express	558	Weekday	\$302,554.13	\$82,467.53	34,792	1,352	\$6.33	25.7	27.3%
Commuter & Express	578	Weekday	\$633,967.63	\$241,215.75	100,622	2,994	\$3.90	33.6	38.0%
Commuter & Express	579	Weekday	\$178,304.45	\$32,542.06	20,539	561	\$7.10	36.6	18.3%
Commuter & Express	587	Weekday	\$408,844.14	\$141,981.08	55,988	1,945	\$4.77	28.8	34.7%
Commuter & Express	588	Weekday	\$156,734.39	\$15,678.52	10,463	810	\$13.48	12.9	10.0%
Commuter & Express	589	Weekday	\$422,539.16	\$93,966.28	38,527	2,240	\$8.53	17.2	22.2%
Commuter & Express	597	Weekday	\$907,044.26	\$329,132.79	134,948	4,142	\$4.28	32.6	36.3%
Commuter & Express	643	Weekday	\$257,154.56	\$31,531.33	29,388	1,275	\$7.68	23.0	12.3%
Commuter & Express	645	Weekday	\$1,089,875.08	\$188,280.92	146,143	6,483	\$6.17	22.5	17.3%
Commuter & Express	649	Weekday	\$267,833.66	\$65,562.66	41,589	1,418	\$4.86	29.3	24.5%
Commuter & Express	652	Weekday	\$221,499.41	\$69,333.84	36,727	947	\$4.14	38.8	31.3%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenue	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Commuter & Express	663	Weekday	\$479,161.19	\$261,110.07	110,732	2,319	\$1.97	47.8	54.5%
Commuter & Express	664	Weekday	\$397,858.46	\$107,505.93	45,819	1,820	\$6.34	25.2	27.0%
Commuter & Express	667	Weekday	\$769,793.71	\$253,739.50	106,219	3,350	\$4.86	31.7	33.0%
Commuter & Express	668	Weekday	\$264,772.88	\$85,451.87	36,430	1,426	\$4.92	25.5	32.3%
Commuter & Express	670	Weekday	\$329,753.61	\$87,126.35	29,007	1,788	\$8.36	16.2	26.4%
Commuter & Express	671	Weekday	\$327,687.71	\$63,501.77	20,194	1,779	\$13.08	11.4	19.4%
Commuter & Express	672	Weekday	\$656,057.38	\$135,957.57	62,471	3,227	\$8.33	19.4	20.7%
Commuter & Express	673	Weekday	\$665,966.30	\$418,190.77	166,244	2,967	\$1.49	56.0	62.8%
Commuter & Express	674	Weekday	\$268,651.20	\$70,327.04	28,210	1,392	\$7.03	20.3	26.2%
Commuter & Express	675	Weekday	\$1,784,799.19	\$360,633.61	214,993	10,593	\$6.62	20.3	20.2%
Commuter & Express	677	Weekday	\$372,938.48	\$113,114.61	48,109	1,689	\$5.40	28.5	30.3%
Commuter & Express	679	Weekday	\$84,448.26	\$19,553.50	7,623	466	\$8.51	16.4	23.2%
Commuter & Express	684	Weekday	\$715,137.71	\$60,182.00	47,935	3,780	\$13.66	12.7	8.4%
Commuter & Express	687	Weekday	\$21,107.11	\$3,773.00	1,407	84	\$12.32	16.7	17.9%
Commuter & Express	690	Weekday	\$2,421,034.15	\$931,687.00	349,651	11,876	\$4.26	29.4	38.5%
Commuter & Express	691	Weekday	\$65,869.21	\$17,004.00	8,097	270	\$6.03	30.0	25.8%
Commuter & Express	692	Weekday	\$376,152.04	\$113,716.00	41,666	1,637	\$6.30	25.5	30.2%
Commuter & Express	694	Weekday	\$166,781.00	\$25,251.00	10,733	863	\$13.19	12.4	15.1%
Commuter & Express	695	Weekday	\$895,702.25	\$249,807.00	92,373	3,637	\$6.99	25.4	27.9%
Commuter & Express	697	Weekday	\$503,577.83	\$230,205.00	60,790	2,141	\$4.50	28.4	45.7%
Commuter & Express	698	Weekday	\$2,279,949.00	\$303,291.00	178,322	11,113	\$11.08	16.0	13.3%
Commuter & Express	699	Weekday	\$1,213,463.00	\$388,965.00	140,838	5,126	\$5.85	27.5	32.1%
Commuter & Express	740	Weekday	\$96,319.56	\$10,751.63	9,557	872	\$8.95	11.0	11.2%
Commuter & Express	741	Weekday	\$116,163.63	\$10,541.25	9,370	1,080	\$11.27	8.7	9.1%
Commuter & Express	742	Weekday	\$282,742.62	\$43,928.93	30,476	2,132	\$7.84	14.3	15.5%
Commuter & Express	743	Weekday	\$5,404.90	\$216.00	192	44	\$27.03	4.4	4.0%
Commuter & Express	747	Weekday	\$408,626.83	\$137,638.07	63,976	2,760	\$4.24	23.2	33.7%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenue	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Commuter & Express	755	Weekday	\$991,420.24	\$142,749.16	109,963	5,628	\$7.72	19.5	14.4%
Commuter & Express	756	Weekday	\$286,320.51	\$141,327.36	57,404	1,373	\$2.53	41.8	49.4%
Commuter & Express	758	Weekday	\$541,082.27	\$244,572.03	101,516	2,370	\$2.92	42.8	45.2%
Commuter & Express	760	Weekday	\$701,665.07	\$299,889.60	138,883	3,340	\$2.89	41.6	42.7%
Commuter & Express	761	Weekday	\$450,129.84	\$122,260.64	60,640	2,138	\$5.41	28.4	27.2%
Commuter & Express	762	Weekday	\$137,953.43	\$30,448.58	19,959	617	\$5.39	32.3	22.1%
Commuter & Express	763	Weekday	\$421,405.07	\$120,367.65	55,825	2,084	\$5.39	26.8	28.6%
Commuter & Express	764	Weekday	\$295,517.82	\$118,578.06	52,393	1,424	\$3.38	36.8	40.1%
Commuter & Express	765	Weekday	\$316,463.51	\$56,400.78	32,951	1,253	\$7.89	26.3	17.8%
Commuter & Express	766	Weekday	\$1,501,645.41	\$330,959.64	156,064	7,468	\$7.50	20.9	22.0%
Commuter & Express	767	Weekday	\$405,512.92	\$90,378.12	41,302	1,683	\$7.63	24.5	22.3%
Commuter & Express	768	Weekday	\$1,498,367.77	\$897,213.29	378,579	5,609	\$1.59	67.5	59.9%
Commuter & Express	771	Weekday	\$140,090.03	\$6,846.75	6,086	1,138	\$21.89	5.3	4.9%
Commuter & Express	772	Weekday	\$256,980.89	\$117,224.06	57,646	2,125	\$2.42	27.1	45.6%
Commuter & Express	774	Weekday	\$475,409.70	\$142,539.56	66,163	4,004	\$5.03	16.5	30.0%
Commuter & Express	776	Weekday	\$462,040.68	\$186,357.90	86,642	3,629	\$3.18	23.9	40.3%
Commuter & Express	777	Weekday	\$322,747.15	\$111,469.14	51,783	2,564	\$4.08	20.2	34.5%
Commuter & Express	780	Weekday	\$337,542.31	\$65,031.27	25,185	1,772	\$10.82	14.2	19.3%
Commuter & Express	781	Weekday	\$1,906,822.08	\$1,046,459.93	405,268	9,390	\$2.12	43.2	54.9%
Commuter & Express	782	Weekday	\$506,419.23	\$103,419.99	40,052	2,653	\$10.06	15.1	20.4%
Commuter & Express	783	Weekday	\$504,121.95	\$152,259.22	61,630	2,590	\$5.71	23.8	30.2%
Commuter & Express	785	Weekday	\$989,799.14	\$603,921.93	233,884	4,819	\$1.65	48.5	61.0%
Commuter & Express	787	Weekday	\$65,321.68	\$-	4,592	335	\$14.23	13.7	0.0%
Commuter & Express	788	Weekday	\$74,071.69	\$6,878.25	6,114	499	\$10.99	12.3	9.3%
Commuter & Express	789	Weekday	\$86,444.12	\$44,004.88	17,042	429	\$2.49	39.7	50.9%
Commuter & Express	790	Weekday	\$436,909.35	\$172,129.96	80,035	3,743	\$3.31	21.4	39.4%
Commuter & Express	791	Weekday	\$84,467.11	\$5,356.13	4,761	750	\$16.62	6.3	6.3%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenue	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Commuter & Express	793	Weekday	\$120,472.29	\$26,162.52	14,652	1,024	\$6.44	14.3	21.7%
Commuter & Express	795	Weekday	\$61,944.38	\$11,967.59	5,566	558	\$8.98	10.0	19.3%
Commuter & Express	850	Weekday	\$2,415,860.57	\$1,192,664.60	486,684	9,600	\$2.51	50.7	49.4%
Commuter & Express	852	Weekday	\$1,874,155.18	\$312,219.97	219,032	10,968	\$7.13	20.0	16.7%
Commuter & Express	854	Weekday	\$931,860.80	\$279,989.72	125,118	4,018	\$5.21	31.1	30.0%
Commuter & Express	860	Weekday	\$853,409.48	\$302,155.50	132,377	3,707	\$4.16	35.7	35.4%
Commuter & Express	865	Weekday	\$917,684.72	\$339,566.01	135,124	3,718	\$4.28	36.3	37.0%
Commuter & Express	465	Saturday	\$32,179.96	\$403.13	382	99	\$83.19	3.9	1.3%
Commuter & Express	495	Saturday	\$246,007.56	\$14,341.66	12,321	1,362	\$18.80	9.0	5.8%
Commuter & Express	645	Saturday	\$75,971.28	\$8,958.01	9,938	508	\$6.74	19.6	11.8%
Commuter & Express	675	Saturday	\$120,290.35	\$13,068.28	13,687	797	\$7.83	17.2	10.9%
Commuter & Express	852	Saturday	\$168,055.30	\$18,813.90	17,036	1,022	\$8.76	16.7	11.2%
Commuter & Express	465	Sunday	\$35,244.72	\$494.86	318	1,044	\$109.28	0.3	1.4%
Commuter & Express	495	Sunday	\$273,850.34	\$12,851.46	12,625	1,517	\$20.67	8.3	4.7%
Commuter & Express	645	Sunday	\$64,550.66	\$6,058.63	7,431	430	\$7.87	17.3	9.4%
Commuter & Express	675	Sunday	\$94,170.24	\$8,208.38	8,850	604	\$9.71	14.7	8.7%
Core Local	2	Weekday	\$5,477,838.45	\$1,084,327.70	1,539,278	34,398	\$2.85	44.7	19.8%
Core Local	3	Weekday	\$7,842,306.25	\$1,470,299.64	1,730,020	46,843	\$3.68	36.9	18.7%
Core Local	4	Weekday	\$7,671,684.92	\$1,640,567.77	1,471,721	46,572	\$4.10	31.6	21.4%
Core Local	5	Weekday	\$11,793,874.68	\$3,013,817.31	3,749,872	72,694	\$2.34	51.6	25.6%
Core Local	6	Weekday	\$9,425,217.00	\$2,116,195.65	2,133,039	56,176	\$3.43	38.0	22.5%
Core Local	7	Weekday	\$3,028,037.56	\$375,748.62	415,771	19,029	\$6.38	21.8	12.4%
Core Local	9	Weekday	\$3,832,199.05	\$623,124.05	654,617	22,921	\$4.90	28.6	16.3%
Core Local	10	Weekday	\$7,592,742.59	\$1,457,307.10	1,715,753	45,539	\$3.58	37.7	19.2%
Core Local	11	Weekday	\$5,436,367.06	\$1,057,916.32	1,043,035	34,008	\$4.20	30.7	19.5%
Core Local	12	Weekday	\$2,358,758.74	\$491,764.25	435,421	13,918	\$4.29	31.3	20.8%
Core Local	14	Weekday	\$6,321,929.74	\$1,216,521.69	1,308,691	38,630	\$3.90	33.9	19.2%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenue	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Core Local	17	Weekday	\$5,986,202.97	\$1,205,861.03	1,232,707	35,863	\$3.88	34.4	20.1%
Core Local	18	Weekday	\$9,095,974.46	\$1,760,429.18	2,270,711	56,953	\$3.23	39.9	19.4%
Core Local	19	Weekday	\$6,036,298.41	\$1,418,449.74	1,727,636	33,984	\$2.67	50.8	23.5%
Core Local	21	Weekday	\$9,866,522.16	\$2,088,854.92	2,966,576	59,941	\$2.62	49.5	21.2%
Core Local	22	Weekday	\$6,854,404.17	\$1,267,198.43	1,416,477	43,684	\$3.94	32.4	18.5%
Core Local	25	Weekday	\$1,981,272.69	\$259,901.76	215,240	11,370	\$8.00	18.9	13.1%
Core Local	54	Weekday	\$4,496,981.42	\$984,064.23	1,049,825	26,155	\$3.35	40.1	21.9%
Core Local	59	Weekday	\$911,277.76	\$201,896.99	145,525	4,287	\$4.87	33.9	22.2%
Core Local	61	Weekday	\$3,530,932.30	\$652,659.50	648,178	21,996	\$4.44	29.5	18.5%
Core Local	62	Weekday	\$3,852,580.20	\$576,119.95	648,376	22,851	\$5.05	28.4	15.0%
Core Local	63	Weekday	\$5,013,181.10	\$973,307.64	1,054,607	32,132	\$3.83	32.8	19.4%
Core Local	64	Weekday	\$5,441,986.39	\$1,085,636.89	1,219,418	32,198	\$3.57	37.9	19.9%
Core Local	67	Weekday	\$3,033,750.36	\$294,721.96	312,765	17,978	\$8.76	17.4	9.7%
Core Local	68	Weekday	\$4,348,004.92	\$740,006.62	782,680	26,318	\$4.61	29.7	17.0%
Core Local	70	Weekday	\$1,672,032.44	\$237,023.74	233,090	9,680	\$6.16	24.1	14.2%
Core Local	71	Weekday	\$3,073,445.85	\$363,103.28	410,131	18,475	\$6.61	22.2	11.8%
Core Local	74	Weekday	\$5,157,988.89	\$1,008,879.25	1,108,851	32,086	\$3.74	34.6	19.6%
Core Local	75	Weekday	\$1,369,661.51	\$169,500.82	176,871	7,915	\$6.79	22.3	12.4%
Core Local	141	Weekday	\$430,552.53	\$135,678.13	92,626	2,393	\$3.18	38.7	31.5%
Core Local	262	Weekday	\$242,809.00	\$45,556.01	28,425	1,136	\$6.94	25.0	18.8%
Core Local	824	Weekday	\$279,848.74	\$77,663.21	43,641	1,166	\$4.63	37.4	27.8%
Core Local	825	Weekday	\$939,927.76	\$264,230.14	152,025	4,752	\$4.44	32.0	28.1%
Core Local	2	Saturday	\$816,051.95	\$118,953.25	179,993	5,060	\$3.87	35.6	14.6%
Core Local	3	Saturday	\$999,695.32	\$104,940.72	146,041	6,083	\$6.13	24.0	10.5%
Core Local	4	Saturday	\$1,101,630.94	\$142,245.69	162,673	6,832	\$5.90	23.8	12.9%
Core Local	5	Saturday	\$1,840,226.08	\$394,857.42	535,831	11,436	\$2.70	46.9	21.5%
Core Local	6	Saturday	\$1,228,633.58	\$185,941.24	239,484	7,383	\$4.35	32.4	15.1%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenue	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Core Local	7	Saturday	\$580,828.86	\$40,321.18	55,258	3,683	\$9.78	15.0	6.9%
Core Local	9	Saturday	\$605,821.12	\$62,138.96	83,173	3,714	\$6.54	22.4	10.3%
Core Local	10	Saturday	\$1,207,596.92	\$183,825.90	250,179	7,077	\$4.09	35.4	15.2%
Core Local	11	Saturday	\$885,823.15	\$93,431.85	115,809	5,701	\$6.84	20.3	10.5%
Core Local	12	Saturday	\$155,667.60	\$14,917.99	20,103	889	\$7.00	22.6	9.6%
Core Local	14	Saturday	\$867,774.98	\$104,635.23	140,693	5,547	\$5.42	25.4	12.1%
Core Local	17	Saturday	\$837,846.33	\$119,101.61	158,397	5,146	\$4.54	30.8	14.2%
Core Local	18	Saturday	\$1,562,084.70	\$219,383.69	333,723	9,637	\$4.02	34.6	14.0%
Core Local	19	Saturday	\$759,474.78	\$158,405.06	217,176	4,363	\$2.77	49.8	20.9%
Core Local	21	Saturday	\$1,750,638.29	\$293,494.82	473,162	10,715	\$3.08	44.2	16.8%
Core Local	22	Saturday	\$1,027,249.87	\$139,066.02	181,224	6,484	\$4.90	28.0	13.5%
Core Local	25	Saturday	\$137,391.37	\$8,991.72	10,103	851	\$12.71	11.9	6.5%
Core Local	54	Saturday	\$788,108.58	\$144,134.36	165,756	4,547	\$3.89	36.5	18.3%
Core Local	61	Saturday	\$261,991.25	\$25,952.30	32,914	1,546	\$7.17	21.3	9.9%
Core Local	62	Saturday	\$626,314.42	\$62,647.90	81,406	3,748	\$6.92	21.7	10.0%
Core Local	63	Saturday	\$902,961.55	\$115,503.24	146,461	5,675	\$5.38	25.8	12.8%
Core Local	64	Saturday	\$849,931.20	\$125,155.79	164,826	5,170	\$4.40	31.9	14.7%
Core Local	67	Saturday	\$522,081.97	\$25,017.40	33,519	2,948	\$14.83	11.4	4.8%
