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When Los Angeles' first transit system began operating in 1874, lamb chops were selling for 16 A a pound and a man's all-wool suit could be bought for \$12.50. In those days, passengers could ride the Spring and 6th Street Railway's two-mule car on a one-mile loop of track for a basic fare of 10 E . In 1877 ail transit lines operating in Los Angeles adopted a 5e cash fare. Throughout the history of public transit in Los Angeles, passengers have enjoyed a relstively stable fare structure. Over a period of more than a century there were only seven increases in base cash fares, followed by a County-subsidized decrease in fares in mid-1974. Before 1976, base fares tended to remain in effect for a relatively long time. Incredible as it seems today, base fares on local transit lines remained at $5 t$ for 51 years. A $7 t$ fare prevailed for another eighteen years -- from before the stock market crash until after World War II.

By setting the inflationary spiral in motion, the energy crisis that began in late 1973 changed dramatically the pattern of transit fare increases in Los Angeles. Beginning in 1976, as Los Angeles County transit operating subsidies were phased out, fares began to escalate rapidly. Over a six year period, base fares were increased six times. Mercifully, this spate of increases was followed by a second decrease in fares, subsidized by a one-half cent sales tax increase under the provisions of Proposition $A$.

As fare increases became more frequent, they also tended to grow in magnitude. Before 1976 increases in base fares were 5t or less. But 10\& increases in 1976, 1979 and 1980 and a 20 et increase in 1.981 drove fares up at an alarming rate, It took seventy years for fares to double from 5t to $10 \epsilon$, fourteen years to double to $20 t$ and seventeen years to double again to 40t. For base fares to more than double to 85t took only four years.

Figure 1 illustrates the pattern of base cash fares on public transit in Los Angeles since the first horse-car lines began. The pernicious effects of inflation and oil shortages are apparent beginning in the mid-70's. Supporting data are given in Table 1. The table also stiows the stability of zone fares until 1973. Zone fare increments remained at 5t for more than thirty years. Over a fifty year period, zone fares rose only $3 k$.

The long-term stability of fares in Los Angeles has provided the public with a real transportation bargain. When the pattern of fare growth is compared to the Consumer Price Index, as in Figure 2, the extent of this bargain can be seen. The price index of transit fares was consistently below the CPI for over fifty years. Only during the inflationary $70^{\prime \prime} s$ did the gap between the indices narrow, to eventually close with the 1981 hike in fares to 85d.

The graph in Figure 3 shows that not only have los Angeles transit fares consistentiy lagged behind the Consumer Price Index, but that until 1979 they tended to be significantly below average transft fares
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nationwide, as well. Table 2 shows that not until fiscal Year 1981 did base fares in Los Angeles start to rise significantly in comparison to fares in the largest U.S. metropolitan areas. Before that time, Los Angeles fares tended to be in the aiddle range of fares charged in major cities.

Oniy the masisive fare increase in July, 1981 elevated Los Angeles fares to a level on a par with the $C P I$ and above average fares in other U.S. cities. With the three-year drop in fares mandated by Proposition $A$, Los Angeles County fares have become a bargain once again. Table 3 provides comparative data to support Figures 2 and 3.

Historically, some categories of transit rider - students, the elderly, and the handicapped -- have enjoyed discounts from the base fare charged on public transit. Long distance riders, on the other hand, have usually paid premium fares in the form of zone fares, express step increments or some other type of distance-based fares. Due to the diversity of fare categories that have arisen as a result of the recognition of these various types of rider, it may be inappropriate at times to discuss only changes in base fare. Figure 4 shows how significantly different was the pattern of fare changes since 1969 among cash fare categories. When the base cash fare decreased in Fiscal Year 1974, for exarople, student, senior citizen and handicapped fares remained unchanged. When student fares began to increase in fiscal Year 1977, senior citizen and handicapped fares still held steady at 10\&. Student cash fare discounts were eliminated in Fiscal Year 1978 and reinstated in 1981. Transfer fares fluctuated from 56 to 10 L , back to a nickel, up to 20\&, down to 15 d and then back to a dime again.

Figure 5 shows that the prices of RTD monthly passes have also displayed radically different patterns of change. Senior Citizen and Handicapped pass users have benefitted especially from RTD's uneven fare change policy. When introduced in the late 60's, these passes sold for $\$ 9$, a price they maintained from Fiscal 1968 through 1974. The price was lowered 56\%, to only $\$ 4$, in Fiscal Year 1975 and stayed at that level through 1980. Raises to $\$ 6$ in Fiscal Year 1981 and to $\$ 7.50$ in ' 82 (with additional charges for discount express stamps) were negated in Fiscal 1983 when the price returnet to $\$ 4$.

The price of the $R T D$ base monthly pass remained at $\$ 12$ from its introduction in Fiscal 1963 until the two-year decrease to $\$ 10$ in Fiscal 1975 and 1976. During the next six years there were five increases in the price of the base pass, ranging from $\$ 2$ to $\$ 8$.

The price of student monthly passes was raised four times in the six years, by as little as $\$ 2$ and as much as $\$ 6$.

When express stamps were first introduced in Fiscal Year 1978, the highest priced express pass (with five stamps) was $\$ 48$. Four years later the price of this pass had risen $96 \%$ to $\$ 94$ a month.

Just as fare increases in the past had not been evenly distributed
nationwide, as well. Table 2 shows that not until fiscal Year 1981 did base fares in Los Angeles start to rise significantly in comparison to fares in the largest U.S. metropolitan areas. Before that time, Los Angeles fares tended to be in the middie range of fares charged in major cities.

Only the massive fare increase in July, 1981 elevated Los Angeles fares to a level on a par with the CPI and above average fares in other U.S. cities. With the three-year drop in fares mandated by Proposition A, Los Angeles County fares have become a bargain once again. Table 3 provides comparative data to support Figures 2 and 3.

