



Public Transit System Cost Efficiency Report

Report Year 2017

Report prepared by:

Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Public and Specialized Transit Section

Rail Transit Safety Oversight Program

July 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	2
METHODOLOGY	3
STEP ONE COMPLIANCE	4
STEP TWO COMPLIANCE	5
STEP THREE COMPLIANCE	6
STEP FOUR COMPLIANCE	7
APPENDIX I: 2017 STEP TWO COMPLIANCE ANALYSIS TABLES	10
APPENDIX II: 2017 STEP ONE PERFORMANCE MEASURES	12

INTRODUCTION

The Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) publishes a cost efficiency report for the state's public transit systems on an annual basis, as specified by Wis. Stat. 85.20 and Administrative Rule Trans 4. All services receiving Wis. Stat. 85.20 Urban Mass Transit Operating Assistance program aid are subject to cost efficiency reporting. Transit system cost efficiency standards are one way to gauge efficiency over time and identify areas for potential improvement. This report presents cost efficiency measures for the 2017 reporting year.

Wisconsin's public transit systems take many forms, ranging from large urban bus systems to rural shared-ride taxi services. Some services are publicly-operated while others are operated by private, for-profit companies under contract with public bodies.

Overall, public transit systems in Wisconsin offer transportation services in an efficient manner and meet performance standards year after year. It is important for public transit systems to maintain a high level of efficiency for several reasons. Most public transit systems in Wisconsin are supported by federal, state and local funds. More efficient public transit systems maximize the effectiveness of limited funds, providing the best service for the dollars available. Additionally, more efficient systems minimize the required funding contributions from local revenue sources, such as tax levies and passenger fares.

Questions about this report should be directed to a WisDOT Public Transit Program Managers Steve Hirshfeld (stephen.hirshfeld@dot.wi.gov) or Kevin Lange (kevin.lange@dot.wi.gov). Additional Contact information is available online at the following URL:

<http://wisconsindot.gov/Pages/doing-bus/local-gov/astnce-pgms/transit/contacts.aspx>

METHODOLOGY

The following six performance measures are used to compare the relative efficiency of public transit systems in Wisconsin:

- operating expenses per revenue hour
- operating ratio (revenue/expense ratio or “farebox recovery”)
- operating expenses per passenger
- passengers per revenue hour
- passengers per capita
- revenue hours per capita

Wisconsin transit systems are broken into seven peer groups for the purposes of this report:

- Milwaukee County Transit System peer group
- Madison Metro Transit System peer group
- medium-community bus
- small-community bus
- commuter bus
- shared-ride taxi
- county-wide shared-ride taxi

Grouping public transit systems into peer groups allows for fair and reasonable comparisons. For example, the passenger counts and expenses for shared-ride taxi systems (which usually transport individuals within a village or city) are significantly lower than any fixed-route bus system in a medium or large metropolitan area. Commuter buses, on the other hand, cover long distances to bring rural or suburban residents to job centers. Therefore, they are more expensive to operate per passenger than other types of systems. The operational differences between the public transit systems justifies the need to arrange them into related peer groups.

Madison Metro Transit System, Milwaukee County Transit System (MCTS), and medium-sized bus systems are compared to a group of nation-wide peers, all of which report their operating statistics to the National Transit Database (NTD). Small-community bus systems, commuter bus systems and shared-ride taxi services use a statewide peer group for comparison since comparable NTD data are not available.

NTD reporters submit data from their respective fiscal years. NTD publishes this data on a “report year” basis, which may include fiscal years that are not equivalent. Data not retrieved from NTD are gathered from WisDOT records or directly from the transit system.

Administrative Rule guides this report analysis and format. The following analysis is organized by subsection of applicable Administrative Rule and assigned a numerical “step.” “In compliance” in each step means that the public transit system meets or exceeds the performance standard.

STEP ONE COMPLIANCE

The first stage of analysis (referred to as “step one”) involves annual comparisons within peer groups. Public transit systems are compliant in step one if they meet or exceed the performance standard in four of six performance measures. Meeting or exceeding the performance standard means being within one standard deviation of the mean, within that performance measure. The table below shows the number and percentage of public transit systems in step one compliance since 2008.

Year	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Systems in Step One Compliance	65	62	65	69	69	70	69	66	69	71
All Systems	71	71	75	76	76	77	78	76	79	80
Percent in Compliance	91.5%	87.3%	86.7%	90.8%	90.8%	90.9%	88.5%	86.8%	87.3%	88.8%

Public Transit Systems Out of Step One Compliance in 2017

SYSTEM	PEER GROUP
Beloit	Medium Bus
Fond du Lac	Medium Bus
Kenosha County	Small Bus
Clintonville	Shared-ride Taxi
Edgerton	Shared-ride Taxi
Hartford	Shared-ride Taxi
Onalaska	Shared-ride Taxi
Rice Lake*	Shared-ride Taxi
Waupun	Shared-ride Taxi

**Rice Lake transitioned from public operation to a private provider in calendar year 2017. This system is also expected to completely discontinue its shared-ride taxi service in 2019.*

STEP TWO COMPLIANCE

For transit systems not meeting the cost-efficiency standards at step one, a second stage of analysis is prescribed. During “step two” analysis all six performance measures are reviewed for improvement. If improvement is observed in four or more of the indicators over the time-period, then no further action is taken and the system is considered in compliance with step two.