Core Local	68	Saturday	\$729,093.74	\$88,883.94	111,051	4,627	\$5.76	24.0	12.2%
Core Local	70	Saturday	\$87,570.11	\$7,429.46	9,729	502	\$8.24	19.4	8.5%
Core Local	71	Saturday	\$389,631.98	\$22,811.96	33,061	2,181	\$11.10	15.2	5.9%
Core Local	74	Saturday	\$846,464.14	\$103,798.25	135,157	5,440	\$5.49	24.8	12.3%
Core Local	2	Sunday	\$785,915.18	\$97,237.76	144,763	4,686	\$4.76	30.9	12.4%
Core Local	3	Sunday	\$647,931.84	\$76,962.96	105,072	3,987	\$5.43	26.4	11.9%
Core Local	4	Sunday	\$878,789.32	\$110,176.84	120,185	5,315	\$6.40	22.6	12.5%
Core Local	5	Sunday	\$1,597,160.35	\$332,785.02	435,113	9,930	\$2.91	43.8	20.8%
Core Local	6	Sunday	\$1,198,851.99	\$156,349.91	202,793	7,089	\$5.14	28.6	13.0%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenue	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Core Local	7	Sunday	\$637,222.83	\$35,015.43	45,941	3,982	\$13.11	11.5	5.5%
Core Local	9	Sunday	\$631,126.19	\$56,801.67	73,577	3,777	\$7.81	19.5	9.0%
Core Local	10	Sunday	\$883,364.30	\$142,782.27	184,008	4,894	\$4.02	37.6	16.2%
Core Local	11	Sunday	\$605,604.27	\$65,351.25	80,075	3,858	\$6.75	20.8	10.8%
Core Local	12	Sunday	\$108,890.92	\$9,799.55	12,959	588	\$7.65	22.1	9.0%
Core Local	14	Sunday	\$849,235.80	\$90,270.09	116,446	5,075	\$6.52	22.9	10.6%
Core Local	17	Sunday	\$732,633.09	\$101,002.16	129,800	4,451	\$4.87	29.2	13.8%
Core Local	18	Sunday	\$1,313,111.75	\$199,223.79	283,458	7,977	\$3.93	35.5	15.2%
Core Local	19	Sunday	\$748,163.83	\$135,449.41	182,009	4,279	\$3.37	42.5	18.1%
Core Local	21	Sunday	\$1,384,349.78	\$235,595.37	367,566	8,397	\$3.13	43.8	17.0%
Core Local	22	Sunday	\$823,827.29	\$119,474.48	151,632	5,345	\$4.65	28.4	14.5%
Core Local	54	Sunday	\$654,792.44	\$132,069.60	141,561	3,863	\$3.69	36.6	20.2%
Core Local	62	Sunday	\$425,639.82	\$49,523.90	61,583	2,424	\$6.11	25.4	11.6%
Core Local	63	Sunday	\$948,311.27	\$96,370.29	116,331	5,733	\$7.32	20.3	10.2%
Core Local	64	Sunday	\$654,340.05	\$102,554.57	130,795	3,953	\$4.22	33.1	15.7%
Core Local	67	Sunday	\$405,448.11	\$17,721.58	23,567	2,269	\$16.45	10.4	4.4%
Core Local	68	Sunday	\$490,514.51	\$70,015.51	85,713	3,093	\$4.91	27.7	14.3%
Core Local	70	Sunday	\$76,381.30	\$4,924.71	6,428	428	\$11.12	15.0	6.4%
Core Local	71	Sunday	\$135,777.48	\$11,612.86	14,431	799	\$8.60	18.1	8.6%
Core Local	74	Sunday	\$698,097.06	\$82,790.92	102,599	4,109	\$6.00	25.0	11.9%
Suburban Local	219	Weekday	\$949,618.89	\$185,954.71	129,009	13,396	\$5.92	9.6	19.6%
Suburban Local	223	Weekday	\$211,761.34	\$41,309.95	30,454	2,873	\$5.60	10.6	19.5%
Suburban Local	225	Weekday	\$191,497.47	\$32,999.26	23,642	2,321	\$6.70	10.2	17.2%
Suburban Local	227	Weekday	\$206,223.42	\$31,348.91	25,639	2,397	\$6.82	10.7	15.2%
Suburban Local	415	Weekday	\$59,065.93	\$1,715.90	2,987	272	\$19.20	11.0	2.9%
Suburban Local	420	Weekday	\$338,287.65	\$17,452.04	17,786	3,219	\$18.04	5.5	5.2%
Suburban Local	421	Weekday	\$113,999.45	\$3,578.98	4,421	1,164	\$24.98	3.8	3.1%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenue	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Suburban Local	426	Weekday	\$136,644.68	\$9,551.38	8,122	811	\$15.65	10.0	7.0%
Suburban Local	436	Weekday	\$273,608.56	\$30,697.91	25,435	1,161	\$9.55	21.9	11.2%
Suburban Local	440	Weekday	\$1,002,495.85	\$53,338.46	45,991	7,018	\$20.64	6.6	5.3%
Suburban Local	442	Weekday	\$566,889.07	\$24,398.88	26,571	6,070	\$20.42	4.4	4.3%
Suburban Local	444	Weekday	\$1,877,351.10	\$202,156.53	209,593	14,041	\$7.99	14.9	10.8%
Suburban Local	446	Weekday	\$1,008,496.71	\$87,059.50	81,087	7,253	\$11.36	11.2	8.6%
Suburban Local	489	Weekday	\$223,579.72	\$22,530.60	15,552	1,264	\$12.93	12.3	10.1%
Suburban Local	497	Weekday	\$296,208.59	\$15,617.15	16,295	2,962	\$17.22	5.5	5.3%
Suburban Local	499	Weekday	\$324,669.93	\$15,435.59	16,474	3,098	\$18.77	5.3	4.8%
Suburban Local	515	Weekday	\$3,118,891.53	\$351,046.76	414,658	16,835	\$6.68	24.6	11.3%
Suburban Local	537	Weekday	\$163,500.56	\$27,505.42	20,405	1,517	\$6.66	13.4	16.8%
Suburban Local	538	Weekday	\$559,348.56	\$130,324.27	96,709	7,553	\$4.44	12.8	23.3%
Suburban Local	539	Weekday	\$964,835.23	\$308,746.14	221,685	13,056	\$2.96	17.0	32.0%
Suburban Local	540	Weekday	\$826,742.15	\$255,773.70	172,258	11,200	\$3.31	15.4	30.9%
Suburban Local	542	Weekday	\$327,998.92	\$81,755.59	51,749	4,118	\$4.76	12.6	24.9%
Suburban Local	604	Weekday	\$132,205.26	\$14,899.47	12,073	1,999	\$9.72	6.0	11.3%
Suburban Local	612	Weekday	\$608,775.97	\$75,380.10	90,331	3,587	\$5.90	25.2	12.4%
Suburban Local	614	Weekday	\$174,820.05	\$10,247.37	6,945	2,474	\$23.70	2.8	5.9%
Suburban Local	615	Weekday	\$317,634.25	\$57,099.70	36,984	5,483	\$7.04	6.7	18.0%
Suburban Local	638	Weekday	\$123,502.46	\$802.00	610	718	\$201.15	0.8	0.6%
Suburban Local	705	Weekday	\$449,173.07	\$92,404.72	66,538	5,712	\$5.36	11.6	20.6%
Suburban Local	716	Weekday	\$195,413.42	\$54,579.20	38,122	3,060	\$3.69	12.5	27.9%
Suburban Local	717	Weekday	\$208,645.87	\$79,584.82	64,321	3,468	\$2.01	18.5	38.1%
Suburban Local	721	Weekday	\$1,240,071.65	\$237,287.66	247,193	7,181	\$4.06	34.4	19.1%
Suburban Local	722	Weekday	\$1,205,202.87	\$179,895.79	218,499	6,678	\$4.69	32.7	14.9%
Suburban Local	723	Weekday	\$1,023,608.33	\$150,805.44	183,793	5,521	\$4.75	33.3	14.7%
Suburban Local	724	Weekday	\$2,350,155.88	\$450,525.08	523,056	12,698	\$3.63	41.2	19.2%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenue	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Suburban Local	801	Weekday	\$414,063.94	\$97,869.67	77,565	4,475	\$4.08	17.3	23.6%
Suburban Local	805	Weekday	\$522,726.23	\$114,732.19	73,651	6,061	\$5.54	12.2	21.9%
Suburban Local	831	Weekday	\$243,331.68	\$31,103.72	24,740	2,656	\$8.58	9.3	12.8%
Suburban Local	445 /437 /438	Weekday	\$1,140,473.29	\$87,362.58	82,966	8,762	\$12.69	9.5	7.7%
Suburban Local	SW Flex	Weekday	\$485,809.78	\$44,447.00	21,391	2,518	\$20.63	8.5	9.1%
Suburban Local	219	Saturday	\$89,468.06	\$13,459.73	9,262	1,321	\$8.21	7.0	15.0%
Suburban Local	225	Saturday	\$27,294.07	\$1,979.38	1,872	322	\$13.52	5.8	7.3%
Suburban Local	227	Saturday	\$26,979.63	\$2,464.96	1,709	322	\$14.34	5.3	9.1%
Suburban Local	440	Saturday	\$130,413.71	\$4,566.39	4,752	976	\$26.48	4.9	3.5%
Suburban Local	442	Saturday	\$32,505.26	\$675.64	681	254	\$46.74	2.7	2.1%
Suburban Local	444	Saturday	\$188,085.45	\$22,004.99	22,037	1,269	\$7.54	17.4	11.7%
Suburban Local	445	Saturday	\$109,234.37	\$7,357.57	7,891	814	\$12.91	9.7	6.7%
Suburban Local	515	Saturday	\$488,947.98	\$52,479.66	69,421	2,746	\$6.29	25.3	10.7%
Suburban Local	538	Saturday	\$79,566.50	\$16,723.38	14,139	1,136	\$4.44	12.4	21.0%
Suburban Local	539	Saturday	\$96,477.11	\$29,142.38	20,887	1,379	\$3.22	15.1	30.2%
Suburban Local	540	Saturday	\$45,990.12	\$22,301.71	14,656	600	\$1.62	24.4	48.5%
Suburban Local	612	Saturday	\$196,043.54	\$19,839.57	23,562	1,130	\$7.48	20.9	10.1%
Suburban Local	615	Saturday	\$61,096.72	\$8,341.38	6,114	1,050	\$8.63	5.8	13.7%
Suburban Local	716	Saturday	\$36,144.11	\$8,276.19	6,362	582	\$4.38	10.9	22.9%
Suburban Local	721	Saturday	\$149,756.64	\$15,734.57	21,699	858	\$6.18	25.3	10.5%
Suburban Local	722	Saturday	\$223,347.59	\$26,355.54	33,795	1,208	\$5.83	28.0	11.8%
Suburban Local	723	Saturday	\$81,684.08	\$10,592.00	12,963	467	\$5.48	27.8	13.0%
Suburban Local	724	Saturday	\$245,198.06	\$51,104.06	61,534	1,200	\$3.15	51.3	20.8%
Suburban Local	805	Saturday	\$81,060.15	\$13,557.92	9,769	960	\$6.91	10.2	16.7%
Suburban Local	440	Sunday	\$145,178.36	\$3,901.09	5,554	1,087	\$25.44	5.1	2.7%
Suburban Local	442	Sunday	\$35,601.37	\$567.31	795	1,140	\$44.07	0.7	1.6%
Suburban Local	444	Sunday	\$209,370.15	\$17,982.44	26,275	1,413	\$7.28	18.6	8.6%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenue	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Suburban Local	445	Sunday	\$121,600.58	\$6,490.06	8,683	906	\$13.26	9.6	5.3%
Suburban Local	515	Sunday	\$400,780.91	\$40,881.43	52,348	2,052	\$6.88	25.5	10.2%
Suburban Local	538	Sunday	\$71,087.71	\$11,573.78	10,076	1,016	\$5.91	9.9	16.3%
Suburban Local	539	Sunday	\$80,489.54	\$16,836.66	13,905	1,146	\$4.58	12.1	20.9%
Suburban Local	540	Sunday	\$46,501.84	\$16,099.79	11,699	603	\$2.60	19.4	34.6%
suburban Local	612	Sunday	\$141,695.91	\$14,051.18	15,923	788	\$8.02	20.2	9.9%
Suburban Local	721	Sunday	\$168,801.81	\$15,102.19	19,287	957	\$7.97	20.2	8.9%
Suburban Local	722	Sunday	\$223,370.02	\$20,657.49	25,005	1,262	\$8.11	19.8	9.2%
Suburban Local	723	Sunday	\$82,232.43	\$8,432.35	10,282	474	\$7.18	21.7	10.3%
Suburban Local	724	Sunday	\$244,774.33	\$45,172.34	51,150	1,208	\$3.90	42.3	18.5%
Supporting Local	16	Weekday	\$2,054,914.74	\$136,847.14	227,690	12,202	\$8.42	18.7	6.7%
Supporting Local	20	Weekday	\$173,386.75	\$5,883.82	12,011	490	\$13.95	24.5	3.4%
Supporting Local	23	Weekday	\$2,332,360.71	\$357,952.16	411,235	14,215	\$4.80	28.9	15.3%
Supporting Local	27	Weekday	\$229,152.15	\$25,959.16	23,977	3,296	\$8.47	7.3	11.3%
Supporting Local	30	Weekday	\$1,553,005.62	\$150,204.88	173,739	9,838	\$8.07	17.7	9.7%
Supporting Local	32	Weekday	\$1,002,666.00	\$370,182.73	329,161	9,870	\$1.92	33.3	36.9%
Supporting Local	39	Weekday	\$200,250.88	\$34,320.64	34,223	692	\$4.85	49.4	17.1%
Supporting Local	46	Weekday	\$2,662,504.28	\$284,594.13	315,068	15,307	\$7.55	20.6	10.7%
Supporting Local	65	Weekday	\$2,335,934.95	\$229,405.41	270,457	13,101	\$7.79	20.6	9.8%
Supporting Local	80	Weekday	\$278,536.53	\$116,959.13	91,018	3,552	\$1.78	25.6	42.0%
Supporting Local	83	Weekday	\$649,644.16	\$155,374.37	113,974	10,781	\$4.34	10.6	23.9%
Supporting Local	84	Weekday	\$2,103,998.22	\$168,780.31	210,924	11,518	\$9.17	18.3	8.0%
Supporting Local	87	Weekday	\$1,190,827.81	\$300,676.32	226,690	14,854	\$3.93	15.3	25.2%
Supporting Local	129	Weekday	\$140,169.26	\$1,169.65	14,604	381	\$9.52	38.3	0.8%
Supporting Local	16	Saturday	\$393,201.23	\$18,025.99	34,476	2,247	\$10.88	15.3	4.6%
Supporting Local	23	Saturday	\$433,580.91	\$41,833.93	55,404	2,647	\$7.07	20.9	9.6%
Supporting Local	30	Saturday	\$230,099.76	\$13,716.23	20,366	1,434	\$10.62	14.2	6.0%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenue	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Supporting Local	32	Saturday	\$142,515.68	\$38,697.26	38,331	1,813	\$2.71	21.1	27.2%
Supporting Local	46	Saturday	\$364,218.49	\$19,593.75	26,700	2,267	\$12.91	11.8	5.4%
Supporting Local	65	Saturday	\$440,897.64	\$29,270.52	35,458	2,413	\$11.61	14.7	6.6%
Supporting Local	80	Saturday	\$55,807.15	\$16,994.95	14,818	706	\$2.62	21.0	30.5%
Supporting Local	83	Saturday	\$127,470.43	\$19,740.37	15,900	2,069	\$6.78	7.7	15.5%
Supporting Local	84	Saturday	\$339,577.67	\$21,868.36	30,957	1,841	\$10.26	16.8	6.4%
Supporting Local	87	Saturday	\$217,352.29	\$27,538.78	22,465	2,618	\$8.45	8.6	12.7%
Supporting Local	16	Sunday	\$381,429.17	\$13,976.12	25,168	2,252	\$14.60	11.2	3.7%
Supporting Local	23	Sunday	\$370,713.93	\$34,688.97	44,160	2,258	\$7.61	19.6	9.4%
Supporting Local	30	Sunday	\$266,770.16	\$13,723.87	19,255	1,739	\$13.14	11.1	5.1%
Supporting Local	32	Sunday	\$147,375.09	\$26,557.98	27,274	1,860	\$4.43	14.7	18.0%
Supporting Local	46	Sunday	\$319,977.93	\$13,302.98	18,575	1,865	\$16.51	10.0	4.2%
Supporting Local	65	Sunday	\$406,959.81	\$23,759.03	27,741	2,201	\$13.81	12.6	5.8%
Supporting Local	80	Sunday	\$33,648.86	\$10,888.98	9,550	425	\$2.38	22.5	32.4%
Supporting Local	83	Sunday	\$142,318.58	\$15,921.26	13,789	2,310	\$9.17	6.0	11.2%
Supporting Local	84	Sunday	\$261,938.91	\$15,765.33	21,624	1,502	\$11.38	14.4	6.0%
Supporting Local	87	Sunday	\$179,353.15	\$17,010.36	15,025	2,325	\$10.80	6.5	9.5%
Arterial BRT	A Line	Weekday	\$5,403,123.39	\$1,198,691.43	1,234,836	27,161	\$3.40	45.5	22.2%
Arterial BRT	A Line	Saturday	\$1,043,646.75	\$169,855.51	215,083	5,213	\$4.06	41.3	16.3%
Arterial BRT	A Line	Sunday	\$1,117,305.00	\$135,970.57	181,767	5,337	\$5.40	34.1	12.2%
Highway BRT	METRO Red Line	Weekday	\$2,412,370.43	\$149,573.00	204,753	11,678	\$11.05	17.5	6.2%
Highway BRT	METRO Red Line	Saturday	\$289,410.08	\$25,845.00	35,380	1,401	\$7.45	25.3	8.9%
Highway BRT	METRO Red Line	Sunday	\$322,668.49	\$22,110.00	30,267	1,562	\$9.93	19.4	6.9%
Light Rail	METRO Blue Line	Weekday	\$26,829,804.95	\$8,159,381.00	8,003,597	37,845	\$2.33	211.5	30.4%
