AN EVALUATION GUIDEBOOK FOR RURAL AND SMALL URBAN TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS IN THE MOUNTAIN-PLAINS REGION

John Bitzan

and

Jill Hough

Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute
North Dakota State University
Fargo, North Dakota 58105
(701) 237-7767

August 1994

Acknowledgement

This report has been prepared with funds provided by the United States Department of Transportation to the Mountain-Plains Consortium (MPC). The MPC member universities include North Dakota State University, Colorado State University, University of Wyoming, and Utah State University. The authors extend thanks to Tonya Martin, Heather Bates, Kathy McCarthy, Bev Trittin, and Avis Sather for their help in preparing this document for publication. Thanks is also extended to Suzanne Miller for her research assistance.

Table of Contents

Section
One

Introduction

A future of budgetary cuts and limited funding suggests that continued passenger transportation service to rural and small urban residents of the Mountain Plains Region will depend heavily on the efficiency and effectiveness of the operators providing such service. Efficiency and effectiveness of rural passenger transportation services is difficult to achieve without some kind of evaluation tool.

However, no evaluation tools for rural and small urban transit operators currently exist. Moreover, many rural and small urban transit operators do not develop performance measures, or even gather the underlying data necessary to do so. In a recent survey of rural transit operators in the Mountain Plains Region, less than half reported the use of any kind of performance evaluation. Many of the systems that reported the use of performance evaluation only used a ridership survey.

Because of the lack of performance evaluation taking place by rural and small urban transit systems in the Mountain Plains Region, and because of an absence of targets for these transit systems to measure their performance against, this guidebook has been formulated. This guidebook is designed to provide transit operators with a tool for evaluating performance against other similar systems in the region. Recommended performance measures are provided, along with explanations of each, and formulas for converting raw data elements into these performance measures. Moreover, target ranges for performance measures of peer groups are provided, along with an explanation of how to evaluate performance and some remedies for poor performance.

This guidebook is separated into specific topic areas, and is meant to be used as a guide for rural and small urban transit systems in the Mountain Plains Region in evaluating their performance on an ongoing basis. The guidebook is organized as follows:

- First, an explanation of performance evaluation will be presented, including a discussion of the uses of performance evaluation and its value to rural and small urban transit operators.
- Second, a discussion of the types of performance evaluation will be presented, along with the merits and deficiencies of each.
- Third, the recommended performance evaluation method will be presented, along with the recommended performance measures and explanations of each.
- Fourth, a description of the peer groups formulated will be presented, along with a description of how to place your system into one of these peer groups.
- Fifth, formulas for converting raw data into performance measures will be presented.
- Sixth, target ranges for the various performance measures will be presented by peer group.
- Seventh, possible causes for exemplary or poor performance along with strategies for improving performance are presented. This will include a checklist of things to look for when a given performance measure is out of line.
- Finally, performance measure averages, outliers, and values will be presented for each peer group.

Section
Two

Importance of Performance Evaluation

Rural transit agencies are currently at a critical point in their development. The need for passenger transportation services is increasing in rural areas at the same time that funding is uncertain. On the demand side, the aging of the U.S. population and the migration of young rural residents to urban areas have created an increased need for passenger transportation in rural areas. On the financing side, the decreasing rural tax base and the increased attention of the federal government to efficiency suggest that future funding may become limited; or uncertain at best. These trends suggest that rural transit agencies of the future will be expected to provide service to more people with less resources. In order to meet these expectations the efficiency and effectiveness of rural transit systems must improve greatly.[1] Such an improvement cannot occur without some kind of monitoring and evaluation tool. This section of the guidebook provides insight into why performance evaluation is necessary, and how it can be useful to your system.

Performance evaluations are a diagnostic tool used to monitor and measure the efficiency and effectiveness of transit systems. They are not difficult to implement, because no new or unusual data collection should be required. Performance evaluation can be used dynamically to make continuous improvements to a transit system.

Such a dynamic tool appears necessary, given emerging trends. Rather than boosting the amount of funding an agency may receive, the Federal Government's focus appears to be headed towards accountability. In a recent news release, the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation revealed a need for an investment based criteria for evaluating requests for new transportation projects.[2]

---

[1]Efficiency refers to a transit systems ability to provide the most services at the least cost, while effectiveness refers to its ability to meet the transportation needs of the targeted population.

[2]While this committee created a great deal of controversy by not appearing to adhere to these criteria in recent transportation appropriations, the shift to such criteria appears imminent.

Congressman Bob Carr (D-Michigan), Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, stated "The time has come to change the way government does business. By utilizing investment based criteria we change the focus from doling out dollars based on political factors to allocating funds that will support long term positive economic impact that saves the tax payers' money."

Moreover, transit systems are going to have to adopt a "business mentality." Some state DOT's have already forced transit systems in their states to adopt this "business mentality." In Mississippi, for example, transit systems obtain some transit funding through a competitive process. Funds are initially allocated to specific districts, and may be reallocated to alternative districts if applications for the funds are not completed in a timely manner. The reallocation of these funds takes place on a competitive basis. The gauge for the reallocation of funds is measured by the economic and innovative performance of systems applying for additional funds. The state measures economic performance by examining accounting indices such as cost recovery ratios, and measures innovative performance by assessing the innovation of ideas implemented by the transit system.

A transit agency can develop a business mentality by increasing their strategic planning and strategic management. Just as a privately owned firm sets goals and plans for the future, public agencies should also plan accordingly. Several privately held firms rely on Dunn and Bradstreet industry norms to assist in goal setting and monitoring of the company's current status. Transit agencies can use a set of diagnostic indicators to track their performance over time and also compare it with peers. The indicators may not capture every activity of the system, but will indicate progress or problems in key areas. Every agency should monitor their system's performance so that problems can be identified and remedied.

Performance evaluations help agencies manage transit systems. Without using evaluations to measure and monitor performance, managers are merely supervising operations.[3] It is when we learn to measure a problem that we can do something about it. For example, one of an agency's goals may be to deliver

[3]Fielding, Gordon J., *Managing Public Transit Strategically: A Comprehensive Approach to Strengthening Service and Monitoring Performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1987, p. 59.

safe service. This goal can be monitored by measuring the number of accidents per vehicle mile each month, each quarter, and each year. If the number exceeds the standard norm in comparison with the performance of peer agencies, an action plan should be developed to improve safety. Changes could be made in activities such as in recruitment procedures, in training procedures, and in monitoring employee records. It is through identified and measured performance variables that an action plan can be developed and implemented by transit managers.

Public funds are scarce, and must be allocated to their best possible use. Presently, the federal government does not require rural and small urban transit agencies to conduct performance evaluations. However, as public funds continue to become scarce, and competition for them intensifies, funding agencies and elected officials may rely on performance evaluation to allocate funds and ensure that funds are being spent wisely.

Furthermore, changing U.S. demographics suggest that there may be an increased need for rural transit services in the future. In 1960, only 13 percent of the population was 60 years of age or above. In 1989, the 60 years and older population category increased to 17 percent. Projections indicate that by the year 2020 the 60 years and older age category will make up nearly 25 percent of the population. As the "baby boomers" reach retirement there will be two additional strains placed on public transit. On one hand, this group will no longer be providing income tax revenues to federal and state governments. This may reduce the money available for transit. On the other hand, the need for service may be even greater than today as reductions in personal mobility will increase the transit dependence of this group with age.[4] Rural transit systems need to be prepared for the inevitable aging of the largest segment of our population.

Performance evaluation serves as a generator of exemplary performance. It not only serves a tool for identifying problems or accomplishments within the transit system, but can also improve the attitude and appearance of the system. One of the first steps involved in monitoring and evaluating performance of a

[4]However, this effect may be lessened some by the higher percentage of baby boomers with drivers licenses compared with today's elderly population.

transit system is goal setting. As goals are set and taken seriously, individuals tend to become enthusiastic and dedicated to achieving the goals. This process continues, as employee enthusiasm is fueled by goal achievement. Finally, as the agency's dedication to improving performance becomes apparent to the community, the transit system's image improves. This may increase ridership and donations to the system.

Every transit system should implement a performance evaluation system. This guidebook will present a methodology for implementing such a system, and will provide initial target ranges for achieving performance. While the process may appear somewhat time consuming, it is a process that will generate benefits far in excess of the personal costs realized by learning and implementing the system. The next section of the guidebook describes the different types of performance evaluation, and explains the reasons for using the methods used in this guidebook.

Section
Three

Types of Performance Evaluation

Performance evaluations are an important strategy for any business. Transit managers use performance evaluations to determine whether the agency is functioning in the most efficient and effective manner. Evaluation methods can differ among agencies, ranging from informal methods, such as regular staff meetings to detailed evaluation of statistical measures. Performance evaluations are a key ingredient to the success of any transit agency. In this section, two broad types of performance evaluations are discussed along with their merits and deficiencies.

Two broad categories of performance evaluation are quantitative and qualitative methods. Quantitative methods use financial, operational, and other data to highlight exemplary or problem areas in the system, while qualitative methods use non-numeric indicators such as surveys and management review to evaluate specific areas of the system.

Two basic quantitative performance methods can be identified. One method examines raw data elements, such as ridership or expenses, while the other examines ratios between data elements. When used correctly, the ratio type of analysis is far superior to the raw data analysis. The ratio analysis method standardizes raw data elements so that meaningful comparisons can be made to past performance or to peer group performance.

The ratio analysis method is fairly simple. First, a manager selects several key segments of the system to analyze (i.e. revenues, expenses, safety, etc.). After choosing the areas to analyze, the manager determines the current data that best measures performance in these areas. Measures of expenses or revenues, for example, are then standardized by relating them to service output (e.g. miles, hours, or passengers). After the ratio of revenues or expenses to output is calculated, the transit manager can

compare this derived number to that of peers and to previous performance. This comparison gives an indication of how well the agency is presently performing in the targeted areas.

System records typically supply the necessary data for quantitative analysis. However, other data may be collected in the form of a survey. Surveys may ask questions regarding on-time performance, driver courtesy, comfort, or other factors.

At least three advantages of quantitative performance stand out. First, quantitative methods are objective, because all of the analysis is based on actual data. Second, quantitative measures allow a means for comparison to other systems, and to previous performance. Third, problem areas can be identified so that further investigation may take place.

On the other hand, quantitative measures have a couple of evident deficiencies. First, information collected incorrectly or inconsistently may result in misleading results. This may lead to poor decision making and result in poor performance. Second, quantitative measures alone do not identify the causes of poor or exemplary performance. Without identifying the causes of poor or exemplary performance, evaluation is useless as no actions to remedy problems or assure continued success can be taken.

Qualitative performance methods examine the causes of exemplary or poor performance, rather than indicators of performance. There are several methods of qualitative performance evaluations. One method is weekly or monthly staff meetings. Regularly scheduled meetings give employees the opportunity to discuss the current tendencies of the system and to make planning decisions about the system. This is an excellent way to induce staff input and open the channels of communication between managers and staff.

Another qualitative approach is a systems analysis approach. This approach uses business, marketing, and other theories to evaluate the operations and administration of the transit system. This method can be very useful when combined with the correct quantitative approach.

Surveys are a third method of qualitative analysis. Surveys enable the transit system to better understand their customers and thus better serve them. Within the survey, questions related to

demographics promote awareness of customer needs. Different age groups have different needs to be met. Furthermore, questions regarding satisfaction with the driver or safety concerns of the vehicle also provide valuable information to maintain customer satisfaction.