The table below shows the number and percentage of public transit systems compliant in step two since 2008. Detailed tables showing 2017 step two compliance analysis are found in Appendix I. Of the eight systems reviewed for step two compliance in 2017:

- Rice Lake is not included in step two compliance analysis;
- One system (Kenosha County) is considered compliant in step two; and
- Seven systems are considered noncompliant in step two.

Year	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Systems in Step Two Compliance	67	65	70	74	73	74	73	73	73	73
All Systems	71	71	75	76	76	77	78	76	79	80
Percent in Compliance	94.4%	91.5%	93.3%	97.4%	96.1%	96.1%	93.6%	96.1%	92.4%	91.3%

Public Transit Systems Out of Step Two Compliance in 2017

SYSTEM	PEER GROUP
Beloit	Medium Bus
Fond du Lac	Medium Bus
Clintonville	Shared-ride Taxi
Edgerton	Shared-ride Taxi
Hartford	Shared-ride Taxi
Onalaska	Shared-ride Taxi
Waupun	Shared-ride Taxi

City of Rice Lake Step Two Compliance

In calendar year 2019, the city of Rice Lake plans to discontinue its shared-ride taxi service. Therefore, Step Two Compliance check will not be performed.

STEP THREE COMPLIANCE

Per Administrative Rule Trans 4.09(4)(e), step three compliance analysis requires the review of the most recent management performance audit. WisDOT conducts a management performance audit (commonly referred to as a management performance review, or MPR) of urban mass transit systems at least once every five years. MPRs are not required of shared-ride taxi systems. The goal of the MPR program is to identify opportunities for transit systems to increase efficiencies. The MPR process consists of three main activities: performance analysis, written questionnaire completion, and an on-site interview and facility review. The review of each system results in a final report that includes a review of these metrics and recommendations for improvement.

Of the seven systems out of step two compliance, only Beloit and Fond du Lac are required to participate in MPRs. Fond du Lac had its last MPR in 2011 (MPR scheduled for 2019), so that system will be covered in step four.

Clintonville, Edgerton, Hartford, Onalaska, and Waupun operate shared-ride taxi systems which are exempt from the MPR requirement. However, the department may choose to include a shared-ride taxi system in an MPR if the department believes the MPR can assist the transit system to increase efficiencies. Clintonville, Edgerton, Onalaska, and Waupun have not undergone an MPR since at least 2006. Hartford participated in an MPR in 2016 and will be included in step three analysis.

City of Beloit (Beloit Transit System)

The Beloit Transit System (BTS) is a fixed-route bus system with complementary ADA paratransit service. The service covers approximately 36,500 residents in and near Beloit. The system operates in an urbanized area and is included in the “medium bus” category for the purposes of the Cost Efficiency Report.

Step two compliance analysis shows that over the five-year period under review the system has not shown improvement in the performance metrics and has, in fact, declined. The decline in the performance metrics can largely be attributed to increasing expenses and lower ridership. Both factors have been experienced by a wide number of public transit systems across the United States since about 2009. Increasing expenses and reduced ridership have been attributed to an improving economy.

BTS participated in an MPR in 2018. Part of the report was dedicated to reviewing what changes were recommended to BTS in the 2011 MPR. It was determined that most recommendations have not been completed or adequately addressed (related primarily to oversight via a transit planning commission and monthly reports to the Beloit city council).

Other recommendations in the 2018 MPR include greater use of social media for advertising and information. BTS does not have its own dedicated social media account (only use is through City of Beloit). It was also recommended that BTS set quarterly goals for community outreach to grow community collaboration and support.

Not included in the MPR is the recent departure of the Transit Director. Once a new Transit Director has been put in place, WisDOT will work with the Director to implement the recommendations of the 2018 MPR.

WisDOT is considering the City of Beloit Transit System in compliance with Step Three analysis due to the recently completed MPR process.

City of Hartford (Hartford City Taxi)

The city of Hartford is a Tier B demand response shared-ride taxi system that provides services to approximately 15,000 residents in Hartford.

Step two compliance analysis shows that over the five-year period under review, the system has declined in five out of six performance metrics. However, in an analysis using preliminary 2018 data their operating expense to revenue hour ratio did improve.

Hartford participated in an MPR in 2016. This was Hartford's first MPR, so there were no prior recommendations to review. Some recommendations from the MPR included:

- Develop a computer aided system to verify logs.
- Develop a transit operator training handbook and update the training program.
- Improve documentation of revenue collection procedures.
- Survey the community to determine adequacy of service. Market penetration is below average.
- Develop a system to track origin and destination data, then complete a needs assessment.
- Establish an outreach program to schools, non-profits, and advocacy groups.

WisDOT is considering the city of Hartford in compliance with Step Three analysis due to the recently completed MPR process and their efforts to improve overall performance.

STEP FOUR COMPLIANCE

Because the Clintonville Transit Commission, city of Edgerton, city of Fond du Lac, city of Onalaska and city of Waupun, and public transit services have not undergone a MPR, the department is unable to review their MPR recommendations for improvement during step three compliance analysis. Therefore, the five systems are subject to step four compliance review per Administrative Rule Trans 4.09(4)(f).