Light Rail	METRO Green Line	Weekday	\$25,267,674.16	\$10,399,341.00	10,300,823	45,647	\$1.44	225.7	41.2%
Light Rail	METRO Blue Line	Saturday	\$4,873,113.35	\$1,371,296.00	1,345,115	7,242	\$2.60	185.7	28.1%
Light Rail	METRO Green Line	Saturday	\$4,544,895.49	\$1,616,326.00	1,601,013	8,621	\$1.83	185.7	35.6%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenue	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Light Rail	METRO Blue Line	Sunday	\$4,715,113.71	\$1,345,815.00	1,320,120	7,839	\$2.55	168.4	28.5%
Light Rail	METRO Green Line	Sunday	\$4,716,239.92	\$1,252,190.00	1,240,327	9,434	\$2.79	131.5	26.6%
Commuter Rail	888	Weekday	\$ 13,833,571.00	\$2,270,048.00	715,942	2,639	\$16.15	271.3	16.4%
Commuter Rail	888	Saturday	\$707,792.00	\$116,146.00	36,631	277	\$16.15	132.2	16.4%
Commuter Rail	888	Sunday	\$796,511.00	\$130,705.00	41,223	270	\$16.15	152.7	16.4%
Commuter Vanpool	Metro Vanpool	All Days	\$985,014.00	\$646,139.00	149,904	35,509	\$2.26	4.2	65.6%
Gen Pub Dial-a-Ride	Plymouth Dial-a-Ride	All Days	\$1,232,818.00	\$71,543.96	31,026	10,773	\$37.43	2.9	5.8%
Gen Pub Dial-a-Ride	SouthWest Prime	All Days	\$829,977.00	\$180,992.00	74,531	24,300	\$8.71	3.1	21.8%
Gen Pub Dial-a-Ride	Transit Link	All Days	\$6,436,951.00	\$859,413.00	286,325	117,772	\$19.48	2.4	13.4%
Gen Pub Dial-a-Ride	Maple Grove Dial-a-Ride	All Days	\$757,688.00	\$46,269.01	39,741	11,548	\$17.90	3.4	6.1%
Dial-a-Ride - ADA	Metro Mobility	All Days	\$ 64,200,843.00	\$5,716,719.00	2,256,154	1,153,352	\$25.92	2.0	8.9%

2018 Route Performance Detail

Performance Review Legend	
<i>Subsidy per Passenger and Farebox Recovery</i>	<i>Passengers per In-Service Hour</i>
Meets Standards	Meets Standards
Level 1 Review	Does not Meet Standards
Level 2 Review	
Level 3 Review	

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Net Subsidy	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery
Commuter & Express Bus	416	Weekday	\$250,764.66	\$5,351.99	6,818	1,665.0	\$245,412.67	\$35.99	4.1	2.1%
Commuter & Express Bus	460	Weekday	\$2,245,372.83	\$1,034,817.56	395,097	9,565.0	\$1,210,555	\$3.06	41.3	46.1%
Commuter & Express Bus	464	Weekday	\$919,709.49	\$141,772.63	54,608	4,819.7	\$777,937	\$14.25	11.3	15.4%
Commuter & Express Bus	465	Weekday	\$2,145,379.28	\$495,713.35	231,204	11,820.5	\$1,649,666	\$7.14	19.6	23.1%
Commuter & Express Bus	470	Weekday	\$679,748.69	\$267,353.93	103,128	3,449.1	\$412,395	\$4.00	29.9	39.3%
Commuter & Express Bus	472	Weekday	\$697,527.94	\$222,100.25	70,428	3,748.2	\$475,428	\$6.75	18.8	31.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	475	Weekday	\$759,219.09	\$139,956.41	57,878	4,233.4	\$619,263	\$10.70	13.7	18.4%
Commuter & Express Bus	476	Weekday	\$892,679.24	\$255,373.18	92,676	5,009.1	\$637,306	\$6.88	18.5	28.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	477	Weekday	\$1,787,334.08	\$902,981.20	349,669	8,924.4	\$884,353	\$2.53	39.2	50.5%
Commuter & Express Bus	478	Weekday	\$618,223.22	\$110,208.10	39,323	3,348.2	\$508,015	\$12.92	11.7	17.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	479	Weekday	\$197,955.94	\$30,896.07	11,297	1,091.9	\$167,060	\$14.79	10.3	15.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	480	Weekday	\$945,571.13	\$355,468.10	134,129	4,964.2	\$590,103	\$4.40	27.0	37.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	484	Weekday	\$494,373.06	\$140,230.41	54,999	2,626.6	\$354,143	\$6.44	20.9	28.4%
Commuter & Express Bus	490	Weekday	\$1,071,269.26	\$325,989.71	127,797	6,388.9	\$745,280	\$5.83	20.0	30.4%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Net Subsidy	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery
Commuter & Express Bus	491	Weekday	\$243,300.11	\$14,296.86	7,986	1,551.6	\$229,003	\$28.68	5.1	5.9%
Commuter & Express Bus	492	Weekday	\$129,491.27	\$10,520.05	3,805	956.4	\$118,971	\$31.27	4.0	8.1%
Commuter & Express Bus	493	Weekday	\$1,028,433.06	\$181,005.27	72,994	5,317.9	\$847,428	\$11.61	13.7	17.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	495	Weekday	\$1,051,880.96	\$90,037.31	78,774	6,689.3	\$961,844	\$12.21	11.8	8.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	465	Saturday	\$77,692.43	\$1,248.64	883	254.7	\$76,444	\$86.57	3.5	1.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	495	Saturday	\$238,298.54	\$18,904.89	17,688	1,422.9	\$219,394	\$12.40	12.4	7.9%
Commuter & Express Bus	465	Sunday	\$83,447.78	\$1,028.26	676	273.6	\$82,420	\$121.92	2.5	1.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	495	Sunday	\$255,925.51	\$15,518.41	16,014	1,527.4	\$240,407	\$15.01	10.5	6.1%
Commuter & Express Bus	742	Weekday	\$315,804.86	\$60,828.15	25,861	2,082.4	\$254,977	\$9.86	12.4	19.3%
Commuter & Express Bus	747	Weekday	\$458,481.74	\$142,791.27	60,736	2,762.4	\$315,690	\$5.20	22.0	31.1%
Commuter & Express Bus	772	Weekday	\$287,526.73	\$147,013.90	62,493	2,118.7	\$140,513	\$2.25	29.5	51.1%
Commuter & Express Bus	774	Weekday	\$534,351.02	\$203,747.99	86,513	4,013.6	\$330,603	\$3.82	21.6	38.1%
Commuter & Express Bus	776	Weekday	\$518,749.59	\$194,707.63	82,710	3,636.8	\$324,042	\$3.92	22.7	37.5%
Commuter & Express Bus	777	Weekday	\$362,597.27	\$124,400.13	52,891	2,569.9	\$238,197	\$4.50	20.6	34.3%
Commuter & Express Bus	790	Weekday	\$491,251.44	\$169,595.87	72,086	3,754.5	\$321,656	\$4.46	19.2	34.5%
Commuter & Express Bus	793	Weekday	\$134,093.29	\$32,771.32	13,936	1,013.1	\$101,322	\$7.27	13.8	24.4%
Commuter & Express Bus	795	Weekday	\$69,633.77	\$13,672.70	5,805	561.7	\$55,961	\$9.64	10.3	19.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	780	Weekday	\$298,369.42	\$62,991.84	22,535	1,547.2	\$235,378	\$10.44	14.6	21.1%
Commuter & Express Bus	781	Weekday	\$1,762,121.79	\$1,145,009.08	409,621	8,267.6	\$617,113	\$1.51	49.5	65.0%
Commuter & Express Bus	782	Weekday	\$462,494.50	\$108,546.66	38,832	2,386.6	\$353,948	\$9.11	16.3	23.5%
Commuter & Express Bus	783	Weekday	\$461,288.10	\$181,224.18	64,832	2,298.0	\$280,064	\$4.32	28.2	39.3%
Commuter & Express Bus	785	Weekday	\$871,112.89	\$660,764.39	236,385	3,980.3	\$210,348	\$0.89	59.4	75.9%
Commuter & Express Bus	789	Weekday	\$99,602.98	\$52,638.09	18,831	481.0	\$46,965	\$2.49	39.2	52.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	690	Weekday	\$2,913,803.00	\$1,000,421.00	350,141	11,904.0	\$1,913,382	\$5.46	29.4	34.3%
Commuter & Express Bus	691	Weekday	\$77,858.00	\$18,213.00	8,151	271.8	\$59,645	\$7.32	30.0	23.4%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Net Subsidy	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery
Commuter & Express Bus	692	Weekday	\$350,399.00	\$104,131.00	35,563	1,212.5	\$246,268	\$6.92	29.3	29.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	695	Weekday	\$1,079,551.00	\$235,597.00	82,670	3,639.4	\$843,954	\$10.21	22.7	21.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	697	Weekday	\$490,510.00	\$148,193.00	51,086	1,684.3	\$342,317	\$6.70	30.3	30.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	698	Weekday	\$2,480,765.00	\$455,042.00	186,109	10,242.8	\$2,025,723	\$10.88	18.2	18.3%
Commuter & Express Bus	699	Weekday	\$1,386,785.00	\$412,183.00	142,741	4,873.3	\$974,602	\$6.83	29.3	29.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	118	Weekday	\$4,516.19	\$2,375.52	1,244	40.9	\$2,141	\$1.72	30.5	52.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	350	Weekday	\$316,688.66	\$40,428.32	30,184	1,441.8	\$276,260	\$9.15	20.9	12.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	364	Weekday	\$93,536.28	\$26,357.37	11,962	1,175.7	\$67,179	\$5.62	10.2	28.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	417	Weekday	\$53,156.82	\$6,116.59	2,898	607.0	\$47,040	\$16.23	4.8	11.5%
Commuter & Express Bus	670	Weekday	\$305,742.67	\$94,825.32	35,150	1,796.3	\$210,917	\$6.00	19.6	31.0%
Commuter & Express Bus	671	Weekday	\$303,589.37	\$57,612.78	21,345	1,783.7	\$245,977	\$11.52	12.0	19.0%
Commuter & Express Bus	762	Weekday	\$5,129.16	\$2,239.96	1,382	46.2	\$2,889	\$2.09	29.9	43.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	53	Weekday	\$850,877.04	\$246,213.66	181,852	4,114.5	\$604,663	\$3.33	44.2	28.9%
Commuter & Express Bus	94	Weekday	\$2,621,718.34	\$671,619.39	505,013	12,453.3	\$1,950,099	\$3.86	40.6	25.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	111	Weekday	\$133,959.62	\$29,394.36	16,796	554.6	\$104,565	\$6.23	30.3	21.9%
Commuter & Express Bus	113	Weekday	\$478,295.61	\$127,870.00	89,183	1,778.5	\$350,426	\$3.93	50.1	26.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	114	Weekday	\$640,337.04	\$156,447.88	111,063	1,952.1	\$483,889	\$4.36	56.9	24.4%
Commuter & Express Bus	115	Weekday	\$85,855.72	\$10,092.51	11,474	342.5	\$75,763	\$6.60	33.5	11.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	118	Weekday	\$118,842.67	\$26,235.78	15,858	503.1	\$92,607	\$5.84	31.5	22.1%
Commuter & Express Bus	133	Weekday	\$571,607.36	\$124,131.65	67,690	2,174.5	\$447,476	\$6.61	31.1	21.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	134	Weekday	\$862,524.51	\$265,157.16	133,418	3,411.5	\$597,367	\$4.48	39.1	30.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	135	Weekday	\$473,489.48	\$144,449.75	70,936	1,731.0	\$329,040	\$4.64	41.0	30.5%
Commuter & Express Bus	146	Weekday	\$856,960.68	\$201,778.85	94,726	3,318.6	\$655,182	\$6.92	28.5	23.5%
Commuter & Express Bus	156	Weekday	\$955,165.19	\$305,983.74	115,334	4,265.1	\$649,181	\$5.63	27.0	32.0%
Commuter & Express Bus	250	Weekday	\$2,730,364.32	\$1,178,497.42	428,363	10,315.4	\$1,551,867	\$3.62	41.5	43.2%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Net Subsidy	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery
Commuter & Express Bus	252	Weekday	\$134,578.44	\$42,927.83	20,053	506.2	\$91,651	\$4.57	39.6	31.9%
Commuter & Express Bus	261	Weekday	\$637,625.26	\$264,603.75	92,624	2,277.0	\$373,022	\$4.03	40.7	41.5%
Commuter & Express Bus	263	Weekday	\$494,562.18	\$211,374.16	74,729	1,666.4	\$283,188	\$3.79	44.8	42.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	264	Weekday	\$964,070.62	\$362,344.34	142,055	3,761.6	\$601,726	\$4.24	37.8	37.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	265	Weekday	\$396,609.32	\$129,715.88	50,090	1,839.3	\$266,893	\$5.33	27.2	32.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	270	Weekday	\$2,062,861.32	\$963,317.95	340,372	7,490.5	\$1,099,543	\$3.23	45.4	46.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	272	Weekday	\$165,546.67	\$24,021.91	10,466	648.2	\$141,525	\$13.52	16.1	14.5%
Commuter & Express Bus	275	Weekday	\$704,732.27	\$273,857.11	103,059	2,765.3	\$430,875	\$4.18	37.3	38.9%
Commuter & Express Bus	288	Weekday	\$1,134,765.83	\$396,927.04	139,539	4,260.5	\$737,839	\$5.29	32.8	35.0%
Commuter & Express Bus	294	Weekday	\$794,054.73	\$164,547.83	70,718	4,143.7	\$629,507	\$8.90	17.1	20.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	351	Weekday	\$430,619.37	\$186,519.53	73,320	1,769.7	\$244,100	\$3.33	41.4	43.3%
Commuter & Express Bus	353	Weekday	\$63,219.48	\$15,755.85	8,123	201.7	\$47,464	\$5.84	40.3	24.9%
Commuter & Express Bus	355	Weekday	\$1,379,128.87	\$707,597.71	249,820	5,349.4	\$671,531	\$2.69	46.7	51.3%
Commuter & Express Bus	361	Weekday	\$461,778.76	\$134,184.46	51,105	1,641.7	\$327,594	\$6.41	31.1	29.1%
Commuter & Express Bus	365	Weekday	\$1,222,622.39	\$469,615.13	162,456	4,171.2	\$753,007	\$4.64	38.9	38.4%
Commuter & Express Bus	375	Weekday	\$948,039.19	\$490,558.42	168,916	3,340.9	\$457,481	\$2.71	50.6	51.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	452	Weekday	\$269,926.96	\$86,741.81	31,286	1,295.4	\$183,185	\$5.86	24.2	32.1%
Commuter & Express Bus	467	Weekday	\$1,760,798.63	\$846,560.10	290,882	5,792.2	\$914,239	\$3.14	50.2	48.1%
Commuter & Express Bus	535	Weekday	\$3,715,265.62	\$576,140.50	366,047	18,712.4	\$3,139,125	\$8.58	19.6	15.5%
Commuter & Express Bus	552	Weekday	\$553,702.99	\$120,431.08	44,283	2,205.4	\$433,272	\$9.78	20.1	21.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	553	Weekday	\$632,703.62	\$138,897.50	53,222	2,461.0	\$493,806	\$9.28	21.6	22.0%
Commuter & Express Bus	554	Weekday	\$686,044.07	\$165,914.66	74,727	3,118.0	\$520,129	\$6.96	24.0	24.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	558	Weekday	\$569,701.41	\$96,851.96	38,030	2,360.5	\$472,849	\$12.43	16.1	17.0%