There are three advantages to qualitative analysis. First, unlike quantitative performance evaluation, qualitative performance evaluation can pinpoint specific causes of poor or exemplary performance. Second, qualitative performance can improve employee attitude and morale, as it provides an opportunity for employee input into decisions in many cases. Third, qualitative performance improves management information, allowing better decision making.

On the other hand, qualitative measures have some deficiencies. First, qualitative performance evaluation is not good for measuring many areas of performance. It only can identify causes in many cases. Second, qualitative performance may be subjective, since it uses no numeric data. Third, qualitative performance does not provide a good means for comparison to other systems or to past performance.

Quantitative and qualitative measures both have some deficiencies. However, when both methods are used in conjunction with one another the deficiencies of both can be overcome.

The quantitative method of measuring general performance indicators works well to identify exemplary or problem areas of the transit system. Once the area is identified by general and supplementary performance indicators, qualitative measures can help to identify the causes, and possible solutions.

Ideally, this performance evaluation guidebook will enable rural and small urban transit systems to use the best performance evaluation method available. Quantitative measures (Section 4) will be used to identify exemplary or problem areas of the system, while qualitative methods will be used to identify possible causes for exemplary or poor performance and recommended improvements (Section 8).

Section
Four

Recommended Performance Evaluation Method

This section of the guidebook provides an overview of the recommended evaluation method. Because the first step in any performance evaluation is the establishment of goals and objectives, there may be some variation in this method depending on the goals and objectives of the agency. This guidebook allows for such variation by providing a method for evaluating overall system performance, along with methods for evaluating parts of the system.

While there are several methods of evaluation, both formal and informal, the recommended method is based on quantitative measures of efficiency and effectiveness, supplemented by qualitative evaluation. In order to make a meaningful comparison of a given transit system with other similar transit systems it is necessary to use some form of quantitative analysis. Quantitative performance measures will serve as an indicator of performance, while qualitative analysis will supplement the quantitative analysis in order to find ways that performance can be improved.[5]

Performance evaluation should entail the following steps:

- Use the characteristics of the peer groups (detailed in the next section) to place your system into a particular peer group. Peer groups are formulated based on those factors beyond the control of the transit manager. Thus, by placing your system into an appropriate peer group, you will ensure comparison with systems of similar potential.

- Choose the appropriate performance measures for the evaluation at hand. This is where you can alter the performance evaluation to meet your current goals and objectives. General system performance measures should be examined periodically, as these will provide an indicator of overall system performance. Furthermore, a transit system may wish to examine more detailed measures, based on areas of emphasis or concern. It is also recommended that transit systems explore detailed measures when the general indicators indicate a potential problem.

[5]The evaluation method presented in this guidebook focusses on peer group evaluation. However, the performance measures presented in the guidebook can also be used for time-series analysis.

- Calculate performance measures for your system (detailed formulas are provided in Section 6).
- Calculate the group mean, standard deviation, and t-statistic for each performance measure to be evaluated. Explanations of each will be provided below.
- Based on the t-statistics calculated, determine where improvement is necessary and where performance is significantly better than peers. Calculate and evaluate more detailed performance measures where necessary.
- Examine possible causes for poor performance, and formulate changes in policy or operations that are likely to remedy the problems. When examining these possible changes, it is important to choose changes that are not likely to cause deterioration in performance in other areas. In addition, examine possible causes for exemplary performance, and formulate policy and operations to ensure continued exemplary performance in these areas.

The following paragraphs present each of these steps in detail, along with the recommended performance measures.

Placing Your System Into a Peer Group

Peer groups are defined as groups of transit systems that are similar in factors beyond the control of the transit manager. The evaluation method recommended in this guidebook makes comparisons between systems based on the assumption that all transit systems in a comparison group should be able to achieve the performance achieved by the transit system with the best performance in the group. Thus, it is necessary to separate the peer groups by service area characteristics such as population density, income levels, percent of households with automobiles, percent of population over 65 years old, and land area, and other uncontrollable factors such as the number of vehicles operated by the transit system. By making such a separation, accurate peer group comparisons are possible.

In order to place your transit system into a peer group it is first necessary to determine the values for the uncontrollable variables as applied to your transit system. All service area characteristics are available in publications of the U.S. Census Bureau (Table 1), and other uncontrollable variables (e.g. number of vehicles) should be readily available to the transit system.

Table 1: Sources for Data on Service Area Characteristics

Uncontrollable Variable	Source	Table Number
Percent of all persons over 65 years old	U.S. Census of Population, General Population Characteristics	1
Per capita income	U.S. Census of Population, Summary of Social, Economic, and Housing Char.	10
Percent of occupied housing units with vehicles available	U.S. Census of Population, Summary of Social, Economic, and Housing Char.	14
Persons per square mile	U.S. Census of Population, Summary of Population and Housing Characteristics	16
Square miles of land area	U.S. Census of Population, Summary of Population and Housing Characteristics	16

Next, it is necessary to place your transit system into the appropriate peer group. One fairly crude way to do so is to examine the uncontrollable data values for your system in conjunction with the averages for those data values for each peer group. Table 2 shows average values for the uncontrollable variables for Peer Groups 1 and 2 for purposes of exposition. Eyeballing these variables along with the values for your transit system may work as an approximation, when time is extremely limited. However, this method is not recommended. A more precise way to place your transit system into a peer group is to compare the standardized values of uncontrollable variables for your transit system to peer group averages of these variables. This method is explained in Section 5 of the guidebook.

Table 2: Uncontrollable Variable Data Means For Peer Groups 1 And 2

Uncontrollable Variable	Peer Group 1 Average	Peer Group 2 Average
Percent of all persons over 65 years old	16	8
Per capita income	$10,512	$12,655
Percent of occupied housing units with vehicles available	94	97
Persons per square mile	8.4	24.8
Square miles of land area	7985	3438
# of transit vehicles operated	12.5	5.2

Choosing Appropriate Performance Measures For the Evaluation at Hand

There are two types of evaluation that a given transit system can perform. These are an evaluation of the overall system, and an evaluation of specific parts of the system. In most cases it is desirable to perform an evaluation of the overall system, and then perform an evaluation on specific parts that may need further attention as indicated by the evaluation of the overall system. However, it is also desirable to examine specific parts of the system periodically to make improvements in the overall system, or to catch problems in system parts before they affect the overall system. Furthermore, a manager may wish to evaluate all the parts of the system as part of a review of the overall system, since the costs associated with doing so are small. However, when doing such a review it is important for the manager to view the various indicators separately as indicators of the overall system and as parts of the system. The performance measures presented in this section include those used for an evaluation of the overall system, as well as those used for evaluating specific parts of the system.

The evaluation methods presented in this section are divided into two basic categories; efficiency and effectiveness. The efficiency category includes a group of measures that are aimed at providing service in the most productive and least cost manner, while the effectiveness category includes a group of measures aimed at maximizing the quality and utilization of service provided. An efficient system will be able to

maximize the level of service provided with limited resources, while an effective system will serve the needs of the community for which the service is provided. Efficiency and effectiveness categories can be further broken down as follows:[6]

Social Effectiveness	this measures the amount of service supplied to or consumed by a specific population.
Service Effectiveness	this measures the amount of utilization of the transit system, and the quality of service.
Cost Effectiveness	this measures the transit system's ability to minimize costs per passenger.
Labor Efficiency	this measures the transit system's ability to control labor expenses.
Admin. Efficiency	this measures the ability of the transit system to minimize administrative costs while providing transportation service.
Vehicle Efficiency	this measures the suitability of a fleet size and the shape of the system's fleet. A system which has vehicles that are in good shape and which has an adequate number of vehicles will have lower maintenance costs because of elevated vehicle efficiency.
Cost Efficiency	this measures the transit system's ability to minimize costs while providing adequate service in terms of vehicle miles and vehicle hours.
Revenue Efficiency	this measures the revenue generated by the transit system in comparison to the amount of service provided.
Operations Efficiency	this measures the ability of the transit system to minimize operations expenses for the amount of service provided. Operations expenses are those attributable to dispatching, scheduling, and driving vehicles.
Maint. Efficiency	this measures the ability of the transit system to manage its vehicle maintenance resources.

Each of these performance categories have general measures that can be used to evaluate the overall performance of the system, as well as measures for analyzing specific parts of the system. Table 3 shows the efficiency measures by category, and Table 4 shows the effectiveness measures by category.

---

6 Schimpeler Corradino Associates. *Kentucky Section 18 Transit Evaluation Study.* For the Commonwealth of Kentucky Transportation Cabinet, Division of Mass Transportation, Frankfurt, KY, November, 1989.

Table 3: Efficiency Measures (By Category)

Efficiency Category	Measures of Overall System Performance	Measures of the Performance of Individual Parts
Cost	Total Expense Per Vehicle Mile (hour)	Direct Operating Expense Per Vehicle Mile (hour)
		Administrative Expense Per Vehicle Mile (hour)
		Maintenance Expense Per Vehicle Mile (hour)
		Total Wages and Fringe Benefits Per Vehicle Mile (hour)
		Direct Operating Expense/Total Expense
		Administrative Expense/Total Expense
		Maintenance Expense/Total Expense
		Labor Expense/Total Expense
Operations	Direct Operating Expense Per Vehicle Mile (hour)	Direct Operating Salary and Fringe Benefits Per Vehicle Mile (hour)
		Driver Salary and Fringe Benefits Per Vehicle Mile (hour)
		Direct Operating Expense/Total Expense
		Direct Operating Expense Per Vehicle
		Operating Employees Per Vehicle
Administrative	Administrative Expense per Vehicle Mile (hour)	Administrative Salary and Fringe Benefits Per Vehicle Mile (hour)
		Administrative Expense/Total Expense
		Administrative Expense Per Vehicle
		Administrative Employees Per Vehicle
Labor	Total Salary and Fringe Benefits Per Vehicle Mile (hour)	Direct Operating Salary and Fringe Benefits Per Vehicle Mile (hour)
		Administrative Salary and Fringe Benefits Per Vehicle Mile (hour)
		Direct Operating Salary and Fringe Benefits/Total Expense
		Administrative Salary and Fringe Benefits/Total Expense
		Vehicle Miles (hours) Per Employee
		Labor Expense/Total Expense
Revenue	Operating Revenue Per Vehicle Mile (hour)	Farebox Revenue Per Vehicle Mile (hour)
	Operating Revenue Per Passenger	Farebox Revenue Per Passenger
	Operating Revenue/Total Expenses	Operating Revenue/Direct Operating Expenses
		Farebox Revenue/Total Expenses
		Farebox Revenue/Direct Operating Expenses
		Operating (Farebox) Revenue Per Active Vehicle
Maintenance	Maintenance Expense Per Vehicle Mile (hour)	Maintenance Expense/Total Expense
		Maintenance Expense Per Active Vehicle
Vehicle	Vehicle Miles (hours) Per Active Vehicle	Maintenance Expense Per Vehicle
		Vehicle Mile / Vehicle Breakdown

Table 4: Effectiveness Measures (By Category)

Effectiveness Category	Measures of Overall System Performance	Measures of the Performance of Individual Parts
Social	Passengers Per Capita	Trips to Elderly/Elderly Population
	Vehicle Miles (Hours) Per Capita	Vehicle Miles (hours) Per Elderly Population
Service	Passengers Per Vehicle Mile (Hour)	Elderly/Handicapped Passengers Per Vehicle Mile (Hour)
	Passengers Per Vehicle	
	Vehicle Mile/Accident	
Cost	Total Expense Per Passenger	Direct Operating Expense Per Passenger
	Subsidy Per Passenger	Administrative Expense Per Passenger
		Maintenance Expense Per Passenger
		Labor Expense Per Passenger

Calculate Performance Measures For Your System

The performance measures are relatively easy to calculate; most require only straight division. Detailed calculations are provided for all of the recommended performance measures in Section Six.

