

# CITY OF ONALASKA MEETING NOTICE

**COMMITTEE/BOARD:** Utilities Committee  
**DATE OF MEETING:** April 4, 2018 (Wednesday)  
**PLACE OF MEETING:** City Hall – 415 Main Street (Common Council Chambers)  
**TIME OF MEETING:** 7:00 PM

## **PURPOSE OF MEETING**

1. Call to Order and roll call.
2. Approval of minutes from the previous meeting.
3. Public Input (Limited to 3 minutes per individual)

### **Consideration and possible action on the following items:**

4. **MASS TRANSIT**
  - a. MTU Transit financials (Jim Krueger)
  - b. Shared Ride Transit:
    1. Financials (Justin Running or Jeff Burkhart/ Fred Buehler)
    2. Update regarding any issues with the shared ride program
      - (a) Draft of Public System Cost Efficiency Report
  - c. Holmen Transit Input (Holmen Rep.)
  - d. West Salem Transit Input (West Salem Rep.)
  - e. Onalaska Transit Input (Onalaska Rep.)
5. **UTILITIES**  
No Report

### **Adjournment.**

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that members of the Common Council of the City of Onalaska who do not serve on the committee may attend this meeting to gather information about a subject over which they have decision making responsibility.

Therefore, further notice is hereby given that the above meeting may constitute a meeting of the Common Council and is hereby noticed as such, even though it is not contemplated that the Common Council will take any formal action at this meeting.

#### **NOTICES MAILED TO:**

Mayor Joe Chilsen  
Ald. Jim Binash  
\*Ald. Jim Olson – Chair  
Ald. Jerry Every – Vice Chair  
\*Ald. Harvey Bertrand  
Ald. Ron Gjertsen  
\*Ald. Bob Muth – Vice Chair  
City Administrator      City Attorney  
Dept. Heads      La Crosse Tribune  
Coulee Courier  
WKTY WLXR WLAX WKBT WXOW FOX

\*Committee Members

#### **\*Mass Transit Members**

\*Dawn Kulcinski – Village of Holmen Trustee  
\*Leroy Brown - Village of West Salem Trustee  
  
Jim Krueger, Interim MTU  
Richard Running  
Village of Holmen  
Village of West Salem  
Onalaska Public Library      Omni Center

Date Notices Posted and Mailed: 3-26-18

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, the City of Onalaska will provide reasonable accommodations to qualified individuals with a disability to ensure equal access to public meetings provided notification is given to the City Clerk within seventy-two (72) hours prior to the public meeting and that the requested accommodation does not create an undue hardship for the City.



**ONALASKA/HOLMEN/WEST SALEM PUBLIC TRANSIT  
MONTHLY TOTALS  
CALENDAR YEAR 2018**

<u>Month</u>	<u>2018 Miles</u>	<u>2017 Miles</u>	<u>Onalaska Trips</u>	<u>Holmen Trips</u>	<u>West Salem Trips</u>	<u>Total 2018 Trips</u>	<u>Total 2017 Trips</u>	<u>2018 Agency Trips</u>	<u>2017 Agency Trips</u>	<u>2018 MTU Passes</u>	<u>2017 MTU Passes</u>	<u>Ave. Fare</u>	<u>2018 Operating Stats Hours</u>	<u>2017 Operating Stats Hours</u>	<u>Gallons</u>	<u>Fares</u>	<u>Freight Package</u>	<u>Agency Revenue</u>
January	35,813	33,509	2,967	1,282	600	4,849	5,045	881	729	706	610	\$3.41	2,700.18	2,451.98	2,420.854	\$ 10,815.75	\$ -	\$ 5,735.00
February	31,972	32,288	2,805	1,139	522	4,466	4,799	806	668	578	699	\$3.54	2,433.00	2,271.38	2,162.330	\$ 11,093.00	\$ -	\$ 4,718.75
March		35,201				0	5,222		761		723			2,575.78				
<b>1st Qtr Total</b>	<b>67,785</b>	<b>100,998</b>	<b>5,772</b>	<b>2,421</b>	<b>1,122</b>	<b>9,315</b>	<b>15,066</b>	<b>1,687</b>	<b>2,158</b>	<b>1,284</b>	<b>2,032</b>	<b>\$3.48</b>	<b>5,133.18</b>	<b>7,299.14</b>	<b>4,583.184</b>	<b>\$ 21,908.75</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 10,453.75</b>
April		33,279				0	4,618		813		703			2,442.75				
May		34,596				0	5,026		847		670			2,657.77				
June		34,959				0	4,886		814		646			3,006.90				
<b>2nd Qtr Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>102,834</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14,730</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,474</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,019</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>8,107.42</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Y.T.D.</b>	<b>67,785</b>	<b>203,832</b>	<b>5,772</b>	<b>2,421</b>	<b>1,122</b>	<b>9,315</b>	<b>29,796</b>	<b>1,687</b>	<b>4,632</b>	<b>1,284</b>	<b>4,051</b>	<b>\$3.48</b>	<b>5,133.18</b>	<b>15,406.56</b>	<b>4,583.184</b>	<b>\$21,908.75</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$10,453.75</b>
July		36,400				0	4,575		832		611			2,654.78				
August		37,768				0	4,843		953		723			2,704.36				
September		35,377				0	4,773		899		734			2,649.20				
<b>3rd Qtr Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>109,545</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14,191</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,684</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,068</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>8,008.34</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Y.T.D.</b>	<b>67,785</b>	<b>313,377</b>	<b>5,772</b>	<b>2,421</b>	<b>1,122</b>	<b>9,315</b>	<b>43,987</b>	<b>1,687</b>	<b>7,316</b>	<b>1,284</b>	<b>6,119</b>	<b>\$3.48</b>	<b>5,133.18</b>	<b>23,414.90</b>	<b>4,583.184</b>	<b>\$21,908.75</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$10,453.75</b>
October		36,054				0	5,000		923		748			2,528.68				
November		36,217				0	4,921		982		682			2,544.73				
December		35,507				0	4,801		938		674			2,641.01				
<b>4th Qtr Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>107,778</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14,722</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,843</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,104</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>7,714.42</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>
<b>Y.T.D.</b>	<b>67,785</b>	<b>421,155</b>	<b>5,772</b>	<b>2,421</b>	<b>1,122</b>	<b>9,315</b>	<b>58,709</b>	<b>1,687</b>	<b>10,159</b>	<b>1,284</b>	<b>8,223</b>	<b>\$3.48</b>	<b>5,133.18</b>	<b>31,129.32</b>	<b>4,583.184</b>	<b>\$21,908.75</b>	<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$10,453.75</b>

