



Division of Transportation  
Investment Management  
Bureau of Transit , Local Roads, Rails and Harbors  
PO Box 7913  
Madison, WI 53707-7913

Jim Doyle, Governor  
Frank J. Busalacchi, Secretary  
Internet: [www.dot.wisconsin.gov](http://www.dot.wisconsin.gov)

Telephone: 608-267-9497

Facsimile (FAX): 608-266-0658

---

November 4, 2010

To: Members of the Wisconsin Legislature

Re: 2008 and 2009 Cost-efficiency Analyses for Wisconsin's Public Transit Systems

The Wisconsin Department of Transportation is required to have cost-efficiency standards for Wisconsin transit systems, as specified by statute and administrative rule. The language contained in Administrative Rule TRANS 4 states:

*"The department shall assess the performance of each transit system receiving aid under the {state operating assistance} program on an annual basis, using the six performance indicators defined in sub. (2). . . ."*

The six performance indicators are: passengers/capita, expense/passenger, expense/revenue hour, passengers/revenue hour, revenue hours/capita, and operating ratio (revenue/expense ratio). *The measures mentioned in these report reflect the figures from calendar years 2005 (for the 2008 report) and 2006 (for the 2009 report), and do not reflect changes in service that have occurred since that time.* The cost-efficiency standards implementation plan (attached) discusses in greater depth the process and methodology for determining transit system compliance.

The process of analysis follows a tiered methodology (attached). Transit systems are divided into six peer groups based on commonality of operating system characteristics. The first stage of analysis involves peer group comparisons by system type. To be judged in compliance at this stage, a transit system must meet or exceed the performance standard for four of the six performance measures.

For transit systems not meeting the cost-efficiency standards at step one, a second stage of analysis is prescribed. That analysis involves a time-trend review over a five-year period. When a system shows improvement over those five years in enough measures so that at least four of the six indicators are noted as in compliance or showing improvement, then that system is deemed to be in compliance.

For calendar year 2005, the preliminary results show that 67 of Wisconsin's 69 transit systems were in compliance with the cost-efficiency standards. Further analysis of the other two transit systems will be explained below, Onalaska (Shared Ride Taxi) and New Richmond (Shared Ride Taxi), whose stage 1 & 2 analyses indicate a need for further evaluation.

Eight transit systems, (Fond du Lac, Grant Co., New Richmond, Onalaska, Ozaukee Co. Shared-Ride Taxi, Washington Co. Shared-Ride Taxi, and Waterloo/Marshall) were found to be out of compliance with three or more of the six performance measures after this step. A detailed chart of the calendar year 2005 step one analyses is attached.

After performing the second step of the analysis, two transit systems, the Onalaska Shared-Ride Taxi and the New Richmond Shared-Ride Taxi, were in need of third step evaluation. A detailed matrix of the step two analysis is also attached.

A third tier analysis assesses the implementation status of recommendations made in the transit system's most recently completed management performance review. Prior to receiving this analysis, Onalaska had taken steps to be in compliance on performance measures such as cost and hours of service per capita, so no further action is necessary at this time. WisDOT identified that New Richmond's costs were well above the state average for 2006 and 2007, and generated an audit of the New Richmond service provider. Based on the results of this audit, WisDOT recommended the service be re-bid for 2009. New Richmond followed this recommendation and was able to award the service at a competitive rate. We anticipate this change will move Shared-Ride Taxi services for New Richmond into compliance with state performance measures starting with the 2012 report.

For calendar year 2006, the preliminary results show that 66 of Wisconsin's 69 transit systems are in compliance with the cost-efficiency standards. Further analysis will be explained below of the other three transit systems, Rice Lake (Small Bus), New Richmond (Shared Ride Taxi), and Ozaukee County (Shared-Ride Taxi), whose stage 1 & 2 analyses indicate a need for further evaluation.

Seven transit systems, (Fond du Lac, Grant Co., New Richmond, Ozaukee Co. Shared-Ride Taxi, Rice Lake, Washington Co. Shared-Ride Taxi, and Waterloo/Marshall) were found to be out of compliance with three or more of the six performance measures after this step. A detailed chart of the 2006 step one analyses is attached.

After performing the second step of the analysis, three transit systems, Rice Lake Small Bus, New Richmond Shared-Ride Taxi, and Ozaukee Co. Shared-Ride Taxi, were in need of third step evaluation. A detailed matrix of the step two analysis is also attached.

For the third tier analysis from calendar year 2006, WisDOT took the actions against New Richmond's service provider that were described above, and expects that shared-ride taxi program to be in compliance in future years. Rice Lake dramatically reduced its service in the 2006 service year, which triggered a Management Performance Audit of its operations and plans for the future. WisDOT and the City of Rice Lake plan to discuss these findings and possible action in future years based on the audit.

As a result of audit findings, Ozaukee County transitioned from a problematic Shared-Ride Taxi contractor during 2006. The below-standard measures in 2006 reflect the difficulties that resulted in part due to this change of providers. Analysis of future years of Ozaukee County's Shared-Ride Taxi operations will be required to determine if progress is being made on these performance measures to bring them closer to compliance.

In viewing the detailed data sheets, it is useful to note that the analyses for the Milwaukee County, Madison, and Medium-sized bus systems use a nationwide peer group. Consistent with previous years, Milwaukee County and Madison rank high in their peer groups for both passengers and hours of service per capita, and below their peer averages in cost-per-passenger. The data is drawn from the National Transit Database for years 2005 and 2006, and does not reflect changes in service levels and rider behavior that have occurred

since then. The analyses for the small-sized bus systems, commuter bus systems, and shared-ride taxi systems use the statewide peer group itself for comparison, since comparable national transit data for these systems is not available. This group uses the most recently audited state data, which is for 2005 and 2006.