Calculate the Group Mean, Standard Deviation, and T-Statistic For Each Performance Measure to Be Evaluated

The recommended performance evaluation method attempts to formulate peer groups that have similar potential. It does so by formulating groups based on those factors not controlled by the transit system. Thus, the transit systems in a given peer group should all be able to achieve a similar performance level to the best in the group. For this reason, each of the transit systems' performance measures within a given peer group are compared to the average (or mean) of these performance measures for the group. The comparison is made to determine whether a given performance measure is significantly different than the overall group. This is where the calculation of the mean (average), standard deviation (a measure of variability of the performance measures around the mean), and the t-statistic (a statistical measure to determine whether a transit system's performance measure is significantly different from the group's) are necessary.[7]

[7]These calculations are only necessary if your system was not surveyed for this guidebook. These calculations have already been made for all systems responding to the survey.

In order to calculate the mean and standard deviation for a given performance measure in your peer group it is necessary to know the values of these measures for other systems in your peer group. Section Seven shows the values of performance measures for all transit systems by peer group. Formulas and an example of calculating each of these measures are shown below:[8]

$$Mean = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i}{n}$$

where:
- Mean = mean (or average) of the performance measure for the peer group
- a_i = the performance measure value for transit system i
- n = the number of transit systems in the peer group
- Σ = summation (add all a_is together)

$$Standard\ Deviation = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (a_i - \bar{a})^2}{n-1}}$$

where: $\bar{a}$ = the mean (average) performance measure value for the peer group

$$t\text{-}statistic = \frac{a^* - \bar{a}}{s} * \sqrt{n}$$

where:
- a^* = the performance measure value for your system
- s = standard deviation

This t-statistic in conjunction with the t-values at the five percent level of significance (Table 5) will show whether your performance measure is significantly different from the mean for the peer group. By using the five percent level of significance as the critical level, you are allowing a 5 percent chance of committing a type 1 error. (That is, finding a difference between your performance measure and the group mean when they are the same.) An example of calculating a mean, standard deviation, and t-statistic is presented next.

[8]Many computer software packages compute means and standard deviations routinely. These packages include Lotus 1-2-3, Microsoft Excel, SAS, SPSS, Supercalc, and several others.

Table 5: Critical T-Values at the Five Percent Level of Significance

Degrees of Freedom (number of transit systems in your peer group - 1)	Critical T-Value
1	12.706
2	4.303
3	3.182
4	2.776
5	2.571
6	2.447
7	2.365
8	2.306
9	2.262
10	2.228
11	2.201
12	2.179
13	2.160
14	2.145
15	2.131
16	2.120
17	2.110
18	2.101
19	2.093
20	2.086
21	2.080
22	2.074
23	2.069
24	2.064
25	2.060
26	2.056
27	2.052
28	2.048
29	2.045
30	2.042
40	2.021
60	2.000
120	1.980
Infinity	1.960

Example: Suppose your transit agency fit into Peer Group Z, and you wished to evaluate the total expenses per passenger on your system. Use the values in Table 6, to calculate the mean, standard deviation, and t-statistic, and compare its value with the critical values in Table 5.

Table 6: Hypothetical Values For Total Expenses Per Passenger (For Peer Group Z)	
Transit System	**Total Expenses Per Passenger**
A	3.15
B	3.23
C	2.97
D	3.54
E	3.17
F	3.20
G	3.05
Your System	3.70

The mean is calculated as follows:

$$\textit{Mean} = (3.15+3.23+2.97+3.54+3.17+3.20+3.05+3.70)/8$$
$$= 3.25$$

The standard deviation is calculated as follows:

$$\textit{Standard Deviation} = \sqrt{[(3.15-3.25)^2 + (3.23-3.25)^2 + \ldots + (3.05-3.25)^2 + (3.70-3.25)^2] / (8-1)}$$
$$= 0.25$$

The t-statistic is calculated as follows:

$$t = \frac{3.70 - 3.25}{0}.25 * \sqrt{8}$$

In this example, the calculated t-statistic of 5.09 exceeds the critical t-value (at seven degrees of freedom) of 2.365 suggesting that this system's expenses per passenger are significantly higher than those of the peer group.

Determine Where Improvement is Necessary and Where Performance is Better than Peers

The calculation of the peer group mean, standard deviation, and t-statistic must be performed for all performance measures to be evaluated. At a minimum this will be done for all of the general indicators listed in Tables 3 and 4. T-statistics can then be compared to the critical t-values from Table 5 in order to determine where improvement is necessary and where performance is significantly better than peers. When doing this the absolute value of the t-statistic must always be used as the comparison factor to the critical t-value. This is necessary, since there may be some performance measure values that are significantly lower than the group mean. When the absolute value of a calculated t-statistic exceeds the critical t-value, it is necessary to determine whether this difference between the performance measure value and the mean represents an area where improvement is needed or an area where the system has exhibited exemplary performance. Section Six explains all of the performance measures in detail, provides formulas for calculating them, and explains the meaning of positive and negative outliers for each.

Examine Possible Causes for Poor Performance and Formulate Changes to Remedy Problems

Any areas where improvement is needed (based on the calculated t-statistic) should be examined in greater detail to find possible causes for this poor performance, and to examine possible solutions. The first step in examining these areas in greater detail should be to examine the detailed performance measures that are subsets of the measures that indicate poor performance. For example, if labor efficiency appears to be a problem area, the transit manager should examine factors such as direct operating salaries and fringe benefits per total expense and administrative salaries and fringe benefits per total expense. This may give insight into the possible causes for the poor performance of the general indicator, and provide focus areas

for improvement. Next, qualitative analysis should be performed to examine policies or practices that could be changed to improve performance. Section Eight provides remedies for poor performance, and examines possible causes for poor performance in the various areas.

In addition to examining areas where performance may need improvement, it is also necessary to examine areas where performance appears to be superior to the peer group. Investigation into these areas may provide insight into possible improvements that could be made in other areas. Moreover, the likelihood of continued success in the areas of outstanding performance will increase with knowledge of why the area is successful.

Section
Five

Peer Group Formulation and Characteristics

When evaluating rural transit systems, it is important to recognize that these systems do not form one homogeneous group. Furthermore, little meaning can be derived from a comparison among a diverse set of transit agencies. Just as it would be inappropriate to compare urban transit systems in New York City and Fargo, it would also be inappropriate to compare widely differing rural transit systems. In order to assure meaningful target measures for each rural transit system, it is necessary to formulate groups of transit systems that have the potential to perform equally in terms of efficiency and effectiveness (peer groups). Such a determination of the potential of each transit system requires a comparison of factors affecting transit efficiency and effectiveness that are not under control of the transit manager.

Several factors are used in order to group transit systems of similar potential for this guidebook. These factors include population density, land area served, the number of vehicles in operation by the transit agency, the percent of the population in the service area that is over 65 years old, the percent of households in the service area that have at least one automobile available, and the per capita income of the service area. These factors are believed to affect ridership, revenues, costs, vehicle hours, vehicle costs, and nearly every operational statistic that is used for measuring efficiency and effectiveness.

In order to formulate peer groups and set target ranges for performance for this guidebook, all transit agencies receiving Section 18 funding in Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah were surveyed. Out of 162 surveys sent out, a total of 63 agencies responded with fully completed surveys (about 39 percent). Data was then collected for each of these transit systems relating to service area characteristics, and a statistical technique known as Clustering was used to create peer groups.[9]

[9]Peer groups refer to groups of transit systems that have similar potential, based on those factors that cannot be controlled by the transit system.

The Clustering method formed peer groups based on similarities in the service area characteristics and in the number of vehicles operated by the transit agency.

Peer Group Composition

A total of seven peer groups were formulated based on these criteria. Tables 7 and 8 show the average characteristics for each of these peer groups and the minimum and maximum values of the characteristics for each peer group. Table 9 shows the names of the transit systems included in each peer group.[10]

As the tables show, a wide variety of transit systems receiving Federal Section 18 funding exist. Nonetheless, these transit systems can be grouped into fairly homogeneous sub-groups, in terms of the characteristics of the service area and the number of vehicles operated. For example, Peer Group 1 is characterized by transit systems covering large, sparsely populated areas, with moderate income per capita. The second peer group is also characterized by systems in areas with low population density, but encompassing somewhat smaller (though still large) areas, with a smaller percentage of population that is elderly, and a higher per capita income, on average. Peer Group 3 transit agencies serve smaller land areas, serve areas with larger average population densities, and operate less vehicles than transit systems in Peer Groups 1 and 2, on average.

[10]There was one transit agency that was markedly different from the other agencies in terms of service area characteristics and the number of vehicles operated. This was Avon/Beaver Creek Transit, which serves a ski resort area. While the transit system was not included in any of the mean performance value calculations, it still can be compared to a specific peer group. Avon/Beaver Creek Transit can be compared to peer group 2 for evaluation purposes.

Table 7: Average Characteristics of the Transit Peer Groups in the Region						
	Service Area Characteristics					
Peer Group	**Pop. Density**	**Percent of Population Over 65**	**Percent of Hshlds. w/vehicles**	**Per Capita Income**	**Land Area (Square Miles)**	**# of Transit Vehicles Operated**
1 (8 systems)	8.4	16	94	$10,512	7985	12.5
2 (5 systems)	24.8	8	97	$12,655	3438	5.2
3 (26 systems)	197.4	19	93	$10,765	1336	2.9
4 (5 systems)	530.2	6	95	$17,147	398	10.2
5 (5 systems)	853.1	30	85	$9,885	4.8	1.4
6 (11 systems)	2061.9	13	91	$11,233	8.12	5.8
7 (2 systems)	185.0	11	83	$7,165	640	1.0

Table 8: Minimum and Maximum Characteristics of the Transit Peer Groups in the Region						
	Service Area Characteristics					
Peer Group	**Pop. Density**	**Percent of Population Over 65**	**Percent of Hshlds. w/vehicles**	**Per Capita Income**	**Land Area (Square Miles)**	**# of Transit Vehicles Oper.**
1 (8 systems)	4 - 12	7 - 23	92 - 96	$8,652 - $13,698	5775 - 10077	6 - 18
2 (5 systems)	1 - 96	4 - 13	95 - 98	$11,718 - $13,596	437 - 4935	2 - 8
3 (26 systems)	1 - 1410	10 - 25	88 - 97	$7,737 - $13,161	3.4 - 3932	1 - 7
4 (5 systems)	134 - 1044	3 - 8	92 - 97	$16,009 - $18,945	1.9 - 772	2 - 19
5 (5 systems)	560 - 1390	26 - 34	82 - 88	$8,793 - $11,339	0.3 - 16.8	1 - 3
6 (11 systems)	1369 - 2937	9 - 17	87 - 95	$9,271 - $14,482	2.6 - 14.1	2 - 13
7 (2 systems)	3 - 367	6 - 16	81 - 84	$5,185 - $9,146	26 - 1254	1 - 1