During step four compliance:

- Each service is reviewed for technical assistance that the department may provide, and
- The department will review the MPR schedule to include the systems in the upcoming schedules.

Clintonville Transit Commission (Clintonville)

The Clintonville Transit Commission is a Tier C demand response shared-ride taxi system that provides services to approximately 4,400 residents in and surrounding Clintonville.

The Clintonville Transit Commission has an MPR tentatively scheduled during 2020. Clintonville recently rebid its public transit service under a new contract beginning in calendar year 2018. A new provider was awarded the service. Clintonville's hourly rate decreased under the new contractor in 2018, and 2018 pro forma showed an increase in passengers per revenue hour and per capita. This led to an improvement in three of the four cost efficiency ratios out of step one compliance for 2017. In fact, the improvements in the expenses per passenger and passenger per revenue hour created a positive five-year trend (2014-2018) in those categories. WisDOT will re-evaluate whether the 2020 MPR is required if the improvement in those categories continues into calendar year 2019.

WisDOT will continue an ongoing communication with Transit Commission officials to ensure they possess the support they need to contract for and carry out an efficient shared-ride taxi system. WisDOT will accomplish this through regular quarterly report review, review of annual applications and supporting documentation, and conversations with city officials.

Because of the recent re-bid for public transit service WisDOT expects operating statistics to stabilize and costs to be reduced. The MPR scheduled for 2020, if required, will allow WisDOT to review and confirm that operating statistics have improved. For these reasons, WisDOT is considering the Clintonville Transit Commission in compliance with step four analysis.

City of Edgerton

The city of Edgerton is a Tier C shared-ride taxi system that provides demand response services to approximately 5,600 residents in Edgerton. An MPR is tentatively scheduled for 2020.

Step two compliance analysis shows that over the five-year review period Edgerton has declined in five out of six performance measures. However, their operating expense per revenue hour did improve from report year 2016 to report year 2017. Initial evaluation of 2018 data does not reveal any improvements in system efficiency.

Because its next MPR is scheduled for 2020, Edgerton is in compliance with step four analysis.

City of Fond du Lac (Fond du Lac Area Transit)

Fond du Lac Area Transit (FDLAT) is a Fixed Route, Demand Response & Complementary Paratransit system that provides services to approximately 49,000 residents in the city of Fond du Lac and village of North Fond du Lac. The system operates in an urbanized area and is included in the “medium bus” category for the purposes of this report.

Step two compliance analysis shows that over the five-year review period, FDLAT has declined in five out of six performance measures. However, in performing a separate pro forma analysis using preliminary 2018 data, there were some improvements noted in the ratios. Specifically, they showed improvement in 2 out of the 3 ratios (expenses per passenger, passengers per capita) that were not step one compliant.

FDLAT underwent its last MPR in 2011. Because its next MPR is scheduled for 2019, FDLAT is in compliance with step four analysis.

City of Onalaska (Onalaska)

The city of Onalaska is a Tier B shared-ride taxi system that provides demand response services to the residents of the city of Onalaska, village of Holmen, and village of West Salem (approximately 34,000 residents combined).

Onalaska is tentatively scheduled for an MPR during 2020. While WisDOT has oversight for state grant requirements, the city of Onalaska has operated a service for many years under direct FTA oversight for federal grants. The city’s additional federal grant responsibilities and the fact the city is in a small urban designation (Tier B) signals to WisDOT that the city has additional capacity to monitor, evaluate and adjust services to meet the needs of residents while providing safe and efficient service.

WisDOT will continue an ongoing communication with city officials to ensure they possess the support they need to contract for and carry out an efficient shared-ride taxi system. WisDOT will accomplish this through regular quarterly report review, review of annual applications and supporting documentation, and conversations with city officials.

The city of Onalaska does not appear to have any obvious operating practices that would indicate performance issues. However, the MPR tentatively scheduled for 2019 or 2020 may reveal opportunities to enhance efficiencies. Due to these reasons, WisDOT is considering the city of Onalaska in compliance with step four analysis.

City of Waupun

The city of Waupun is a Tier C shared-ride taxi system that provides demand response services to approximately 11,000 residents in Waupun. An MPR is tentatively scheduled for 2020.

Step two compliance analysis shows that over the five-year review period Waupun has declined in five out of six performance measures. However, in performing a separate pro forma analysis using preliminary 2018 data, they showed improvement in all six performance measures. The improvements in revenue as a percentage of expenses, passengers per revenue hour, and passengers per capita were significant enough to provide positive five-year trend (2014-2018) in those categories. WisDOT will re-evaluate whether the 2020 MPR is required if the improvement in those categories continues into calendar year 2019.

Because of the improvement in the 2018 pro forma data and the fact that Waupun is scheduled to undergo a MPR in 2020, if required, they are in compliance with step four analysis.

APPENDIX I: 2017 STEP TWO COMPLIANCE ANALYSIS TABLES

Green check-marks signify an improving trend or balanced status during the 5-year period.

A red "X" signifies the trend has not improved during the time period.

Cells with colors indicate a performance measure value outside the standard deviation for that transit system in 2017. Colors correspond to each performance measure (column). Colors from previous years are not included in these tables.