If you have any questions about these standards or the analysis, please contact me at 608-266-2963.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Rod Clark".

Rod Clark, Director  
Bureau of Transit and Local Roads

Enclosures

cc: Transit Systems

## COST EFFICIENCY STANDARDS IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

### BACKGROUND

1. Cost efficiency standards will be established for each of the following performance indicators:
  - A. The ratio of passengers, as expressed in unlinked trips, to service area population.
  - B. The ratio of operating expenses to passengers, as expressed in unlinked trips.
  - C. The ratio of operating expenses to revenue hours.
  - D. The ratio of revenues to operating expenses.
  - E. The ratio of passengers, as expressed in unlinked trips, to revenue hours.
  - F. The ratio of revenue hours to service area population.
  
2. For purposes of establishing cost efficiency standards, transit systems are divided into the following peer groups:
  1. Milwaukee
  2. Madison
  3. Medium Bus Systems
  4. Small Bus Systems
  5. Commuter Bus Systems
  6. Shared-Ride Taxi Systems

### STEP 1

Prepare tables for each of the performance indicators for each of the peer groups.

For the Milwaukee, Madison, and the Medium Bus Systems, peer groups of similar sized transit systems with similar operating characteristics external to the state will be developed to establish the cost efficiency standards. For each of these groups, the transit systems used to establish the peer group will be those used in the most recent management performance audit. Data used for these transit systems will be the most recent available from the National Transit Database.

For Small Bus, Commuter Bus, and Shared-Ride Taxi systems, standards shall be established using data from only in-state systems. Data used shall be from the most recently audit calendar year.

For all peer groups, standards will be established for each of the six performance indicators by using a standard deviation. Systems that are within one standard deviation of the arithmetic mean shall be judged as in compliance with the standard for the

## STEP 2

For those systems not in compliance with the cost efficiency standard after completion of Step 1, prepare tables showing a time-trend analysis of each of the six performance measures over the most recent five-year period. Systems showing improvement in measures in which they did not meet the standards in Step 1 will be deemed in compliance with the cost efficiency standards if when added to the number of measures they were in compliance with in Step 1 the total is 4 or more.

## STEP 3

For those systems still not in compliance after completion of Steps 1 and 2, assess the implementation status of recommendations made in the system's most recently completed management performance audit. A system that has made significant progress in implementing the majority of recommendations targeted at improving efficiency shall be deemed in compliance with the cost efficiency standards. At this time, WISDOT shall notify all transit systems of their status relative to compliance with the cost efficiency standards.

## STEP 4

If any transit systems remain out of compliance after completion of Steps 1 through 3, one of the following actions will be taken:

- A. If management performance audit recommendations have not been implemented, WISDOT shall provide technical assistance to aid in the implementation of the recommendations. If consultant services are necessary, the transit system shall pay the nonfederal share of the costs.
- B. If a management performance audit has not been conducted within the last three years, WISDOT shall schedule an audit as soon as possible.

## PENALTY

Systems deemed out of compliance with the cost efficiency standards as outlined above will be given a three-year period of time in which to comply before being assessed a revenue penalty. After three years of non-compliance, a 10% revenue penalty shall be imposed, which will limit state aids to 90% of the state aid the system would have been entitled to if it were in compliance. The penalty remains in effect until the system comes into compliance.

## **2005 Performance Measures**

SUMMARY RESULTS  
STEP ONE ANALYSIS

2005

The following transit systems failed to meet the performance standards in three or more performance measures. Compliance, at this stage, is defined as meeting the standard in four of the six cost efficiency measures.

Medium Bus						
	Cost/Revenue Hour	Farebox Recovery	Cost/Passenger	Passengers/Revenue Hour	Passengers/Capita	Revenue Hours/Capita
Fond du Lac			X	X	X	

Small Bus						
	Cost/Revenue Hour	Farebox Recovery	Cost/Passenger	Passengers/Revenue Hour	Passengers/Capita	Revenue Hours/Capita
Rice Lake		X	X	X		

SUMMARY RESULTS  
STEP ONE ANALYSIS

Shared Ride Taxi Group						
	Cost/Revenue Hour	Operating Ratio	Cost/Passenger	Passengers/Revenue Hour	Passengers/Capita	Revenue Hours/Capita
Grant Co.		X			X	X
New Richmond	X	X	X			
Onalaska	X	X	X			
Ozaukee Co.		X	X		X	
Washington Co.		X	X	X	X	
Waterloo/Marshall		X	X	X	X	

*"X" indicates failure to meet performance standard in the step one analysis.*



## Summary Results for Step Two Analysis

### Performance Over Past 5 Years (2001-2005)/Five-Year Trend Analysis

	Expense/Revenue Hour	Operating Ratio	Cost/Passenger	Passengers/Revenue Hour	Passengers/Capita	Revenue Hours/Capita	Number of areas out of compliance	Number of areas out of compliance showing improvement	Final number of areas out of compliance	System pass/fail
Medium Bus										
Fond du Lac	In Compliance	In Compliance	Improvement	Improvement	No Improvement	In Compliance	3	2	1	Pass
Small Bus										
Rice Lake	In Compliance	No Improvement	Improvement	No Improvement	In Compliance	In Compliance	3	1	2	Pass
Shared-Ride Taxi										
Grant Co.	In Compliance	Improvement	In Compliance	In Compliance	No Improvement	No Improvement	3	1	2	Pass
New Richmond	No Improvement	No Improvement	No Improvement	In Compliance	In Compliance	In Compliance	3	0	3	Fail
Dnalaska	No Improvement	In Compliance	In Compliance	In Compliance	No Improvement	No Improvement	3	0	3	Fail
Ozaukee Co.	In Compliance	Improvement	Improvement	Improvement	Improvement	In Compliance	3	3	0	Pass
Washington Co.	In Compliance	No Improvement	No Improvement	Improvement	Improvement	In Compliance	4	2	2	Pass
Waterloo/Marshall	In Compliance	No Improvement	No Improvement	Improvement	Improvement	In Compliance	4	2	2	Pass