\*\*\*Agency Trips are included in total trips



# Public Transit System Cost Efficiency Report Report Year 2016

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>STEP ONE COMPLIANCE .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>STEP TWO COMPLIANCE .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>STEP THREE COMPLIANCE .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>STEP FOUR COMPLIANCE .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>APPENDIX I: 2016 STEP TWO COMPLIANCE ANALYSIS TABLES .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>APPENDIX II: 2016 STEP ONE PERFORMANCE MEASURES .....</b>	<b>10</b>

*March 2018*

## INTRODUCTION

The State of Wisconsin provides funds to urban and rural public transit systems because of the benefits these systems provide to local communities. Most public transit systems in Wisconsin are supported by federal, state and local funds. Local communities sponsor public transit systems for a variety of reasons, including the benefit of increased mobility among residents and reduced reliance on automotive travel. 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.

The Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) publishes cost efficiency reports for the state's public transit systems on an annual basis, as specified by Wis. Statute 85.20 and Administrative Rule Trans 4. All services receiving Wis. Stat. 85.20 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 2016 reporting year.

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. More efficient public transit systems maximize the effectiveness of limited statewide 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 Manager. Contact information is available online at the following URL:

<http://wisconsin.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. They are, therefore, 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, 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.

In the past, performance measures were calculated using audited data. This was in order to capture the most accurate accounting of revenues and expenses. However, audits may take several years to complete and in the interest of utilizing the most up-to-date information, this report includes unaudited data. Audited data is utilized when available. Future reports may include updated data and analysis if completed audits reveal material differences. However, comparisons between audited and reported data over the past years do not reveal significant differences that may result in material changes to results.

This report analysis and format is guided by Administrative Rule. 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 2007.

Year	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Systems in Step One Compliance	62	65	62	65	69	69	70	69	66	69
All Systems	70	71	71	75	76	76	77	78	76	79
Pct in Compliance	88.6%	91.5%	87.3%	86.7%	90.8%	90.8%	90.9%	88.5%	86.8%	87.3%

### Public Transit Systems Out of Step 1 Compliance in 2016

SYSTEM	PEER GROUP
Beloit	Medium Bus
Superior	Medium Bus
Clintonville	Shared-ride Taxi
Edgerton	Shared-ride Taxi
Hartford	Shared-ride Taxi
Marinette	Shared-ride Taxi
Onalaska	Shared-ride Taxi
Rice Lake*	Shared-ride Taxi
Sun Prairie	Shared-ride Taxi
Waupun	Shared-ride Taxi

*\*Rice Lake transitioned from public operation to a private provider in calendar year 2017.*

## 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 analysis.

The table below shows the number and percentage of public transit systems compliant in step two since 2007. Detailed tables showing 2016 step two compliance analysis are found in Appendix I. Of the ten systems reviewed for step two compliance in 2016:

- Rice Lake is not included in step two compliance analysis,
- three systems are considered compliant in step two, and
- six systems are considered noncompliant in step two.