Table 9: Peer Group Composition	
Peer Group	**Transit Systems Belonging to the Peer Group**
1	Blue Peaks Developmental Services, Inc. - Alamosa, CO North East Colorado Transportation Authority - Sterling, CO Rural Office of Community Services - Lake Andes, SD Souris Basin Transportation - Minot, ND South Central Senior Services - Valley City, ND Sweetwater County Transit Authority - Rock Springs, WY Tri-Valley Heartland Express - Crookston, MN West River Transportation Council - Bismarck, ND
2	Campbell County Senior Citizens Center - Gillette, WY Eagle Transit - Kalispell, MT Sherburne Heartland Express - Becker, MN Sublette Hi-Country Senior Citizens, Inc. - Pinedale, WY Unita Senior Citizens - Evanston, WY
3 (continued on next page)	Annandale Heartland Express - Annandale, MN Arrow Public Transit - Lemmon, SD Beadle Transit System - Huron, SD Butte-Silver Bow Transit - Butte, MT Cavalier County Transit - Langdon, ND City of Le Sueur Transit - Le Sueur, MN City of Red Wing Transit - Red Wing, MN Cody Senior Citizen's Center - Cody, WY

3 (continued)	Cottonwood County Transit System - Windom, MN
	Dickey County Senior Citizens - Ellendale, ND
	Dunn County Council on Aging - Killdeer, ND
	Golden Valley - Billings Council on Aging - Beach, ND
	Granite Falls Heartland Express - Granite Falls, MN
	James River Senior Citizen's Center - Jamestown, ND
	Lincoln County Heartland Express - Ivanhoe, MN
	Mahnomen County Heartland Express - Mahnomen, MN
	Mahube Community Council, Inc. - Detroit Lakes, MN
	Montevideo Heartland Express - Montevideo, MN
	Niobrara Senior Center - Lusk, WY
	Ransom County Senior Transportation - Lisbon, ND
	SEMCAC Heartland Express - Rushford, MN
	Senior Meals and Services - Devils Lake, ND
	Southwest Senior Services - Bowman, ND
	Spink County Public Transit - Redfield, SD
	Steele County Transit - Sharon, ND
	Walsh County Transportation - Park River, ND
4	Carver County Transportation - Chaska, MN
	Mountain Express - Crested Butte, CO
	Seniors Resource Center - Wheat Ridge, CO
	Senior Transportation - Champlin, MN
	Special Transit - Boulder, CO

5	City of Appleton Transit - Appleton, MN City of Fosston Transit - Fosston, MN City of Ortonville Transit - Ortonville, MN City of Pelican Rapids Transit - Pelican Rapids, MN Virginia Dial-A-Ride - Virginia, MN
6	City of Hastings Transit - Hastings, MN City of Hutchinson Transit - Hutchinson, MN City of La Junta Transit - La Junta, CO City of Morris Transit - Morris, MN City of Northfield Transit - Northfield, MN City of St. Peter Transit - St. Peter, MN City of Winona Transit - Winona, MN Elder Care - Dickinson, ND Helena Dial-A-Ride - Helena, MT Logan Transit District - Logan, UT The Durango Lift - Durango, CO
7	Upsala Transit Heartland Express - Upsala, MN Standing Rock College - Fort Yates, ND

The fourth through sixth peer groups are all depicted by areas with much higher population densities, on average. However, there are noticeable differences between the groups. For example, Peer Group 4 systems have much smaller percentages of population that is over 65 than the other two, while Peer Group 5 transit systems have much larger percentages of population over 65 than the other two, on average. Furthermore, other differences exist, such as the higher average per capita income and the larger average land size for Peer

Group 4 transit systems. Finally, Peer Group 7 systems have similar population densities to Peer Group 3 systems on average, but serve smaller areas and use less vehicles on average, and have service areas with a smaller percentage of households with vehicles available and lower per capita incomes on average.

When examining the differences between peer groups, it is apparent that any comparisons across the entire sample of transit systems would be inappropriate. The peer groups categorized in this section of the guidebook should serve as useful categories for evaluating performance now and into the near future. While service area characteristics will change over time, these characteristics are likely to remain fairly stable in the near future.

Placing Your System Into a Peer Group

For transit systems that did not complete surveys for this guidebook, the most appropriate method for placing your system into a peer group is to examine standardized values for uncontrollable variables relating to your system, and to compare them to averages for each peer group. This method consists of the following steps:

- Identify values for uncontrollable variables relating to your transit system.
- Standardize these values. This process will be explained below.
- Examine average standardized values for each peer group, and calculate the total distance your values are from peer group means.
- Choose the peer group that is the minimum total distance from your transit system in terms of these uncontrollable variables.

Identify Values for Uncontrollable Variables Relating to Your System

Identifying the values for uncontrollable variables relating to your system is a very simple process. It merely requires assessing the area that is served by your transit system, and obtaining the values for population density, the percentage of population over 65, the size of the land area served, the percentage of households with vehicles available to them, and the per capita income for the appropriate area. These values

can be obtained in the U.S. Census Bureau publications highlighted in Table 1.[11] The number of transit vehicles operated is already known by the transit operator.

Standardize Uncontrollable Variables Relating to Your System

Standardizing is a method for placing variables on an equal scale. This is useful for assessing the appropriateness of placing your system into various peer groups, since it allows all uncontrollable variables to take equal importance in the process. In the absence of standardization, comparisons between larger scaled variables such as per capita income and land area dominate. The standardization process chosen places all variables on an equal scale with a mean (average) of zero, and a standard deviation (measure of variation around the mean) of one. The formula used for standardizing uncontrollable variables is shown below.[12]

$$Standardized\ Value = \frac{x_i - \bar{x}}{s_x}$$

where: x_i = the uncontrollable value for transit system

$\bar{x}$ = the overall mean (average) for the uncontrollable variable

s_x = the overall standard deviation for the uncontrollable variable

Table 10 shows means and standard deviations for each of the uncontrollable variables.

[11]Census publications give all of these values by state, county, city, and township. When a multi-county or multi-town area is served by the transit agency weighted averages must be calculated for population density, the percent of the population over 65, the percent of households with vehicles, and the per capita income.

[12]The actual standardized value of the variable for Transit System A would include the value of the variable for A in its calculation of the group mean and standard deviation. Howevers, the formula shown here will provide a close approximation.

Table 10: Overall Mean and Standard Deviation of Uncontrollable Variables		
Variable	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**
Population Density	512.1313	786.0445
Percent of Population Over 65 Years Old	16.6464	6.9359
Percent of Households with Vehicles	92.3188	3.7041
Per Capita Income	11218.12	2423.57
Land Area (Square Miles)	1841.95	2623.22
# of Transit Vehicles	5.4203	6.6097

Calculate the Distance of Your Transit System's Uncontrollable Variables From Each Peer Group's Averages

The calculation of the distance of your transit system's uncontrollable variables from the peer group means is performed in order to provide a similarity measure between your transit system and each peer group. The peer group that is most similar to your transit system will then be the one with the least distance. The formula for calculating the distance of your transit system from the peer groups in terms of uncontrollable variables is shown below.[13]

$$D = \sqrt{(PD_i - \overline{PD_j})^2 + (P65_i - \overline{P65_j})^2 + (PWV_i - \overline{PWV_j})^2 + (PCI_i - \overline{PCI_j})^2 + (LA_i - \overline{LA_j})^2 + (TVO_i - \overline{TVO_j})^2}$$

[13]This is similar to the method used to cluster the transit systems, but not identical. In the clustering process, the average distance from each peer group was minimized, based on the distance from each transit system already included in the peer groups. This is known as the average linkage method.

where:

PD_i = the standardized value population density of the area served by your transit system

$\overline{PD_j}$ = the mean of the standardized values of population density for peer group j

$P65_i$ = the standardized value of the percent over 65 in your service area

$\overline{P65_j}$ = the mean of the standardized values of the percent over 65 for peer group j

PWV_i = the standardized value of the percent of households with vehicles in your service area

$\overline{PWV_j}$ = the mean of the standardized values of the percent of households with vehicles for peer group j

PCI_i = the standardized value of per capita income in your service area

$\overline{PCI_j}$ = the mean of the standardized values of the per capita income for peer group j

LA_i = the standardized value of land area that your service area encompasses

$\overline{LA_j}$ = the mean of the standardized values of land area for peer group j

TVO_i = the standardized value for the number of transit vehicles operated by your system

$\overline{TVO_j}$ = the mean of the standardized values of the number of transit vehicles operated for transit systems in peer group j

Table 11 shows the means of the standardized values for uncontrollable variables for each peer group.

Table 11: Average Standardized Values For Service Area and Operational Characteristics For Each Peer Group

	Service Area Characteristics					
Peer Group	**Pop. Density**	**Percent of Population Over 65**	**Percent of Hshlds. w/vehicles**	**Per Capita Income**	**Land Area (Square Miles)**	**# of Transit Vehicles Operated**
1	-0.6409	-0.1722	0.3864	-0.2913	2.3416	1.0591
2	-0.6200	-1.2302	1.1557	0.5927	0.6083	-0.0336
3	-0.4004	0.3382	0.1320	-0.1870	-0.1930	-0.3881
4	0.0230	-1.5436	0.8318	2.4467	-0.5505	0.7117
5	0.4338	1.8476	-1.9757	-0.5497	-0.7003	-0.6070
6	1.9716	-0.5100	-0.3560	0.0060	-0.6991	0.0586
7	-0.4162	-0.8429	-2.6506	-1.6722	-0.4583	-0.6680

Once you have calculated your system's distance from each of these peer groups, the process of choosing a comparison peer group merely amounts to choosing the peer group that is the least distance from your system in terms of uncontrollable variables. An example will illustrate this process more clearly.

Example: After compiling service area data from U.S. Bureau of Census Publications, you find that your system has the values for uncontrollable variables as shown in Table 12. Standardize these variables, with the overall means and standard deviations given in Table 10, and calculate distances from each peer group with the means of standardized variables given in Table 11.

Table 12: Hypothetical Values Of Uncontrollable Variables For Transit System J	
Population Density (persons per square mile)	1
Percent of Population Over 65 Years Old	12
Percent of Households With Vehicles	98
Per Capita Income	$12,567
Land Area (Square Miles)	4,843
# of Transit Vehicles	2

Standardized values are calculated as follows:

$$SPD = \frac{1 - 512.1313}{786.0445} = -0.65026$$

$$SP65 = \frac{12 - 16.6464}{6.9359} = -0.6699$$

$$SPWV = \frac{98 - 92.3188}{3.7041} = 1.5338$$

$$SPCI = \frac{12567 - 11218.12}{2423.57} = 0.5566$$

$$SLA = \frac{4843 - 1841.95}{2623.22} = 1.1440$$

$$STV = \frac{2 - 5.4203}{6.6097} = -0.5175$$

In order to calculate distances, these standardized values must be used in conjunction with the mean (average) values of peer groups shown in Table 11. The distance from Peer Group 1 is calculated as follows:

$$\sqrt{(-.65026+.6409)^2+(-.6699+.1722)^2+(1.5338-.3864)^2+(.5566+.2913)^2+(1.1440-2.3416)^2+(-.5175-1.0591)^2}$$
$$= 2.49062$$

All of the other distances are calculated in the same manner, and the following distances are obtained:

Distance PG2 = 0.99007
Distance PG3 = 2.32400
Distance PG4 = 3.10873
Distance PG5 = 4.94600
Distance PG6 = 3.80830
Distance PG7 = 5.01513

As these distances show, the closest peer group to the hypothetical transit system is Peer Group 2. Thus, this transit system should use Peer Group 2 as a comparison group for performance evaluation.

Section
Six

Performance Measures

This section of the guidebook explains the purpose of each of the performance measures listed in Section 4, and provides detailed formulas for calculating each of them. Furthermore, the meaning behind high and low indicators of each measure will be explained. Performance measures are presented by category of efficiency or effectiveness below.[14]

Cost Efficiency

Total Expense Per Vehicle Mile (or Hour)

This is a general measure of the cost efficiency of a transit system, standardizing expenses by placing them on a vehicle mile or vehicle hour basis. Decreases in this indicator represent improvements in performance. Thus, an outlier that is negative indicates exemplary performance in this area.