Commuter & Express Bus	578	Weekday	\$843,463.64	\$263,110.17	99,808	3,532.5	\$580,353	\$5.81	28.3	31.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	579	Weekday	\$193,049.55	\$40,751.09	20,954	559.9	\$152,298	\$7.27	37.4	21.1%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Net Subsidy	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery
Commuter & Express Bus	587	Weekday	\$426,988.99	\$166,735.62	58,784	1,769.0	\$260,253	\$4.43	33.2	39.0%
Commuter & Express Bus	588	Weekday	\$182,026.40	\$15,507.40	9,254	809.6	\$166,519	\$18.00	11.4	8.5%
Commuter & Express Bus	589	Weekday	\$466,092.58	\$122,277.88	44,277	2,231.5	\$343,815	\$7.77	19.8	26.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	597	Weekday	\$1,074,452.03	\$357,446.31	131,303	4,409.0	\$717,006	\$5.46	29.8	33.3%
Commuter & Express Bus	643	Weekday	\$287,561.80	\$32,462.12	28,360	1,277.6	\$255,100	\$8.99	22.2	11.3%
Commuter & Express Bus	645	Weekday	\$3,393,509.49	\$515,340.78	373,026	18,005.2	\$2,878,169	\$7.72	20.7	15.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	652	Weekday	\$208,335.65	\$79,892.17	35,500	901.7	\$128,443	\$3.62	39.4	38.3%
Commuter & Express Bus	663	Weekday	\$574,022.11	\$337,801.19	124,212	2,311.8	\$236,221	\$1.90	53.7	58.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	664	Weekday	\$448,875.78	\$126,788.34	49,723	1,774.6	\$322,087	\$6.48	28.0	28.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	667	Weekday	\$771,087.08	\$285,129.02	104,929	3,118.0	\$485,958	\$4.63	33.7	37.0%
Commuter & Express Bus	668	Weekday	\$286,691.33	\$90,146.13	33,534	1,345.9	\$196,545	\$5.86	24.9	31.4%
Commuter & Express Bus	672	Weekday	\$689,695.07	\$142,344.38	59,258	3,124.5	\$547,351	\$9.24	19.0	20.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	673	Weekday	\$773,230.93	\$458,210.08	160,492	2,879.5	\$315,021	\$1.96	55.7	59.3%
Commuter & Express Bus	674	Weekday	\$304,009.89	\$73,978.81	26,871	1,370.7	\$230,031	\$8.56	19.6	24.3%
Commuter & Express Bus	677	Weekday	\$406,711.13	\$112,180.46	42,850	1,673.3	\$294,531	\$6.87	25.6	27.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	679	Weekday	\$109,207.04	\$5,893.29	2,649	465.5	\$103,314	\$39.00	5.7	5.4%
Commuter & Express Bus	755	Weekday	\$1,095,556.36	\$158,592.77	108,536	5,569.7	\$936,964	\$8.63	19.5	14.5%
Commuter & Express Bus	756	Weekday	\$309,917.51	\$145,361.95	50,753	1,369.9	\$164,556	\$3.24	37.0	46.9%
Commuter & Express Bus	758	Weekday	\$597,163.03	\$290,877.89	108,774	2,360.5	\$306,285	\$2.82	46.1	48.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	760	Weekday	\$724,142.42	\$298,175.90	124,623	3,274.5	\$425,967	\$3.42	38.1	41.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	761	Weekday	\$460,022.70	\$141,092.65	63,696	1,977.5	\$318,930	\$5.01	32.2	30.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	762	Weekday	\$150,516.35	\$34,398.85	23,146	568.6	\$116,118	\$5.02	40.7	22.9%
Commuter & Express Bus	763	Weekday	\$424,288.21	\$117,665.64	48,676	1,972.8	\$306,623	\$6.30	24.7	27.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	764	Weekday	\$311,061.63	\$130,385.51	51,912	1,420.0	\$180,676	\$3.48	36.6	41.9%
Commuter & Express Bus	765	Weekday	\$316,907.37	\$62,503.43	33,453	1,193.4	\$254,404	\$7.60	28.0	19.7%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Net Subsidy	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery
Commuter & Express Bus	766	Weekday	\$1,516,177.06	\$321,880.43	135,160	6,571.1	\$1,194,297	\$8.84	20.6	21.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	767	Weekday	\$418,159.20	\$97,402.33	40,488	1,607.9	\$320,757	\$7.92	25.2	23.3%
Commuter & Express Bus	768	Weekday	\$1,520,660.03	\$912,410.42	339,431	5,466.1	\$608,250	\$1.79	62.1	60.0%
Commuter & Express Bus	850	Weekday	\$2,474,652.22	\$1,281,070.53	463,539	9,403.4	\$1,193,582	\$2.57	49.3	51.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	852	Weekday	\$2,059,167.68	\$345,957.09	224,125	10,857.4	\$1,713,211	\$7.64	20.6	16.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	854	Weekday	\$951,096.14	\$305,386.32	126,065	3,812.2	\$645,710	\$5.12	33.1	32.1%
Commuter & Express Bus	860	Weekday	\$946,860.70	\$268,782.22	125,252	3,693.8	\$678,078	\$5.41	33.9	28.4%
Commuter & Express Bus	865	Weekday	\$896,787.59	\$311,742.63	129,000	3,229.4	\$585,045	\$4.54	39.9	34.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	94	Saturday	\$14,177.73	\$459.11	504	71.5	\$13,719	\$27.21	7.0	3.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	535	Saturday	\$295,999.68	\$7,218.86	7,815	1,509.6	\$288,781	\$36.95	5.2	2.4%
Commuter & Express Bus	645	Saturday	\$217,941.02	\$19,732.82	21,325	1,318.8	\$198,208	\$9.29	16.2	9.1%
Commuter & Express Bus	852	Saturday	\$180,520.61	\$18,399.73	15,853	1,019.0	\$162,121	\$10.23	15.6	10.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	94	Sunday	\$7,059.99	\$116.76	186	35.8	\$6,943	\$37.39	5.2	1.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	535	Sunday	\$310,775.60	\$5,810.05	6,277	1,583.4	\$304,966	\$48.59	4.0	1.9%
Commuter & Express Bus	645	Sunday	\$179,585.52	\$13,333.06	15,932	1,071.2	\$166,252	\$10.44	14.9	7.4%
Core Local	2	Weekday	\$6,029,659.97	\$1,180,598.22	1,448,128	34,245.46	\$4,849,061.74	\$3.35	42.3	19.6%
Core Local	3	Weekday	\$8,334,695.09	\$1,600,583.83	1,622,310	45,503.83	\$6,734,111.27	\$4.15	35.7	19.2%
Core Local	4	Weekday	\$8,472,733.39	\$1,743,602.65	1,382,842	45,790.79	\$6,729,130.74	\$4.87	30.2	20.6%
Core Local	5	Weekday	\$12,818,463.89	\$3,117,375.88	3,476,014	71,385.46	\$9,701,088.01	\$2.79	48.7	24.3%
Core Local	6	Weekday	\$10,417,667.88	\$2,334,586.06	2,027,757	55,663.52	\$8,083,081.83	\$3.99	36.4	22.4%
Core Local	7	Weekday	\$3,346,123.42	\$423,037.74	414,415	18,936.20	\$2,923,085.67	\$7.05	21.9	12.6%
Core Local	9	Weekday	\$4,356,100.46	\$673,915.66	631,496	23,429.68	\$3,682,184.80	\$5.83	27.0	15.5%
Core Local	10	Weekday	\$8,311,803.07	\$1,513,812.19	1,637,924	46,708.96	\$6,797,990.89	\$4.15	35.1	18.2%
Core Local	11	Weekday	\$5,862,003.82	\$1,163,903.36	1,034,386	33,264.92	\$4,698,100.46	\$4.54	31.1	19.9%
Core Local	12	Weekday	\$1,992,431.96	\$456,907.81	331,528	10,514.23	\$1,535,524.15	\$4.63	31.5	22.9%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Net Subsidy	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery
Core Local	14	Weekday	\$6,991,607.37	\$1,274,032.85	1,217,588	38,569.95	\$5,717,574.51	\$4.70	31.6	18.2%
Core Local	17	Weekday	\$6,364,218.68	\$1,402,319.88	1,263,729	34,088.84	\$4,961,898.80	\$3.93	37.1	22.0%
Core Local	18	Weekday	\$9,821,024.66	\$1,958,612.70	2,308,186	53,329.89	\$7,862,411.96	\$3.41	43.3	19.9%
Core Local	19	Weekday	\$6,977,505.27	\$1,410,539.89	1,514,187	35,110.04	\$5,566,965.38	\$3.68	43.1	20.2%
Core Local	21	Weekday	\$10,789,554.87	\$2,161,467.99	2,808,846	59,311.15	\$8,628,086.88	\$3.07	47.4	20.0%
Core Local	22	Weekday	\$7,540,097.18	\$1,391,058.52	1,386,877	43,373.86	\$6,149,038.66	\$4.43	32.0	18.4%
Core Local	25	Weekday	\$2,088,527.00	\$316,682.68	229,364	11,314.95	\$1,771,844.32	\$7.73	20.3	15.2%
Core Local	54	Weekday	\$6,279,223.80	\$1,160,368.10	1,155,359	34,157.41	\$5,118,855.70	\$4.43	33.8	18.5%
Core Local	59	Weekday	\$941,796.04	\$221,579.80	138,883	4,235.66	\$720,216.24	\$5.19	32.8	23.5%
Core Local	61	Weekday	\$3,854,303.65	\$714,683.09	620,602	21,756.00	\$3,139,620.56	\$5.06	28.5	18.5%
Core Local	62	Weekday	\$4,239,345.26	\$591,695.70	639,637	22,834.66	\$3,647,649.56	\$5.70	28.0	14.0%
Core Local	63	Weekday	\$5,453,775.91	\$1,033,073.03	1,023,117	31,867.58	\$4,420,702.88	\$4.32	32.1	18.9%
Core Local	64	Weekday	\$6,036,968.86	\$1,069,064.66	1,106,637	32,159.05	\$4,967,904.20	\$4.49	34.4	17.7%
Core Local	67	Weekday	\$2,979,471.60	\$294,455.50	285,248	15,835.40	\$2,685,016.10	\$9.41	18.0	9.9%
Core Local	68	Weekday	\$4,772,499.47	\$727,220.71	745,909	26,305.20	\$4,045,278.76	\$5.42	28.4	15.2%
Core Local	70	Weekday	\$1,801,984.18	\$243,455.92	211,936	9,566.35	\$1,558,528.26	\$7.35	22.2	13.5%
Core Local	71	Weekday	\$3,425,476.08	\$371,317.47	392,870	18,363.24	\$3,054,158.61	\$7.77	21.4	10.8%
Core Local	74	Weekday	\$5,612,809.91	\$1,066,357.19	1,056,654	31,594.83	\$4,546,452.72	\$4.30	33.4	19.0%
Core Local	75	Weekday	\$1,495,917.07	\$178,446.89	170,156	7,885.95	\$1,317,470.18	\$7.74	21.6	11.9%
Core Local	141	Weekday	\$439,205.77	\$141,848.00	84,769	2,302.14	\$297,357.78	\$3.51	36.8	32.3%
Core Local	262	Weekday	\$240,032.71	\$40,790.65	23,082	1,029.14	\$199,242.06	\$8.63	22.4	17.0%
Core Local	824	Weekday	\$281,618.43	\$80,265.95	40,912	1,164.90	\$201,352.47	\$4.92	35.1	28.5%
Core Local	825	Weekday	\$965,458.14	\$273,539.40	138,892	4,634.12	\$691,918.74	\$4.98	30.0	28.3%
Core Local	2	Saturday	\$899,509.00	\$116,567.63	160,819	5,012.32	\$782,941.37	\$4.87	32.1	13.0%
Core Local	3	Saturday	\$981,675.21	\$100,224.48	123,263	5,338.32	\$881,450.73	\$7.15	23.1	10.2%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Net Subsidy	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery
Core Local	4	Saturday	\$1,246,919.80	\$147,067.72	156,183	6,860.06	\$1,099,852.08	\$7.04	22.8	11.8%
Core Local	5	Saturday	\$2,020,622.40	\$382,708.06	478,409	11,219.44	\$1,637,914.35	\$3.42	42.6	18.9%
Core Local	6	Saturday	\$1,360,931.59	\$185,778.57	220,675	7,383.48	\$1,175,153.03	\$5.33	29.9	13.7%
Core Local	7	Saturday	\$639,957.50	\$42,424.30	53,116	3,727.36	\$597,533.20	\$11.25	14.3	6.6%
Core Local	9	Saturday	\$697,816.67	\$68,139.51	81,347	3,913.78	\$629,677.16	\$7.74	20.8	9.8%
Core Local	10	Saturday	\$1,331,449.89	\$179,688.98	233,790	7,345.56	\$1,151,760.90	\$4.93	31.8	13.5%
Core Local	11	Saturday	\$971,114.11	\$99,484.19	118,022	5,571.80	\$871,629.91	\$7.39	21.2	10.2%
Core Local	14	Saturday	\$964,835.20	\$107,261.08	133,117	5,547.66	\$857,574.12	\$6.44	24.0	11.1%
Core Local	17	Saturday	\$876,281.45	\$124,783.16	150,223	4,836.00	\$751,498.29	\$5.00	31.1	14.2%
Core Local	18	Saturday	\$1,652,530.81	\$228,387.65	330,073	9,137.22	\$1,424,143.17	\$4.31	36.1	13.8%
Core Local	19	Saturday	\$915,852.58	\$151,705.21	186,949	4,576.73	\$764,147.37	\$4.09	40.8	16.6%
Core Local	21	Saturday	\$1,924,329.34	\$283,674.00	433,084	10,649.38	\$1,640,655.34	\$3.79	40.7	14.7%
Core Local	22	Saturday	\$1,131,684.13	\$144,312.56	175,112	6,438.12	\$987,371.58	\$5.64	27.2	12.8%
Core Local	25	Saturday	\$149,808.15	\$9,075.62	9,581	878.80	\$140,732.54	\$14.69	10.9	6.1%
Core Local	54	Saturday	\$1,013,024.36	\$161,761.57	176,794	5,526.24	\$851,262.79	\$4.82	32.0	16.0%
Core Local	61	Saturday	\$287,460.04	\$26,988.52	31,527	1,546.48	\$260,471.52	\$8.26	20.4	9.4%
Core Local	62	Saturday	\$691,805.92	\$66,364.27	82,465	3,747.64	\$625,441.65	\$7.58	22.0	9.6%
Core Local	63	Saturday	\$986,308.07	\$117,419.35	137,489	5,649.28	\$868,888.72	\$6.32	24.3	11.9%
Core Local	64	Saturday	\$939,863.96	\$115,731.16	147,087	5,169.84	\$824,132.80	\$5.60	28.5	12.3%
Core Local	67	Saturday	\$488,127.88	\$23,114.73	28,821	2,478.49	\$465,013.15	\$16.13	11.6	4.7%
Core Local	68	Saturday	\$803,213.18	\$89,338.91	104,873	4,627.48	\$713,874.28	\$6.81	22.7	11.1%
Core Local	70	Saturday	\$77,255.57	\$5,745.43	6,716	403.00	\$71,510.15	\$10.65	16.7	7.4%
Core Local	71	Saturday	\$427,606.43	\$23,261.52	32,240	2,127.36	\$404,344.91	\$12.54	15.2	5.4%
Core Local	74	Saturday	\$933,274.28	\$101,795.25	126,955	5,389.00	\$831,479.02	\$6.55	23.6	10.9%
Core Local	2	Sunday	\$862,044.58	\$104,537.65	137,876	4,607.62	\$757,506.93	\$5.49	29.9	12.1%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Net Subsidy	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery
Core Local	3	Sunday	\$705,975.40	\$80,411.92	93,079	3,922.64	\$625,563.48	\$6.72	23.7	11.4%
Core Local	4	Sunday	\$1,003,043.57	\$114,712.74	114,865	5,420.42	\$888,330.83	\$7.73	21.2	11.4%
Core Local	5	Sunday	\$1,739,631.04	\$351,626.81	413,413	9,772.93	\$1,388,004.23	\$3.36	42.3	20.2%
Core Local	6	Sunday	\$1,326,568.12	\$162,164.75	187,796	7,089.57	\$1,164,403.38	\$6.20	26.5	12.2%
Core Local	7	Sunday	\$706,716.60	\$38,869.12	45,623	4,022.88	\$667,847.48	\$14.64	11.3	5.5%
Core Local	9	Sunday	\$727,891.06	\$64,263.65	75,458	4,005.04	\$663,627.41	\$8.79	18.8	8.8%
Core Local	10	Sunday	\$1,005,678.34	\$145,250.31	177,925	5,122.66	\$860,428.04	\$4.84	34.7	14.4%