Year	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Systems in Step Two Compliance	66	67	65	70	74	73	74	73	73	73
All Systems	70	71	71	75	76	76	77	78	76	79
Pct in Compliance	94.3%	94.4%	91.5%	93.3%	97.4%	96.1%	96.1%	93.6%	96.1%	92.4%

### Public Transit Systems Out of Step 2 Compliance in 2016

SYSTEM	PEER GROUP
Beloit	Medium Bus
Superior	Medium Bus
Clintonville	Shared-ride Taxi
Marinette	Shared-ride Taxi
Onalaska	Shared-ride Taxi
Sun Prairie	Shared-ride Taxi

### City of Rice Lake Step Two Compliance

The City of Rice Lake transitioned to a private provider for shared-ride taxi services in calendar year 2017. Previous to this the City had operated the service directly. This transition was noted in previous cost efficiency reports and is partially the result of attempting to improve system efficiency. Substantial operating and financial differences exist between a publicly-operated system and a privately-operated system, such as ownership of capital, insurance requirements and overhead costs. Therefore, analyzing the service from 2016, when it was publicly operated, would not provide insightful analysis when compared to the private-operations today. Therefore, although the City of Rice Lake was out of compliance in step one in 2015 and 2016, it is not included in the step two analysis for 2016. Beginning with the 2017 Cost Efficiency Report the City of Rice Lake will again be subject to step two compliance review (the first year of operation under a private provider).

## 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 MPRs) 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 six systems out of step two compliance, Clintonville, Marinette, Onalaska and Sun Prairie operate shared-ride taxi systems and are exempt from the MPR requirement. Thus, only the City of Beloit and the City of Superior are required to participate in MPRs. 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, Onalaska and Sun Prairie have not undergone an MPR since at least 2006. Marinette participated in an MPR for the first time in 2017.

### *City of Onalaska*

The City of Onalaska has not undergone a management performance review since at least 2006. Therefore, the Department cannot make a determination on progress towards any MPR recommendations. The City has an MPR tentatively scheduled for 2019 or 2020. The City is subject to step four compliance review.

## STEP FOUR COMPLIANCE

Because the Clintonville Transit Commission, City of Sun Prairie and City of Onalaska public transit services have not undergone an MPR, the department is unable to review their MPR recommendations for improvement during step three compliance analysis. Therefore, the three 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 in an effort to include the systems in the upcoming schedules.

### *City of Onalaska*

Onalaska has been tentatively scheduled for an MPR during 2019 or 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 carryout 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 the aforementioned reasons, WisDOT is considering the City of Onalaska in compliance with step four analysis.

## APPENDIX I: 2016 STEP TWO COMPLIANCE ANALYSIS TABLES

Green check-marks signify an improving trend or balanced status during the 5-year period.  
An "X" signifies the trend has not improved during the time period.

Highlighted values are non-compliant in step one for 2016.		Expense/ Revenue Hour	Revenue/ Expense Ratio	Cost/ Passenger	Passengers / Revenue Hour	Passengers / Capita	Revenue Hours/ Capita
5 year trend:		X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Beloit</b>	2016	\$93.75	8.61%	\$10.49	8.94	5.13	0.57
<i>Medium Bus</i>	2015	\$94.66	9.50%	\$9.98	9.48	5.63	0.59
	2014	\$91.88	11.40%	\$8.11	11.33	6.79	0.6
	2013	\$88.35	11.40%	\$7.44	11.88	6.92	0.58
	2012	\$83.65	11.16%	\$7.36	11.36	6.77	0.6
5 year trend:		X	✓	X	X	X	X
<b>Superior</b>	2016	\$88.86	9.31%	\$9.12	9.74	5.48	0.56
<i>Medium Bus</i>	2015	\$88.56	9.10%	\$9.77	9.06	5.33	0.59
	2014	\$91.58	8.87%	\$9.15	10.01	5.88	0.58
	2013	\$85.94	8.84%	\$9.31	9.24	5.35	0.58
	2012	\$84.37	9.90%	\$8.35	10.1	5.87	0.58
5 year trend:		X	X	X	X	X	✓
<b>Clintonville</b>	2016	\$30.77	22.63%	\$13.97	2.20	1.87	0.85
<i>Shared-ride Taxi</i>	2015	\$30.25	25.10%	\$13.74	2.2	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
	2012	\$28.83	25.67%	\$11.94	2.41	2.05	0.85
5 year trend:		X	✓	X	X	✓	✓
<b>Marinette</b>	2016	\$36.95	24.85%	\$11.62	3.18	3.52	1.11
<i>Shared-ride Taxi</i>	2015	\$39.10	19.90%	\$11.28	3.47	3.79	1.09
	2014	\$37.75	20.97%	\$10.98	3.44	3.71	1.08
	2013	\$36.65	22.45%	\$10.00	3.66	3.33	0.91
	2012	\$35.60	22.69%	\$9.82	3.63	3.31	0.91

Highlighted values are non-compliant in step one for 2016.