It is useful to examine total expenses on both a vehicle mile and vehicle hour basis, as each may provide a different illustration of cost efficiency. For example, in some cases the value for total expenses per vehicle mile will be in line with that of the peer group, but the value for total expenses per vehicle hour will not. This may simply reflect more efficient utilization of vehicles than peers, since more miles are covered in a smaller amount of time. However, it may also show a possible area for improvement as total expenses may be reduced.

Total Expense Per Vehicle Mile is calculated as follows:

(Direct Operating Expenses + Administrative Expenses) / Vehicle Miles (total for all vehicles)

Total Expense Per Vehicle Hour is calculated as follows:

(Dir. Oper. Exp. + Admin. Exp.) / Vehicle Hours (total for all vehicles, incl. non-rev. hrs.)

When the value of total expense per vehicle mile (or hour) is significantly higher than that for the peer group, or when the value is significantly lower than that for the peer group, it is recommended that you examine the following more detailed measures. They will provide insight into possible problems or areas of exemplary performance in the cost efficiency area.

[14]In this section, each indicator can be read as a stand-alone item. Thus it is only necessary to read the items of interest to you.

Direct Operating Expense Per Vehicle Mile (or Hour)

This is one detailed indicator of cost efficiency, showing the efficiency of the direct operations of the transit system. Decreases in this measure indicate improvements in theperformance of operations, while increases indicate a decline in the performance of operations. Negative outliers suggest exemplary performance.

While this indicator is a detailed indicator for diagnosing cost efficinecy, it is also a general indicator for examining operations efficiency. Thus, it a problem in operations is apparent after examining this indicator, more detailed indicators to find specific problems within operations are available.

Direct Operating Expense Per Vehicle Mile is calculated as follows:

Direct Operating Expense / Vehicle Miles (total for all vehicles)

Direct Operating Expense = *Wages and Fringes of Drivers, Dispatchers, and Schedulers, Supervisors, Helpers + Total Maintenance and Fuel Expense, + Total Advertisng and Promotion Expense + Parking, Inspections, Insurance, Vehicle Depreciation, and Other Direct Operating Expenses*

Direct Operating Expense Per Vehicle Hour is calculated as follows::

Direct Operating Expense / Vehicle Hours (total for all vehicles, including non-revenue hours)

Direct Operating Expense as a Portion of Total Expense

This is a detailed indicator of cost efficiency, showing direct operating costs in relation to the rest of the expenses of the system. Moreover, it is a detailed indicator of operations efficiency. Utmost caution should be used in interpreting the value of this measure in relation to that of the peer group, since a high value may be the result of either poor or exemplary performance. For example, if direct operating expenses are high in relation to total expenses as compared to other transit systems in the same peer group, it may be the result of direct operating costs being too high or it may be the result of lower than average costs for system administration. Hence, this measure alone should only be used to assess the portion of total expenses that are the result of direct operations. When using this measure for performance evaluation, it must always be interpreted in conjunction with direct operating expense per vehicle mile (hour) and total expense per vehicle mile (hour) (For example, a high value for direct operating expense as a portion of total expense is probably not a problem when it is accompanied by low values for direct operating expense per vehicle mile and total expense per vehicle mile).

Direct Operating Expense as a Portion of Total Expense is calculated as:

Direct Operating Expense / Total Expenses

Administrative Expense Per Vehicle Mile (or Hour)

This is a detailed indicator of cost efficiency, showing the efficiency of the administration of the transit system. Administrative expenses are standardized by being placed on a vehicle mile or vehicle hour basis. Increases in this measure show deterioration in performance, while decreases show improvements in perfomrance. Positive outliers from the peer group mean suggest a need for improvement.

This measure is a general indicator of administrative efficiency in addition to being an indicator of cost efficiency. Consequently, if an assessment of the detailed measures of cost efficiency suggests that administrative expenses are out of line, an evaluation of detailed measures for administrative efficiency is necessary.

Administrative Expense Per Vehicle Mile is calculated as follows:

Administrative Expense / Vehicle Miles (total for all vehicles)

Administrative Expense = *Wages and Fringes of Office Staff and Security + Office Supplies Expense + Telephone Expense + Utilties Expense + Tax and License Expense + Record Keeping Expense + Rent Expense (or facility depreciation) + Office Equipment Expense + All Other Administrative Expenses*

Administrative Expense Per Vehicle Hour is calculated as follows:

Administrative Expense / Vehicle Hours (total for all vehicles, including non-revenue hours)

Administrative Expense as a Portion of Total Expense

This is a detailed indicator of cost efficiency, showing the portion of total system costs that are due to administration of the system. Furthermore, it is a detailed indicator of administrative efficiency. This measure should be analyzed with extreme caution, since a high value for this measure may be the result of either exemplary or poor performance. For example, a high value for this measure may indicate a problem area in administration of the system, or it may be the result of lower than average direct operating costs for the system.

Thus, this measure alone should only be interpreted as the portion of total expenses that are the result of administration. If this variable is to be used for performance evaluation, it must be evaluated in conjunction with administrative expense per vehicle mile (hour) and total expense per vehicle mile (hour) (e.g. a high value for administrative expense in relation to total expense as compared to peers is probably not a problem when accompanied by a low value for administrative expense per vehicle mile and total expense per vehicle mile).

Administrative Expense as a Portion of Total Expense is calculated as:

Administrative Expense / Total Expenses

Maintenance Expense Per Vehicle Mile (or Hour)

This measure is a detailed indicator of cost efficiency, showing the efficiency of the transit system's vehicle maintenance activities. This measure standardizes a transit system's maintenance expenses by placing them on a vehicle mile or vehicle hour basis. Increases in this measure suggest that performance of maintenance is deteriorating, while decreases suggest that performance is improving in this area. Positive outliers from the peer group mean suggest a need for improvement.

This measure is a general indicator of vehicle maintenance efficiency as well as a detailed indicator of cost efficiency. When this measure shows a significant difference from the group mean, detailed measures of maintenance efficiency should be calculated and analyzed.

Maintenance Expense Per Vehicle Mile is calculated as follows:

Vehicle Maintenance Expense / Vehicle Miles (total for all vehicles)

Vehicle Maintenance Expense = *Routine Maintenance Expense + Spare Parts + Tires + Other Maintenance and Repairs*

Maintenance Expense Per Vehicle Hour is calculated as follows:

Vehicle Maintenance Expense / Vehicle Hours (total for all vehicles, including non-revenue hours)

Maintenance Expense as a Portion of Total Expenses

This measure is a detailed indicator of cost efficiency showing the costs of vehicle maintenance in relation to other expenses of the transit system. Additionally, it is a detailed measure of maintenance efficiency. A great deal of caution should be used when interpreting this measure in relation to the peer group, because a high value for this measure could be the result of exemplary or poor performance. For example, if maintenance expenditures are high in relation to total expenditures as compared to the appropriate peer group, the general interpretation would be that this is an area in need of improvement. However, this could also be the result of low expenditures in other areas in relation to peers. Thus, this measure alone should only be used to determine what portion of expenses are spent on maintenance. When using the measure for performance evaluation, it must always be examined in conjunction with total expenses per vehicle mile (hour) and maintenance expenses per vehicle mile (hour) (For example, a high value for maintenance expense as a portion of total expenses is probably not a problem when maintenance expense per vehicle mile and total expense per vehicle mile are low).

Maintenance Expense as a Portion of Total Expense is calculated as:

Maintenance Expense / Total Expenses

Total Wages and Fringe Benefits Per Vehicle Mile (or Hour)

This measure is a detailed measure of cost efficiency, showing the efficiency of labor in the transit system. Labor expenses are standardized by placing them on a vehicle mile or vehicle hour basis. Increases in this measure indicate a decline in performance, while decreases indicate an improvement in performance. Negative outliers from the group mean suggest that the system is performing well in this area, while positive outliers suggest the opposite.

In addition to being a detailed indicator of cost efficiency, this measure is also a general indicator of labor efficiency. Hence, an outlier for this measure warrants additional investigation of the detailed measures of labor efficiency.

Total Wages and Fringe Benefits Per Vehicle Mile are calculated as:

Total Wages and Fringe Benefits / Vehicle Miles (total for all vehicles)

Total Wages and Fringe Benefits = *Wages and Fringes of Office Staff and Security, Drivers, Helpers, Dispatchers and Schedulers, Supervisors, and others*

Total Wages and Fringe Benefits Per Vehicle Hour are calculated as:

Total Wages and Fringe Benefits / Vehicle Hours (total for all vehicles, including non-revenue hours)

Labor Expense as a Portion of Total Expenses

This measure is a detailed measure of cost efficiency, showing the costs of labor in relation to other expenses. Furthermore, it is a detailed measure of labor efficiency. Extreme caution should be used when interpreting the value of this measure in relation to that of the peer group, since a high value for this measure may result from either exemplary or poor performance. The measure shows what portion of expenses are spent on labor, and should only be interpreted as such. If labor expenses as a portion of total expenses are high it may mean that labor expenses are higher for the system than its peers; but it may also be the result of equivalent labor expenses in relation to peers and lower materials and capital expenses. Thus, the value for this measure must be interpreted in conjunction with the values for total expenses per vehicle mile (and hour) and total wages and fringe benefits per vehicle mile (and hour) (e.g. a positive outlier for labor expense as a portion of total expense is probably not a problem when accompanied by negative outliers for total expense per vehicle mile and total wages and fringe benefits per vehicle mile).

Labor Expense as a Portion of Total Expenses is calculated as follows:

Total Wages and Fringe Benefits / Total Expenses

Operations Efficiency

Direct Operating Expense Per Vehicle Mile (or Hour)

This is a general indicator of operations efficiency, standardizing operations expenses on a vehicle mile or vehicle hour basis. Decreases in this measure indicate improvements in the performance of operations, while increases indicate a decline in the performance of operations. Negative outliers suggest exemplary performance.

While this indicator is a general indicator for diagnosing operations efficiency, it is also a detailed indicator for examining cost efficiency. Thus, any problems that may exist in the operations of the transit system are also likely to become apparent when examining the cost efficiency of the system.

Direct Operating Expense Per Vehicle Mile is calculated as follows:

Direct Operating Expense / Vehicle Miles (total for all vehicles)

Direct Operating Expense = *Wages and Fringes of Drivers, Dispatchers and Schedulers, Supervisors, Helpers + Total Maintenance and Fuel Expense + Total Advertising and Promotion Expense + Parking, Inspections, Insurance, Vehicle Depreciation, and Other Direct Operating Expenses*

Direct Operating Expense Per Vehicle Hour is calculated as follows:

Direct Operating Expense / Vehicle Hours (total for all vehicles, including non-rev. hours)

Direct Operating Expense as a Portion of Total Expense

This is a detailed indicator of operations efficiency, showing direct operating costs in relation to the rest of the expenses of the system. Moreover, it is a detailed indicator of cost efficiency. Extreme caution should be used in interpreting the value of this measure in relation to that of the peer group, since a high value may be the rsult of either poor or exemplary performance. For example, if direct operating expenses are high in relaiton to total expenses as compared to other transit systems in the same peer group, it may be the result of direct operating costs being too high or it may be the result of lower than average costs for system administration. Hence, this measure alone should only be used to assess the portion of total expenses that are the result of direct operations. When using this measure for perfomrance evaluation, it must always be interpreted in conjunction with direct operating expense per vehicle mile (hour) and total expense per vehicle mile (hour). (For example, a high value for direct operating expense as a portion of total expense is probably not a problem when it is accompanied by low values for direct operating expenses per vehicle mile and total expense per vehicle mile).