2017 Step Two Compliance								
		Highlighted values are non-compliant in step one for 2017.	Expense/ Revenue Hour	Revenue/ Expense Ratio	Expense/ Passenger	Passengers/ Revenue Hour	Passengers/ Capita	Revenue Hours/ Capita
		5 year trend:	X	X	X	X	X	✓
Beloit	2017	\$94.17	6.83%	\$13.30	7.08	4.18	0.59	
Medium Bus	2016	\$93.75	8.61%	\$10.49	8.94	5.13	0.57	
	2015	\$94.66	9.50%	\$9.98	9.48	5.63	0.59	
	2014	\$91.88	11.40%	\$8.11	11.33	6.79	0.60	
	2013	\$88.35	11.40%	\$7.44	11.88	6.92	0.58	
		5 year trend:	X	X	X	X	X	✓
Fond du Lac	2017	\$61.29	27.58%	\$9.01	6.80	4.08	0.60	
Medium Bus	2016	\$55.20	29.80%	\$7.50	7.37	4.25	0.58	
	2015	\$54.12	30.56%	\$7.56	7.16	4.19	0.59	
	2014	\$54.85	30.22%	\$7.79	7.04	4.10	0.58	
	2013	\$59.90	30.25%	\$7.98	7.50	4.42	0.59	
		5 year trend:	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Kenosha County	2017	\$45.22	5.45%	\$30.56	1.48	0.43	0.29	
Small Bus	2016	\$44.37	5.85%	\$26.38	1.68	0.47	0.28	
	2015	\$43.25	4.39%	\$31.56	1.37	0.40	0.30	
	2014	\$45.10	2.78%	\$36.24	1.24	0.35	0.28	
	2013	\$45.80	4.07%	\$34.25	1.34	0.38	0.28	
		5 year trend:	X	X	X	X	X	✓
Clintonville	2017	\$31.07	22.19%	\$14.63	2.12	1.80	0.85	
Shared-ride Taxi	2016	\$30.77	22.63%	\$13.97	2.20	1.87	0.85	
	2015	\$30.25	25.10%	\$13.74	2.20	1.84	0.84	
	2014	\$29.77	26.23%	\$12.58	2.37	1.97	0.83	
	2013	\$29.68	26.73%	\$11.75	2.53	2.13	0.84	
		5 year trend:	✓	X	X	X	X	X
Edgerton	2017	\$23.73	19.91%	\$11.71	2.03	1.00	0.49	
Shared-ride Taxi	2016	\$24.02	22.40%	\$10.77	2.23	1.11	0.50	
	2015	\$22.69	24.92%	\$8.93	2.54	1.27	0.50	
	2014	\$22.23	24.35%	\$10.41	2.13	1.07	0.50	
	2013	\$21.90	24.08%	\$10.61	2.06	1.04	0.50	
		5 year trend:	X	✓	X	X	X	X
Hartford	2017	\$38.41	42.62%	\$11.17	3.44	1.24	0.36	
Shared-ride Taxi	2016	\$37.38	30.26%	\$10.60	3.53	1.31	0.37	
	2015	\$37.06	32.25%	\$10.09	3.67	1.40	0.38	
	2014	\$37.98	35.99%	\$9.15	4.15	1.43	0.34	
	2013	\$40.10	33.67%	\$9.49	4.23	1.54	0.37	

APPENDIX I: 2017 STEP TWO COMPLIANCE ANALYSIS TABLES (CONTINUED)

2017 Step Two Compliance								
	<i>Highlighted values are non-compliant in step one for 2017.</i>	Expense/ Revenue Hour	Revenue/ Expense Ratio	Expense/ Passenger	Passengers/ Revenue Hour	Passengers/ Capita	Revenue Hours/ Capita	
	5 year trend:	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Onalaska	2017	\$26.42	24.66%	\$14.01	1.89	1.73	0.92	
<i>Shared-ride Taxi</i>	2016	\$26.11	26.03%	\$11.78	2.22	2.03	0.92	
	2015	\$25.98	29.31%	\$11.07	2.35	2.19	0.93	
	2014	\$27.01	27.06%	\$11.13	2.43	2.36	0.97	
	2013	\$25.70	29.27%	\$10.27	2.50	2.46	0.98	
	5 year trend:	X	X	X	X	X		√
Waupun	2017	\$22.52	24.84%	\$12.71	1.77	0.85	0.48	
<i>Shared-ride Taxi</i>	2016	\$19.38	30.09%	\$8.71	2.23	1.08	0.49	
	2015	\$19.02	29.71%	\$9.12	2.09	1.02	0.49	
	2014	\$19.10	27.94%	\$10.13	1.89	0.89	0.47	
	2013	\$21.55	21.12%	\$12.44	1.73	0.77	0.44	

APPENDIX II: 2017 STEP ONE PERFORMANCE MEASURES

2017 PERFORMANCE MEASURES
EXTERNAL PEER GROUP SUMMARY
MILWAUKEE COUNTY TRANSIT SYSTEM
 Data: National Transit Database, Report year 2017

Performance Measure	Mean	Standard Deviation	Performance Parameters	
			+/- One Standard Deviation	
Operating Expense / Revenue Hour	\$ 105.91	\$ 16.61	\$ 89.29	\$ 122.52
Revenue / Operating Expense	17.2%	6.0%	11.1%	23.2%
Operating Expenses / Passenger	\$ 6.21	\$ 1.31	\$ 4.89	\$ 7.52
Passengers / Revenue Hour	17.56	3.73	13.83	21.29
Passengers / Capita	20.55	8.91	11.64	29.46
Revenue Hours / Capita	1.13	0.26	0.87	1.39