Historically, some categories of transit rider -- students, the elderly, and the handicapped -- have enjoyed discounts from the base fare charged on public transit. Long distance riders, on the other hand, have usually paid premium fares in the form of zone fares, express step increments or some other type of distancébased fares. Due to the diversity of fare categories that have arisen as a result of the recognition of these various types of rider, it may be inappropriate at times to discuss only changes in base fare. Figure 4 shows how significantly different was the pattern of fare changes since 1969 among cash fare categories. When the base cash fare decreased in fiscal Year 1974, for example, student, senior citizen and handicapped fares remained unchanged. When student fares began to increase in Fiscal Year 1977, senior citizen and handicapped fares still held steady at 10 d . Student cash fare discounts were eliminated in Fiscal Year 1978 and reinstated in 1981. Transfer fares fluctuated from 5 te to 10 A , back to a nickel, up to 20 d , down to 15 t and then back to a dime again.

Figure 5 shows that the prices of RTD monthly passes have also displayed radically different patterns of change. Senior Citizen and Handicapped pass users have benefitted especially from RTD's uneven fare change policy. When introduced in the late 60's, these passes sold for $\$ 9$, a price they maintained from Fiscal 1968 through 1974. The price was lowered 56\%, to only $\$ 4$, in Fiscal Year 1975 and stayed at that level through 1980. Raises to $\$ 6$ in Fiscal Year 1981 and to $\$ 7.50$ in $\quad 82$ (with additional charges for discount express stamps) were negated in Fiscal 1983 when the price returnet to $\$ 4$.

The price of the RTD base monthly pass remained at $\$ 12$ from its introduction in Fiscal 1968 until the two-year decrease to $\$ 10$ in Fiscal 1975 and 1976. During the next six years there were five increases in the price of the base pass, ranging from $\$ 2$ to $\$ 8$.

The price of student monthly passes was raised four times in the six years, by as little as $\$ 2$ and as much as $\$ 5$.

When express stamps were first introduced in Fiscal Year 1978, the highest priced express pass (with five stamps) was \$48. Four years later the price of this pass had risen 96\% to $\$ 94$ a month.

Just as fare increases in the past had not been evenly distributed
among various transit rider groups, so, too, did the increase in july, 1981 affect some riders more than others as shown in Tables 4 and 5. Cash riders who ride more than one bus wers among the least affected by the fare increase. The fare of elderly and handicapped cash riders making two transfers remained unchanged at the FY 1980 level of 50 . Elementary and high school students making two transfers saw their cash fare increased only 7\% from 70\& to 75E. Adult cash riders making only one transfer or more than two transfers had their fares raised by amounts varying from $13 \%$ to 188 , or as much as 30\&. Cash riders taking only one bus to complete their trips had to pay $30 \%$ to $33 \%$ more fare in FY. 82 than in '81. Single ride student cash fares rose to 65e from 50t. Adult fares for riding one bus rose 20t, to 85t, and senior citizen and handicapped fares went up'a dime to $30 \%$.

Adult cash riders making trips on express lines experienced a fare increase of $32 \%$ to $33 \%$. But with the introduction of express step fares for students under 19 years old, and for the elderly and handicapped, riding on express lines became much more expensive for these riders. The percentage of fare increase among riders in these categories escalated as the length of the trip increased. Student riders on the bus for one express step had their fares raised 70: those riding for five express steps had their fares raised $230 \%$. Senior citizens and handicapped riders paying cash on express lines suffered even more severe increases in fares, ranging from 100\% for one express step to a whopping 367\% for five steps. In other words, riders paying adult cash fares to ride five express steps had to pay 70t more after the July, 1981 increase and student riders had to pay $\$ 1.15$ more for this ride. The elderly and handicapped were charged $\$ 1.10$ more.

The uneven effects of the July, 1981 fare increase are also evident among riders who use a monthly pass, as illustrated in Figure 6. The increase for riders using a senior citizen or handicapped pass was only 25\%, fromi $\$ 5$ month to $\$ 7.50$. College/vocational pass users experienced a $30 \%$ price increase when their pass went from $\$ 20$ to $\$ 26$ a month, and regular pass users saw their pass increase $31 \%$, from $\$ 26$ to \$34. Elementary and high school students were subjected to the largest percentage increase -- 38\%; their pass increased from $\$ 16$ to \$22.

Before the 1981 fare increase, riders using a $\$ 6$ senior citizen or handicapped pass, a $\$ 16$ student pass or a $\$ 20$ college/vocational pass could ride any number of express steps without paying extra express fares. This priviledge was revoked with the fare increase, however, and riders in these categories had to buy express stamps in order to ride express trips. Although these stamps cost only $\$ 6$ per increment -- half the price of non-discount stamps -- pass prices for these riders rose precipitously. Seníor citizens or handicapped riders using an express pass had to pay $\$ 7.50$ more a month for a one-stamp pass and $\$ 31.50$ more for a five-stamp pass -- increases of $125 \%$ to 525\%. Student passes with one stamp cost $\mathbf{\$ 1 2}$ a month more after the fare increase, and passes with five stamps cost $\$ 36$ more -- increases of $75 \%$ to 225\%. Riders who used a college/vocational pass after July 1. 1981 also were charged froil $\$ 12$ to $\$ 35$ more -- increases of $60 \%$ to 180\%. By way of comparison, riders who used a regular pass with express stamps affixed had to pay from $\$ 12$ a month to $\$ 23$ more after the fare increase. These increases were $35 \%$ to $42 \%$ over the price charged before the farg increase.
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TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF TRANSIT FARES IN LOS ANGELES
1874-1985


TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF TRANSIT FARES IN LOS ANGELES 1874 - 1985

| Calendar Year | Base <br> Fare | Zone or Express Increments | Changes | Effective Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1874 | $10 ¢$ | NA | Spring \& 6th St Railway Begins Operation | July 1 |
| 1875 | $10 \%$ | NA |  |  |
| 1876 | $10 ¢$ | NA |  |  |
| 1877 | 56 | NA | Nickel Fare Introduced on All Transit Lines | NA |
| 1878 | 56 | NA | - |  |
| 1879 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1880 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1881 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1882 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1883 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1884 | 5.6 | NA |  |  |
| 1885 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1886 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1887 | 56 | NA | LA Electric Ry Opens 1st Electric Line on Pico | January 4 |
| 1888 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1889 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1890 | 56 | NA | LA Consolidated Electric Ry (LACE) Established | November 12 |
| 1891 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1892 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1893 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1894 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1895 | 56 | NA | LA Railway (LARY) Buys LACE | August 18 |
| 1896 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1897 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1898 | 56 | NA | Henry Huntington Büys LARY | October 1 |
| 1899 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1900 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1901 | 56 | NA | Pacific Electric Ry Estabilshed | NA |
| 1902 | 56 | NA | First PE Interurban Line to Long Bch Begins | Jùly 4 |
| 1903 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1904 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1905 | 56 | NA | PE Building Operied |  |
| 1906 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1907 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1908 | 5 | NA |  |  |
| 1909 | 54 | NA |  |  |
| 1910 | 56 | NA | LARY 5¢ Fare Zone Extended to Manchester Avenue | July |
| 1911 | 56 | NA | Public Agitation For Lower Fares/PE Merges 631 l |  |
| 1912 | 56 | HA | Arnoid Report Recommends Against Lower Fares | April |
| 1913 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1914 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1915 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1916 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1917 | $5{ }^{\circ}$ | NA | PE Operates First Bus/Voters Nix Transit Bonds | NA |
| 1918 | 56 | NA | Interurban Fares Set at $1.5 ¢$ to 36 per mile |  |
| 1919 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1920 | $5 \%$ | NA | LARY Petitions For 7¢ Fare; Denied by RR Comm | August |
| 1921 | 56 | NA |  |  |
| 1922 | 54 | NA |  |  |
| 1923 | 56 | 55 | LA Motor Coach Co. Established. | August 18 |
| 1924 | 56 | 56 |  |  |
| 1925 | 56 | 56 | Subway to Glendale Opens |  |
| 1926 | 56 | 56 | LARY Petitions For 76 Fare | NA |
| 1927 | 56 | 56 | Voters Defeat Rapid Transit Bond Issue | NA |
| 1928 | 7 c | 56 | Fare 1ncrease/PE \$1 \% \$2.50 Sunday Passes Begin | Oct 21/Apr 29 |
| 1929 | 75 | 56 | PE Experiments with \$6 to \$12 Monthly Passes |  |

TABLE 1 (Cont'd)
SUMMARY OF TRANSIT FARES IN LOS ANGELES
1874.-1985



FIGURE 2
COMPARISON OF US CONSUMER PRICE INDEX
to price index for los angeles public trainsit base fares 1923-1984
CPI


FIGURE 2


1-1)


## FIGURE 3

CONSUMER PRICE INDEX COMPARISON
LOS ANGELES TRANSIT FARES VS US TRANSIT FARES AND LOS ANGELES COUHTY CPI

1964-1985


Table 2
Base Fare Comparison
10 Largest U.S. Metropolitan Areas
FY 1978-1981

| Population $\qquad$ | City | 19.78 | 1.979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | New York | \$. 50 | NA | \$. 60 | \$. 60 | \$.75 | \$.75 |
| 2 | Los Angeles | . 40 | \$.45 | . 55 | . 65 | . 85 | . 50 |
| 3 | Chicago | .50 | .60 | . 60 | . 80 | . 90 | . 90 |
| 4 | Philadelphia | .45 | . 50 | .70 | . 70 | . 70 | .75 |
| 5 | Detroit | . 50 | . 55 | . 60 | . 60 | . 75 | 1.00 |
| 6 | San Francisco | .25 | . 25 | . 50 | . 50 | . 75 | . 75 |
| 7 | Washingtor, D.C. | .40 | .50 | . 55 | . 60 | . 60 | . 60 |
| 8 | Dallas | . 40 | . 60 | . 60 | . 65 | .70 | . 70 |
| 9 | Houston | . 40 | . 40 | . 40 | . 40 | . 40 | . 40 |
| 10 | Boston | . 25 | . 25 | . 25 | . 25 | . 50 | . 50 |
|  | Mean | \$.40 | \$.40 | \$.50 | \$.50 | \$.69 | \$. 69 |

Sources: Transit Fare Summary, APTA, October 1, 1982
Market Impact Survey: A Study of the Effect of the July. 1978 Fare Increase, SCRTD Market Research, April 11, 1979

Transit Fare Sumiary, California Association of Publicly Owned Transit Systems, August 1, 1980

Bus Fares for Selected Agencies Nationwide and Selected California Properties, SCRTD Market Research, May 22, 1981

Table 2
Base Fare Comparison
10 Largest U.S. Metropolitan Areas FY 1978 - 1981

| Population Rank | City | 1978 | 1.979 | 1980 | 1.98 .1 | 1982 | 1983 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | New York | \$. 50 | NA | \$. 60 | \$.60 | \$.75 | \$. 75 |
| 2 | Los Angeles | .40 | \$.45 | . 55 | . 65 | . 85 | . 50 |
| 3 | Chicago | . 50 | .60 | .60 | .80 | .90 | . 90 |
| 4 | Philadelphia | .45 | . 50 | . 70 | . 70 | . 70 | . 75 |
| 5 | Detroit | . 50 | . 55 | .60 | .60 | . 75 | 1.00 |
| 6 | San Francisco | .25 | . 25 | . 50 | . 50 | . 75 | . 75 |
| 7 | Washington, D.C. | .40 | . 50 | . 55 | .60 | .60 | .60 |
| 8 | Dallas | .40 | . 60 | .60 | . 65 | .70 | . 70 |
| 9 | Houston | .40 | . 40 | .40 | . 40 | . 40 | .40 |
| 10 | Boston | . 25 | . 25 | . 25 | . 25 | . 50 | . 50 |
|  | Mean | \$.40 | \$. 40 | \$.50 | \$.50 | \$.69 | \$.69 |

Sources: Transit Fare Summary, APTA, October 1; 1982
Market Impact Survey: A. Study of the Effect of the July, 1978 Fare Increase, SCRTD Market Research, April 11, 1979

Transit Fare Summary, Cal-ifornia Association of Publicly Owned Transit Systems, August 1, 1980