		Expense/ Revenue Hour	Revenue/ Expense Ratio	Cost/ Passenger	Passengers / Revenue Hour	Passengers / Capita	Revenue Hours/ Capita
5 year trend:		X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Onalaska</b>	2016	\$26.11	26.03%	\$11.78	2.22	3.65	1.65
Shared-ride Taxi	2015	\$25.98	29.31%	\$11.07	2.35	3.92	1.67
	2014	\$27.01	27.06%	\$11.13	2.43	4.23	1.74
	2013	\$25.70	29.27%	\$10.27	2.50	4.39	1.75
	2012	\$24.73	28.32%	\$10.80	2.29	4.14	1.81
5 year trend:		X	X	X	X	X	✓
<b>Sun Prairie</b>	2016	\$30.57	25.61%	\$12.98	2.35	1.90	0.81
Shared-ride Taxi	2015	\$30.57	26.00%	\$13.12	2.33	1.83	0.78
	2014	\$25.77	31.90%	\$8.14	3.17	2.75	0.87
	2013	\$19.87	35.88%	\$6.99	2.84	2.47	0.87
	2012	\$30.70	31.14%	\$8.53	3.60	2.50	0.70
5 year trend:		X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
<b>Edgerton</b>	2016	\$24.02	22.40%	\$10.77	2.23	1.11	0.50
Shared-ride Taxi	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
	2012	\$21.37	20.88%	\$13.48	1.58	0.80	0.50
5 year trend:		✓	✓	✓	X	X	✓
<b>Hartford</b>	2016	\$37.38	30.26%	\$10.60	3.53	1.31	0.37
Shared-ride Taxi	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
	2012	\$41.81	29.15%	\$10.89	3.84	1.44	0.37
5 year trend:		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
<b>Waupun</b>	2016	\$19.38	30.09%	\$8.71	2.23	1.08	0.49
Shared-ride Taxi	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
	2012	\$20.59	19.56%	\$13.47	1.53	0.67	0.44

**APPENDIX II: 2016 STEP ONE PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**2016 PERFORMANCE MEASURES  
EXTERNAL PEER GROUP SUMMARY  
MILWAUKEE COUNTY TRANSIT SYSTEM**

Data: National Transit Database, Report year 2016

Performance Measure	Mean	Standard Deviation	Performance Parameters	
			+/- One Standard Deviation	
Operating Expense / Revenue Hour	\$ 105.61	\$ 17.29	\$ 88.32	\$ 122.90
Revenue / Operating Expense	18.5%	6.2%	12.3%	24.7%
Operating Expenses / Passenger	\$ 5.62	\$ 1.29	\$ 4.33	\$ 6.91
Passengers / Revenue Hour	19.70	5.80	13.90	25.51
Passengers / Capita	22.54	10.41	12.12	32.95
Revenue Hours / Capita	1.11	0.26	0.85	1.37

2016 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	\$ 97.19	22.6%	\$ 3.64	26.72	42.51	1.59
Southwest Ohio Regional Transit Authority	Cincinnati, OH	50012	\$ 112.03	30.8%	\$ 6.09	18.39	18.02	0.98
Central Ohio Transit Authority	Columbus, OH	50016	\$ 104.47	15.7%	\$ 6.62	15.78	17.77	1.13
City of Detroit Department of Transportation	Detroit, MI	50119	\$ 122.00	20.4%	\$ 3.70	32.94	38.05	1.16
Indianapolis and Marion County Public Transportation	Indianapolis, IN	50050	\$ 97.02	16.4%	\$ 7.11	13.64	10.23	0.75
Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority	Austin, TX	60048	\$ 115.85	10.7%	\$ 6.24	18.57	25.61	1.38
The Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority	Cleveland, OH	50015	\$ 133.67	15.9%	\$ 6.68	20.02	21.80	1.09
Bi-State Development Agency of the Missouri-Illinois Metropolitan District, d.b.a.(St. Louis)	St. Louis, MO	70006	\$ 108.05	17.7%	\$ 6.44	16.77	18.05	1.08
VIA Metropolitan Transit	San Antonio, TX	60011	\$ 95.24	10.7%	\$ 5.32	17.89	21.29	1.19
Central Florida Regional Transportation Authority	Orlando, FL	40035	\$ 70.56	24.0%	\$ 4.33	16.31	12.02	0.74
<b>GROUP MEAN:</b>			<b>\$ 105.61</b>	<b>18.5%</b>	<b>\$ 5.62</b>	<b>19.70</b>	<b>22.54</b>	<b>1.11</b>