**2008 COST EFFICIENCY ANALYSIS  
PERFORMANCE STANDARDS  
MILWAUKEE CO. NATIONWIDE PEER GROUP SUMMARY**

Performance Measure	Data	Mean	Standard Deviation
Cost/Hour	2005	\$83.37	\$19.99
Operating Ratio	2005	21.68%	7.20%
Cost/Passenger	2005	\$3.66	\$1.01
Passenger/Hour	2005	23.50	4.72
Passenger/Capita	2005	24.83	12.66
Hours/Capita	2005	1.02	0.37

**Performance Parameters**  
+/- One Standard Deviation

\$83.38	\$103.36
14.40%	28.97%
\$2.66	\$4.67
18.78	28.22
12.17	37.48
0.66	1.39

\*Shading denotes system outside of the St. Dev.

MCTS Peer Group	Expense/ Revenue Hour	Farebox Recovery	Cost/ Passenger	Passengers/ Revenue Hour	Passengers/ Capita	Revenue Hours/ Capita
Milwaukee County	\$82.49	30.46%	\$2.73	30.26	54.76	1.81
Cincinnati	\$79.06	30.97%	\$2.86	27.60	30.95	1.12
Columbus, OH	\$99.29	16.05%	\$4.95	20.04	13.98	0.70
Detroit	\$131.96	11.63%	\$5.27	25.04	37.43	1.49
Indianapolis	\$72.16	18.65%	\$4.69	15.38	11.13	0.72
Providence	\$84.85	25.65%	\$4.04	21.01	22.81	1.09
Hampton	\$59.92	27.30%	\$2.26	26.48	19.59	0.74
Nashville	\$79.04	23.81%	\$4.01	19.72	13.16	0.67
Louisville	\$70.00	12.54%	\$3.57	19.60	20.38	1.04
San Antonio	\$64.12	14.10%	\$2.69	23.90	27.36	1.14
San Diego	\$94.18	27.36%	\$3.20	29.44	21.54	0.73
<b>GROUP MEAN AVERAGE:</b>	<b>\$83.37</b>	<b>21.68%</b>	<b>\$3.66</b>	<b>23.50</b>	<b>24.83</b>	<b>1.02</b>

**2008 COST EFFICIENCY ANALYSIS  
PERFORMANCE STANDARDS  
MADISON METRO NATIONWIDE PEER GROUP SUMMARY**

Performance Measure	Data	Mean	Standard Deviation
Cost/Hour	2005	\$69.67	\$13.08
Operating Ratio	2005	17.80%	8.36%
Cost/Passenger	2005	\$4.14	\$0.84
Passenger/Hour	2005	17.53	6.14
Passenger/Capita	2005	19.29	12.62
Hours/Capita	2005	1.06	0.60

**Performance Parameters**  
+/- One Standard Deviation

\$66.59	\$82.74
9.44%	26.15%
\$3.30	\$4.97
12.39	22.67
6.67	31.91
0.56	1.58

\*Shading denotes system outside of the St. Dev.

Madison Metro Peer Group	Expense/ Revenue Hour	Farebox Recovery	Cost/ Passenger	Passengers/ Revenue Hour	Passengers/ Capita	Revenue Hours/ Capita
Madison Metro	\$83.38	19.20%	\$3.39	24.57	50.18	2.04
Lansing	\$79.79	12.53%	\$3.21	24.86	33.40	1.34
Grand Rapids	\$63.09	13.44%	\$4.12	15.33	13.40	0.87
Ann Arbor	\$72.88	13.33%	\$4.36	16.74	23.91	1.43
Des Moines	\$56.43	37.47%	\$3.25	17.37	11.45	0.66
Omaha	\$61.34	21.49%	\$3.98	15.39	8.58	0.56
Syracuse	\$91.69	22.82%	\$3.90	23.50	19.24	0.82
Harrisburg	\$60.55	27.29%	\$6.20	9.76	7.46	0.76
Knoxville	\$49.90	7.47%	\$4.09	12.19	17.52	1.44
Birmingham	\$58.49	12.67%	\$4.55	12.86	5.79	0.45
Albuquerque	\$82.78	11.63%	\$3.66	22.60	15.82	0.70
Spokane	\$75.70	14.22%	\$4.97	15.24	24.73	1.62
<b>GROUP MEAN AVERAGE:</b>	<b>\$69.67</b>	<b>17.80%</b>	<b>\$4.14</b>	<b>17.53</b>	<b>19.29</b>	<b>1.06</b>

**2008 COST EFFICIENCY ANALYSIS  
PERFORMANCE STANDARDS  
COMMUTER BUS PEER GROUP SUMMARY**

Performance Measure	Data	Mean	Standard Deviation
Cost/Hour	2005	\$114.04	\$11.83
Operating Ratio	2005	22.27%	3.12%
Cost/Passenger	2005	\$10.07	\$2.22
Passenger/Hour	2005	11.61	1.94
Passenger/Capita	2005	0.99	0.39
Hours/Capita	2005	0.08	0.02

**Performance Parameters**  
+/- One Standard Deviation

\$102.41	\$125.66
19.15%	25.39%
\$7.85	\$12.30
9.88	13.55
0.61	1.38
0.08	0.10

\*Shading denotes system outside of the St. Dev.