Bus Fares for Selected Agencies Nationwide and Selected California Properties, SCRTD Market Research, May 22, 1981


Table 3
Coneuner Price Indez and Iranelt taree
1923 - 198 B

| Calender Te日r. | $\begin{aligned} & 0.3 . \\ & \text { c. } 31 \end{aligned}$ | La County CPI | CPI <br> For <br> La <br> Fares | cpz <br> For 0.3 <br> Triensit <br> Fape |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1923 | 51.1 |  | 16.7 |  |
| 1924 | 51.2 |  | 16.7 |  |
| 1925 | 52.5 |  | 16.7 |  |
| 1926 | 53.0 |  | 16.7 |  |
| 1927 | 52.0 |  | 16.7 |  |
| 1928 | 51.3 |  | 23.3 |  |
| 1929 | 51.3 |  | 23.3 |  |
| 1930 | 50.0 |  | 23.3 |  |
| 1931 | 45.6 |  | 23.3 |  |
| 1932 | 10.9 |  | 23.3 |  |
| 1933 | 38.8 |  | 23.3 |  |
| 1934 | 40.1 |  | 23.3 |  |
| 1935 | 41.1 | - | 23.3 |  |
| 1936 | 41.5 |  | 23.3 |  |
| 1937 | 43.0 |  | 23.3 |  |
| 1938 | 42.2 |  | 23.3 |  |
| 1939 | 11.6 |  | 23.3 |  |
| 1940 | 42.0 |  | 23.3 |  |
| 1941 | 48.1 |  | 23.3 |  |
| 1942 | 48.8 |  | 23.3 |  |
| 1943 | 51.8 |  | 23.3 |  |
| 194. | 52.7 |  | 23.3 |  |
| 1945 | 53.9 |  | 23.3 |  |
| 1946 | $5 \% .5$ |  | 33.3 |  |
| 1947 | 56.9 |  | 33.3 |  |
| 1949 | 72.1 |  | 33.3 |  |
| 1949 | 71.4 |  | 33.3 |  |
| 1.950 | 72.1 |  | 33.3 |  |
| 1961 | 77.-2 |  | 33.3 |  |
| 1952 | 79.5 |  | 50.0 |  |
| 1953 | 80.1 |  | 50.0 |  |
| 1.954 | 80.5 |  | 50.0 |  |
| 1955 | 80.2 |  | 56.7 | 77.4 |
| 1956 | 8 8. 4 |  | 56.7 |  |
| 1957 | 84.3 |  | 56.7 |  |
| 1958 | 86.6 |  | 56.7 |  |
| 1959 | 87.3 |  | 56.7 |  |
| 1960 | 18.7 |  | 66.7 |  |
| 1961 | 89.6 |  | 83.3 |  |
| 19.52 | 90.6 |  | 83. 3 |  |
| 1963 | 91.7 |  | 83.3 |  |
| 1964 | 92.9 |  | 83.3 | 90.1 |
| 1965 | 94.5 |  | 83.3 | 89.4 |
| 1966 | 97.2 |  | 83.3 | 95.2 |
| 1967 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1968 | 104.2 | 103.9 | 100.0 | 104.6 |
| 1969 | 109.8 | 108.8 | 100.0 | 112.7 |
| 1970 | 118.3 | 114.3 | 100:0 | 134.5 |
| 1971 | 121.3 | 118.5 | 100.0 | 137.7 |
| 1972 | 125.3 | 122.3 | 100.0 | 150.1 |
| 1973 | 133.1 | 129.2 | 100.0 | 150.1 |
| 1974 | 147.7 | 142.5 | 83.3 | 148.0 |
| 1975 | 161.2 | 162.5 | 83.3 | 155.5 |
| 1976 | 170.5 | 172.1 | 116.7 | 173.3 |
| 1977 | 18.1 .5 | 182.9 | 133.3 | 178.5 |
| 1978 | 195. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 197.1 | 150.0 | 181.5 |
| 1979 | 2.17.4 | 229.0 | 183.3 | 189.8 |
| 1980 | 246.3 | 258.7 | 216.7 | 217.6 |
| 1981 | 269.0(\%ay) | 282.3 | 283.3 | 251.9 |
| 1982 |  | 288.2(Sepr) | 166.7 | - |
| 1983 | - | - | 166.7 | - |
| 1984 | - | - | 156:7 | - |
| Sources: | Long Terg Econoaie Grouth. 1860-1970. U.S' Departement of Comierce'. Junt. 1973 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | "History of Fara Incracisea |  |  |  |
|  | tropolitan | Insit Authopi | ty. Yay |  |
|  | Southerin Cilifornie Rapid Trinsit oistract, Transportation Department |  |  |  |
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Table 4 SCRTD Fares By Category FY 1978 - 1.985