2017 PERFORMANCE MEASURES								
System	City, State	NTDID	Operating Expense / Revenue Hour	Revenue / Operating Expense	Operating Expenses / Passenger	Passengers / Revenue Hour	Passengers / Capita	Revenue Hours / Capita
Milwaukee County Transit System	Milwaukee, WI	50008	\$ 95.69	23.5%	\$ 4.11	23.29	36.84	1.58
Southwest Ohio Regional Transit Authority	Cincinnati, OH	50012	\$ 112.40	29.6%	\$ 6.43	17.48	17.15	0.98
Central Ohio Transit Authority	Columbus, OH	50016	\$ 115.00	13.7%	\$ 7.71	14.92	17.62	1.18
City of Detroit Department of Transportation	Detroit, MI	50119	\$ 114.85	16.5%	\$ 4.68	24.55	34.86	1.42
Indianapolis and Marion County Public Transportation	Indianapolis, IN	50050	\$ 98.80	14.3%	\$ 7.77	12.72	9.76	0.77
Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority	Austin, TX	60048	\$ 116.67	10.2%	\$ 6.72	17.37	22.82	1.31
The Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority	Cleveland, OH	50015	\$ 133.31	16.0%	\$ 7.29	18.28	19.34	1.06
Bi-State Development Agency of the Missouri-Illinois Metropolitan District, d.b.a. (St. Louis)	St. Louis, MO	70006	\$ 106.61	16.3%	\$ 6.91	15.43	16.65	1.08
VIA Metropolitan Transit	San Antonio, TX	60011	\$ 92.75	10.4%	\$ 5.55	16.72	19.05	1.14
Central Florida Regional Transportation Authority	Orlando, FL	40035	\$ 72.98	21.1%	\$ 4.91	14.85	11.42	0.77
GROUP MEAN:			\$ 105.91	17.2%	\$ 6.21	17.56	20.55	1.13

2017 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

EXTERNAL PEER GROUP SUMMARY

MADISON METRO TRANSIT

Data: National Transit Database, Report year 2017

Performance Measure	Mean	Standard Deviation	Performance Parameters	
			+/- One Standard Deviation	
Operating Expense / Revenue Hour	\$ 106.78	\$ 15.57	\$ 91.22	\$ 122.35
Revenue / Operating Expense	16.4%	6.4%	10.1%	22.8%
Operating Expenses / Passenger	\$ 5.66	\$ 2.24	\$ 3.42	\$ 7.90
Passengers / Revenue Hour	21.32	7.78	13.54	29.10
Passengers / Capita	30.49	24.35	6.14	54.83
Revenue Hours / Capita	1.27	0.56	0.71	1.83

2017 PERFORMANCE MEASURES								
System	City, State	NTDID	Operating Expense / Revenue Hour	Revenue / Operating Expense	Operating Expenses / Passenger	Passengers / Revenue Hour	Passengers / Capita	Revenue Hours / Capita
Metro Transit System	Madison, WI	50005	\$ 106.64	24.1%	\$ 4.16	25.61	52.84	2.06
Capital Area Transportation Authority (CATA)	Lansing, MI	50036	\$ 100.56	15.6%	\$ 4.32	23.30	35.36	1.52
Ann Arbor Area Transportation Authority & University of Michigan	Ann Arbor, MI & UMich	50040 & 50158	\$ 84.58	12.3%	\$ 3.15	26.84	47.97	1.79
METRO Regional Transit Authority	Akron, OH	50010	\$ 111.65	8.4%	\$ 9.56	11.68	9.51	0.81
Greater Dayton Regional Transit Authority	Dayton, OH	50017	\$ 131.92	10.6%	\$ 9.00	14.66	12.77	0.87
Champaign-Urbana Mass Transit District	Urbana, IL	50060	\$ 104.16	23.7%	\$ 2.67	38.95	88.26	2.27
Des Moines Area Regional Transit Authority	Des Moines, IA	70010	\$ 101.74	23.5%	\$ 6.06	16.80	11.67	0.69
Spokane Transit Authority	Spokane, WA	00002	\$ 110.21	14.3%	\$ 5.88	18.75	25.38	1.35
CNY Centro, Inc.	Syracuse, NY	20018	\$ 135.60	22.2%	\$ 6.17	21.98	16.92	0.77
Capital Area Transit System	Baton Rouge, LA	60022	\$ 90.42	7.2%	\$ 7.08	12.78	10.39	0.81
Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County	Reno, NV	90001	\$ 97.13	18.8%	\$ 4.19	23.19	24.26	1.05
GROUP MEAN:			\$ 106.78	16.4%	\$ 5.66	21.32	30.49	1.27

2017 PERFORMANCE MEASURES
MEDIUM BUS TRANSIT SYSTEMS

Data: NTD, report year 2017; for systems not in NTD, BlackCat operations reports

Performance Measure	Mean	Standard Deviation	Performance Parameters	
			+/- One Standard Deviation	
Operating Expense / Revenue Hour	\$ 82.75	\$ 12.72	\$ 70.03	\$ 95.47
Revenue / Operating Expense	14.7%	6.0%	8.7%	20.7%
Operating Expenses / Passenger	\$ 6.54	\$ 1.91	\$ 4.63	\$ 8.46
Passengers / Revenue Hour	13.40	3.36	10.04	16.75
Passengers / Capita	10.26	4.60	5.66	14.86
Revenue Hours / Capita	0.75	0.25	0.51	1.00