Commuter Bus	Expense/ Revenue Hour	Farebox Recovery	Cost/ Passenger	Passengers/ Revenue Hour	Passengers/ Capita	Revenue Hours/ Capita
Ozaukee Co.	\$127.11	19.83%	\$9.54	13.32	1.19	0.09
Racine Commuter	\$120.52	22.64%	\$13.22	9.12	0.67	0.07
Washington Co.	\$105.07	26.55%	\$9.55	11.01	0.67	0.06
Waukesha Co.	\$103.44	20.07%	\$7.98	12.97	1.44	0.11
<b>GROUP MEAN AVERAGE:</b>	<b>\$114.04</b>	<b>22.27%</b>	<b>\$10.07</b>	<b>11.61</b>	<b>0.99</b>	<b>0.08</b>

**2008 COST EFFICIENCY ANALYSIS  
PERFORMANCE STANDARDS  
MEDIUM BUS NATIONWIDE PEER GROUP SUMMARY**

Performance Measure	Data	Mean	Standard Deviation
Cost/Hour	2005	\$57.71	\$9.66
Operating Ratio	2005	14.79%	5.92%
Cost/Passenger	2005	\$4.63	\$2.03
Passenger/Hour	2005	14.15	4.64
Passenger/Capita	2005	11.51	6.36
Hours/Capita	2005	0.81	0.26

**Performance Parameters**  
± One Standard Deviation

\$48.05	\$67.37
8.87%	20.70%
\$2.60	\$6.66
9.61	18.69
6.16	16.87
0.54	1.07

\*Shading denotes system outside of the St. Dev.

Medium Bus	Expense/ Revenue Hour	Farebox Recovery	Cost/ Passenger	Passengers/ Revenue Hour	Passengers/ Capita	Revenue Hours/ Capita
Appleton	\$ 51.79	15.94%	\$ 5.14	10.07	4.58	0.45
Beloit	\$ 75.77	9.44%	\$ 6.04	12.64	7.63	0.61
Eau Claire	\$ 45.02	16.80%	\$ 3.06	14.69	17.99	1.22
Fond du Lac	\$ 41.22	14.21%	\$ 6.90	5.98	3.97	0.66
Green Bay	\$ 52.98	15.09%	\$ 3.81	13.90	10.58	0.76
Janesville	\$ 72.95	15.78%	\$ 4.31	16.94	8.33	0.49
Kenosha	\$ 75.58	8.84%	\$ 3.67	20.58	17.47	0.85
La Crosse	\$ 52.49	19.55%	\$ 3.77	13.93	17.33	1.24
Oshkosh	\$ 49.75	12.83%	\$ 3.39	14.67	17.18	1.17
Racine	\$ 72.86	13.19%	\$ 4.41	16.46	13.68	0.82
Sheboygan	\$ 55.77	15.21%	\$ 5.91	9.43	9.16	0.97
Wausau	\$ 60.64	13.87%	\$ 3.87	15.98	18.34	1.15
Waukesha	\$ 61.85	13.84%	\$ 5.24	11.57	11.05	0.96
Kalamazoo	\$ 65.68	14.91%	\$ 3.83	17.13	15.82	0.92
Muskegon Heights	\$ 62.46	9.11%	\$ 5.97	10.47	2.67	0.25
Bloomington, IL	\$ 45.16	15.62%	\$ 3.34	13.53	11.22	0.83
Decatur	\$ 62.21	10.66%	\$ 3.97	13.16	12.12	0.92
Rochester, MN	\$ 55.15	39.04%	\$ 2.96	18.65	12.89	0.69
St. Cloud	\$ 59.45	14.88%	\$ 3.36	21.68	17.69	0.82
Cedar Rapids	\$ 68.48	13.19%	\$ 5.88	11.65	11.69	0.99
Dubuque	\$ 45.89	15.83%	\$ 3.10	14.81	10.95	0.74
Waterloo	\$ 57.69	17.41%	\$ 7.57	7.62	4.19	0.55
Iowa City	\$ 61.14	22.01%	\$ 2.54	24.10	25.00	1.04
Topeka	\$ 59.37	14.85%	\$ 3.73	15.91	11.61	0.73
St. Joseph, MO	\$ 48.94	3.01%	\$ 11.28	4.34	3.91	0.90
Fargo	\$ 44.15	19.06%	\$ 2.92	15.14	8.92	0.59
Manchester	\$ 64.52	17.64%	\$ 6.49	9.94	2.95	0.30
Charlottesville	\$ 50.70	10.08%	\$ 3.41	14.88	17.78	1.19
Asheville	\$ 51.09	20.02%	\$ 3.20	15.99	15.50	0.97
Lafayette, LA	\$ 52.13	9.44%	\$ 2.38	21.94	10.20	0.46
Santa Fe	\$ 74.61	6.19%	\$ 9.92	7.52	8.04	1.07
Pueblo	\$ 59.56	15.10%	\$ 3.46	17.23	9.92	0.58
Missoula	\$ 57.50	15.37%	\$ 3.96	14.61	9.92	0.68
<b>GROUP MEAN AVERAGE:</b>	<b>\$57.71</b>	<b>14.79%</b>	<b>\$4.63</b>	<b>14.15</b>	<b>11.51</b>	<b>0.81</b>

**2008 COST EFFICIENCY ANALYSIS  
PERFORMANCE STANDARDS  
SMALL BUS SUMMARY**

Performance Measure	Data	Mean	Standard Deviation
Cost/Hour	2005	\$48.32	\$6.28
Operating Ratio	2005	11.63%	5.50%
Cost/Passenger	2005	\$9.38	\$4.10
Passenger/Hour	2005	6.28	3.24
Passenger/Capita	2005	4.61	2.85
Hours/Capita	2005	0.76	0.48

**Performance Parameters**  
+/- One Standard Deviation

\$42.04	\$54.60
6.13%	17.13%
\$5.29	\$13.48
3.05	9.52
1.76	7.45
0.28	1.24

\*Shading denotes system outside of the St. Dev.