| Fare Category | Fare <br> Increment | 1978 |  | 1979 |  | 1980 |  | 1981 |  | 1982 |  | 1983-85 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Cash | Pass | Cash | Pass | Cash | Pass | Cash | Pass | Cash | Pass | Cash | Pass |
| adult | Locil | 3.40 | \$18 | 3.45 | \$20 | \$.55 | \$20 | 3.65 | 326 | 3.85 | \$34 | \$.50 | $\$ 20$ |
| adult | Express 1 | . 60 | 24 | . 65 | 926 | . 75 | 526 | . 95 | \$34 | 1.25 | 946 | . 75 | 4 |
| Adult | Express 2 | . 80 | \$30 | . 85 | \$32 | . 95 | \$32 | 1.25 | \$42 | 1.65 | 558 | 1.00 | 334 |
| Adult | Express 3 | 1.00 | \$36 | 1.05 | \$38 | 1.15 | \$38 | 1.55 | \$50 | 2.05 | $\$ 70$ | 1.25 | \$41 |
| Adult | Express 4 | 1.20 | \$42 | 1.25 | 344 | 1.35 | \$48 | 1.85 | \$58 | 2.45 | 182 | 1.50 | \$48 |
| Adult | Pxpress 5 | 1.40 | 348 | 1.45 | \$50 | 1.55 | \$50 | 2.15 | 566 | 2.85 | 594 | 1.75 | \$55 |
| Adult | 1 Transfer | . 50 | \$18 | . 55 | $\$ 20$ | . 60 | \$20 | . 85 | 92 | 1.00 | 834 | . 60 | \$20 |
| Adult | 2 Transfers | . 50 | \$18 | . 55 | \$20 | . 60 | \$20 | 1.05 | 926 | 1.15 | \$34 | . 60 | \$20 |
| Adult | 3 Transfers | . 50 | \$18 | . 55 | $\$ 20$ | . 60 | \$20 | 1.70 | \$26 | 2.00 | 334 | . 60 | \$20 |
| College | Local | . 40 | \$12 | . 45 | 314 | . 45 | \$14 | . 65 | $\$ 20$ | . 85 | \$26 | . 20 | 94 |
| College | Express 1 | . 60 | \$12 | .65 | 314 | . 45 | \$14 | . 95 | $\$ 20$ | 1.25 | \$32 | :20 | 94 |
| College | Express 2 | . 80 | \$12 | . 85 | \$14 | . 45 | 314 | 1.25 | $\$ 20$ | 1.65 | \$38 | 20 | 94 |
| College | Express 3 | 1.00 | \$12 | 1.05 | \$14 | . 45 | \$14 | 1.55 | \$20. | 2.05 | 944 | . 20 | 94 |
| college | Express 4 | 1.20 | \$12 | 1.25 | \$14 | . 45 | 314 | 1.85 | 920 | 2.45 | \$50 | . 20 | 54 |
| college | Express 5 | 1.40 | \$12 | 1.45 | \$14 | . 45 | \$14 | 2.15 | \$20 | 2.85 | \$56 | . 20 | 34 |
| College | 1 Transfer | . 50 | \$12 | .55 | 314 | . 50 | 314 | . 85 | \$0 | 1.00 | 526 | . 30 | \% 4 |
| College | 2 Iransfers | . 50 | \$12 | . 55 | \$14 | . 50 | \$14 | 1.05 | \$20 | 1.15 | 926 | . 30 | 94 |
| college | 3 Transfers | . 50 | \$12 | . 55 | \$14 | . 50 | \$14 | 1.70 | $\$ 20$ | 2.00 | 926 | . 30 | 94 |
| Studert | Local | . 40 | \$12 | . 45 | \$14 | . 45 | 814 | -50 | \$16 | . 65 | \$2 | . 20 | 94 |
| Student | Express 1 | . 60 | \$12 | . 65 | \$14 | . 45 | \$14 | - 50 | \$16 | . 85 | 928 | . 20 | 94 |
| Student | Express 2 | . 80 | \$12 | . 85 | 314 | . 45 | 314 | . 50 | \$16 | 1.05 | 334 | . 20 | 94 |
| Student | Express 3 | 1.00 | $\$ 12$ | 1.05 | \$14 | . 45 | 314 | . 50 | \$16 | 1.25 | 440 | . 20 | 94 |
| Student | Express 4 | 1.20 | \$12 | 1.25 | \$14 | :45 | \$14 | . 50 | \$16 | 1.45 | 546 | . 20 | 94 |
| Student | Express 5 | 1.40 | \$12 | 1.45 | \$14 | . 45 | 314 | . 50 | \$16 | 1.65 | 552 | . 20 | 94 |
| Student | 1 Trrạnsfer | . 50 | \$12 | . 55 | \$14 | . 50 | 314 | . 60 | \$16 | . 70 | 522 | . 30 | in |
| Student | 2 Transfers | . 50 | $\$ 12$ | .55 | \$14 | . 50 | 314 | .70 | \$16 | . 75 | 522 | . 30 | 9 |
| Student | 3 Transfers | . 50 | \$12 | . 55 | \$14 | . 50 | \$14 | 1.40 | 02 | 1.20 | \$16 | .30 | 94 |
| E\% | Local | .10 | 34 | .15 | \$ 4 | 20 | \$ 4 | . 30 | \$ 6 | . 40 | \$7.50 | . 20 | 84 |
| Ef H | Express 1 | .10 | 34 | . 15 | 34 | . 20 | 34 | . 30 | \$ 6 | . 60 | \$13.50 | . 20 | \% |
| E\& H | Express 2 | - 10 | \$ 4 | . 15 | \$4 | . 20 | 34 | . 30 | \$ 6 | . 80 | \$19.50 | . 20 | 34 |
| E\& H | Express 3 | . 10 | 34 | . 15 | 14 | . 20 | 34 | . 30 | \$ 6 | 1.00 | \$25.50 | . 20 | 4 |
| E \% H | Express 4 | . 10 | \$4 | . 15 | 34 | . 20 | \$4 | . 30 | \$ 6 | 1.20 | \$31.50 | . 20 | 84 |
| E\% H | Express 5 | . 10 | 34 | . 15 | \$4 | . 20 | 34 | . 30 | \$ 6 | 1.40 | \$37.50 | . 20 | 84 |
| E\% H | 1 Transfer | . 20 | 34 | . 25 | 34 | . 25 | 34 | . 40 | \$ 6 | . 45 | \$ 7.50 | . 30 | 84 |
| E\& H | 2 Iransfers | . 20 | 34 | . 25 | 34 | . 25 | \$ 4 | . 50 | \$ 6 | . 50 | \$ 7.50 | :30 | 54 |
| E\& H | 3 Transfers | . 20 | \$4 | . 25 | \$4 | . 25 | \$ 4 | . 90 | \$ 6 | . 90 | \$ 7.50 | . 30 | 54 |

Source: SCRTD. Transportation Department
SCRTD. Marketing \& Commulications Department