Direct Operating Expense as a Portion of Total Expense is calculated as:

Direct Operating Expense / Total Expense

Direct Operating Salary and Fringe Benefits Per Vehicle Mile (or Hour)

This is a detailed measure for diagnosing the operations efficiency of the transit system. Specifically, it standardizes direct operating wages and fringe benefits by placing them on a vehicle mile or vehicle hour basis. Increases in this measure indicate decreases in performance, while decreases indicate improvements in performance. Thus, a positive outlier indicates below average performance in this area, while a negative outlier indicates exemplary performance in this area.

This measure should be examined when an outlier for operations efficiency is found, as the efficiency of direct operating labor is one thing that may affect the operations efficiency of the system. There are several factors that may cause this measure to vary, such as the productivity of operating labor, the hourly wage that they are paid, route characteristics, passenger characteristics, and other factors. A detailed discussion about the factors causing measures to vary is provided in Section 8 (Remedies For Poor Performance).

Direct Operating Salary and Fringe Benefits Per Vehicle Mile are calculated as follows:

Direct Operating Salary and Fringe Benefits / Vehicle Miles (total for all vehicles)

Direct Operating Salary and Fringe Benefits = *Wages and Fringes of Drivers, Dispatchers and Schedulers, Supervisors, and Helpers*

Direct Operating Salary and Fringe Benefits Per Vehicle Hour are calculated as follows:

Direct Operating Salary and Fringe Benefits / Vehicle Hours (total for all vehicles, incl. non-rev. hrs.)

Direct Operating Expense Per Vehicle

This is a detailed measure of operations efficiency, standardizing direct operating expenses by placing them on a per vehicle basis. Increases in this measure may indicate a decline in operations efficiency, while decreases may indicate an improvement in operations performance. Thus, a negative outlier may suggest exemplary performance in this area.

However, this measure should be used with extreme caution, since placing expenses on a per vehicle basis does not take vehicle productivity into account. It is possible for this measure to suggest exemplary performance in operations, when exemplary performance in this area is not taking place. For example, a transit system may have extremely low direct operating costs on a per vehicle basis, but high direct operating costs on a vehicle mile and vehicle hour basis, due to poor vehicle utilization. Consequently, this measure should never be examined alone, as a measure of operations efficiency. It should be used in conjunction with examination of other measures, such as direct operating expense per vehicle mile and hour.

Direct Operating Expense Per vehicle is calculated as:

Direct Operating Expense / Vehicles Operated by the Transit System

Administrative Efficiency

Vehicle Miles Per Operating Employee

This a detailed measure of operating efficiency, providing a measure of the productivity of operating employees. Increases in this measure indicated improvements in performance, while decreases indicated deterioration of performance. Negative outliers suggest poor performance in this area, while positive outliers suggest exemplary performance.

When the direct operations of a transit system warrant further investigation, this measure may provide some insight into the causes of the exemplary or poor performance in the operations area. Moreover, it is a relatively good indicator of the productivity of operating employees.

Vehicle Miles Per Operating Employee are calculated as follows:

Total Vehicle Miles / Total Full Time Direct Operating Employees

*Total Full Time Direct Operating Employees = Full Time Direct Operating Employees + (Part Time Direct Operating Employees *Number of Hours Per Week Worked by Part Time Direct Operating Employees) / 40*

Administrative Expense Per Vehicle Mile (or Hour)

This is a general indicator of administrative efficiency, standardizing administrative expenses by placing them on a vehicle mile or vehicle hour basis. Increases in this measure show deterioration in performance, while decreases show improvements in performance. Positive outliers from the peer group mean suggest a need for improvement.

While this indicator is a general indicator for diagnosing administrative efficiency, it is also a detailed indicator for examining cost efficiency. Thus, any problems that may exist in the administrative efficiency of the transit system are also likely to become apparent when examining the cost efficiency of the system.

Administrative Expense Per Vehicle Mile is calculated as follows:

Administrative Expense / Vehicle Miles (total for all vehicles)

Administrative Expense = Wages and Fringes of Office Staff and Security + Office Supplies Expense + Telephone Expense + Utilities Expense + Tax and License Expense + Record Keeping Expense + Rent Expense (or facility depreciation) + Office Equipment Expense + All Other Administrative Expenses

Administrative Expense Per Vehicle Hour is calculated as follows:

Administrative Salary and Fringe Benefits Per Vehicle Mile (or Hour)

This is a detailed measure of the labor efficiency of the transit system. Specifically, it standardizes administrative wages and fringe benefits by placing them on a vehicle mile or vehicle hour basis. Increases in this measure indicate decreases in performance, while decreases indicate improvements in performance. Thus, a positive outlier indicates below average performance in this area, while a negative outlier indicates exemplary performance in this area.

This measure should be examined when an outlier for labor efficiency is found, as the efficiency of administrative labor is one thing that may affect the overall labor efficiency of the system. There are several factors that may cause this measure to vary, such as the productivity of administrative labor, the hourly wage that they are paid, route characteristics, passenger characteristics, and other factors.

Administrative Salary and Fringe Benefits Per Vehicle Mile are calculated as follows:

Administrative Salary and Fringe Benefits / Vehicle Miles (total for all vehicles)

Administrative Salary and Fringe Benefits = *Wages and Fringes of Office Staff, Bookkeepers, and Security Guards*

Administrative Salary and Fringe Benefits Per Vehicle Hour are calculated as follows:

Administrative Salary and Fringe Benefits / Vehicle Hours (total for all vehicles, incl. non-rev. hrs.)

Administrative Expense as a Portion of Total Expense

This is a detailed indicator of administrative efficiency, showing the portion of total system costs that are due to administration of the system. Furthermore, it is a detailed indicator of cost efficiency. This measure should be analyzed with extreme caution, since a high value for this measure may be the result of either exemplary or poor performance. For example, a high value for this measure may indicate a problem area in administration of the system, or it may be the result of lower than average direct operating costs for the system. Thus, this measure alone should only be interpreted as the portion of total expenses that are the result of administration. If this variable is to be used for performance evaluation, it must be evaluated in conjunction with administrative expense per vehicle mile (hour) and total expense per vehicle mile (hour) (e.g. a high value for administrative expense in relation to total expense as compared to peers is probably not a problem when accompanied by a low value for administrative expense per vehicle mile and total expense per vehicle mile).

Administrative Expense as a Portion of Total Expense is calculated as:

Administrative Expense / Total Expenses

Administrative Expense Per Vehicle

This is a detailed measure of administrative efficiency, standardizing administrative expenses by placing them on a per vehicle basis. Increases in this measure may indicate a decline in administrative efficiency, while decreases may indicate an improvement in administrative performance. Thus, a negative outlier may suggest exemplary performance in this area, while a positive outlier may indicate poor performance in this area.

However, this measure should be used with extreme caution, since placing expenses on a per vehicle basis does not take vehicle productivity into account. It is possible for this measure to suggest exemplary performance in administration, when exemplary performance in this area is not taking place. For example, a transit system may have extremely low administrative costs on a per vehicle basis, but high administrative costs on a vehicle mile and vehicle hour basis, due to poor vehicle utilization. Consequently, this measure should never be examined alone, as a measure of administrative efficiency. It should be used in conjunction with examination of other measures, such as administrative expense per vehicle mile and hour.

Administrative Expense Per vehicle is calculated as:

Administrative Expense / Vehicles Operated by the Transit System

Vehicle Miles Per Administrative Employee

This is a detailed measure of administrative efficiency, providing a measure of the productivity of administrative employees. Increases in this measure indicate improvements in performance, while decreases indicate deterioration of performance. Negative outliers suggest poor performance in this area, while positive outliers suggest exemplary performance.

When the administrative efficiency of a transit system warrants further investigation, this measure may provide some insight into the causes of the exemplary or poor performance in the administrative area. Moreover, it is a fairly good indicator of administrative productivity.

Vehicle Miles Per Administrative Employee are calculated as follows:

Total Vehicle Miles / Total Full Time Administrative Employees

Total Full Time Administrative Employees = *Full Time Administrative Employees + (Part Time Administrative Employees * Number of Hours Per Week Worked By Part Time Administrative Employees) / 40*

Labor Efficiency

Total Salary and Fringe Benefits Per Vehicle Mile (Hour)

This is a general indicator of labor efficiency, standardizing total wages and fringe benefits by placing them on a vehicle mile or vehicle hour basis. Increases in this measure suggest deterioration in performance, while decreases suggest improvements in performance. Hence, a negative outlier for this measure indicates exemplary performance, while a positive outlier indicates poor performance.

Factors that may cause this measure to vary include labor productivity, wage rates, route characteristics, passenger characteristics, and other factors.

Total Salary and Fringe Benefits Per Vehicle Mile are calculated as follows:

Total Wages and Fringe Benefits / Vehicle Miles (total for all vehicles)

Total Salary and Fringe Benefits Per Vehicle Hour are calculated as follows:

Total Wages and Fringe Benefits / Vehicle Hours (total for all vehicles, including non-revenue hours)

Direct Operating Salary and Fringe Benefits Per Vehicle Mile (Hour)

This is a detailed measure of labor efficiency, standardizing direct operating wages and fringe benefits by placing them on a vehicle mile or vehicle hour basis. Increases in this measure indicate decreases in performance, while decreases indicate improvements in performance. Thus, a positive outlier indicates below average performance in this area, while a negative outlier indicates exemplary performance in this area.

There are several factors that may cause this measure to vary, such as the productivity of operating labor, the hourly wage that they are paid, route characteristics, passenger characteristics, and other factors. A detailed discussion about the factors causing measures to vary is provided in Section 8 (Remedies For Poor Performance).

Direct Operating Salary and Fringe Benefits Per Vehicle Mile are calculated as follows:

Direct Operating Salary and Fringe Benefits / Vehicle Miles (total for all vehicles)

Direct Operating Salary and Fringe Benefits Per Vehicle Hour are calculated as follows:

Direct Operating Salary and Fringe Benefits / Vehicle Hours (total for all vehicles, including non-revenue hours)

Administrative Salary and Fringe Benefits Per Vehicle Mile (or Hour)

This is a detailed measure for diagnosing the administrative efficiency of the transit system. Specifically, it standardizes administrative wages and fringe benefits by placing them on a vehicle mile or vehicle hour basis. Increases in this measure indicate decreases in performance, while decreases indicate improvements in performance. Thus, a positive outlier indicates below average performance in this area, while a negative outlier indicates exemplary performance in this area.

This measure should be examined when an outlier for administrative efficiency is found, as the efficiency of administrative labor is one thing that may affect the administrative efficiency of the system. There are several factors that may cause this measure to vary, such as the productivity of administrative labor, the hourly wage that they are paid, route characteristics, passenger characteristics, and other factors.

Administrative Salary and Fringe Benefits Per Vehicle Mile are calculated as follows:

Administrative Salary and Fringe Benefits / Vehicle Miles (total for all vehicles)

Administrative Salary and Fringe Benefits = *Wages and Fringes of Office Staff, Bookkeepers, and Security Guards*

Administrative Salary and Fringe Benefits Per Vehicle Hour are calculated as follows:

Administrative Salary and Fringe Benefits / Vehicle Hours (total for all vehicles, incl. non-rev. hrs.)