2017 PERFORMANCE MEASURES								
System	City, State	NTDID	Operating Expense / Revenue Hour	Revenue / Operating Expense	Operating Expenses / Passenger	Passengers / Revenue Hour	Passengers / Capita	Revenue Hours / Capita
Valley Transit	Appleton	50001	\$ 72.37	20.3%	\$ 6.73	10.75	5.31	0.49
City of Beloit Transit System	Beloit	50109	\$ 94.17	6.8%	\$ 13.30	7.08	4.18	0.59
Eau Claire Transit	Eau Claire	50099	\$ 69.91	20.5%	\$ 5.76	12.15	12.25	1.01
Fond du Lac Area Transit	Fond du Lac	50171	\$ 61.29	27.6%	\$ 9.01	6.80	4.08	0.60
Green Bay Metro	Green Bay	50002	\$ 76.63	11.5%	\$ 5.69	13.46	7.27	0.54
Janesville Transit System	Janesville	50108	\$ 113.00	14.6%	\$ 7.02	16.09	7.71	0.48
Kenosha Transit	Kenosha	50003	\$ 73.70	11.8%	\$ 5.16	14.29	12.98	0.91
LaCrosse Municipal Transit Utility	La Crosse	50004	\$ 80.55	15.9%	\$ 5.54	14.55	14.41	0.99
Maritime Metro Transit	Manitowoc	n/a	\$ 82.03	11.8%	\$ 6.23	13.16	9.23	0.70
GO Transit	Oshkosh	50009	\$ 81.68	19.3%	\$ 4.66	17.54	14.85	0.85
Belle Urban System - Racine	Racine	50006	\$ 82.30	15.8%	\$ 6.12	13.45	10.34	0.77
Shoreline Metro	Sheboygan	50088	\$ 78.12	18.9%	\$ 6.94	11.26	9.50	0.84
Stevens Point Transit	Stevens Point	n/a	\$ 85.05	18.2%	\$ 7.46	11.40	8.25	0.72
Duluth Transit Authority	Superior	n/a	\$ 92.27	9.2%	\$ 9.12	10.11	5.74	0.57
Wausau Area Transit System	Wausau	50091	\$ 97.35	14.0%	\$ 5.66	17.20	12.80	0.74
City of Waukesha Transit Commission	Waukesha	50096	\$ 90.41	14.1%	\$ 6.87	13.15	6.25	0.48
City of Dubuque	Dubuque, IA	70011	\$ 59.37	11.3%	\$ 6.98	8.51	8.64	1.02
Kalamazoo Metro Transit System	Kalamazoo, MI	50035	\$ 71.64	20.5%	\$ 5.41	13.24	13.84	1.04
Bloomington-Normal Public Transit System	Normal, IL	50047	\$ 83.89	10.6%	\$ 5.14	16.31	17.82	1.09
Decatur Public Transit System	Decatur	50061	\$ 87.40	7.6%	\$ 5.64	15.49	15.10	0.98
Rockford Mass Transit District	Rockford, IL	50058	\$ 107.95	8.3%	\$ 9.29	11.62	7.39	0.64
City of Rochester Public Transportation	Rochester, MN	50092	\$ 87.76	31.3%	\$ 4.53	19.36	18.10	0.93
St. Cloud Metropolitan Transit Commission	St. Cloud, MN	50028	\$ 79.00	12.9%	\$ 5.96	13.27	18.35	1.38
Cedar Rapids Transit	Cedar Rapids, IA	70008	\$ 89.72	13.7%	\$ 6.83	13.13	8.00	0.61
City of Fargo, DBA: Metropolitan Area Transit	Fargo, ND	80003	\$ 69.94	9.7%	\$ 4.95	14.13	9.47	0.67
Muncie Indiana Transit System	Muncie, IN	50054	\$ 93.60	3.2%	\$ 4.96	18.87	20.45	1.08
Metropolitan Evansville Transit System	Evansville, IN	50043	\$ 69.19	21.3%	\$ 5.26	13.16	13.02	0.99
Topeka Metropolitan Transit Authority	Topeka, KS	70014	\$ 96.14	15.0%	\$ 6.08	15.82	9.80	0.62
Manchester Transit Authority	Manchester, NH	10002	\$ 67.96	17.0%	\$ 8.36	8.13	3.39	0.42
Lafayette Transit System	Lafayette, LA	60038	\$ 74.16	8.1%	\$ 3.64	20.38	7.13	0.35
Billings Metropolitan Transit	Billings, MT	80004	\$ 101.38	11.8%	\$ 9.54	10.63	4.59	0.43
Pueblo Transit System	Pueblo, CO	80007	\$ 77.93	18.1%	\$ 5.50	14.17	8.10	0.57
GROUP MEAN:			\$ 82.75	14.7%	\$ 6.54	13.40	10.26	0.75