Table 4
scitd Fares By Category
FI 1978 - 1985

| Fare <br> Category | Fare <br> Increment | 1978 |  | 1979 |  | 1980. |  | 1981. |  | 1982 |  | 1983-85 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Cash | Pass | Cash | Pass | Cash | Pass | Cash. | Pass | Cash | Pass | Cash | Pass |
| Adult | Local | 3.40 | \$18 | 3.45 | 220 | \$.55 | $\$ 2$ | 3.65 | \$26 | \$.85 | \$34 | \$.50 | $\$ 20$ |
| Aduat | Exprësis 1 | . 60 | 24 | . 65 | 126 | . 75 | 926 | . 95 | \$34 | 1.25 | 846 | . 75 | $\$ 27$ |
| sdult | Express 2 | . 80 | 330 | . 85 | \$32 | . 95 | 332 | 1.25 | \$42 | 1.65 | \$58 | 1.00 | 334 |
| Adult | Express 3 | 1.00 | \$36 | 1.05 | \$38 | 1.15 | \$38 | 1.55 | \$50 | 2.05 | \$70 | 1.25 | 341 |
| Adult | Express 4 | 1.20 | \$42 | 1.25 | \$44 | 1.35 | $\$ 44$ | 1.85 | \$58 | 2.45 | $\$ 82$ | 1.50 | 348 |
| Aduit | Express 5 | 1.40 | 348 | 1.45 | \$50 | 1.55 | \$50 | 2.15 | \$66 | 2.85 | \$94 | 1.75 | \$55 |
| Adurit | 1 Transfer | . 50 | \$18 | . 55 | 920 | . 60 | $\$ 20$ | . 85 | \$2 | 1.00 | \$34 | . 60 | \$20 |
| Aduit | 2 Transfers | . 50 | \$18 | . 55 | $\$ 20$ | . 60 | $\$ 20$ | 1.05 | $\$ 26$ | 1.15 | \$34 | . 60 | \$20 |
| Adult | 3 Transfers | . 50 | \$18 | . 5 | 120 | .60 | $\$ 20$ | 1.70 | \$26 | 2.00 | \$34 | 60 | \$20 |
| College | Locá | . 40 | \$12 | . 45 | \$14 | . 45 | \$14 | . 65 | 520 | . 85 | \$6 | . 20 | 84 |
| College | Express 1 | . 60 | \$12 | . 65 | \$14 | . 45 | \$14 | . 95 | $\$ 20$ | 1.25 | \$ 32 | . 20 | 84 |
| College | Expresis 2 | . 80 | \$12 | . 85 | \$14 | '. 45 | \$14 | 1.25 | $\$ 20$ | 1.65 | \$38 | . 20 | 84 |
| college | Express 3 | 1.00 | \$12 | 1.05 | \$14 | . 45 | \$14 | 1.55 | $\$ 20$ | 2.05 | 844 | .20 | \% |
| college | Express 4 | 1.20 | \$12 | 1.25 | \$14 | . 45 | \$14 | 1.85 | $\$ 20$ | 2.45 | \$50 | . 20 | sth |
| College | Brpress 5 | 1.40 | \$12 | 1.45 | \$14 | . 45 | \$14 | 2.15 | \$20 | 2.85 | \$56 | . 20 | 84 |
| college | 1 Transfer | . 50 | \$12 | . 53 | \$14 | . 50 | \$14 | . 85 | 520 | 1.00 | $\$ 26$ | . 30 | 94 |
| College | 2 Transfers | . 50 | \$12 | . 55 | \$14 | . 50 | 314 | 1.05 | $\$ 20$ | 1.15 | \$26 | . 30 | 84 |
| college | 3 Transfers | . 50 | \$12 | . 55 | \$14 | . 50 | \$14 | 1.70 | $\$ 20$ | 2.00 | \$26 | . 30 | 84 |
| Student | Local | .40 | \$12 | . 45 | \$14 | . 45 | \$14 | . 50 | \$16 | . 65 | 32 | . 20 | 84 |
| Student | Express 1 | . 60 | \$12 | . 65 | \$14 | . 45 | \$14 | . 50 | \$16 | . 85 | 928 | . 20 | 84 |
| Student | Express 2 | . 80 | \$12. | . 85 | \$14 | . 45 | \$14 | . 50 | \$16 | 1.05 | \$34 | . 20 | 84 |
| Student | Express 3 | 1.00 | \$12 | 1.05 | \$14 | . 45 | \$14 | . 50 | \$16 | 1:25 | $\$ 40$ | . 20 | 84 |
| Student | Express 4 | 1.20 | \$12 | 1.25 | \$14 | .45 | \$14 | . 50 | \$16 | 1.45 | . 846 | . 20 | 84 |
| Student | Express 5 | 1.40 | \$12 | 1.45 | \$14 | . 45 | \$14 | . 50 | \$16 | 1.65 | \$52 | .20 | \$4 |
| Student | 1 Transfer | . 50 | \$12 | . 55 | \$14 | . 50 | \$14 | . 60 | \$16 | . 70 | $\$ 22$ | . 30 | 84 |
| Stuitent | 2 Transfers | . 50 | \$12 | . 55 | \$14 | . 50 | \$14 | .70 | \$16 | . 75 | 522 | . 30 | ¢4 |
| Student | 3 Transfers | . 50 | \$12 | . 55 | \$14 | . 50 | \$14 | 1.40 | 422 | 1.20 | \$16 | . 30 | sil |
| Ef H | Local | . 10 | 34 | . 15 | \$ 4 | . 20 | \$ 4 | . 30 | \$ 6 | . 40 | \$7.50 | . 20 | 84 |
| E \% H | Express 1 | . 10 | \$ 4 | . 15 | 34 | . 20 | \$ 4 | . 30 | \$ 6 | . 60 | \$13.50 | . 20 | \$4 |
| E \% H | Express 2 | . 10 | 3.4 | . 15 | \$ 4 | . 20 | \$4 | . 30 | \$ 6 | . 90 | \$19.50 | . 20 | sn |
| Ef $\mathrm{H}^{\text {c }}$ | Express 3 | . 10 | . 54 | . 15 | 34 | . 20 | \$ 4 | . 30 | \$ 6 | 1.00 | \$25.50 | . 20 | st |
| E \% H | Express 4 | . 10 | \$4 | . 15 | 34 | . 20 | \$4 | . 30 | \$ 6 | 1.20 | \$31.50 | . 20 | 54 |
| E \% H | Express 5 | . 10 | \$ 4 | . 15 | \$ 4 | . 20 | \$4 | . 30 | \$ 6 | 1.40 | \$37.50 | :20 | st |
| E \& H | 1 Transfer | . 20 | 54 | .25 | \$ 4 | . 25 | \$4 | . 40 | \$ 6 | . 45 | \$ 7.50 | :30 | st |
| E \& H | 2 Transfers | . 20 | \$4 | .25 | \$ 4 | . 25 | \$ 4 | . 50 | \$ 6 | . 50 | \$ 7.50 | . 30 | sin |
| E $\mathbf{C H}^{\text {H }}$ | 3 Transfers | . 20 | 34 | . 25 | 34 | . 25 | \$ 4 | .80 | \$ 6 | :90 | \$ 7.50 | .30 | in |