Small Bus	Expense/ Revenue Hour	Farebox Recovery	Cost/ Passenger	Passengers/ Revenue Hour	Passengers/ Capita	Revenue Hours/ Capita
Day Area Rural	\$46.02	11.16%	\$11.38	4.05	0.69	0.15
Ladysmith	\$42.09	9.16%	\$9.52	4.43	7.51	1.70
Manitowoc	\$43.22	10.26%	\$4.53	9.54	5.23	0.55
Merrill	\$58.67	21.08%	\$5.36	10.95	7.40	0.68
Monona	\$47.57	12.64%	\$12.62	3.77	2.03	0.54
Rice Lake	\$46.32	2.89%	\$15.62	2.90	2.80	0.90
Stevens Point	\$55.38	14.23%	\$6.64	8.34	6.89	0.83
<b>GROUP MEAN AVERAGE:</b>	<b>\$ 48.32</b>	<b>11.63%</b>	<b>\$9.38</b>	<b>6.28</b>	<b>4.61</b>	<b>0.76</b>

**2008 COST EFFICIENCY ANALYSIS  
PERFORMANCE STANDARDS  
SHARED RIDE TAXI SUMMARY**

Performance Measure	Data	Mean	Standard Deviation
Cost/Hour	2005	\$23.18	\$4.72
Operating Ratio	2005	26.81%	7.34%
Cost/Passenger	2005	\$8.66	\$2.59
Passenger/Hour	2005	2.83	0.76
Passenger/Capita	2005	3.46	2.35
Hours/Capita	2005	1.20	0.77

**Performance Parameters**  
+/- One Standard Deviation

\$18.45	\$27.90
19.47%	34.15%
\$6.07	\$11.25
2.07	3.59
1.11	5.81
0.44	1.97

\*Shading denotes system outside of the St. Dev.

Shared-Ride Taxi	Expense/ Revenue Hour	Farebox Recovery	Cost/ Passenger	Passengers/ Revenue Hour	Passengers/ Capita	Revenue Hours/ Capita
Baraboo	\$26.04	35.71%	\$9.16	2.84	3.11	1.10
Beaver Dam	\$20.67	25.96%	\$7.10	2.91	6.45	2.22
Berlin	\$25.76	25.52%	\$7.07	3.64	4.66	1.28
Black River Falls	\$28.72	31.95%	\$7.60	3.78	9.78	2.59
Chippewa Falls	\$23.48	29.50%	\$5.52	4.26	4.91	1.15
Clinonville	\$25.76	28.54%	\$10.16	2.45	2.15	0.88
Edgerton	\$15.54	21.45%	\$9.21	1.69	0.92	0.54
Fort Atkinson	\$20.86	34.58%	\$5.79	3.61	3.96	1.10
Grant Co.	\$24.39	13.43%	\$8.02	3.04	0.42	0.14
Hartford	\$32.44	27.20%	\$8.02	4.05	1.52	0.38
Jefferson	\$21.79	28.66%	\$6.39	3.41	2.94	0.86
Lake Mills	\$20.60	21.74%	\$8.06	2.56	1.91	0.76
Marquette	\$28.02	21.52%	\$8.18	3.42	3.06	0.89
Marshfield	\$20.99	31.15%	\$6.05	3.47	4.13	1.19
Mauston	\$29.54	24.84%	\$10.12	2.92	4.52	1.55
Medford	\$18.60	20.92%	\$7.98	2.33	3.28	1.41
Monroe	\$19.01	34.55%	\$5.74	3.31	4.49	1.36
Nellsville	\$19.87	23.27%	\$10.28	1.93	5.53	2.87
New Richmond	\$28.74	16.69%	\$13.61	2.11	1.47	0.70
Onalaska	\$28.43	20.57%	\$10.44	2.72	0.95	0.35
Ozaukee Co.	\$26.49	18.40%	\$12.08	2.23	0.96	0.44
Platteville	\$11.40	33.82%	\$5.78	1.97	1.88	0.95
Plover	\$25.86	25.70%	\$11.95	2.16	1.03	0.48
Port Washington	\$28.66	23.98%	\$10.68	2.68	1.78	0.66
Portage	\$28.84	38.94%	\$6.84	3.26	10.38	3.18
Prairie Du Chien	\$20.99	26.46%	\$8.37	2.51	4.27	1.70
Prairie Du Sac	\$17.25	22.27%	\$9.11	1.89	1.60	0.85
Reedsburg	\$28.66	26.74%	\$11.23	2.55	3.21	1.28
Rhineland	\$21.96	39.90%	\$8.86	2.48	7.99	3.22
Ripon	\$17.94	33.04%	\$6.48	2.77	4.24	1.53
River Falls	\$30.93	19.38%	\$10.06	3.07	1.91	0.82
Shawano	\$21.13	35.11%	\$6.91	3.06	3.13	1.02
Stoughton	\$26.69	33.97%	\$7.33	3.64	2.74	0.75
Sun Prairie	\$22.51	38.40%	\$5.26	4.28	3.67	0.86
Viroqua	\$18.82	18.82%	\$8.66	2.17	5.12	2.36
Washington County	\$27.72	10.52%	\$17.15	1.62	0.90	0.56
Waterloo/ Marshall	\$16.47	13.04%	\$15.29	1.08	0.49	0.45
Watertown	\$21.40	35.39%	\$5.28	4.05	5.45	1.36
Waupaca	\$23.83	33.23%	\$6.67	3.57	6.55	1.83
Waupun	\$16.04	20.54%	\$8.60	1.96	0.88	0.45
West Bend	\$22.55	24.98%	\$7.37	3.06	4.30	1.41
Whitewater	\$20.29	28.46%	\$6.08	2.91	1.57	0.54
Wis Rapids	\$20.08	33.95%	\$8.92	2.25	4.53	2.01
<b>GROUP MEAN AVERAGE:</b>	<b>\$23.18</b>	<b>26.81%</b>	<b>\$8.66</b>	<b>2.83</b>	<b>3.46</b>	<b>1.20</b>