Labor Expense as a Portion of Total Expense

This measure is a detailed measure of labor efficiency, showing the costs of labor in relation to other expenses. Furthermore, it is a detailed measure of cost efficiency. A great deal of caution should be used when interpreting the value of this measure in relation to that of the peer group, since a high value for this measure may result from either exemplary or poor performance. The measure shows what portion of expenses are spent on labor, and should only interpreted as such. If labor expenses as a portion of total expenses are high it may mean that labor expense are higher for the system than its peers; but it may also be the result of equivalent labor expenses in relation to peers and lower materials and capital expenses. Thus, the value for this measure must be interpreted in conjunction with the values for total expenses per vehicle mile (and hour) and total wages and fringe benefits per vehicle (and hour) (e.g. a positive outlier for labor expense as a portion of total expense is probably not a problem when accompanied by negative outliers for total expense per vehicle mile and total wages and fringe benefits per vehicle mile).

Labor Expense as a Portion of Total Expenses is calculated as follows:

Total Wages and Fringe Benefits / Total Expenses

Direct Operating Salary and Fringe as a Portion of Total Expenses

This measure is a detailed measure of labor efficiency, showing the costs of direct operating salary and fringe benefits in relation to other expenses. Extreme caution should be used when interpreting the value of this measure in relation to that of the peer group, since a high value for this measure may result from either exemplary or poor performance. The measure shows what portion of expenses are spent on direct operating labor, and should only be interpreted as such. If direct operating labor expenses as a portion of total expenses are high it may mean that direct operating labor expenses are higher for the system than its peers; but it may also be the result of equivalent direct operating labor expenses in relation to peers and lower materials and capital expenses. Thus, the value for this measure must be interpreted in conjunction with the values for total expenses per vehicle mile (and hour) and total direct operating wages and fringe benefits per vehicle mile (and hour) (e.g. a positive outlier for direct operating expense as a portion of total expense is probably not a problem when accompanied by a negative outlier for total expense per vehicle mile and total direct operating wages and fringe benefits per vehicle mile).

Direct Operating Salary and Fringe Expense as a Portion of Total Expense is calculated as follows:

Total Direct Operating Wages and Fringe Benefits / Total Expenses

Administrative Salary and Fringe as a Portion of Total Expenses

This measure is a detailed measure of labor efficiency, showing the costs of administrative labor in relation to other expenses. A great deal of caution should be used when interpreting the value of this measure in relation to that of the peer group, since a high value for this measure may result from either exemplary or poor performance. The measure shows what portion of expenses are spent on administrative labor, and should only be interpreted as such. If administrative labor expenses as a portion of total expenses are high it may mean that administrative labor expenses are higher for the system than its peers; but it may also be the result of equivalent administrative labor expenses in relation to peers and lower materials and capital expenses. Thus, the value for this measure must be interpreted in conjunction with the values for total expenses per vehicle mile (and hour) and administrative wages and fringe benefits per vehicle mile (and hour) (e.g. a positive outlier for administrative labor expense as a portion of total expense is probably not a problem when accompanied by negative outliers for total expense per vehicle mile and administrative wages and fringe benefits per vehicle mile).

Administrative Salary and Fringe Benefits as a Portion of Total Expenses is calculated as follows:

Administrative Wages and Fringe Benefits / Total Expenses

Vehicle Miles (Hours) Per Employee

This is a detailed measure of labor efficiency, providing a measure of the productivity of employees. Increases in this measure indicate improvements in performance, while decreases indicate deterioration of performance. Negative outliers suggest poor performance in this area, while positive outliers suggest exemplary performance.

Factors causing this measure to vary include the productivity of employees, route characteristics, passenger characteristics, and other factors.

Vehicle Miles Per Employee are calculated as follows:

Total Vehicle Miles / Total Full Time Employees

*Total Full Time Employees = Full Time Employees + (Part Time Employees * Number of Hours Per Week Worked By Part Time Employees) / 40*

Vehicle Hours Per Employee are calculated as follows:

Total Vehicle Hours / Total Full Time Employees

Revenue Efficiency

Operating Revenue Per Passenger

This is a general measure of revenue efficiency that places operating revenues on a per passenger basis. Increases in this measure suggest improvements in performance, while decreases suggest deterioration in performance. Thus, a positive outlier for this measure indicates exemplary performance, while a negative outlier indicates poor performance in this area.

This measure gives a good indication of the transit systems ability to generate revenues from passengers and other non-government sources. Factors causing variation in this measure include fare structure, passenger characteristics (such as income level), route characteristics, and other factors.

Operating Revenue Per Passenger is calculated as follows:

Total Operating Revenue / Total One Way Passenger Trips Provided

Operating Revenue	=	*Farebox Revenue + Contract Revenue + Advertising Revenue + All Other Project Generated Revenue (non-grant, non-government revenues)*

Operating Revenue Per Vehicle Mile (or Hour)

This is a general measure of revenue efficiency, standardizing operating revenues by placing them on a vehicle mile or vehicle hour basis. Operating revenues are defined as those revenues that the transit system earns from fares, contracts, advertising, promotions, and other revenues gained from sources other than grants, local, state, or federal funds. A positive outlier in for this measure suggests exemplary performance in the revenue efficiency area, while a negative outlier suggests poor performance in this area.

This is a very important measure of revenue efficiency, as it serves as an indicator of the transit system's ability to generate revenues in the absence of government funding. Factors that may affect this measure are the pricing practices of the agency, the characteristics of service area population, the innovation of the transit agency, the route characteristics, and other factors.

Operating Revenue Per Vehicle Mile is calculated as follows:

Total Operating Revenue / Vehicle Miles (total for all vehicles)

Total Operating Revenue	=	*Farebox Revenue + Contract Revenue + Advertising Revenue + All Other Project Generated Revenue (non-grant, non-public funding)*

Operating Revenue Per Vehicle Hour is calculated as follows:

Total Operating Revenue / Vehicle Hours (total for all vehicles, including non-rev. hours)

Farebox Revenue Per Vehicle Mile (or Hour)

This is a detailed indicator of revenue efficiency, standardizing farebox revenues by placing them on a vehicle mile or vehicle hour basis. Farebox revenues are defined as those revenues collected from passengers, including cash fares and donations. A positive outlier for this measure suggests exemplary performance in the revenue efficiency area, while a negative outlier suggests poor performance in this area.

This measure shows the transit systems ability to generate revenues from passengers. Factors that may affect this measure are the pricing practices of the agency, the characteristics of service area population, the innovation of the transit agency, the route characteristics, and other factors.

Farebox Revenue Per Vehicle Mile is calculated as follows:

Total Farebox Revenue / Vehicle Miles (total for all vehicles)

Farebox Revenue Per Vehicle Hour is calculated as follows:

Total Farebox Revenue / Vehicle Hours (total for all vehicles, including non-rev. hours)

Farebox Revenue Per Passenger

This is a general measure of revenue efficiency that places farebox revenues on a per passenger basis. Increases in this measure suggest improvements in performance, while decreases suggest deterioration in performance. Thus, a positive outlier for this measure indicates exemplary performance, while a negative outlier indicates poor performance in this area.

This measure gives a good indication of the transit systems ability to generate revenues from passengers. Factors causing variation in this measure include fare structure, passenger characteristics (such as income level), route characteristics, and other factors.

Farebox Revenue Per Passenger is calculated as follows:

Total Farebox Revenue / Total One Way Passenger Trips Provided

Operating Revenue as a Portion of Total Expense

This is a general indicator of revenue efficiency for transit systems. Increases in this measure suggest improvements in performance, while decreases suggest deterioration of performance in this area. Thus, a positive outlier for this measure indicates exemplary performance, while a negative outlier indicates poor performance.

This measure is an excellent indicator of the transit system's dependence on public subsidies. It serves as an indicator of the system's ability to generate revenues, and to keep costs down. As public funding for transit services becomes increasingly limited, those systems that can achieve a high ratio for operating revenues / total expenses will be in a good position to withstand such funding decreases.

Operating Revenue / Total Expense is calculated as follows:

Total Operating Revenues / Total Expenses (direct operating and administrative)

Operating Revenue Per Direct Operating Expenses

This is a detailed indicator of the revenue efficiency of the transit system. It is a subset of operating revenue/total expenses, providing a direct comparison between revenues generated from operations and the expenses directly attributable to operations. Increases in this measure indicate improvements in performance, while decreases indicate deterioration of performance. Thus, a positive outlier suggests exemplary performance, while a negative outlier suggests poor performance.

Factors that may cause this measure to vary include fare structure, route characteristics, passenger characteristics, operations practices, contracting practices, and other factors.

Operating Revenues / Direct Operating Expenses are calculated as follows:

Total Operating Revenues / Total Direct Operating Expenses

Farebox Revenue as a Portion of Total Expenses

This is a general indicator of revenue efficiency for transit systems. Increases in this measure suggest improvements in performance, while decreases suggest deterioration of performance in this area. Thus, a positive outlier for this measure indicates exemplary performance, while a negative outlier indicates poor performance.

This measure is a good indicator of the transit system's ability to recover expenses through passenger service. It serves as an indicator of the system's ability to generate revenues, and to keep costs down.

Farebox Revenue / Total Expense is calculated as follows:

Total Farebox Revenues / Total Expenses (direct operating and administrative)

Farebox Revenue Per Direct Operating Expenses

This is a detailed indicator of the revenue efficiency of the transit system. It is a subset of farebox revenue/total expenses, providing a direct comparison between revenues generated from passengers and the expenses directly attributable to operations. Increases in this measure indicate improvements in performance, while decreases indicate deterioration of performance. Thus, a positive outlier suggests exemplary performance, while a negative outlier suggests poor performance.

Factors that may cause this measure to vary include fare structure, route characteristics, passenger characteristics, operations practices, and other factors.

Farebox Revenues / Direct Operating Expenses are calculated as follows:

Total Farebox Revenues / Total Direct Operating Expenses

Operating (or Farebox) Revenue Per Vehicle

This is a detailed measure of revenue efficiency, placing operating or farebox revenues on a per vehicle basis. It serves as an indicator of the transit systems ability to generate revenues with a given amount of capital (vehicles). Increases in this measure indicate improvements in performance, while decreases indicate deterioration of performance. Thus, a positive outlier for this measure suggests exemplary performance, and a negative outlier suggests poor performance in this area.

Operating Revenue Per Vehicle is calculated as follows:

Total Operating Revenue / Total Number of Vehicles

Farebox Revenue Per Vehicle is calculated as follows:

Total Farebox Revenue / Total Number of Vehicles

Maintenance Efficiency

Maintenance Expense Per Vehicle Mile (or Hour)

This measure is a general indicator of maintenance efficiency, showing the efficiency of the transit system's vehicle maintenance activities. This measure standardizes a transit system's maintenance expenses by placing them on a vehicle mile or vehicle hour basis. Increases in this measure suggest that performance of maintenance is deteriorating, while decreases suggest that performance is improving in this area. Positive outliers from the peer group mean suggest a need for improvement.

This measure is also a detailed indicator of cost efficiency. Thus, any changes in maintenance efficiency are also likely to affect cost efficiency.