Source: SCRTD. Transportation Department-
SCRTD. Yarketing \& Corminications Department


Magnitude of SCRID Fare Changes By Categoriy

## Fiscal Year

| Fare | Fare | 1979. |  | 1980 |  | 1981 |  | 1982 |  | 1983-1985 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Category | Incriment | Cash | Pass | Cash | Pass | Cash | Pass | Cash | Pass | Cash | Pass |
| Adult | Local | +138 | +118 | +22\% | -0- | +18\% | +308 | +318 | +318 | -418 | -418 |
| Adult | Express 1 | $+88$ | +88 | +158 | -0- | +278 | +318 | +388 | +35\% | -40\% | -418 |
| Adult | Express 2 | +68 | + 78 | $+128$ | -0- | +328 | +318 | +32\% | +38\% | -39\% | -41\% |
| Adult | Express 3 | +58 | + 68 | +108 | -0- | +35\% | +328 | +328 | + 4 | -39\% | -418 |
| Adult | Express 4 | + 48 | + 58 | +88 | -0- | +37\% | +32\% | +32\% | +41\% | -39\% | -418 |
| Adult | Express 5 | +48 | + 48 | +7\% | -0- | +398 | +32\% | +33\% | +428 | -39\% | -418 |
| Adult 1 | Transfer | +108 | +118 | +98 | -0- | +423 | +308 | +18\% | +318 | -40\% | -41\% |
| Adult 2 | Transfers | +108 | +118 | +98 | -0- | +75\% | +308 | +10\% | +318 | -48\% | -41\% |
| Adult 3 | Transfers | +108 | +118 | +98 | -0- | +183\% | +308 | +18\% | +318 | -70\% | -41\% |
| College | Local | +138 | +178 | -0- | -0- | +1488 | +438 | +318 | +30\% | -76\% | -85\% |
| College | Express 1 | +8\% | +178 | -318 | -0- | +1118 | +438 | +328 | +60\% | -848 | -88\% |
| college | Express 2 | +68 | +178 | -478 | -0- | +178\% | +438 | +328 | +908 | -888 | -898 |
| College | Express 3 | +58 | +17\% | -578 | -0- | +2448 | +43\% | +328 | +1208 | -90\% | -918 |
| College | Express 4 | +48 | +17\% | -648 | -0- | +311\% | +438 | $+328$ | +150\% | -988 | -98 |
| college | Fxprees 5 | +48 | +17\% | -69\% | -0- | $+378 \%$ | +438 | +33\% | +180\% | -938 | -93\% |
| college 1 | 1 Transfer | $+108$ | +178 | -98 | -0- | +708 | $+438$ | +188 | +30\% | -708 | - 58 |
| College 2 | 2 Transfers | $+108$ | +17\% | -98 | -0- | +1118 | +438 | +108 | +30\% | -748 | -85\% |
| college 3 | 3 Transfers | +10\% | +17\% | -98 | -0- | $+2008$ | $+438$ | +18\% | +30\% | -85\% | -858 |
| Sturent | Local | +13\% | +17\% | -0- | -0- | +118 | +148 | +30\% | +38\% | -698 | -82\% |
| Student | Express 1 | +8\% | $+178$ | -318 | -0- | +118 | +148 | +70\% | +758 | -768 | -86\% |
| Student | Express 2 | +6\% | $+178$ | -47\% | -0- | +118 | +148 | +110\% | +1138 | -818 | -88\% |
| Student | Express 3 | +58 | +178 | -57\% | -0- | +118 | +148 | +150\% | +150\% | -848 | -908 |
| Student | Express 4 | +48 | +17\% | -648 | -0- | +118 | +148 | +1908 | +188\% | -86\% | -918 |
| Student | Express 5 | +48 | +178 | -69\% | -0- | +118 | $+148$ | $+2308$ | +2258 | -88\% | -98 |
| Student 1 | 1 Transfer | +108 | +178 | -98 | -0- | +20\% | +148 | +17\% | +38\% | -578 | -2\% |
| Student 2 | 2 Transfers | +10\% | $+178$ | -98 | -0- | +10\% | $+148$ | + 78 | +38\% | -60\% | -82\% |
| Student 3 | 3 Transfers | +104 | +17\% | -98 | -0- | +140\% | $+148$ | +178 | +38\% | -79\% | $-828$ |
| E\& H | Local | +508 | -0- | +33\% | -0- | $+50 \%$ | +50\% | +33\% | +25\% | -50\% | -17\% |
| E\&H | Express 1 | +50\% | -0- | +338 | -0- | +50\% | +50\% | +100\% | +125\% | -67\% | -708 |
| E\& H | Express 2 | +508 | -0- | +338 | -0- | +50\% | +50\% | +167\% | +25\% | -75\% | -798 |
| E\& H | Express 3 | $+508$ | -0- | +33\% | -0- | +50\% | +50\% | +2338 | +325\% | -808 | -848 |
| E\& H | Express 4 | +50\% | -0- | +33\% | -0- | +50\% | +50\% | +3008 | +425\% | -83\% | -87\% |
| E\&H | Express 5 | +50\% | -0, | +33\% | -0- | +50\% | +50\% | +3674 | +525\% | -86\% | -89\% |
| E\&H 1 | 1 Transfer | +25\% | -0- | -0- | -0- | +60\% | +508 | +13\% | +258 | -33\% | -7\% |
| E\&H 2 | 2 Transfers | +258 | -0- | -0- | -0- | $+100 \%$ | +50\% | -0- | +258 | -40\% | -47\% |
| E\&H 3 | 3 Transfers | +25\% | -0- | -0- | -0- | +220\% | +50\% | +138 | +258 | -67\% | -77\% |
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Table 5
Maginitude of SCRID Fare Changes By Category
FY 1979-1985
Fïscal Year