## 2006 Performance Measures



**2009 COST EFFICIENCY ANALYSIS  
PERFORMANCE STANDARDS  
MEDIUM BUS NATIONWIDE PEER GROUP SUMMARY**

Performance Measure	Data	Mean	Standard Deviation
Cost/Hour	2006	\$60.47	\$9.48
Operating Ratio	2006	15.31%	6.35%
Cost/Passenger	2006	\$4.69	\$2.05
Passenger/Hour	2006	14.77	4.94
Passenger/Capita	2006	12.06	5.61
Hours/Capita	2006	0.81	0.28

**Performance Parameters**  
+/- One Standard Deviation

\$50.98	\$69.95
8.96%	21.67%
\$2.64	\$6.74
9.82	19.71
6.46	17.67
0.53	1.09

\*Shading denotes system outside of the St. Dev.

Medium Bus	Expense/ Revenue Hour	Farebox Recovery	Cost/ Passenger	Passengers/ Revenue Hour	Passengers/ Capita	Revenue Hours/ Capita
Appleton	\$ 54.69	17.57%	\$ 5.51	9.92	4.50	0.45
Beloit	\$ 78.39	10.80%	\$ 5.57	14.07	8.57	0.61
Eau Claire	\$ 48.92	15.12%	\$ 3.42	14.32	18.07	1.26
Fond du Lac	\$ 44.70	13.16%	\$ 7.51	5.95	3.97	0.67
Green Bay	\$ 54.55	15.94%	\$ 3.85	14.16	10.24	0.72
Janesville	\$ 78.13	15.12%	\$ 4.49	17.40	8.58	0.49
Kenosha	\$ 74.33	8.96%	\$ 3.54	21.02	17.75	0.84
La Crosse	\$ 50.89	20.46%	\$ 4.03	12.64	17.38	1.38
Oshkosh	\$ 54.86	13.59%	\$ 3.43	16.00	17.38	1.09
Racine	\$ 72.83	14.14%	\$ 4.35	16.76	13.69	0.82
Sheboygan	\$ 63.27	16.92%	\$ 6.02	10.52	9.84	0.94
Wausau	\$ 63.67	14.53%	\$ 3.91	16.29	19.39	1.19
Waukesha	\$ 61.94	17.77%	\$ 5.40	11.47	10.91	0.95
Kalamazoo	\$ 66.30	16.99%	\$ 4.15	15.96	15.67	0.98
Muskegon Heights	\$ 65.67	9.84%	\$ 5.45	12.04	2.90	0.24
Bloomington, IL	\$ 58.65	17.16%	\$ 3.10	18.91	13.35	0.71
Decatur	\$ 55.66	10.40%	\$ 3.91	14.23	13.16	0.92
Rochester, MN	\$ 57.28	41.81%	\$ 2.81	20.37	14.05	0.61
St. Cloud	\$ 64.32	14.61%	\$ 3.52	23.01	18.27	0.79
Cedar Rapids	\$ 76.87	12.52%	\$ 6.51	11.81	12.00	1.02
Dubuque	\$ 43.59	14.11%	\$ 3.13	13.93	11.87	0.85
Waterloo	\$ 59.49	21.55%	\$ 7.61	7.68	4.06	0.53
Iowa City	\$ 67.06	20.96%	\$ 2.59	25.91	27.10	1.05
Topeka	\$ 57.51	16.28%	\$ 3.61	15.91	12.55	0.79
St. Joseph, MO	\$ 51.38	3.29%	\$ 11.51	4.46	4.24	0.95
Fargo	\$ 49.36	19.91%	\$ 3.23	15.29	8.99	0.59
Manchester	\$ 64.52	17.64%	\$ 6.49	10.57	3.17	0.30
Charlottesville	\$ 52.51	10.22%	\$ 3.46	15.16	18.80	1.24
Asheville	\$ 55.48	19.70%	\$ 3.26	17.00	16.79	0.99
Lafayette, LA	\$ 53.85	11.28%	\$ 2.19	24.60	11.46	0.47
Santa Fe	\$ 75.67	5.30%	\$ 9.58	7.90	8.93	1.13
Pueblo	\$ 59.77	13.67%	\$ 3.40	17.58	9.98	0.57
Missoula	\$ 59.38	14.00%	\$ 4.12	14.42	10.39	0.72
<b>GROUP MEAN AVERAGE:</b>	<b>\$60.47</b>	<b>15.31%</b>	<b>\$4.69</b>	<b>14.77</b>	<b>12.06</b>	<b>0.81</b>

**2009 COST EFFICIENCY ANALYSIS  
PERFORMANCE STANDARDS**

**SMALL BUS SUMMARY**

Performance Measure	Data	Mean	Standard Deviation
Cost/Hour	2006	\$49.45	\$11.83
Operating Ratio	2006	15.78%	7.28%
Cost/Passenger	2006	\$9.67	\$6.31
Passenger/Hour	2006	6.44	3.27
Passenger/Capita	2006	4.68	3.21
Hours/Capita	2006	0.70	0.46

**Performance Parameters  
+/- One Standard Deviation**

\$37.63	\$61.28
8.51%	23.06%
\$3.37	\$15.98
3.17	9.71
1.48	7.89
0.24	1.16

\*Shading denotes system outside of the St. Dev.