2017 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

SMALL BUS TRANSIT SYSTEMS

Data: BlackCat database, calendar year 2017

Performance Measure	Mean	Standard Deviation	Performance Parameters	
			+/- One Standard Deviation	
Operating Expense / Revenue Hour	\$ 48.35	\$ 9.50	\$ 38.85	\$ 57.86
Revenue / Operating Expense	12.7%	13.7%	-1.0%	26.5%
Operating Expenses / Passenger	\$ 13.54	\$ 7.86	\$ 5.68	\$ 21.40
Passengers / Revenue Hour	5.25	4.06	1.19	9.31
Passengers / Capita	3.48	2.37	1.11	5.85
Revenue Hours / Capita	0.76	0.41	0.35	1.17

2017 PERFORMANCE MEASURES						
System	Operating Expense / Revenue Hour	Revenue / Operating Expense	Operating Expenses / Passenger	Passengers / Revenue Hour	Passengers / Capita	Revenue Hours / Capita
Bay Area Rural Transit Commission (BART)	\$ 41.17	10.8%	\$ 10.63	3.87	6.28	1.62
Dunn County Transit Commission	\$ 55.63	11.4%	\$ 3.86	14.42	2.65	0.18
Kenosha County	\$ 45.22	5.5%	\$ 30.56	1.48	0.43	0.29
Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin	\$ 46.26	4.6%	\$ 17.82	2.60	2.62	1.01
City of Merrill	\$ 61.07	14.2%	\$ 6.80	8.98	8.25	0.92
City of Monona	\$ 50.16	50.0%	\$ 12.83	3.91	2.18	0.56
Oneida-Vilas Transit Commission	\$ 38.84	10.9%	\$ 13.54	2.87	2.55	0.89
City of Platteville	\$ 42.01	1.0%	\$ 5.16	8.15	4.74	0.58
Rusk County	\$ 65.33	6.1%	\$ 15.62	4.18	3.83	0.92
Sawyer County/LCO Transit Commission	\$ 37.85	12.8%	\$ 18.55	2.04	1.26	0.62
GROUP MEAN:	\$ 48.35	12.7%	\$ 13.54	5.25	3.48	0.76

2017 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

COMMUTER BUS SUMMARY

Data: NTD Database, report year 2017

Performance Measure	Mean	Standard Deviation	Performance Parameters	
			+/- One Standard Deviation	
Operating Expense / Revenue Hour	\$ 127.92	\$ 42.50	\$ 85.41	\$ 170.42
Revenue / Operating Expense	22.3%	7.5%	14.8%	29.9%
Operating Expenses / Passenger	\$ 14.03	\$ 5.39	\$ 8.64	\$ 19.41
Passengers / Revenue Hour	11.86	8.92	2.94	20.78
Passengers / Capita	2.25	3.93	-1.68	6.18
Revenue Hours / Capita	0.12	0.12	0.00	0.24

2017 PERFORMANCE MEASURES							
System	NTDID	Operating Expense / Revenue Hour	Revenue / Operating Expense	Operating Expenses / Passenger	Passengers / Revenue Hour	Passengers / Capita	Revenue Hours / Capita
Ozaukee County	50161	\$ 155.12	22.3%	\$ 11.26	13.77	1.19	0.09
Racine Commuter	50006	\$ 114.20	15.5%	\$ 19.67	5.81	0.28	0.05
Scenic Mississippi River Transit (SMRT)	n/a	\$ 48.85	15.1%	\$ 17.59	2.78	0.21	0.08
Verona (Madison Metro Transit)	50005	\$ 133.14	30.8%	\$ 4.71	28.26	10.24	0.36
Washington County	50160	\$ 159.68	32.1%	\$ 14.44	11.06	0.60	0.05
Waukesha County	50096	\$ 156.50	18.1%	\$ 16.49	9.49	0.98	0.10
GROUP MEAN:		\$ 127.92	22.3%	\$ 14.03	11.86	2.25	0.12

2017 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

SHARED-RIDE TAXI SUMMARY

Data: BlackCat Database, calendar year 2017

Performance Measure	Mean	Standard Deviation	Performance Parameters	
			+/- One Standard Deviation	
Operating Expense / Revenue Hour	\$ 27.03	\$ 3.91	\$ 23.12	\$ 30.95
Revenue / Operating Expense	37.2%	9.3%	27.9%	46.5%
Operating Expenses / Passenger	\$ 9.92	\$ 1.97	\$ 7.95	\$ 11.90
Passengers / Revenue Hour	2.80	0.51	2.29	3.31
Passengers / Capita	4.01	2.58	1.43	6.59
Revenue Hours / Capita	1.41	0.88	0.53	2.29