| Fare | Fare | 1979 |  | 1980 |  | 1981 |  | 1982 |  | 1983-1985 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Category | Increment | Cash | Pass | Cash | Pass | Cash | Pass | Cash | Pais | Cash | Pass |
| Adulit | Local | +138 | +118 | +228 | -0- | +18\% | $+308$ | +318 | +318 | -418 | -418 |
| Adult | Express 1 | +88 | +8\% | +15\% | -0- | +27\% | +318 | +32\% | +358 | -108 | -418 |
| Adult | Express 2 | +68 | + 7\% | +12\% | -0 | +32\% | +318 | +32\% | +38\% | -398 | -418 |
| Adult | Express 3 | +58 | +68 | +10\% | -0 | +35\% | +328 | +328 | $+408$ | -398 | -41\% |
| Adult | Express 4 | $+48$ | + 58 | +88 | -0 | +37\% | +328 | +328 | +418 | -398 | -418 |
| Adult | Express 5 | + 48 | $+48$ | + 78 | -0 | +39\% | +32\% | +33\% | +42\% | -39\% | -418 |
| Adult 1 | 1 Transfer | +10\% | +118 | +98 | -0- | +42\% | +30\% | +18\% | +318 | -408 | -418 |
| Adult 2 | 2 Transfers | $+108$ | +118 | +98 | -0- | +758 | +30\% | +10\% | +318 | -488 | -418 |
| Adult 3 | 3 Transfers | $+10 \%$ | +118 | +98 | -0- | +1838 | +308 | +18\% | +318 | -708 | -418 |
| College | Local | +13\% | +178 | -0- | -0- | +448 | +43\% | +318 | +308 | -76\% | -85\% |
| College | Express 1 | +8\% | +17\% | -31\% | -0- | +1118 | +438 | +32\% | $+60 \%$ | -848 | -88\% |
| College | Express 2 | +68 | +178 | -47\% | -0- | +178\% | +438 | +329 | $+908$ | -88\% | -89\% |
| College | Express 3 | +58 | +17\% | -57\% | -0- | +2448 | +438 | +328 | +1208 | -908 | -91\% |
| College. | Express 4 | $+48$ | +17\% | -64\% | -0- | +3118 | +43\% | +32\% | +1508 | -98 | -92\% |
| College | Fxprees 5 | + 48 | +17\% | -69\% | -0 | +378\% | +438 | +33\% | +180\% | -938 | -93\% |
| College 1 | 1 Iransfer | +10\% | +178 | -98 | -0 | $+708$ | +438 | +18\% | +30\% | -70\% | -85\% |
| Coilege 2 | 2 Transfers | $+10 \%$ | +17\% | -98 | -0- | +1118 | +43\% | +10\% | +30\% | -74\% | -858 |
| College 3 | 3 Transfers | +10\% | +17\% | - 9\% | -0- | $+200 \%$ | +438 | +18\% | $+30 \%$ | -85\% | -85\% |
| Student | Local | +13\% | +17\% | -0- | -0 | +118 | $+148$ | +30\% | +38\% | -69\% | -82\% |
| Student | Express 1 | + 8\% | +17\% | -318 | -0- | +11\% | +148 | $+708$ | +75\% | -768 | -86\% |
| Student | Express 2 | +6\% | +17\% | -478 | -0 | +118 | $+148$ | +110\% | +113\% | -818 | -888 |
| Student | Express 3 | +58 | +17\% | -57\% | -0- | +1.18 | $+148$ | +150\% | +150\% | -848 | -908 |
| Student | Express 4 | + 48 | +17\% | -648 | -0- | +11\% | $+148$ | $+1908$ | +188\% | -868 | -918 |
| Studert | Express 5 | + 48 | +178 | -69\% | -0- | +11\% | $+148$ | +2308 | +225\% | -88\% | -928 |
| Student 1 | 1 Transfer | +10\% | +17\% | -98 | -0- | +208 | $+148$ | $+17 \%$ | +38\% | -57\% | -82\% |
| Student 2 | 2 Transfers | +108 | +17\% | -98 | -0- | +40\% | $+148$ | $+78$ | +388 | -60\% | -828 |
| Studert 3 | 3 Transfers | +108 | +17\% | -98 | -0- | +140\% | +148 | $+17 \%$ | +38\% | -7.9\% | -82\% |
| FE H | Local | +50\% | -0- | +33\% | -0- | +50\% | +50\% | +33\% | +25\% | -50\% | -47\% |
| E\& H | Express 1 | +50\% | -0- | +33\% | -0- | +508 | +50\% | $+100 \%$ | +1258 | -67\% | -70\% |
| E\& H | Express 2 | +50\% | -0- | +33\% | -0- | +50\% | +50\% | +167\% | +2258 | -758 | -79\% |
| E\&H | Express 3 | +50\% | -0- | +33\% | -0- | +50\% | +50\% | +233\% | +325\% | -80\% | -848 |
| E\& H | Express 4 | +50\% | -0- | +33\% | -0- | +50\% | +50\% | +300\% | +425\% | -83\% | -87\% |
| E\& H | Express 5 | +50\% | -0- | +33\% | -0- | +50\% | +50\% | +3678 | +5258 | -86\% | -89\% |
| E\&H 1 | 1 Transfer | +25\% | -0- | -0- | -0- | +60\% | +508 | +138 | +258 | -33\% | -47\% |
| E\&H 2 | 2 Transfers | +258 | -0 | -0. | -0- | +100\% | +508 | -0 | +25\% | -40\% | -47\% |
| E\&H 3 | 3 Transfers | +25\% | -0- | -- | -0- | $+2208$ | +50\% | +138 | +25\% | -67\% | -47\% |
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