Small Bus	Expense/ Revenue Hour	Farebox Recovery	Cost/ Passenger	Passengers/ Revenue Hour	Passengers/ Capita	Revenue Hours/ Capita
Bay Area Rural	\$45.50	11.98%	\$11.53	3.95	0.75	0.19
Ladysmith	\$31.49	15.52%	\$6.63	4.75	7.81	1.64
Manitowoc	\$47.86	10.74%	\$5.17	9.26	5.88	0.64
Merrill	\$61.49	25.78%	\$5.83	10.54	7.15	0.68
Monona	\$39.22	25.31%	\$9.67	4.06	2.12	0.52
Rice Lake	\$62.89	6.53%	\$22.97	2.74	1.20	0.44
Stevens Point	\$57.72	14.62%	\$5.91	9.77	7.88	0.81
<b>GROUP MEAN AVERAGE:</b>	<b>\$ 49.45</b>	<b>15.78%</b>	<b>\$9.67</b>	<b>6.44</b>	<b>4.68</b>	<b>0.70</b>

**2009 COST EFFICIENCY ANALYSIS  
PERFORMANCE STANDARDS  
SHARED RIDE TAXI SUMMARY**

Performance Measure	Data	Mean	Standard Deviation
Cost/Hour	2006	\$23.71	\$4.77
Operating Ratio	2006	27.71%	7.31%
Cost/Passenger	2006	\$8.86	\$2.82
Passenger/Hour	2006	2.83	0.74
Passenger/Capita	2006	3.41	2.25
Hours/Capita	2006	1.21	0.80

**Performance Parameters**  
+/- One Standard Deviation

\$18.94	\$28.49
20.40%	35.03%
\$6.04	\$11.68
2.09	3.58
1.16	5.66
0.40	2.01

\*Shading denotes system outside of the St. Dev.

Shared-Ride Taxi	Expense/ Revenue Hour	Farebox Recovery	Cost/ Passenger	Passengers/ Revenue Hour	Passengers/ Capita	Revenue Hours/ Capita
Baraboo	\$27.95	34.92%	\$10.55	2.65	2.82	1.06
Beaver Dam	\$19.00	30.79%	\$6.91	2.75	6.44	2.34
Berlin	\$25.47	30.60%	\$7.66	3.32	4.49	1.35
Black River Falls	\$26.96	31.14%	\$7.62	3.54	9.65	2.73
Chippewa Falls	\$24.10	29.08%	\$5.68	4.24	4.88	1.15
Clintonville	\$25.46	28.35%	\$10.75	2.37	2.07	0.87
Edgerton	\$18.26	20.70%	\$9.80	1.86	0.98	0.53
Fort Atkinson	\$21.80	32.88%	\$6.22	3.51	3.77	1.07
Grant Co.	\$27.18	13.35%	\$7.05	3.85	0.62	0.16
Hartford	\$32.64	26.63%	\$8.54	3.82	1.44	0.38
Jefferson	\$21.31	30.69%	\$7.06	3.02	2.64	0.87
Lake Mills	\$20.79	22.24%	\$9.17	2.27	1.58	0.70
Marinette	\$27.51	23.33%	\$7.44	3.70	3.26	0.88
Marshfield	\$21.57	32.66%	\$6.07	3.55	4.12	1.16
Mauston	\$26.86	28.24%	\$9.41	2.85	4.28	1.50
Medford	\$19.31	22.22%	\$7.39	2.61	3.81	1.46
Monroe	\$20.15	36.51%	\$5.42	3.72	4.58	1.23
Neillsville	\$20.47	21.16%	\$11.97	1.71	4.92	2.88
New Richmond	\$38.01	13.09%	\$17.17	2.21	1.44	0.65
Onalaska	\$21.96	22.67%	\$11.36	1.93	1.19	0.62
Ozaukee Co.	\$29.87	17.65%	\$16.16	1.85	0.93	0.50
Platteville	\$12.00	32.34%	\$5.98	2.01	1.84	0.92
Plover	\$26.71	23.68%	\$11.71	2.29	1.08	0.47
Port Washington	\$29.56	26.36%	\$10.18	2.91	1.90	0.65
Portage	\$25.43	40.62%	\$8.91	2.63	9.42	3.58
Prairie Du Chien	\$22.25	28.47%	\$7.93	2.81	4.76	1.69
Prairie Du Sac	\$17.68	24.60%	\$9.38	1.88	1.55	0.83
Reedsburg	\$27.49	31.17%	\$10.47	2.62	3.07	1.17
Rhineland	\$22.65	39.36%	\$8.88	2.55	8.13	3.19
Ripon	\$20.37	33.97%	\$6.19	3.29	4.41	1.34
River Falls	\$27.82	22.57%	\$8.80	3.16	1.82	0.58
Shawano	\$21.53	31.56%	\$8.10	2.66	2.55	0.96
Stoughton	\$25.00	35.06%	\$7.11	3.52	2.79	0.79
Sun Prairie	\$23.67	36.60%	\$5.58	4.24	3.61	0.85
Viroqua	\$19.97	21.04%	\$8.52	2.34	5.68	2.43
Washington County	\$31.66	10.37%	\$15.90	1.99	0.93	0.47
Waterloo/ Marshall	\$17.35	14.08%	\$13.26	1.31	0.55	0.42
Watertown	\$21.94	37.48%	\$5.47	4.01	5.21	1.30
Waupaca	\$24.78	33.51%	\$7.52	3.30	5.84	1.77
Waupun	\$17.51	25.01%	\$8.07	2.17	0.95	0.44
West Bend	\$24.75	28.56%	\$7.91	3.13	4.13	1.32
Whitewater	\$22.06	33.48%	\$6.42	3.44	1.86	0.54
Wis Rapids	\$20.86	32.86%	\$9.45	2.20	4.60	2.09
<b>GROUP MEAN AVERAGE:</b>	<b>\$23.71</b>	<b>27.71%</b>	<b>\$8.86</b>	<b>2.83</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>1.21</b>

**2009 COST EFFICIENCY ANALYSIS  
PERFORMANCE STANDARDS  
MILWAUKEE CO. NATIONWIDE PEER GROUP SUMMARY**

Performance Measure	Data	Mean	Standard Deviation
Cost/Hour	2006	\$85.62	\$21.87
Operating Ratio	2006	22.52%	7.15%
Cost/Passenger	2006	\$3.71	\$0.79
Passenger/Hour	2006	23.42	4.68
Passenger/Capita	2006	24.46	12.21
Hours/Capita	2006	1.01	0.34

**Performance Parameters  
+/- One Standard Deviation**

\$63.75	\$107.49
15.36%	29.67%
\$2.92	\$4.50
18.74	28.10
12.25	36.67
0.67	1.36

\*Shading denotes system outside of the St. Dev.