Core Local	11	Sunday	\$670,253.29	\$71,820.75	81,075	3,735.06	\$598,432.54	\$7.38	21.7	10.7%
Core Local	14	Sunday	\$941,573.27	\$96,539.49	109,727	5,066.26	\$845,033.77	\$7.70	21.7	10.3%
Core Local	17	Sunday	\$735,342.97	\$107,155.56	123,922	4,056.66	\$628,187.40	\$5.07	30.5	14.6%
Core Local	18	Sunday	\$1,410,471.14	\$213,977.11	290,215	7,574.01	\$1,196,494.04	\$4.12	38.3	15.2%
Core Local	19	Sunday	\$894,079.93	\$139,526.07	166,354	4,472.16	\$754,553.86	\$4.54	37.2	15.6%
Core Local	21	Sunday	\$1,536,798.72	\$245,127.97	351,311	8,362.00	\$1,291,670.75	\$3.68	42.0	16.0%
Core Local	22	Sunday	\$905,437.24	\$124,270.32	146,195	5,311.64	\$781,166.92	\$5.34	27.5	13.7%
Core Local	54	Sunday	\$733,791.81	\$137,335.26	138,096	3,950.22	\$596,456.55	\$4.32	35.0	18.7%
Core Local	62	Sunday	\$469,148.15	\$52,060.33	60,854	2,424.40	\$417,087.82	\$6.85	25.1	11.1%
Core Local	63	Sunday	\$1,028,903.14	\$98,809.88	112,963	5,700.24	\$930,093.26	\$8.23	19.8	9.6%
Core Local	64	Sunday	\$723,134.44	\$105,570.95	127,490	3,953.28	\$617,563.49	\$4.84	32.2	14.6%
Core Local	67	Sunday	\$436,675.51	\$18,727.47	22,982	2,211.18	\$417,948.04	\$18.19	10.4	4.3%
Core Local	68	Sunday	\$540,991.16	\$70,043.73	83,590	3,092.56	\$470,947.42	\$5.63	27.0	12.9%
Core Local	70	Sunday	\$85,580.69	\$4,558.73	5,427	428.04	\$81,021.96	\$14.93	12.7	5.3%
Core Local	71	Sunday	\$147,134.88	\$12,056.39	14,009	782.75	\$135,078.48	\$9.64	17.9	8.2%
Core Local	74	Sunday	\$768,042.51	\$82,492.38	96,380	4,052.32	\$685,550.13	\$7.11	23.8	10.7%
Supporting Local	16	Saturday	\$17,374.97	\$1,061.69	1,830	155.10	\$16,313	\$8.91	11.8	6.1%
Supporting Local	30	Saturday	\$123,274.51	\$16,127.97	18,477	1,647.00	\$107,147	\$5.80	11.2	13.1%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Net Subsidy	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery
Supporting Local	80	Saturday	\$63,413.43	\$13,620.55	16,439	732.78	\$49,793	\$3.03	22.4	21.5%
Supporting Local	83	Saturday	\$123,046.67	\$14,980.09	15,359	1,904.58	\$108,067	\$7.04	8.1	12.2%
Supporting Local	84	Saturday	\$15,961.28	\$1,449.98	1,805	143.15	\$14,511	\$8.04	12.6	9.1%
Supporting Local	87	Saturday	\$182,530.55	\$21,102.92	22,016	2,144.88	\$161,428	\$7.33	10.3	11.6%
Supporting Local	16	Sunday	\$19,636.32	\$720.79	1,163	171.18	\$18,916	\$16.26	6.8	3.7%
Supporting Local	30	Sunday	\$132,405.59	\$14,739.71	16,224	1,769.00	\$117,666	\$7.25	9.2	11.1%
Supporting Local	80	Sunday	\$36,816.23	\$9,295.13	10,070	425.14	\$27,521	\$2.73	23.7	25.2%
Supporting Local	83	Sunday	\$132,161.34	\$13,853.05	14,140	2,045.66	\$118,308	\$8.37	6.9	10.5%
Supporting Local	84	Sunday	\$14,182.83	\$907.88	1,110	126.48	\$13,275	\$11.96	8.8	6.4%
Supporting Local	87	Sunday	\$196,672.97	\$16,740.03	16,903	2,324.64	\$179,933	\$10.65	7.3	8.5%
Supporting Local	16	Weekday	\$68,162.51	\$5,546.83	8,246	653.22	\$62,616	\$7.59	12.6	8.1%
Supporting Local	27	Weekday	\$198,839.54	\$16,034.20	20,552	2,788.06	\$182,805	\$8.89	7.4	8.1%
Supporting Local	30	Weekday	\$740,903.76	\$157,690.42	154,565	9,689.90	\$583,213	\$3.77	16.0	21.3%
Supporting Local	80	Weekday	\$302,711.37	\$96,714.17	98,052	3,526.06	\$205,997	\$2.10	27.8	31.9%
Supporting Local	83	Weekday	\$600,486.51	\$114,548.84	106,379	9,500.15	\$485,938	\$4.57	11.2	19.1%
Supporting Local	84	Weekday	\$72,173.73	\$8,747.33	10,032	680.52	\$63,426	\$6.32	14.7	12.1%
Supporting Local	87	Weekday	\$1,091,659.80	\$259,128.70	227,554	12,940.95	\$832,531	\$3.66	17.6	23.7%
Supporting Local	16	Weekday	\$1,976,459.66	\$116,078.49	170,545	10,610.81	\$1,860,381	\$10.91	16.1	5.9%
Supporting Local	20	Weekday	\$185,205.73	\$8,328.77	13,153	469.20	\$176,877	\$13.45	28.0	4.5%
Supporting Local	23	Weekday	\$2,833,949.77	\$374,580.90	371,878	14,844.52	\$2,459,369	\$6.61	25.1	13.2%
Supporting Local	32	Weekday	\$2,105,422.01	\$407,566.91	397,356	10,562.21	\$1,697,855	\$4.27	37.6	19.4%
Supporting Local	39	Weekday	\$220,878.33	\$31,984.02	27,872	682.09	\$188,894	\$6.78	40.9	14.5%
Supporting Local	46	Weekday	\$2,878,662.57	\$302,406.47	282,388	15,180.01	\$2,576,256	\$9.12	18.6	10.5%
Supporting Local	65	Weekday	\$2,431,160.55	\$227,766.13	242,457	11,839.34	\$2,203,394	\$9.09	20.5	9.4%
Supporting Local	84	Weekday	\$2,144,630.11	\$157,895.52	185,031	10,605.02	\$1,986,735	\$10.74	17.4	7.4%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Net Subsidy	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery
Supporting Local	129	Weekday	\$151,220.43	\$1,787.88	12,512	379.50	\$149,433	\$11.94	33.0	1.2%
Supporting Local	16	Saturday	\$372,541.56	\$13,238.34	24,090	1,928.41	\$359,303	\$14.92	12.5	3.6%
Supporting Local	23	Saturday	\$511,450.32	\$42,937.78	51,007	2,756.29	\$468,513	\$9.19	18.5	8.4%
Supporting Local	32	Saturday	\$336,118.12	\$35,016.27	46,003	1,761.24	\$301,102	\$6.55	26.1	10.4%
Supporting Local	46	Saturday	\$397,140.13	\$20,759.88	25,341	2,256.24	\$376,380	\$14.85	11.2	5.2%
Supporting Local	65	Saturday	\$444,770.98	\$28,679.47	32,823	2,077.40	\$416,092	\$12.68	15.8	6.4%
Supporting Local	84	Saturday	\$330,723.44	\$21,444.98	28,075	1,663.80	\$309,278	\$11.02	16.9	6.5%
Supporting Local	16	Sunday	\$366,332.78	\$11,934.17	19,928	1,980.68	\$354,399	\$17.78	10.1	3.3%
Supporting Local	23	Sunday	\$458,206.13	\$34,863.22	39,295	2,326.62	\$423,343	\$10.77	16.9	7.6%
Supporting Local	32	Sunday	\$336,404.15	\$27,889.87	35,150	1,749.02	\$308,514	\$8.78	20.1	8.3%
Supporting Local	46	Sunday	\$352,090.42	\$14,301.03	17,665	1,858.46	\$337,789	\$19.12	9.5	4.1%
Supporting Local	65	Sunday	\$453,566.40	\$23,938.19	26,628	2,200.52	\$429,628	\$16.13	12.1	5.3%
Supporting Local	84	Sunday	\$259,683.51	\$15,025.64	19,469	1,346.80	\$244,658	\$12.57	14.5	5.8%
Suburban Local	420	Weekday	\$362,762.46	\$19,013.72	17,255	3,745.86	\$343,749	\$19.92	4.6	5.2%
Suburban Local	421	Weekday	\$108,447.03	\$4,208.36	4,858	1,164.31	\$104,239	\$21.46	4.2	3.9%
Suburban Local	426	Weekday	\$129,061.94	\$10,994.27	8,052	810.61	\$118,068	\$14.66	9.9	8.5%
Suburban Local	436	Weekday	\$266,334.23	\$32,872.57	27,011	1,199.45	\$233,462	\$8.64	22.5	12.3%
Suburban Local	440	Weekday	\$934,007.04	\$58,864.51	43,965	6,859.40	\$875,143	\$19.91	6.4	6.3%
Suburban Local	442	Weekday	\$516,024.01	\$24,249.42	26,968	5,846.11	\$491,775	\$18.24	4.6	4.7%
Suburban Local	444	Weekday	\$1,771,233.74	\$201,456.17	197,660	14,040.74	\$1,569,778	\$7.94	14.1	11.4%
Suburban Local	445 /437 /438	Weekday	\$1,057,228.51	\$92,356.56	79,444	8,697.46	\$964,872	\$12.15	9.1	8.7%
Suburban Local	446	Weekday	\$952,507.10	\$92,146.93	77,552	7,306.40	\$860,360	\$11.09	10.6	9.7%
Suburban Local	489	Weekday	\$216,834.39	\$31,305.81	16,106	1,264.49	\$185,529	\$11.52	12.7	14.4%
Suburban Local	497	Weekday	\$291,071.68	\$16,715.28	17,299	3,074.40	\$274,356	\$15.86	5.6	5.7%
Suburban Local	499	Weekday	\$303,920.07	\$15,030.13	14,635	3,070.41	\$288,890	\$19.74	4.8	4.9%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Net Subsidy	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery
Suburban Local	420	Saturday	\$6,434.61	\$0.00	124	45.04	\$6,435	\$51.89	2.8	0.0%
Suburban Local	440	Saturday	\$121,826.26	\$4,875.52	5,405	970.13	\$116,951	\$21.64	5.6	4.0%
Suburban Local	442	Saturday	\$71,671.88	\$2,502.00	2,743	594.22	\$69,170	\$25.22	4.6	3.5%
Suburban Local	444	Saturday	\$180,009.46	\$22,609.70	24,242	1,293.08	\$157,400	\$6.49	18.7	12.6%
Suburban Local	445	Saturday	\$104,288.22	\$7,129.50	8,093	829.55	\$97,159	\$12.01	9.8	6.8%
Suburban Local	420	Sunday	\$6,434.61	\$0.00	76	45.04	\$6,435	\$84.67	1.7	0.0%
Suburban Local	440	Sunday	\$131,051.44	\$3,721.12	4,258	1,043.81	\$127,330	\$29.90	4.1	2.8%
Suburban Local	442	Sunday	\$77,473.10	\$1,849.63	2,285	642.53	\$75,623	\$33.10	3.6	2.4%
Suburban Local	444	Sunday	\$193,345.00	\$18,596.37	19,564	1,388.87	\$174,749	\$8.93	14.1	9.6%
Suburban Local	445	Sunday	\$112,011.98	\$5,885.73	6,711	891.00	\$106,126	\$15.81	7.5	5.3%
Suburban Local	740	Weekday	\$108,368.80	\$0.00	8,052	874.93	\$108,369	\$13.46	9.2	0.0%
Suburban Local	741	Weekday	\$130,668.15	\$0.00	8,681	1,083.06	\$130,668	\$15.05	8.0	0.0%
Suburban Local	771	Weekday	\$157,491.97	\$0.00	8,115	1,141.19	\$157,492	\$19.41	7.1	0.0%
Suburban Local	791	Weekday	\$94,882.81	\$0.00	3,944	752.72	\$94,883	\$24.06	5.2	0.0%
Suburban Local	787	Weekday	\$55,620.17	\$0.00	3,093	224.00	\$55,620	\$17.98	13.8	0.0%
Suburban Local	788	Weekday	\$75,462.58	\$0.00	5,971	494.00	\$75,463	\$12.64	12.1	0.0%
Suburban Local	SW Flex	Weekday	\$839,951.00	\$99,146.00	40,219	3,938.74	\$740,805	\$18.42	10.2	11.8%
Suburban Local	219	Saturday	\$103,077.01	\$12,533.86	9,987	1,342.20	\$90,543	\$9.07	7.4	12.2%
Suburban Local	225	Saturday	\$30,438.63	\$2,045.55	2,021	334.80	\$28,393	\$14.05	6.0	6.7%
Suburban Local	227	Saturday	\$30,438.63	\$2,428.67	2,010	334.80	\$28,010	\$13.94	6.0	8.0%
Suburban Local	538	Saturday	\$91,509.09	\$13,599.38	14,417	1,179.90	\$77,910	\$5.40	12.2	14.9%
Suburban Local	539	Saturday	\$111,376.67	\$23,172.19	21,706	1,432.08	\$88,204	\$4.06	15.2	20.8%
Suburban Local	540	Saturday	\$46,948.06	\$17,943.16	13,421	599.40	\$29,005	\$2.16	22.4	38.2%
Suburban Local	615	Saturday	\$67,007.62	\$7,795.78	6,228	1,090.80	\$59,212	\$9.51	5.7	11.6%
Suburban Local	716	Saturday	\$39,572.42	\$7,729.59	7,106	604.80	\$31,843	\$4.48	11.7	19.5%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Net Subsidy	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery
Suburban Local	805	Saturday	\$89,617.72	\$11,304.58	8,323	997.22	\$78,313	\$9.41	8.3	12.6%
Suburban Local	538	Sunday	\$78,730.84	\$11,165.42	11,652	1,016.16	\$67,565	\$5.80	11.5	14.2%
Suburban Local	539	Sunday	\$89,429.67	\$15,899.65	13,850	1,145.50	\$73,530	\$5.31	12.1	17.8%
Suburban Local	540	Sunday	\$48,594.63	\$15,942.68	11,032	609.00	\$32,652	\$2.96	18.1	32.8%
Suburban Local	219	Weekday	\$1,033,220.65	\$161,076.91	129,786	13,284.61	\$872,144	\$6.72	9.8	15.6%
Suburban Local	223	Weekday	\$227,321.21	\$38,680.28	30,802	2,686.69	\$188,641	\$6.12	11.5	17.0%
Suburban Local	225	Weekday	\$203,367.96	\$25,387.43	23,653	2,302.30	\$177,981	\$7.52	10.3	12.5%
Suburban Local	227	Weekday	\$219,514.79	\$28,870.00	23,225	2,378.20	\$190,645	\$8.21	9.8	13.2%
Suburban Local	537	Weekday	\$171,934.44	\$19,824.34	17,578	1,505.35	\$152,110	\$8.65	11.7	11.5%
Suburban Local	538	Weekday	\$610,334.30	\$111,615.13	106,301	7,493.86	\$498,719	\$4.69	14.2	18.3%
Suburban Local	539	Weekday	\$1,056,183.63	\$256,351.15	228,448	12,954.36	\$799,832	\$3.50	17.6	24.3%
Suburban Local	540	Weekday	\$832,295.31	\$204,592.85	166,029	10,946.20	\$627,702	\$3.78	15.2	24.6%
Suburban Local	542	Weekday	\$310,559.99	\$59,166.36	46,687	4,000.30	\$251,394	\$5.38	11.7	19.1%
Suburban Local	604	Weekday	\$141,097.06	\$10,150.40	11,407	1,733.05	\$130,947	\$11.48	6.6	7.2%
Suburban Local	614	Weekday	\$179,917.46	\$11,812.49	8,139	2,454.10	\$168,105	\$20.65	3.3	6.6%
Suburban Local	615	Weekday	\$332,914.32	\$53,074.02	40,624	5,439.50	\$279,840	\$6.89	7.5	15.9%
Suburban Local	705	Weekday	\$468,700.45	\$74,868.91	67,419	5,667.20	\$393,832	\$5.84	11.9	16.0%
Suburban Local	716	Weekday	\$203,313.99	\$43,236.20	34,751	3,036.00	\$160,078	\$4.61	11.4	21.3%
Suburban Local	717	Weekday	\$217,903.06	\$59,300.00	59,814	3,440.80	\$158,603	\$2.65	17.4	27.2%
Suburban Local	801	Weekday	\$432,159.24	\$78,426.60	71,127	4,440.15	\$353,733	\$4.97	16.0	18.1%
Suburban Local	805	Weekday	\$550,607.09	\$94,726.24	67,708	6,013.05	\$455,881	\$6.73	11.3	17.2%
Suburban Local	831	Weekday	\$254,966.95	\$23,037.65	22,388	2,635.50	\$231,929	\$10.36	8.5	9.0%
Suburban Local	415	Weekday	\$62,904.57	\$2,070.96	3,054	270.71	\$60,834	\$19.92	11.3	3.3%
Suburban Local	515	Weekday	\$3,276,392.63	\$334,540.14	375,224	15,885.50	\$2,941,852	\$7.84	23.6	10.2%
Suburban Local	612	Weekday	\$1,262,192.15	\$127,212.70	155,730	6,791.31	\$1,134,979	\$7.29	22.9	10.1%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Net Subsidy	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery
Suburban Local	721	Weekday	\$1,306,906.32	\$246,663.04	235,078	7,104.14	\$1,060,243	\$4.51	33.1	18.9%
Suburban Local	722	Weekday	\$1,284,733.50	\$170,984.02	203,074	6,675.06	\$1,113,749	\$5.48	30.4	13.3%
Suburban Local	723	Weekday	\$1,077,782.63	\$141,727.71	163,730	5,508.06	\$936,055	\$5.72	29.7	13.1%
Suburban Local	724	Weekday	\$2,609,322.80	\$459,916.28	511,738	12,672.34	\$2,149,407	\$4.20	40.4	17.6%