**2016 PERFORMANCE MEASURES**  
**EXTERNAL PEER GROUP SUMMARY**  
**MADISON METRO TRANSIT**

Data: National Transit Database, Report year 2016

Performance Measure	Mean	Standard Deviation	Performance Parameters	
			+/- One Standard Deviation	
Operating Expense / Revenue Hour	\$ 104.30	\$ 14.19	\$ 90.11	\$ 118.49
Revenue / Operating Expense	16.9%	6.4%	10.5%	23.2%
Operating Expenses / Passenger	\$ 5.30	\$ 1.98	\$ 3.32	\$ 7.29
Passengers / Revenue Hour	22.10	8.19	13.90	30.29
Passengers / Capita	31.23	25.32	5.90	56.55
Revenue Hours /Capita	1.26	0.55	0.71	1.81

2016 PERFORMANCE MEASURES								
System	City, State	NTDID	Operating Expense / Revenue Hour	Revenue / Operating Expense	Operating Expenses / Passenger	Passengers / Revenue Hour	Passengers / Capita	Revenue Hours / Capita
<b>Metro Transit System</b>	<b>Madison, WI</b>	50005	\$ 106.09	24.3%	\$ 3.96	26.76	53.03	1.98
Capital Area Transportation Authority (CATA)	Lansing, MI	50036	\$ 95.97	17.0%	\$ 3.96	24.24	37.57	1.55
Ann Arbor Area Transportation Authority & University of Michigan	Ann Arbor, MI & UMich	50040 & 50158	\$ 85.25	11.6%	\$ 3.21	26.55	45.15	1.70
METRO Regional Transit Authority	Akron, OH	50010	\$ 106.93	8.6%	\$ 8.96	11.93	9.37	0.78
Greater Dayton Regional Transit Authority	Dayton, OH	50017	\$ 117.80	13.0%	\$ 7.35	16.03	14.01	0.87
Champaign-Urbana Mass Transit District	Urbana, IL	50060	\$ 107.91	22.7%	\$ 2.61	41.30	93.42	2.26
Des Moines Area Regional Transit Authority	Des Moines, IA	70010	\$ 98.61	23.5%	\$ 5.64	17.50	12.15	0.69
Spokane Transit Authority	Spokane, WA	00002	\$ 104.88	13.9%	\$ 5.47	19.17	26.22	1.37
CNY Centro, Inc.	Syracuse, NY	20018	\$ 137.42	22.9%	\$ 6.12	22.46	17.02	0.76
Capital Area Transit System	Baton Rouge, LA	60022	\$ 93.78	6.9%	\$ 7.21	13.00	10.38	0.80
Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County	Reno, NV	90001	\$ 92.66	21.1%	\$ 3.84	24.11	25.19	1.04
<b>GROUP MEAN:</b>			<b>\$ 104.30</b>	<b>16.9%</b>	<b>\$ 5.30</b>	<b>22.10</b>	<b>31.23</b>	<b>1.26</b>

**2016 PERFORMANCE MEASURES**  
**MEDIUM BUS TRANSIT SYSTEMS**

Data: NTD, report year 2016; for systems not in NTD, BlackCat operations reports

Performance Measure	Mean	Standard Deviation
Operating Expense / Revenue Hour	\$ 79.39	\$ 14.49
Revenue / Operating Expense	15.7%	6.8%
Operating Expenses / Passenger	\$ 5.93	\$ 1.72
Passengers / Revenue Hour	14.19	3.71
Passengers / Capita	10.61	4.89
Revenue Hours /Capita	0.74	0.24

Performance Parameters	
+/- One Standard Deviation	
\$ 64.89	\$ 93.88
9.0%	22.5%
\$ 4.20	\$ 7.65
10.48	17.90
5.72	15.50
0.50	0.97