MCTS Peer Group	Expense/ Revenue Hour	Farebox Recovery	Cost/ Passenger	Passengers/ Revenue Hour	Passengers/ Capita	Revenue Hours/ Capita
Milwaukee County	\$86.50	32.06%	\$2.98	29.08	52.09	1.79
Cincinnati	\$84.78	30.41%	\$3.15	26.89	30.23	1.12
Columbus, OH	\$99.97	19.60%	\$4.49	22.28	14.19	0.64
Detroit	\$141.29	13.08%	\$4.89	28.90	39.19	1.36
Indianapolis	\$70.09	19.35%	\$4.29	16.32	12.67	0.78
Providence	\$90.64	26.00%	\$4.21	21.54	19.14	0.89
Hampton	\$60.77	25.27%	\$2.78	21.86	17.53	0.80
Nashville	\$83.48	24.51%	\$4.38	19.06	13.80	0.72
Louisville	\$70.06	12.28%	\$3.90	17.98	19.91	1.11
San Antonio	\$67.04	14.73%	\$2.78	24.10	28.40	1.18
San Diego	\$87.20	30.38%	\$2.94	29.62	21.95	0.74
<b>GROUP MEAN AVERAGE:</b>	<b>\$85.62</b>	<b>22.52%</b>	<b>\$3.71</b>	<b>23.42</b>	<b>24.46</b>	<b>1.01</b>

**2009 COST EFFICIENCY ANALYSIS  
PERFORMANCE STANDARDS  
MADISON METRO NATIONWIDE PEER GROUP SUMMARY**

Performance Measure	Data	Mean	Standard Deviation
Cost/Hour	2006	\$73.68	\$12.82
Operating Ratio	2006	17.98%	8.36%
Cost/Passenger	2006	\$4.23	\$0.90
Passenger/Hour	2006	18.29	5.63
Passenger/Capita	2006	20.85	13.33
Hours/Capita	2006	1.09	0.50

**Performance Parameters**  
+/- One Standard Deviation

\$60.86	\$86.51
9.61%	26.34%
\$3.34	\$5.13
12.66	23.91
7.52	34.17
0.58	1.59

\*Shading denotes system outside of the St. Dev.

Madison Metro Peer Group	Expense/ Revenue Hour	Farebox Recovery	Cost/ Passenger	Passengers/ Revenue Hour	Passengers/ Capita	Revenue Hours/ Capita
Madison Metro	\$88.79	19.45%	\$3.44	25.84	51.83	2.01
Lansing	\$79.48	12.81%	\$3.11	25.56	35.81	1.40
Grand Rapids	\$63.05	14.21%	\$3.83	16.47	15.46	0.94
Ann Arbor	\$74.47	15.03%	\$4.01	18.58	27.02	1.45
Des Moines	\$60.99	36.78%	\$3.37	18.09	12.28	0.68
Omaha	\$62.40	21.35%	\$4.89	12.75	7.22	0.57
Syracuse	\$93.44	23.13%	\$3.49	26.75	22.77	0.85
Harrisburg	\$68.36	28.67%	\$5.86	11.67	8.46	0.72
Knoxville	\$56.01	7.59%	\$4.15	13.48	19.12	1.42
Birmingham	\$67.03	12.04%	\$5.54	12.10	5.56	0.46
Albuquerque	\$92.50	10.75%	\$4.08	22.69	17.57	0.77
Spokane	\$77.67	13.89%	\$5.03	15.44	27.08	1.75
<b>GROUP MEAN AVERAGE:</b>	<b>\$73.68</b>	<b>17.98%</b>	<b>\$4.23</b>	<b>18.29</b>	<b>20.85</b>	<b>1.09</b>

**2009 COST EFFICIENCY ANALYSIS  
PERFORMANCE STANDARDS  
COMMUTER BUS PEER GROUP SUMMARY**

Performance Measure	Data	Mean	Standard Deviation
Cost/Hour	2006	\$110.04	\$19.87
Operating Ratio	2006	23.09%	2.00%
Cost/Passenger	2006	\$9.41	\$2.16
Passenger/Hour	2006	12.16	3.53
Passenger/Capita	2006	1.14	0.43
Hours/Capita	2006	0.09	0.01

**Performance Parameters**  
+/- One Standard Deviation

\$90.17	\$129.90
21.08%	25.09%
\$7.26	\$11.57
8.63	15.69
0.70	1.57
0.08	0.10

\*Shading denotes system outside of the St. Dev.

Commuter Bus	Expense/ Revenue Hour	Farebox Recovery	Cost/ Passenger	Passengers/ Revenue Hour	Passengers/ Capita	Revenue Hours/ Capita
Ozaukee Co.	\$123.06	23.00%	\$8.43	14.59	1.37	0.09
Racine Commuter	\$124.13	24.54%	\$12.15	10.22	0.76	0.07
Washington Co.	\$81.51	24.52%	\$9.94	8.20	0.78	0.10
Waukesha Co.	\$111.45	20.28%	\$7.13	15.63	1.63	0.10
<b>GROUP MEAN AVERAGE:</b>	<b>\$110.04</b>	<b>23.09%</b>	<b>\$9.41</b>	<b>12.16</b>	<b>1.14</b>	<b>0.09</b>