Suburban Local	515	Saturday	\$530,696.83	\$48,523.58	59,413	2,563.35	\$482,173	\$8.12	23.2	9.1%
Suburban Local	612	Saturday	\$385,687.93	\$29,806.98	37,757	2,026.96	\$355,881	\$9.43	18.6	7.7%
Suburban Local	721	Saturday	\$165,092.88	\$16,517.58	22,302	858.00	\$148,575	\$6.66	26.0	10.0%
Suburban Local	722	Saturday	\$249,774.23	\$26,830.07	32,523	1,207.96	\$222,944	\$6.85	26.9	10.7%
Suburban Local	723	Saturday	\$92,067.25	\$13,071.66	15,872	466.96	\$78,996	\$4.98	34.0	14.2%
Suburban Local	724	Saturday	\$281,713.31	\$50,763.30	59,208	1,252.56	\$230,950	\$3.90	47.3	18.0%
Suburban Local	515	Sunday	\$436,931.28	\$39,433.97	45,601	1,924.31	\$397,497	\$8.72	23.7	9.0%
Suburban Local	612	Sunday	\$278,100.81	\$22,601.32	26,550	1,388.52	\$255,499	\$9.62	19.1	8.1%
Suburban Local	721	Sunday	\$189,248.65	\$16,873.91	21,003	957.00	\$172,375	\$8.21	21.9	8.9%
Suburban Local	722	Sunday	\$243,184.54	\$21,984.59	25,544	1,261.50	\$221,200	\$8.66	20.2	9.0%
Suburban Local	723	Sunday	\$92,178.63	\$9,907.60	11,476	473.86	\$82,271	\$7.17	24.2	10.7%
Suburban Local	724	Sunday	\$283,997.43	\$46,363.62	49,610	1,235.44	\$237,634	\$4.79	40.2	16.3%
BRT - Arterial	921	Weekday	\$5,888,698.11	\$1,406,324.18	1,232,476	27,165.8	\$4,482,373.94	\$3.64	45.4	23.9%
BRT - Arterial	921	Saturday	\$1,141,729.56	\$192,557.92	207,630	5,220.0	\$949,171.64	\$4.57	39.8	16.9%
BRT - Arterial	921	Sunday	\$1,188,012.77	\$156,754.96	178,097	5,336.6	\$1,031,257.81	\$5.79	33.4	13.2%
Highway BRT	903	Saturday	\$299,896.00	\$29,050.00	34,013	1,394.82	\$270,846	\$7.96	24.4	9.7%
Highway BRT	903	Sunday	\$322,111.00	\$25,595.00	29,968	1,498.14	\$296,516	\$9.89	20.0	7.9%
Highway BRT	903	Weekday	\$1,913,846.00	\$162,399.00	190,144	9,167.04	\$1,751,447	\$9.21	20.7	8.5%
Light Rail	Blue Line	Weekday	\$27,155,242.92	\$8,826,846.31	8,328,955	37,987.4	\$18,328,396.62	\$2.20	219.3	32.5%
Light Rail	Green Line	Weekday	\$26,528,309.08	\$11,622,083.51	10,770,751	46,062.3	\$14,906,225.57	\$1.38	233.8	43.8%
Light Rail	Blue Line	Saturday	\$5,033,693.15	\$1,545,492.38	1,458,317	7,453.3	\$3,488,200.77	\$2.39	195.7	30.7%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Net Subsidy	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per In-Service Hour	Farebox Recovery
Light Rail	Green Line	Saturday	\$4,684,535.55	\$1,817,329.30	1,684,208	8,938.1	\$2,867,206.25	\$1.70	188.4	38.8%
Light Rail	Blue Line	Sunday	\$4,926,987.12	\$1,454,166.62	1,372,142	7,764.9	\$3,472,820.51	\$2.53	176.7	29.5%
Light Rail	Green Line	Sunday	\$4,794,911.73	\$1,447,258.97	1,341,245	9,414.7	\$3,347,652.76	\$2.50	142.5	30.2%
Commuter Rail	888	Weekday	\$14,663,149.58	\$2,380,000.73	712027.6	2636.4	\$12,283,148.85	\$17.25	270.1	16.2%
Commuter Rail	888	Saturday	\$844,680.00	\$137,101.45	41016.8	287.75	\$707,578.55	\$17.25	142.5	16.2%
Commuter Rail	888	Sunday	\$706,003.28	\$114,592.59	34282.8	266.93	\$591,410.69	\$17.25	128.4	16.2%
General Demand Response	Plymouth Dial a Ride	Weekday	1,147,968	65,180	27,514	9,422	1,082,788	\$39.35	2.9	5.7%
General Demand Response	SW Prime	Weekday	991,034	220,638	96,297	27,155	770,396	\$8.00	3.5	22.3%
General Demand Response	SW Prime	Saturday	90,103	20,140	6,214	2,354	69,963	\$11.26	2.6	22.4%
General Demand Response	MG DAR / MY RIDE	All Days	\$788,759.55	\$52,769.59	36568	10913.00	\$735,989.96	\$20.13	3.4	6.7%
General Demand Response	Transit Link	All Days	\$7,007,241	\$957,534.00	243,857	109,827	\$6,049,707.00	\$24.81	2.2	13.7%

2019 Route Performance Detail

Performance Review Legend	
<i>Subsidy per Passenger and Farebox Recovery</i>	<i>Passengers per In-Service Hour</i>
Meets Standards	Meets Standards
Level 1 Review	Does not Meet Standards
Level 2 Review	
Level 3 Review	

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Total Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Commuter & Express Bus	53	Weekday	\$944,244.21	\$259,039.59	190,650	4,196	\$3.59	45.4	27.4%
Commuter & Express Bus	94	Weekday	\$2,751,562.76	\$693,337.50	488,167	12,309	\$4.22	39.7	25.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	111	Weekday	\$147,363.01	\$29,004.83	15,826	559	\$7.48	28.3	19.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	113	Weekday	\$510,388.40	\$136,192.30	88,767	1,795	\$4.22	49.5	26.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	114	Weekday	\$695,112.08	\$153,545.96	101,415	1,924	\$5.34	52.7	22.1%
Commuter & Express Bus	115	Weekday	\$80,115.27	\$9,545.67	9,417	335	\$7.49	28.1	11.9%
Commuter & Express Bus	118	Weekday	\$59,249.72	\$27,063.64	16,920	574	\$1.90	29.5	45.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	133	Weekday	\$599,756.08	\$119,783.84	56,600	2,141	\$8.48	26.4	20.0%
Commuter & Express Bus	134	Weekday	\$881,340.22	\$264,242.83	128,059	3,312	\$4.82	38.7	30.0%
Commuter & Express Bus	135	Weekday	\$574,582.98	\$147,703.58	69,020	1,961	\$6.18	35.2	25.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	146	Weekday	\$883,412.54	\$197,060.60	94,233	2,999	\$7.28	31.4	22.3%
Commuter & Express Bus	156	Weekday	\$971,107.61	\$322,127.45	118,842	3,899	\$5.46	30.5	33.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	250	Weekday	\$2,917,544.16	\$1,086,071.62	383,571	10,655	\$4.77	36.0	37.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	252	Weekday	\$168,264.63	\$46,737.06	20,570	576	\$5.91	35.7	27.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	261	Weekday	\$675,946.49	\$282,980.11	93,634	2,277	\$4.20	41.1	41.9%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Total Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Commuter & Express Bus	263	Weekday	\$604,377.12	\$262,837.34	85,862	1,966	\$3.98	43.7	43.5%
Commuter & Express Bus	264	Weekday	\$1,006,286.82	\$366,849.81	134,743	3,753	\$4.75	35.9	36.5%
Commuter & Express Bus	265	Weekday	\$408,333.14	\$111,825.79	43,816	1,768	\$6.77	24.8	27.4%
Commuter & Express Bus	270	Weekday	\$1,803,550.04	\$908,234.69	314,883	6,163	\$2.84	51.1	50.4%
Commuter & Express Bus	272	Weekday	\$173,744.10	\$22,902.17	9,921	642	\$15.21	15.5	13.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	275	Weekday	\$746,474.53	\$271,460.65	100,302	2,636	\$4.74	38.1	36.4%
Commuter & Express Bus	288	Weekday	\$1,256,485.34	\$401,693.40	138,258	4,377	\$6.18	31.6	32.0%
Commuter & Express Bus	294	Weekday	\$731,362.11	\$159,160.19	66,778	3,318	\$8.57	20.1	21.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	350	Weekday	\$317,306.24	\$47,318.80	28,726	1,519	\$9.40	18.9	14.9%
Commuter & Express Bus	351	Weekday	\$469,651.55	\$191,355.20	73,690	1,767	\$3.78	41.7	40.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	353	Weekday	\$53,794.65	\$12,694.80	6,535	205	\$6.29	31.9	23.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	355	Weekday	\$1,489,134.82	\$720,465.26	246,438	5,308	\$3.12	46.4	48.4%
Commuter & Express Bus	361	Weekday	\$496,374.83	\$133,189.25	50,210	1,654	\$7.23	30.4	26.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	364	Weekday	\$96,686.40	\$25,707.33	11,120	1,165	\$6.38	9.5	26.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	365	Weekday	\$1,266,349.86	\$503,524.57	169,036	4,094	\$4.51	41.3	39.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	375	Weekday	\$1,023,116.09	\$513,798.78	170,529	3,360	\$2.99	50.8	50.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	417	Weekday	\$57,729.00	\$9,068.97	5,165	627	\$9.42	8.2	15.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	452	Weekday	\$328,849.16	\$93,898.55	31,762	1,316	\$7.40	24.1	28.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	460	Weekday	\$2,265,285.40	\$1,056,120.49	398,618	9,307	\$3.03	42.8	46.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	464	Weekday	\$917,088.11	\$137,768.21	51,153	4,820	\$15.24	10.6	15.0%
Commuter & Express Bus	465	Weekday	\$2,073,100.68	\$485,740.50	215,641	11,480	\$7.36	18.8	23.4%
Commuter & Express Bus	465	Saturday	\$8,658.21	\$104.05	82	28	\$104.32	2.9	1.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	465	Sunday	\$10,101.25	\$84.29	69	33	\$145.17	2.1	0.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	467	Weekday	\$1,891,532.73	\$891,263.75	297,589	5,488	\$3.36	54.2	47.1%
Commuter & Express Bus	470	Weekday	\$686,921.51	\$289,404.32	109,604	3,449	\$3.63	31.8	42.1%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Total Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Commuter & Express Bus	472	Weekday	\$706,486.25	\$189,241.51	67,609	3,748	\$7.65	18.0	26.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	475	Weekday	\$757,406.63	\$131,584.00	58,451	4,233	\$10.71	13.8	17.4%
Commuter & Express Bus	476	Weekday	\$898,061.55	\$236,629.89	88,250	5,009	\$7.49	17.6	26.3%
Commuter & Express Bus	477	Weekday	\$1,777,519.57	\$894,190.15	346,040	8,910	\$2.55	38.8	50.3%
Commuter & Express Bus	478	Weekday	\$660,218.60	\$140,974.02	48,301	3,513	\$10.75	13.7	21.4%
Commuter & Express Bus	479	Weekday	\$198,345.01	\$32,436.59	11,468	1,092	\$14.47	10.5	16.4%
Commuter & Express Bus	480	Weekday	\$938,557.98	\$353,419.17	129,186	4,925	\$4.53	26.2	37.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	484	Weekday	\$492,639.41	\$149,215.06	55,825	2,627	\$6.15	21.3	30.3%
Commuter & Express Bus	490	Weekday	\$1,081,736.05	\$292,851.74	126,881	6,570	\$6.22	19.3	27.1%
Commuter & Express Bus	491	Weekday	\$246,634.21	\$9,343.82	5,349	1,552	\$44.36	3.4	3.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	492	Weekday	\$127,641.91	\$27,087.74	2,072	949	\$48.53	2.2	21.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	493	Weekday	\$613,605.35	\$148,971.12	55,379	3,133	\$8.39	17.7	24.3%
Commuter & Express Bus	495	Weekday	\$1,049,221.15	\$92,944.21	80,911	7,087	\$11.82	11.4	8.9%
Commuter & Express Bus	495	Saturday	\$239,875.84	\$18,470.59	17,334	1,507	\$12.77	11.5	7.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	495	Sunday	\$257,632.63	\$15,900.12	15,820	1,617	\$15.28	9.8	6.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	498	Weekday	\$140,627.31	\$772.02	240	698	\$582.73	0.3	0.5%
Commuter & Express Bus	535	Weekday	\$4,382,697.64	\$604,895.40	374,730	19,571	\$10.08	19.1	13.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	535	Saturday	\$223,482.61	\$4,854.72	5,283	967	\$41.38	5.5	2.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	535	Sunday	\$229,827.88	\$3,452.28	3,777	994	\$59.94	3.8	1.5%
Commuter & Express Bus	552	Weekday	\$635,718.49	\$146,356.37	51,422	2,417	\$9.52	21.3	23.0%
Commuter & Express Bus	553	Weekday	\$634,146.19	\$124,883.92	47,555	2,261	\$10.71	21.0	19.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	554	Weekday	\$789,546.24	\$171,116.10	78,714	3,215	\$7.86	24.5	21.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	558	Weekday	\$652,496.14	\$121,478.35	44,651	2,508	\$11.89	17.8	18.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	578	Weekday	\$925,701.04	\$285,528.00	104,748	3,515	\$6.11	29.8	30.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	579	Weekday	\$219,914.69	\$41,093.79	19,283	570	\$9.27	33.8	18.7%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Total Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Commuter & Express Bus	587	Weekday	\$487,048.67	\$158,717.43	59,244	1,817	\$5.54	32.6	32.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	588	Weekday	\$163,384.00	\$16,603.01	8,110	670	\$18.10	12.1	10.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	589	Weekday	\$518,867.93	\$131,937.30	45,853	2,231	\$8.44	20.5	25.4%
Commuter & Express Bus	597	Weekday	\$1,109,935.04	\$350,920.97	126,166	4,388	\$6.02	28.7	31.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	602	Weekday	\$52,856.00	\$7,495.00	2,568	172	\$17.66	14.9	14.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	643	Weekday	\$313,565.65	\$34,155.93	26,069	1,279	\$10.72	20.4	10.9%
Commuter & Express Bus	645	Weekday	\$3,569,057.97	\$508,385.13	357,156	17,950	\$8.57	19.9	14.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	645	Saturday	\$234,040.36	\$17,760.54	19,398	1,318	\$11.15	14.7	7.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	645	Sunday	\$193,915.62	\$11,148.86	12,977	1,068	\$14.08	12.1	5.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	652	Weekday	\$219,237.69	\$76,741.47	32,178	898	\$4.43	35.8	35.0%