2016 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	\$ 69.66	20.4%	\$ 6.24	11.17	5.51	0.49
City of Beloit Transit System	Beloit	50109	\$ 93.75	8.6%	\$ 10.49	8.94	5.13	0.57
Eau Claire Transit	Eau Claire	50099	\$ 63.70	20.9%	\$ 5.55	11.47	12.57	1.10
Fond du Lac Area Transit	Fond du Lac	50171	\$ 55.20	29.8%	\$ 7.50	7.37	4.25	0.58
Green Bay Metro	Green Bay	50002	\$ 68.85	15.1%	\$ 5.05	13.64	7.79	0.57
Janesville Transit System	Janesville	50108	\$ 107.50	16.0%	\$ 6.83	15.73	7.61	0.48
Kenosha Transit	Kenosha	50003	\$ 78.17	12.2%	\$ 4.63	16.89	12.77	0.76
LaCrosse Municipal Transit Utility	La Crosse	50004	\$ 69.10	17.2%	\$ 5.30	13.04	14.88	1.14
Maritime Metro Transit	Manitowoc	n/a	\$ 84.24	9.3%	\$ 6.27	13.43	9.52	0.71
GO Transit	Oshkosh	50009	\$ 53.76	28.5%	\$ 3.16	17.04	15.07	0.88
Belle Urban System - Racine	Racine	50006	\$ 81.15	16.6%	\$ 5.85	13.86	10.71	0.77
Shoreline Metro	Sheboygan	50088	\$ 74.28	18.5%	\$ 6.73	11.04	9.45	0.86
Stevens Point Transit	Stevens Point	n/a	\$ 82.49	18.4%	\$ 7.45	11.08	8.02	0.72
Duluth Transit Authority	Superior	n/a	\$ 88.86	9.3%	\$ 9.12	9.74	5.48	0.56
Wausau Area Transit System	Wausau	50091	\$ 100.72	14.9%	\$ 5.18	19.44	13.56	0.70
City of Waukesha Transit Commission	Waukesha	50096	\$ 88.13	15.6%	\$ 6.74	13.08	6.38	0.49
City of Dubuque	Dubuque, IA	70011	\$ 57.14	10.8%	\$ 6.43	8.89	9.20	1.03
Kalamazoo Metro Transit System	Kalamazoo, MI	50035	\$ 66.92	24.0%	\$ 4.91	13.63	9.73	0.71
Bloomington-Normal Public Transit System	Normal, IL	50047	\$ 90.79	13.1%	\$ 4.31	21.07	19.39	0.92
Decatur Public Transit System	Decatur	50061	\$ 80.19	9.0%	\$ 4.92	16.30	15.99	0.98
Rockford Mass Transit District	Rockford, IL	50058	\$ 108.32	8.8%	\$ 8.82	12.29	7.88	0.64
City of Rochester Public Transportation	Rochester, MN	50092	\$ 86.58	33.7%	\$ 4.27	20.30	16.84	0.83
St. Cloud Metropolitan Transit Commission	St. Cloud, MN	50028	\$ 79.92	15.3%	\$ 5.08	15.72	20.18	1.28
Cedar Rapids Transit	Cedar Rapids, IA	70008	\$ 91.76	13.6%	\$ 5.77	15.90	8.52	0.54
City of Fargo, DBA: Metropolitan Area Transit	Fargo, ND	80003	\$ 66.94	11.1%	\$ 4.51	14.85	11.47	0.77
Muncie Indiana Transit System	Muncie, IN	50054	\$ 87.88	3.6%	\$ 4.20	20.91	23.02	1.10
Metropolitan Evansville Transit System	Evansville, IN	50043	\$ 63.81	22.8%	\$ 4.32	14.77	14.73	1.00
Topeka Metropolitan Transit Authority	Topeka, KS	70014	\$ 92.60	17.3%	\$ 5.78	16.01	9.48	0.59
Manchester Transit Authority	Manchester, NH	10002	\$ 72.63	18.0%	\$ 7.51	9.67	3.65	0.38
Lafayette Transit System	Lafayette, LA	60038	\$ 62.81	9.2%	\$ 3.04	20.67	7.23	0.35
Billings Metropolitan Transit	Billings, MT	80004	\$ 94.86	9.6%	\$ 8.54	11.10	5.19	0.47
Pueblo Transit System	Pueblo, CO	80007	\$ 77.61	12.1%	\$ 5.15	15.07	8.34	0.55
<b>GROUP MEAN:</b>			<b>\$ 79.39</b>	<b>15.7%</b>	<b>\$ 5.93</b>	<b>14.19</b>	<b>10.61</b>	<b>0.74</b>

**2016 PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**SMALL BUS TRANSIT SYSTEMS**

Data: BlackCat database, calendar year 2016

Performance Measure	Mean	Standard Deviation
Operating Expense / Revenue Hour	\$ 52.66	\$ 12.91
Revenue / Operating Expense	8.5%	4.2%
Operating Expenses / Passenger	\$ 14.17	\$ 7.26
Passengers / Revenue Hour	5.25	4.10
Passengers / Capita	3.67	2.43
Revenue Hours /Capita	0.86	0.69

Performance Parameters	
+/- One Standard Deviation	
\$ 39.75	\$ 65.56
4.3%	12.8%
\$ 6.90	\$ 21.43
1.15	9.35
1.24	6.09
0.17	1.56