2017 PERFORMANCE MEASURES						
System	Operating Expense / Revenue Hour	Revenue / Operating Expense	Operating Expenses / Passenger	Passengers / Revenue Hour	Passengers / Capita	Revenue Hours / Capita
Baraboo	\$ 25.37	54.6%	\$ 8.08	3.14	4.46	1.42
Beaver Dam	\$ 23.29	43.6%	\$ 6.65	3.50	7.65	2.18
Berlin	\$ 28.54	29.2%	\$ 11.79	2.42	3.91	1.62
Black River Falls	\$ 27.48	37.7%	\$ 9.21	2.98	8.83	2.96
Chippewa Falls*	\$ 28.72	36.5%	\$ 7.41	3.88	4.46	1.15
Clintonville	\$ 31.07	22.2%	\$ 14.63	2.12	1.80	0.85
Edgerton	\$ 23.73	19.9%	\$ 11.71	2.03	1.00	0.49
Fort Atkinson	\$ 26.27	47.6%	\$ 8.45	3.11	3.72	1.20
Hartford*	\$ 38.41	42.6%	\$ 11.17	3.44	1.24	0.36
Jefferson	\$ 25.55	44.1%	\$ 10.66	2.40	2.22	0.93
Lake Mills	\$ 23.97	34.8%	\$ 10.75	2.23	1.37	0.61
Marinette	\$ 37.44	38.2%	\$ 12.40	3.02	3.35	1.11
Marshfield	\$ 24.35	50.1%	\$ 6.49	3.75	5.37	1.43
Mauston	\$ 24.20	37.0%	\$ 9.68	2.50	4.65	1.86
Medford	\$ 24.24	23.8%	\$ 10.67	2.27	3.04	1.34
Monroe	\$ 25.04	46.5%	\$ 6.71	3.73	6.10	1.64
New Richmond	\$ 28.73	35.1%	\$ 10.27	2.80	1.92	0.68
Onalaska*	\$ 26.42	24.7%	\$ 14.01	1.89	1.73	0.92
Platteville	\$ 27.48	28.2%	\$ 9.75	2.82	2.92	1.04
Plover	\$ 24.87	29.2%	\$ 9.81	2.53	1.85	0.73
Portage	\$ 26.60	39.6%	\$ 10.45	2.55	11.38	4.47
Prairie du Chien	\$ 27.25	33.3%	\$ 9.18	2.97	5.83	1.96
Prairie du Sac/Sauk City	\$ 23.63	42.0%	\$ 10.19	2.32	1.63	0.70
Reedsburg	\$ 23.75	38.8%	\$ 8.68	2.74	4.06	1.48
Rhineland	\$ 24.00	46.8%	\$ 8.34	2.88	10.14	3.52
Rice Lake	\$ 37.52	22.5%	\$ 13.65	2.75	1.83	0.66
Richland Center	\$ 27.53	46.0%	\$ 9.69	2.84	4.46	1.57
Ripon	\$ 26.94	34.4%	\$ 9.98	2.70	4.28	1.58
River Falls	\$ 30.41	27.3%	\$ 8.47	3.59	2.10	0.59
Shawano	\$ 26.25	59.6%	\$ 10.49	2.50	2.95	1.18
Stoughton*	\$ 22.34	41.6%	\$ 8.51	2.63	2.35	0.90
Sun Prairie*	\$ 30.92	27.2%	\$ 12.67	2.44	1.90	0.78
Tomah	\$ 25.07	38.8%	\$ 8.24	3.04	4.83	1.59
Viroqua	\$ 27.25	31.5%	\$ 9.88	2.76	7.26	2.63
Watertown	\$ 25.92	38.5%	\$ 7.79	3.33	4.11	1.24
Waupaca	\$ 27.30	36.7%	\$ 8.82	3.10	8.61	2.78
Waupun	\$ 22.52	24.8%	\$ 12.71	1.77	0.85	0.48
West Bend*	\$ 30.64	38.9%	\$ 11.26	2.72	3.12	1.15
Whitewater	\$ 28.86	46.2%	\$ 8.80	3.28	1.77	0.54
Wisconsin Rapids	\$ 21.52	47.2%	\$ 8.87	2.43	5.19	2.14
GROUP MEAN:	\$ 27.03	37.2%	\$ 9.92	2.80	4.01	1.41

2017 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

SHARED-RIDE TAXI, COUNTY-WIDE SUMMARY

Data: BlackCat Database, calendar year 2017

Performance Measure	Mean	Standard Deviation	Performance Parameters	
			+/- One Standard Deviation	
Operating Expense / Revenue Hour	\$ 31.97	\$ 4.48	\$ 27.48	\$ 36.45
Revenue / Operating Expense	28.9%	24.4%	4.5%	53.3%
Operating Expenses / Passenger	\$ 19.65	\$ 7.21	\$ 12.44	\$ 26.85
Passengers / Revenue Hour	1.83	0.74	1.09	2.57
Passengers / Capita	0.94	0.80	0.14	1.74
Revenue Hours / Capita	0.51	0.36	0.15	0.87

2017 PERFORMANCE MEASURES						
System	Operating Expense / Revenue Hour	Revenue / Operating Expense	Operating Expenses / Passenger	Passengers / Revenue Hour	Passengers / Capita	Revenue Hours / Capita
Door County	\$ 35.64	30.5%	\$ 16.62	2.14	2.38	1.11
Grant County	\$ 28.91	17.1%	\$ 9.26	3.12	0.53	0.17
Neillsville/Clark County	\$ 25.60	13.5%	\$ 20.92	1.22	0.45	0.37
Ozaukee County*	\$ 30.66	76.3%	\$ 16.28	1.88	1.31	0.70
Walworth County	\$ 33.19	10.5%	\$ 29.58	1.12	0.20	0.18
Washington County*	\$ 37.79	25.4%	\$ 25.22	1.50	0.79	0.52
GROUP MEAN:	\$ 31.97	28.9%	\$ 19.65	1.83	0.94	0.51