Commuter & Express Bus	663	Weekday	\$590,472.70	\$326,115.75	115,767	2,281	\$2.28	50.8	55.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	664	Weekday	\$505,779.16	\$127,893.69	49,097	1,775	\$7.70	27.7	25.3%
Commuter & Express Bus	667	Weekday	\$833,778.74	\$288,689.28	102,474	3,114	\$5.32	32.9	34.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	668	Weekday	\$266,498.28	\$88,517.03	32,433	1,189	\$5.49	27.3	33.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	670	Weekday	\$306,461.77	\$97,946.66	34,875	1,799	\$5.98	19.4	32.0%
Commuter & Express Bus	671	Weekday	\$298,229.42	\$54,886.02	19,106	1,750	\$12.74	10.9	18.4%
Commuter & Express Bus	672	Weekday	\$726,898.89	\$129,688.54	52,546	3,156	\$11.37	16.7	17.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	673	Weekday	\$784,406.01	\$431,652.76	146,099	2,882	\$2.41	50.7	55.0%
Commuter & Express Bus	674	Weekday	\$312,844.39	\$67,659.36	22,511	1,304	\$10.89	17.3	21.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	677	Weekday	\$420,668.21	\$114,003.72	40,349	1,688	\$7.60	23.9	27.1%
Commuter & Express Bus	679	Weekday	\$108,314.98	\$8,791.77	3,385	466	\$29.40	7.3	8.1%
Commuter & Express Bus	690	Weekday	\$3,029,710.00	\$962,587.00	344,222	11,000	\$6.01	31.3	31.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	691	Weekday	\$31,871.00	\$7,378.00	3,296	104	\$7.43	31.7	23.1%
Commuter & Express Bus	692	Weekday	\$114,774.00	\$31,148.00	10,717	372	\$7.80	28.8	27.1%
Commuter & Express Bus	695	Weekday	\$1,170,803.00	\$231,762.00	81,343	3,863	\$11.54	21.1	19.8%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Total Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Commuter & Express Bus	697	Weekday	\$879,274.00	\$240,923.00	83,186	2,683	\$7.67	31.0	27.4%
Commuter & Express Bus	698	Weekday	\$2,313,708.00	\$500,556.00	175,352	8,615	\$10.34	20.4	21.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	699	Weekday	\$1,257,614.00	\$354,942.00	123,000	4,091	\$7.34	30.1	28.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	742	Weekday	\$307,602.00	\$51,530.00	21,608	2,089	\$11.85	10.3	16.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	747	Weekday	\$444,591.00	\$136,106.00	57,093	2,748	\$5.40	20.8	30.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	755	Weekday	\$1,072,670.24	\$147,765.51	98,329	5,151	\$9.41	19.1	13.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	756	Weekday	\$330,726.78	\$141,061.48	46,704	1,370	\$4.06	34.1	42.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	758	Weekday	\$622,176.91	\$302,491.03	107,550	2,360	\$2.97	45.6	48.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	760	Weekday	\$766,418.90	\$278,143.49	112,504	3,249	\$4.34	34.6	36.3%
Commuter & Express Bus	761	Weekday	\$404,862.57	\$115,287.55	50,970	1,666	\$5.68	30.6	28.5%
Commuter & Express Bus	762	Weekday	\$65,341.81	\$1,563.00	23,457	617	\$2.72	38.0	2.4%
Commuter & Express Bus	763	Weekday	\$426,653.59	\$120,438.72	47,348	1,684	\$6.47	28.1	28.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	764	Weekday	\$343,952.72	\$127,659.05	50,139	1,424	\$4.31	35.2	37.1%
Commuter & Express Bus	765	Weekday	\$369,009.30	\$66,000.60	34,154	1,194	\$8.87	28.6	17.9%
Commuter & Express Bus	766	Weekday	\$1,388,761.01	\$315,079.35	126,985	5,388	\$8.46	23.6	22.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	767	Weekday	\$472,794.69	\$108,000.81	44,805	1,668	\$8.14	26.9	22.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	768	Weekday	\$1,574,677.93	\$979,204.45	349,523	5,117	\$1.70	68.3	62.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	772	Weekday	\$278,323.00	\$150,551.00	63,158	2,098	\$2.02	30.1	54.1%
Commuter & Express Bus	774	Weekday	\$519,433.00	\$209,543.00	87,867	4,006	\$3.53	21.9	40.3%
Commuter & Express Bus	776	Weekday	\$503,368.00	\$191,911.00	80,491	3,618	\$3.87	22.2	38.1%
Commuter & Express Bus	777	Weekday	\$352,178.00	\$132,555.00	55,595	2,563	\$3.95	21.7	37.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	780	Weekday	\$104,816.71	\$53,000.02	18,640	1,387	\$2.78	13.4	50.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	781	Weekday	\$2,229,278.22	\$1,127,222.76	396,442	8,210	\$2.78	48.3	50.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	782	Weekday	\$212,248.21	\$107,322.19	37,745	2,387	\$2.78	15.8	50.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	783	Weekday	\$338,005.77	\$170,910.83	60,109	2,298	\$2.78	26.2	50.6%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Total Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Commuter & Express Bus	785	Weekday	\$1,323,625.86	\$669,284.43	235,386	4,185	\$2.78	56.3	50.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	789	Weekday	\$100,953.56	\$51,046.64	17,953	480	\$2.78	37.4	50.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	790	Weekday	\$476,751.00	\$190,300.00	79,817	3,742	\$3.59	21.3	39.9%
Commuter & Express Bus	793	Weekday	\$129,438.00	\$25,643.00	10,755	1,005	\$9.65	10.7	19.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	795	Weekday	\$67,827.00	\$12,811.00	5,372	560	\$10.24	9.6	18.9%
Commuter & Express Bus	850	Weekday	\$2,480,421.32	\$1,279,105.15	450,802	8,759	\$2.66	51.5	51.6%
Commuter & Express Bus	852	Weekday	\$2,220,530.86	\$329,389.80	210,003	10,828	\$9.01	19.4	14.8%
Commuter & Express Bus	852	Saturday	\$199,216.61	\$16,253.32	15,389	1,019	\$11.89	15.1	8.2%
Commuter & Express Bus	854	Weekday	\$909,013.37	\$280,912.95	108,481	3,341	\$5.79	32.5	30.9%
Commuter & Express Bus	860	Weekday	\$993,047.60	\$305,260.13	116,019	3,581	\$5.93	32.4	30.7%
Commuter & Express Bus	865	Weekday	\$882,204.55	\$398,326.55	131,935	3,077	\$3.67	42.9	45.2%
Core Local	2	Weekday	\$6,391,478	\$1,146,780	1,357,930	33,051	\$3.86	41.1	17.9%
Core Local	2	Saturday	\$968,945	\$119,709	156,971	4,898	\$5.41	32.0	12.4%
Core Local	2	Sunday	\$877,557	\$101,245	130,579	4,382	\$5.95	29.8	11.5%
Core Local	3	Weekday	\$9,213,719	\$1,623,754	1,531,621	46,254	\$4.96	33.1	17.6%
Core Local	3	Saturday	\$1,043,353	\$97,027	112,669	5,306	\$8.40	21.2	9.3%
Core Local	3	Sunday	\$773,732	\$72,373	85,797	3,936	\$8.17	21.8	9.4%
Core Local	4	Weekday	\$9,199,378	\$1,650,693	1,266,459	46,639	\$5.96	27.2	17.9%
Core Local	4	Saturday	\$1,404,664	\$140,167	142,749	7,177	\$8.86	19.9	10.0%
Core Local	4	Sunday	\$1,088,737	\$100,975	105,100	5,632	\$9.40	18.7	9.3%
Core Local	5	Weekday	\$13,635,704	\$2,801,626	3,114,889	70,814	\$3.48	44.0	20.5%
Core Local	5	Saturday	\$2,123,616	\$357,783	432,065	11,154	\$4.09	38.7	16.8%
Core Local	5	Sunday	\$1,861,554	\$303,105	366,720	9,701	\$4.25	37.8	16.3%
Core Local	6	Weekday	\$11,427,673	\$2,178,322	1,821,324	57,153	\$5.08	31.9	19.1%
Core Local	6	Saturday	\$1,493,374	\$171,575	194,836	7,644	\$6.78	25.5	11.5%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Total Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Core Local	6	Sunday	\$1,481,719	\$144,706	169,330	7,403	\$7.90	22.9	9.8%
Core Local	7	Weekday	\$3,641,801	\$389,927	371,187	19,077	\$8.76	19.5	10.7%
Core Local	7	Saturday	\$690,844	\$40,298	47,948	3,711	\$13.57	12.9	5.8%
Core Local	7	Sunday	\$761,513	\$34,880	41,558	4,010	\$17.48	10.4	4.6%
Core Local	9	Weekday	\$4,811,788	\$633,141	584,574	24,303	\$7.15	24.1	13.2%
Core Local	9	Saturday	\$814,879	\$64,034	75,046	4,070	\$10.01	18.4	7.9%
Core Local	9	Sunday	\$830,975	\$57,349	68,247	4,086	\$11.34	16.7	6.9%
Core Local	10	Weekday	\$8,966,481	\$1,419,701	1,581,501	46,762	\$4.77	33.8	15.8%
Core Local	10	Saturday	\$1,440,582	\$168,480	221,885	7,341	\$5.73	30.2	11.7%
Core Local	10	Sunday	\$1,080,169	\$134,376	176,011	5,120	\$5.37	34.4	12.4%
Core Local	11	Weekday	\$6,343,671	\$1,206,152	1,053,415	33,041	\$4.88	31.9	19.0%
Core Local	11	Saturday	\$1,041,031	\$102,238	116,385	5,496	\$8.07	21.2	9.8%
Core Local	11	Sunday	\$721,977	\$70,613	81,797	3,693	\$7.96	22.1	9.8%
Core Local	12	Weekday	\$2,212,177	\$442,337	312,203	10,917	\$5.67	28.6	20.0%
Core Local	14	Weekday	\$7,601,757	\$1,212,225	1,173,759	38,550	\$5.44	30.4	15.9%
Core Local	14	Saturday	\$1,045,002	\$108,495	131,539	5,548	\$7.12	23.7	10.4%
Core Local	14	Sunday	\$1,003,858	\$91,855	109,649	5,065	\$8.32	21.6	9.2%
Core Local	17	Weekday	\$6,845,396	\$1,398,026	1,248,597	34,116	\$4.36	36.6	20.4%
Core Local	17	Saturday	\$939,940	\$127,344	148,650	4,836	\$5.47	30.7	13.5%
Core Local	17	Sunday	\$791,769	\$101,082	120,134	4,056	\$5.75	29.6	12.8%
Core Local	18	Weekday	\$10,726,000	\$1,884,211	2,250,409	55,581	\$3.93	40.5	17.6%
Core Local	18	Saturday	\$1,839,265	\$229,262	326,815	9,536	\$4.93	34.3	12.5%
Core Local	18	Sunday	\$1,577,674	\$211,636	293,729	7,917	\$4.65	37.1	13.4%
Core Local	19	Weekday	\$4,680,906	\$745,369	801,916	21,715	\$4.91	36.9	15.9%
Core Local	19	Saturday	\$651,290	\$82,076	103,583	3,039	\$5.50	34.1	12.6%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Total Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Core Local	19	Sunday	\$658,697	\$69,517	86,536	3,077	\$6.81	28.1	10.6%
Core Local	21	Weekday	\$10,991,929	\$1,932,580	2,490,778	56,295	\$3.64	44.2	17.6%
Core Local	21	Saturday	\$2,036,304	\$261,326	389,591	10,444	\$4.56	37.3	12.8%
Core Local	21	Sunday	\$1,604,018	\$212,226	314,990	8,127	\$4.42	38.8	13.2%
Core Local	22	Weekday	\$8,331,826	\$1,232,739	1,197,708	43,905	\$5.93	27.3	14.8%
Core Local	22	Saturday	\$1,225,290	\$131,848	155,208	6,550	\$7.05	23.7	10.8%
Core Local	22	Sunday	\$1,002,636	\$109,313	131,743	5,406	\$6.78	24.4	10.9%
Core Local	25	Weekday	\$2,284,377	\$316,152	221,484	11,221	\$8.89	19.7	13.8%
Core Local	25	Saturday	\$161,567	\$8,706	9,711	879	\$15.74	11.1	5.4%
Core Local	54	Weekday	\$7,918,279	\$1,218,296	1,235,407	40,675	\$5.42	30.4	15.4%
Core Local	54	Saturday	\$1,187,164	\$166,653	182,439	6,186	\$5.59	29.5	14.0%
Core Local	54	Sunday	\$788,576	\$119,370	129,586	3,971	\$5.16	32.6	15.1%
Core Local	59	Weekday	\$1,040,970	\$235,486	145,922	4,241	\$5.52	34.4	22.6%
Core Local	61	Weekday	\$4,211,066	\$697,768	589,988	22,241	\$5.95	26.5	16.6%
Core Local	61	Saturday	\$308,290	\$25,649	30,220	1,587	\$9.35	19.0	8.3%
Core Local	62	Weekday	\$4,541,831	\$553,456	613,798	22,835	\$6.50	26.9	12.2%
Core Local	62	Saturday	\$744,656	\$63,494	84,182	3,748	\$8.09	22.5	8.5%
Core Local	62	Sunday	\$503,834	\$46,340	59,769	2,424	\$7.65	24.7	9.2%
Core Local	63	Weekday	\$5,815,474	\$965,812	964,417	31,357	\$5.03	30.8	16.6%
Core Local	63	Saturday	\$1,059,174	\$110,559	130,843	5,552	\$7.25	23.6	10.4%
Core Local	63	Sunday	\$1,103,056	\$90,913	108,133	5,679	\$9.36	19.0	8.2%
Core Local	64	Weekday	\$6,004,698	\$849,304	941,570	30,274	\$5.48	31.1	14.1%
Core Local	64	Saturday	\$1,006,822	\$97,859	129,320	5,159	\$7.03	25.1	9.7%
Core Local	64	Sunday	\$786,017	\$98,330	129,173	3,990	\$5.32	32.4	12.5%
Core Local	67	Weekday	\$2,574,537	\$239,936	229,020	13,110	\$10.19	17.5	9.3%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Total Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Core Local	67	Saturday	\$428,775	\$18,546	23,480	2,035	\$17.47	11.5	4.3%
Core Local	67	Sunday	\$363,381	\$13,793	17,451	1,710	\$20.03	10.2	3.8%
Core Local	68	Weekday	\$5,121,781	\$671,019	712,190	26,301	\$6.25	27.1	13.1%
Core Local	68	Saturday	\$868,378	\$81,213	104,792	4,632	\$7.51	22.6	9.4%
Core Local	68	Sunday	\$605,455	\$63,474	83,368	3,201	\$6.50	26.0	10.5%
Core Local	70	Weekday	\$1,752,547	\$217,048	179,899	8,249	\$8.54	21.8	12.4%
Core Local	70	Saturday	\$82,981	\$5,204	6,674	403	\$11.65	16.6	6.3%
Core Local	70	Sunday	\$91,793	\$3,716	5,274	428	\$16.70	12.3	4.0%
Core Local	71	Weekday	\$3,676,041	\$345,717	382,374	18,162	\$8.71	21.1	9.4%
Core Local	71	Saturday	\$450,896	\$22,006	31,576	2,051	\$13.58	15.4	4.9%
Core Local	71	Sunday	\$138,330	\$10,066	13,015	681	\$9.86	19.1	7.3%
Core Local	74	Weekday	\$6,054,094	\$983,359	990,423	31,671	\$5.12	31.3	16.2%
Core Local	74	Saturday	\$1,000,005	\$91,943	116,557	5,377	\$7.79	21.7	9.2%
Core Local	74	Sunday	\$824,355	\$75,101	93,739	4,039	\$7.99	23.2	9.1%
Core Local	75	Weekday	\$1,606,500	\$174,668	174,525	7,886	\$8.20	22.1	10.9%
Core Local	141	Weekday	\$534,708	\$152,539	88,995	2,505	\$4.29	35.5	28.5%
Core Local	262	Weekday	\$255,752	\$36,211	21,032	1,045	\$10.44	20.1	14.2%
Core Local	824	Weekday	\$309,176	\$81,372	40,356	1,165	\$5.64	34.6	26.3%
Core Local	825	Weekday	\$1,051,900	\$255,718	127,408	4,584	\$6.25	27.8	24.3%
Supporting Local	16	Weekday	\$867,970.40	\$72,535.57	89,634	8,733	\$8.87	10.3	8.4%