2016 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)	\$ 42.45	10.3%	\$ 10.70	3.97	6.57	1.66
Dunn County Transit Commission	\$ 73.03	10.5%	\$ 4.95	14.74	2.55	0.17
Kenosha County	\$ 44.37	5.8%	\$ 26.38	1.68	0.47	0.28
Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin	\$ 59.31	4.6%	\$ 21.39	2.77	6.82	2.46
City of Merrill	\$ 70.60	14.2%	\$ 7.98	8.84	6.85	0.77
City of Monona	\$ 46.79	11.9%	\$ 12.33	3.80	2.11	0.56
Oneida-Vilas Transit Commission	\$ 40.09	7.7%	\$ 16.58	2.42	1.79	0.74
City of Platteville	\$ 41.48	0.8%	\$ 5.28	7.85	4.50	0.57
Rusk County	\$ 64.79	6.3%	\$ 14.82	4.37	3.88	0.89
Sawyer County/LCO Transit Commission	\$ 43.64	13.3%	\$ 21.23	2.06	1.11	0.54
<b>GROUP MEAN:</b>	<b>\$ 52.66</b>	<b>8.5%</b>	<b>\$ 14.17</b>	<b>5.25</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>0.86</b>

2016 PERFORMANCE MEASURES

SHARED-RIDE TAXI SUMMARY

Data: BlackCat Database, calendar year 2016

Performance Measure	Mean	Standard Deviation
Operating Expense / Revenue Hour	\$ 26.54	\$ 4.80
Revenue / Operating Expense	36.3%	8.8%
Operating Expenses / Passenger	\$ 9.41	\$ 2.06
Passengers / Revenue Hour	2.87	0.47
Passengers / Capita	4.15	2.59
Revenue Hours /Capita	1.45	0.90

Performance Parameters	
+/- One Standard Deviation	
\$ 21.74	\$ 31.33
27.5%	45.1%
\$ 7.36	\$ 11.47
2.40	3.34
1.56	6.74
0.54	2.35

2016 PERFORMANCE MEASURES						
System	Operating Expense / Revenue Hour	Revenue / Operating Expense	Operating Expenses / Passenger	Passengers / Revenue Hour	Passengers / Capita	Revenue Hours / Capita
Baraboo	\$ 25.13	52.5%	\$ 8.38	3.00	3.78	1.26
Beaver Dam	\$ 23.06	40.6%	\$ 7.08	3.25	8.14	2.50
Berlin	\$ 24.62	36.5%	\$ 8.63	2.85	4.59	1.61
Black River Falls	\$ 25.98	37.6%	\$ 8.94	2.91	8.69	2.99
Chippewa Falls	\$ 29.91	33.7%	\$ 7.58	3.95	4.52	1.15
Clintonville	\$ 30.77	22.6%	\$ 13.97	2.20	1.87	0.85
Edgerton	\$ 24.02	22.4%	\$ 10.77	2.23	1.11	0.50
Fort Atkinson	\$ 25.98	42.3%	\$ 8.18	3.17	3.63	1.14
Hartford	\$ 37.38	30.3%	\$ 10.60	3.53	1.31	0.37
Jefferson	\$ 25.43	41.8%	\$ 9.83	2.59	2.44	0.94
Lake Mills	\$ 23.72	31.1%	\$ 9.26	2.56	1.59	0.62
Marinette	\$ 36.95	24.9%	\$ 11.62	3.18	3.52	1.11
Marshfield	\$ 24.15	46.1%	\$ 6.86	3.52	5.41	1.54
Mauston	\$ 23.89	39.7%	\$ 9.37	2.55	4.77	1.87
Medford	\$ 24.40	23.5%	\$ 9.59	2.54	3.53	1.39
Monroe	\$ 24.91	44.3%	\$ 6.46	3.85	6.50	1.69
New Richmond	\$ 28.59	43.7%	\$ 10.06	2.84	2.05	0.72
Onalaska	\$ 26.11	26.0%	\$ 11.78	2.22	3.65	1.65
Platteville	\$ 27.03	28.6%	\$ 9.79	2.76	2.72	0.99
Plover	\$ 24.61	29.8%	\$ 9.11	2.70	2.02	0.75
Portage	\$ 26.88	36.6%	\$ 11.03	2.44	11.07	4.54
Prairie du Chien	\$ 26.95	39.9%	\$ 9.45	2.85	5.63	1.98
Prairie du Sac/Sauk City	\$ 17.74	40.6%	\$ 7.63	2.32	3.09	1.33
Reedsburg	\$ 23.49	44.6%	\$ 7.99	2.94	3.88	1.32
Rhineland	\$ 24.01	48.5%	\$ 7.88	3.05	11.07	3.63
Rice Lake	\$ 44.16	15.1%	\$ 17.13	2.58	0.91	0.35
Richland Center	\$ 27.82	44.6%	\$ 11.02	2.52	3.90	1.55
Ripon	\$ 21.45	36.4%	\$ 8.03	2.67	4.39	1.64
River Falls	\$ 30.28	33.0%	\$ 8.25	3.67	2.15	0.58
Shawano	\$ 25.87	52.1%	\$ 10.08	2.57	2.98	1.16
Stoughton	\$ 22.85	45.6%	\$ 8.26	2.77	2.47	0.89
Sun Prairie	\$ 30.57	25.6%	\$ 12.98	2.35	1.90	0.81
Tomah	\$ 23.49	38.5%	\$ 7.65	3.07	4.57	1.49
Viroqua	\$ 26.95	29.3%	\$ 9.44	2.85	7.53	2.64
Watertown	\$ 25.92	38.9%	\$ 7.42	3.50	4.14	1.18
Waupaca	\$ 27.57	31.9%	\$ 8.80	3.13	8.79	2.80
Waupun	\$ 19.38	30.1%	\$ 8.71	2.23	1.08	0.49
West Bend	\$ 29.69	34.8%	\$ 10.39	2.86	3.33	1.16
Whitewater	\$ 28.51	40.4%	\$ 7.82	3.65	2.01	0.55
Wisconsin Rapids	\$ 21.29	48.0%	\$ 8.70	2.45	5.28	2.16
<b>GROUP MEAN:</b>	<b>\$ 26.54</b>	<b>36.3%</b>	<b>\$ 9.41</b>	<b>2.87</b>	<b>4.15</b>	<b>1.45</b>

**2016 PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**COMMUTER BUS SUMMARY**

Data: NTD Database, report year 2016

Performance Measure	Mean	Standard Deviation
Operating Expense / Revenue Hour	\$ 130.39	\$ 49.16
Revenue / Operating Expense	20.2%	3.8%
Operating Expenses / Passenger	\$ 13.23	\$ 5.21
Passengers / Revenue Hour	13.21	10.50
Passengers / Capita	2.54	4.42
Revenue Hours /Capita	0.13	0.11

Performance Parameters	
+/- One Standard Deviation	
\$ 81.23	\$ 179.55
16.4%	24.0%
\$ 8.02	\$ 18.44
2.70	23.71
-1.88	6.96
0.01	0.24

2016 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	\$ 173.32	18.5%	\$ 11.78	14.72	1.25	0.09
Racine Commuter	50006	\$ 112.88	16.4%	\$ 18.29	6.17	0.29	0.05
Scenic Mississippi River Transit (SMRT)	n/a	\$ 48.84	16.1%	\$ 16.82	2.90	0.34	0.12
Verona (Madison Metro Transit)	50005	\$ 119.54	25.2%	\$ 3.64	32.81	11.53	0.35
Washington County	50160	\$ 185.36	23.8%	\$ 14.93	12.41	0.69	0.06
Waukesha County	50096	\$ 142.39	21.2%	\$ 13.93	10.22	1.12	0.11
<b>GROUP MEAN:</b>		<b>\$ 130.39</b>	<b>20.2%</b>	<b>\$ 13.23</b>	<b>13.21</b>	<b>2.54</b>	<b>0.13</b>

**2016 PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

**SHARED-RIDE TAXI, COUNTY-WIDE SUMMARY**

Data: BlackCat Database, calendar year 2016

Performance Measure	Mean	Standard Deviation
Operating Expense / Revenue Hour	\$ 30.80	\$ 5.25
Revenue / Operating Expense	21.4%	6.0%
Operating Expenses / Passenger	\$ 16.66	\$ 5.62
Passengers / Revenue Hour	2.04	0.81
Passengers / Capita	1.06	0.78
Revenue Hours /Capita	0.55	0.36

Performance Parameters	
+/- One Standard Deviation	
\$ 25.54	\$ 36.05
15.5%	27.4%
\$ 11.04	\$ 22.29
1.23	2.85
0.28	1.84
0.19	0.91

2016 PERFORMANCE MEASURES						
System	Operating Expense / Revenue Hour	Revenue / Operating Expense	Operating Expenses / Passenger	Passengers / Revenue Hour	Passengers / Capita	Revenue Hours / Capita
Door County	\$ 34.18	24.8%	\$ 16.21	2.11	2.33	1.11
Grant County	\$ 29.21	18.5%	\$ 8.73	3.35	0.56	0.17
Neillsville/Clark County	\$ 23.18	17.0%	\$ 18.58	1.25	0.45	0.36
Ozaukee County	\$ 30.42	30.4%	\$ 15.50	1.96	1.29	0.66
Washington County	\$ 36.99	16.5%	\$ 24.30	1.52	0.68	0.45
<b>GROUP MEAN:</b>	<b>\$ 30.80</b>	<b>21.4%</b>	<b>\$ 16.66</b>	<b>2.04</b>	<b>1.06</b>	<b>0.55</b>