Supporting Local	16	Saturday	\$175,529.18	\$9,947.36	15,095	1,644	\$10.97	9.2	5.7%
Supporting Local	16	Sunday	\$185,581.43	\$6,922.66	11,218	1,655	\$15.93	6.8	3.7%
Supporting Local	23	Weekday	\$2,834,961.29	\$356,186.99	357,800	14,303	\$6.93	25.0	12.6%
Supporting Local	23	Saturday	\$526,058.35	\$39,757.88	46,551	2,649	\$10.45	17.6	7.6%
Supporting Local	23	Sunday	\$458,642.47	\$31,677.64	38,013	2,280	\$11.23	16.7	6.9%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Total Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Supporting Local	27	Weekday	\$216,670.44	\$22,709.26	21,676	2,796	\$8.95	7.8	10.5%
Supporting Local	30	Weekday	\$744,864.16	\$150,115.63	141,047	9,728	\$4.22	14.5	20.2%
Supporting Local	30	Saturday	\$121,134.93	\$16,050.81	17,844	1,617	\$5.89	11.0	13.3%
Supporting Local	30	Sunday	\$132,562.75	\$12,851.77	15,505	1,769	\$7.72	8.8	9.7%
Supporting Local	32	Weekday	\$2,375,520.87	\$400,121.22	388,200	10,579	\$5.09	36.7	16.8%
Supporting Local	32	Saturday	\$370,372.16	\$36,075.19	45,265	1,761	\$7.39	25.7	9.7%
Supporting Local	32	Sunday	\$367,583.01	\$29,033.77	36,175	1,719	\$9.36	21.0	7.9%
Supporting Local	39	Weekday	\$246,866.59	\$32,866.96	29,170	762	\$7.34	38.3	13.3%
Supporting Local	46	Weekday	\$3,073,591.72	\$267,935.15	255,644	15,261	\$10.97	16.8	8.7%
Supporting Local	46	Saturday	\$406,886.21	\$19,866.93	23,801	2,143	\$16.26	11.1	4.9%
Supporting Local	46	Sunday	\$369,894.27	\$14,629.14	18,362	1,804	\$19.35	10.2	4.0%
Supporting Local	65	Weekday	\$2,599,032.98	\$213,864.06	233,928	11,840	\$10.20	19.8	8.2%
Supporting Local	65	Saturday	\$456,351.86	\$25,441.17	30,881	2,077	\$13.95	14.9	5.6%
Supporting Local	65	Sunday	\$517,404.78	\$22,604.87	27,784	2,201	\$17.81	12.6	4.4%
Supporting Local	80	Weekday	\$303,506.99	\$91,602.63	86,077	3,540	\$2.46	24.3	30.2%
Supporting Local	80	Saturday	\$62,161.75	\$12,350.12	13,771	719	\$3.62	19.2	19.9%
Supporting Local	80	Sunday	\$36,770.21	\$9,061.32	9,244	425	\$3.00	21.8	24.6%
Supporting Local	83	Weekday	\$566,519.68	\$120,423.21	98,459	8,267	\$4.53	11.9	21.3%
Supporting Local	83	Saturday	\$104,667.41	\$15,103.36	14,499	1,495	\$6.18	9.7	14.4%
Supporting Local	83	Sunday	\$135,768.48	\$10,919.29	11,323	1,939	\$11.03	5.8	8.0%
Supporting Local	84	Weekday	\$919,163.39	\$111,258.37	114,031	9,097	\$7.08	12.5	12.1%
Supporting Local	84	Saturday	\$161,240.94	\$12,124.18	12,375	1,517	\$12.05	8.2	7.5%
Supporting Local	84	Sunday	\$134,008.15	\$8,724.67	9,960	1,223	\$12.58	8.1	6.5%
Supporting Local	87	Weekday	\$1,094,356.73	\$268,083.45	217,742	12,992	\$3.79	16.8	24.5%
Supporting Local	87	Saturday	\$178,900.19	\$22,754.87	21,733	2,105	\$7.18	10.3	12.7%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Total Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Supporting Local	87	Sunday	\$196,388.25	\$16,178.63	17,036	2,325	\$10.58	7.3	8.2%
Supporting Local	129	Weekday	\$173,856.19	\$2,154.45	12,284	380	\$13.98	32.4	1.2%
Suburban Local	219	Weekday	\$1,049,230.29	\$175,567.22	148,464	13,335	\$5.88	11.1	16.7%
Suburban Local	219	Saturday	\$101,298.68	\$13,239.92	11,808	1,309	\$7.46	9.0	13.1%
Suburban Local	223	Weekday	\$230,503.00	\$40,064.79	33,985	2,642	\$5.60	12.9	17.4%
Suburban Local	225	Weekday	\$206,692.29	\$24,115.29	23,529	2,311	\$7.76	10.2	11.7%
Suburban Local	225	Saturday	\$29,968.06	\$1,678.34	1,970	329	\$14.36	6.0	5.6%
Suburban Local	227	Weekday	\$223,160.24	\$21,097.16	20,155	2,388	\$10.03	8.4	9.5%
Suburban Local	227	Saturday	\$29,968.06	\$1,914.70	1,790	329	\$15.67	5.4	6.4%
Suburban Local	415	Weekday	\$62,660.62	\$1,828.44	2,493	271	\$24.41	9.2	2.9%
Suburban Local	420	Weekday	\$440,895.46	\$18,281.13	16,748	4,683	\$25.23	3.6	4.1%
Suburban Local	420	Saturday	\$38,722.71	\$830.32	921	270	\$41.14	3.4	2.1%
Suburban Local	420	Sunday	\$41,591.08	\$647.80	718	290	\$57.02	2.5	1.6%
Suburban Local	421	Weekday	\$106,650.52	\$3,137.72	4,429	1,164	\$23.37	3.8	2.9%
Suburban Local	426	Weekday	\$129,692.37	\$10,994.10	7,307	811	\$16.24	9.0	8.5%
Suburban Local	436	Weekday	\$251,177.05	\$34,719.42	23,582	1,134	\$9.18	20.8	13.8%
Suburban Local	440	Weekday	\$689,820.72	\$42,787.04	35,143	5,183	\$18.41	6.8	6.2%
Suburban Local	440	Saturday	\$110,515.71	\$3,842.93	4,366	847	\$24.43	5.2	3.5%
Suburban Local	440	Sunday	\$118,682.18	\$3,511.40	3,610	910	\$31.90	4.0	3.0%
Suburban Local	442	Weekday	\$328,691.75	\$21,475.16	23,801	3,907	\$12.91	6.1	6.5%
Suburban Local	442	Saturday	\$38,327.59	\$2,384.92	2,336	304	\$15.39	7.7	6.2%
Suburban Local	442	Sunday	\$41,170.17	\$1,798.10	1,855	326	\$21.22	5.7	4.4%
Suburban Local	444	Weekday	\$1,770,440.27	\$205,434.65	191,259	14,041	\$8.18	13.6	11.6%
Suburban Local	444	Saturday	\$180,728.67	\$22,376.40	22,650	1,293	\$6.99	17.5	12.4%
Suburban Local	444	Sunday	\$194,117.62	\$19,225.12	19,725	1,389	\$8.87	14.2	9.9%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Total Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Suburban Local	445	Saturday	\$104,779.50	\$6,022.09	7,287	830	\$13.55	8.8	5.7%
Suburban Local	445	Sunday	\$112,538.13	\$5,187.97	6,473	891	\$16.58	7.3	4.6%
Suburban Local	446	Weekday	\$954,155.15	\$82,373.86	69,249	7,294	\$12.59	9.5	8.6%
Suburban Local	489	Weekday	\$211,527.15	\$32,030.89	16,441	1,264	\$10.92	13.0	15.1%
Suburban Local	497	Weekday	\$304,770.69	\$15,367.58	15,982	3,210	\$18.11	5.0	5.0%
Suburban Local	499	Weekday	\$296,007.03	\$15,336.56	15,830	3,070	\$17.73	5.2	5.2%
Suburban Local	515	Weekday	\$3,249,275.38	\$308,096.50	358,860	14,819	\$8.20	24.2	9.5%
Suburban Local	515	Saturday	\$554,958.67	\$47,163.77	57,295	2,396	\$8.86	23.9	8.5%
Suburban Local	515	Sunday	\$438,734.97	\$34,638.30	43,976	1,796	\$9.19	24.5	7.9%
Suburban Local	537	Weekday	\$175,973.62	\$23,335.30	17,321	1,929	\$8.81	9.0	13.3%
Suburban Local	538	Weekday	\$611,644.16	\$110,576.09	93,980	7,523	\$5.33	12.5	18.1%
Suburban Local	538	Saturday	\$89,610.24	\$13,454.49	12,045	1,158	\$6.32	10.4	15.0%
Suburban Local	538	Sunday	\$78,551.32	\$9,899.10	9,271	1,016	\$7.41	9.1	12.6%
Suburban Local	539	Weekday	\$983,025.55	\$230,066.25	184,618	12,552	\$4.08	14.7	23.4%
Suburban Local	539	Saturday	\$109,069.19	\$22,577.40	18,450	1,406	\$4.69	13.1	20.7%
Suburban Local	539	Sunday	\$89,232.83	\$14,406.51	12,065	1,146	\$6.20	10.5	16.1%
Suburban Local	540	Weekday	\$831,851.58	\$204,529.67	159,277	10,922	\$3.94	14.6	24.6%
Suburban Local	540	Saturday	\$46,153.31	\$16,894.04	13,120	588	\$2.23	22.3	36.6%
Suburban Local	540	Sunday	\$48,681.14	\$13,488.17	10,941	609	\$3.22	18.0	27.7%
Suburban Local	542	Weekday	\$311,359.01	\$61,003.58	48,086	4,039	\$5.21	11.9	19.6%
Suburban Local	600	Weekday	\$86,681.00	\$9,452.00	4,728	329	\$16.33	14.4	10.9%
Suburban Local	604	Weekday	\$154,130.23	\$12,741.97	11,501	1,740	\$12.29	6.6	8.3%
Suburban Local	612	Weekday	\$1,370,657.38	\$107,527.68	135,242	6,837	\$9.34	19.8	7.8%
Suburban Local	612	Saturday	\$417,896.77	\$25,558.93	31,481	2,027	\$12.46	15.5	6.1%
Suburban Local	612	Sunday	\$305,047.77	\$17,648.71	22,784	1,389	\$12.61	16.4	5.8%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Total Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Suburban Local	614	Weekday	\$124,461.58	\$7,914.43	5,929	1,559	\$19.66	3.8	6.4%
Suburban Local	615	Weekday	\$362,825.95	\$53,635.26	37,854	5,457	\$8.17	6.9	14.8%
Suburban Local	615	Saturday	\$71,398.09	\$8,246.53	6,406	1,071	\$9.86	6.0	11.6%
Suburban Local	705	Weekday	\$471,538.69	\$76,931.31	66,439	5,690	\$5.94	11.7	16.3%
Suburban Local	716	Weekday	\$221,981.38	\$47,254.85	34,024	3,044	\$5.14	11.2	21.3%
Suburban Local	716	Saturday	\$40,656.55	\$11,513.00	9,589	574	\$3.04	16.7	28.3%
Suburban Local	717	Weekday	\$237,667.21	\$75,703.54	69,595	3,469	\$2.33	20.1	31.9%
Suburban Local	721	Weekday	\$1,379,135.44	\$203,165.06	200,658	7,036	\$5.86	28.5	14.7%
Suburban Local	721	Saturday	\$174,396.03	\$14,968.17	18,312	858	\$8.71	21.3	8.6%
Suburban Local	721	Sunday	\$206,924.74	\$15,881.83	19,200	957	\$9.95	20.1	7.7%
Suburban Local	722	Weekday	\$1,362,866.65	\$162,842.52	193,703	6,672	\$6.20	29.0	11.9%
Suburban Local	722	Saturday	\$265,617.73	\$27,359.73	31,108	1,208	\$7.66	25.8	10.3%
Suburban Local	722	Sunday	\$260,853.61	\$21,290.34	24,058	1,262	\$9.96	19.1	8.2%
Suburban Local	723	Weekday	\$1,122,922.04	\$127,025.59	146,068	5,498	\$6.82	26.6	11.3%
Suburban Local	723	Saturday	\$97,121.53	\$9,915.40	11,541	466	\$7.56	24.8	10.2%
Suburban Local	723	Sunday	\$93,990.19	\$9,075.60	10,074	472	\$8.43	21.3	9.7%
Suburban Local	724	Weekday	\$2,783,575.24	\$425,518.85	468,783	12,820	\$5.03	36.6	15.3%
Suburban Local	724	Saturday	\$293,195.01	\$51,127.97	56,028	1,200	\$4.32	46.7	17.4%
Suburban Local	724	Sunday	\$299,193.66	\$45,601.46	50,022	1,208	\$5.07	41.4	15.2%
Suburban Local	740	Weekday	\$105,302.00	\$0.00	6,052	872	\$17.40	6.9	0.0%
Suburban Local	741	Weekday	\$126,943.00	\$0.00	9,631	1,080	\$13.18	8.9	0.0%
Suburban Local	771	Weekday	\$152,941.00	\$0.00	6,093	1,137	\$25.10	5.4	0.0%
Suburban Local	787	Weekday	\$54,903.61	\$0.00	2,519	198	\$21.80	12.7	0.0%
Suburban Local	788	Weekday	\$80,298.06	\$0.00	6,283	454	\$12.78	13.8	0.0%
Suburban Local	791	Weekday	\$92,016.00	\$0.00	3,290	748	\$27.97	4.4	0.0%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Total Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Suburban Local	801	Weekday	\$423,034.59	\$74,116.51	73,770	4,458	\$4.73	16.5	17.5%
Suburban Local	805	Weekday	\$538,907.83	\$97,881.95	76,746	6,037	\$5.75	12.7	18.2%
Suburban Local	805	Saturday	\$85,746.02	\$11,665.66	10,024	979	\$7.39	10.2	13.6%
Suburban Local	831	Weekday	\$249,580.55	\$23,892.53	23,126	2,646	\$9.76	8.7	9.6%
Suburban Local	445 / 438	Weekday	\$955,993.09	\$73,322.88	72,146	8,156	\$12.23	8.8	7.7%
Suburban Local	SW Flex	Weekday	\$402,602.00	\$43,437.00	20,859	1,773	\$17.22	11.8	10.8%
BRT - Arterial	921	Weekday	\$6,111,821.33	\$1,426,222.12	1,266,246	27,184	\$3.70	46.6	23.3%
BRT - Arterial	921	Saturday	\$1,204,413.44	\$215,035.41	222,552	5,230	\$4.45	42.6	17.9%
BRT - Arterial	921	Sunday	\$1,183,076.71	\$173,015.24	188,118	5,337	\$5.37	35.2	14.6%
BRT - Arterial	923	Weekday	\$3,708,360.34	\$569,532.09	936,069	16,444	\$3.35	56.9	15.4%
BRT - Arterial	923	Saturday	\$673,645.55	\$65,855.94	145,954	2,880	\$4.16	50.7	9.8%
BRT - Arterial	923	Sunday	\$761,053.01	\$55,032.51	136,813	3,223	\$5.16	42.4	7.2%
BRT - Highway	903	Weekday	\$1,995,468.69	\$160,562.78	182,812	9,110	\$10.04	20.1	8.0%
BRT - Highway	903	Saturday	\$302,161.74	\$27,367.66	31,160	1,369	\$8.82	22.8	9.1%
BRT - Highway	903	Sunday	\$330,667.56	\$24,943.56	28,400	1,498	\$10.76	19.0	7.5%
Light Rail	Blue Line	Weekday	\$26,558,913.21	\$8,932,316.07	8,342,242	38,575	\$2.11	216.3	33.6%
Light Rail	Blue Line	Saturday	\$5,653,038.81	\$1,491,436.25	1,392,911	8,161	\$2.99	170.7	26.4%
Light Rail	Blue Line	Sunday	\$5,178,715.73	\$1,402,752.99	1,310,086	7,481	\$2.88	175.1	27.1%
Light Rail	Green Line	Weekday	\$28,048,266.04	\$12,039,125.16	11,133,010	45,791	\$1.44	243.1	42.9%
Light Rail	Green Line	Saturday	\$5,853,724.12	\$1,837,857.91	1,699,533	9,551	\$2.36	177.9	31.4%
Light Rail	Green Line	Sunday	\$5,449,578.58	\$1,537,367.76	1,421,659	8,892	\$2.75	159.9	28.2%
Commuter Rail	888	Weekday	\$15,803,799.25	\$2,351,600.19	693,084	2,631	\$19.41	263.4	14.9%
Commuter Rail	888	Saturday	\$874,165.18	\$130,075.50	38,337	284	\$19.41	134.8	14.9%
Commuter Rail	888	Sunday	\$828,757.03	\$123,318.78	36,346	265	\$19.41	137.0	14.9%
General Demand Response	Plymouth Dial a Ride	Weekday	\$1,368,096.00	\$92,262.00	35,902	11,240	\$35.54	3.2	6.7%

Route Type	Route	Day of Service	Total Cost	Fare Revenues	Total Passenger Trips	In-Service Hours	Subsidy per Passenger	Passengers per Hour	Farebox Recovery Ratio
General Demand Response	SW Prime	Weekday	\$1,159,783.00	\$245,611.00	104,040	32,319	\$8.79	3.2	21.2%
General Demand Response	SW Prime	Saturday	\$72,639.00	\$14,012.00	4,761	1,954	\$12.31	2.4	19.3%
General Demand Response	MY RIDE	Weekday	\$818,051.53	\$43,093.35	35,797	10,287	\$21.65	3.5	5.3%
General Demand Response	Transit Link	Weekday	\$6,832,300.00	\$885,516.00	235,896	108,434	\$25.21	2.2	13.0%



390 Robert Street North
Saint Paul, MN 55101-1805

651.602.1000
TTY 651.291.0904
public.info@metc.state.mn.us
metro council.org

Follow us on:
twitter.com/metcouncilnews
facebook.com/MetropolitanCouncil
youtube.com/MetropolitanCouncil