Maintenance Expense Per Vehicle Mile is calculated as follows:

Vehicle Maintenance Expense / Vehicle Miles (total for all vehicles)

Vehicle Maintenance Expense = *Routine Maintenance Expense + Spare Parts + Tires + Other Maintenance and Repairs*

Maintenance Expense Per Vehicle Hour is calculated as follows:

Vehicle Maintenance Expense / Vehicle Hours (total for all vehicles, including non-revenue hours)

Maintenance Expense as a Portion of Total Expenses

This measure is a detailed indicator of maintenance efficiency showing the costs of vehicle maintenance in relation to other expenses of the transit system. Additionally, it is a detailed measure of cost efficiency. A great deal of caution should be used when interpreting this measure in relation to the peer group, because a high value for this measure could be the result of exemplary or poor performance. For example, if maintenance expenditures are high in relation to total expenditures as compared to the appropriate peer group, the general interpretation would be that this is an area in need of improvement. However, this could also be the result of low expenditures in other areas in relation to peers. Thus, this measure alone should only be used to determine what portion of expenses are spent on maintenance. When using the measure for performance evaluation, it must always be examined in conjunction with total expenses per vehicle mile (hour) and maintenance expenses per vehicle mile (hour) (For example, a high value for maintenance expense as a portion of total expenses is probably not a problem when maintenance expense per vehicle mile and total expense per vehicle mile are low).

Maintenance Expense as a Portion of Total Expense is calculated as:

Maintenance Expense / Total Expenses

Maintenance Expense Per Vehicle

This is a detailed measure of the vehicle efficiency of the transit system. Placing maintenance expenses on a per vehicle basis is a logical measurement, since a certain amount of routine and extraordinary maintenance is required for any vehicle. Increases in this measure indicate deterioration of performance, while decreases indicate improvements in performance. Thus, a negative outlier may suggest exemplary performance, and a positive outlier may suggest poor performance.

Some caution must be used in interpreting this measure, however. Because many routine maintenance costs are a function of time operated or miles operated, this indicator may produce misleading results. For example, a transit system could show high maintenance expenses per vehicle, but low maintenance expenses per vehicle mile due to high utilization. Nonetheless, this indicator may provide insight into system problems resulting from an aging deteriorated vehicle fleet.

Maintenance Expense Per Vehicle is calculated as follows:

Total Maintenance Expenses / Number of Vehicles Operated

Vehicle Efficiency

Vehicle Miles (or Hours) Per Vehicle

This is a general measure of vehicle efficiency, providing an excellent illustration of the utilization of the transit system's vehicles. Increases in this measure represent improvements in performance, while decreases represent deterioration in vehicle performance. Hence, positive outliers for this measure suggest exemplary vehicle efficiency, while negative outliers suggest poor vehicle efficiency.

Factors that may influence this measure are route characteristics, passenger characteristics, system operations, labor efficiency, and other factors.

Vehicle Miles Per Vehicle are calculated as follows:

Total Vehicle Miles (all vehicles) / Number of Vehicles in Operation

Vehicle Hours Per Vehicle are calculated as follows:

Total Vehicle Hours (all vehicles, including non-rev. hours) / Number of Vehicles in Operation

Maintenance Expense Per Active Vehicle

This is a detailed measure of the vehicle efficiency of the transit system. Placing maintenance expenses on a per vehicle basis is a logical measurement, since a certain amount of routine and extraordinary maintenance is required for any vehicle. Increases in this measure indicate deterioration of perfomrance, while decreases indicate improvements in performance. Thus, a negative otlier may suggest exemplary peformance, and a positive outlier may suggest poor performance.

Some caution must be used in interpreting this measure, however. Because may routine maintenance costs are a funtion of time operated or miles operated, this indicator may produce misleading results. For example, a transit system could show high maintenance expenses per vehicle, but low maintenance expenses per vehicle mile due to high utilization. Nonetheless, this indicator may provide insight into system problems resulting from any aging deteriorated vehicle fleet.

Maintenance Expense Per Vehicle is calculated as follows:

Total Maintenance Expenses / Number of Vehicles Operated

Vehicle Miles Per Vehicle Breakdown

This is a detailed measure for examining the vehicle efficiency of transit systems. Increases in this measure suggest improvements in performance, while decreases suggest deterioration in performance. Thus, a positive outlier for this measure implies exemplary performance in this area, while a negative outlier implies poor performance.

A great deal of time and money can be expended when vehicle breakdowns are occurring regularly for a particular transit system. This measure helps identify situations where this is a problem.

Vehicle Miles / Vehicle Breakdowns can be calculated as follows:

Total Vehicle Miles / Total Vehicle Breakdowns (all vehicles)

Social Effectiveness

Passengers Per Capita

This is a general measure of the cost effectiveness of transit systems. It is based on the theory that a system that is doing well in scheduling, routing, advertising, fare setting, and other areas should provide a large number of trips as a percentage of service area population. Increases in this measure suggest improvements in social effectiveness, while decreases suggest deterioration of social effectiveness. Thus, a positive outlier for this measure may indicate exemplary performance, while a negative outlier may indicate poor performance in this area.

Passengers Per Capita are calculated as follows:

Total One Way Passenger Trips Provided / Total Service Area Population

Elderly/Handicapped Trips Per Elderly Population

This is a detailed measure of social effectiveness, providing an indicator of the system's success in serving the elderly population in the service area. The elderly represent a large, transit-dependent population in rural and small urban areas. The transit system's ability to provide effective service to this group is essential. Increases in this measure indicate improvements in performance, while decreases indicate deterioration in performance. Moreover, exemplary performance for this measure is represented by positive outliers, while poor performance is represented by negative outliers.

Elderly/Handicapped Trips Per Elderly Population is calculated as follows:

Total One-Way Trips Provided to Elderly/Handicapped Passengers / Total Elderly (65+) Population in the Service Area

Vehicle Miles (Hours) Per Capita

This is a general measure of service effectiveness, providing an illustration of the service units provided on a per capita basis. Some caution must be used in interpreting this measure, however. Just because a transit system is providing a lot of miles or hours of service in relation to population, it does not mean that it is doing so effectively. Passengers per capita give a better indication of the transit system's ability to provide service where it is in demand. Increases in this measure may indicate improvements in performance, while decreases may indicate deterioration of performance. Moreover, positive outliers for this measure may suggest exemplary performance, and negative outliers may suggest poor performance.

Vehicle Miles Per Capita are calculated as follows:

Total Vehicle Miles (all vehicles) / service area population

Vehicle Hours Per Capita are calculated as follows:

Total Vehicle Hours (all vehicles, including non-rev. hours) / service area population

Vehicle Miles (Hours) Per Elderly Population

This is a detailed measure of social effectiveness, providing an illustration of the service units provided on a per elderly population basis. This is important, due to the transit dependence of the elderly population in rural and small urban areas. Some caution must be used in interpreting this measure, however. Just because a transit system is providing a lot of miles or hours of service in relation to elderly population, it does not mean that it is doing so effectively. Elderly passengers per elderly population give a better indication of the transit system's ability to provide service to the elderly where it is in demand. Increases in vehicle miles per elderly population may indicate improvements in performance, while decreases may indicate deterioration of performance. Moreover, positive outliers for this measure may suggest exemplary performance, and negative outliers may suggest poor performance.

Vehicle Miles Per Elderly Population are calculated as follows:

Total Vehicle Miles (all vehicles) / elderly population (over 65 years old) in the service area

Vehicle Hours Per Capita are calculated as follows:

Total Vehicle Hours (all vehicles, including non-rev. hours) / elderly population in the service area

Service Effectiveness

Passengers Per Vehicle Mile (Hour)

This is a general measure of service effectiveness, showing the utilization of vehicles in terms of passengers. Increases in this measure indicate improvements in performance, while decreases indicate deterioration in performance. Thus, positive outliers for this measure may suggest exemplary service effectiveness, while negative outliers may suggest poor service effectiveness.

Passengers Per Vehicle Mile are calculated as:

Total One-Way Passenger Trips / Vehicle Miles (total for all vehicles)

Passengers Per Vehicle Hour are calculated as:

Total One-Way Passenger Trips / Vehicle Hours (total for all vehicles, including non-revenue hours)

Elderly/Handicapped Passengers Per Vehicle Mile (Hour)

This is a subset of passengers per vehicle mile, showing the utilization of vehicles in terms of elderly/handicapped passengers. Many elderly and handicapped depend on transit for access and mobility in rural and small urban areas. Increases in this measure indicate improvements in performance, while decreases indicate deterioration in performance. Thus, positive outliers for this measure may suggest exemplary service effectiveness, while negative outliers may suggest poor service effectiveness.

Elderly/Handicapped Passengers Per Vehicle Mile are calculated as:

Total One-Way Elderly/Handicapped Passenger Trips / Vehicle Miles (total for all vehicles)

Passengers Per Vehicle Hour are calculated as:

Total One-Way Elderly/Handicapped Passenger Trips / Vehicle Hours (total for all vehicles, including non-revenue hours)

Passengers Per Vehicle

This is a general measure of service effectiveness, showing the annual utilization of vehicles in terms of passengers. Some caution should be used with this measure, since it is not standardized by vehicle miles or hours. If a system has to travel many more miles or hours to generate the same amount of passengers per vehicle as another transit system with similar service area characteristics, this measure may be misleading. Positive outliers for this measure suggest exemplary performance, while negative outliers suggest poor performance.

Passengers Per Vehicle are calculated as follows:

Total One-Way Passenger Trips / Number of Vehicles Operated

Vehicle Miles Per Accidents

This is a general measure of service efficiency, that serves as an indicator of system safety. Safety should always be a top priority for managing a rural or small urban transit system. Increases in this measure indicate improvement in performance, while decreases indicate deterioration in performance. Thus, a negative outlier suggests poor performance, while a positive outlier suggests exemplary performance.

Accidents per Vehicle Mile

Vehicle Miles / Vehicle Accidents (total for all vehicles)

Cost Effectiveness

Total Expense Per Passenger

This is a general measure of cost efficiency, placing expenses on a per passenger basis. Total expense per passenger encompasses both service effectiveness and cost efficiency. Decreases in this measure indicate improvements in performance, while increases indicate deterioration in performance. Hence, a positive outlier suggests poor performance, while a negative outlier suggests exemplary performance.

Total Expense Per Passenger is calculated as follows:

Total Expenses / Total One-Way Passenger Trips

Direct Operating Expense Per Passenger

This is a detailed measure of cost effectiveness, placing direct operating expenses on a per passenger basis. If total expenses per passenger show an outlier, this measure will show whether this outlier is caused by system operations. Increases in this measure suggest deterioration in performance, while decreases suggest improvements in performance. Thus, a negative outlier for this measure suggests exemplary performance, while a positive outlier suggests poor performance.

Direct Operating Expense Per Passenger is calculated as follows:

Total Direct Operating Expense / Total One-Way Passenger Trips

Administrative Expense Per Passenger

This is a detailed measure of cost effectiveness, placing administrative expenses on a per passenger basis. If total expenses per passenger show an outlier, this measure will show whether this outlier is caused by system administration. Increases in this measure suggest deterioration in performance, while decreases suggest improvements in performance. Thus, a negative outlier for this measure suggests exemplary performance, while a positive outlier suggests poor performance.

Administrative Expense Per Passenger is calculated as follows:

Total Administrative Expense / Total One-Way Passenger Trips

Maintenance Expense Per Passenger

This is a detailed measure of cost effectiveness, placing maintenance expenses on a per passenger basis. If total expenses per passenger show an outlier, this measure will show whether this outlier is caused by system maintenance operations. Increases in this measure suggest deterioration in performance, while decreases suggest improvements in performance. Thus, a negative outlier for this measure suggests exemplary performance, while a positive outlier suggests poor performance.

Maintenance Expense Per Passenger is calculated as follows:

Total Maintenance Expense / Total One-Way Passenger Trips

Labor Expense Per Passenger

This is a detailed measure of cost effectiveness, placing labor expenses on a per passenger basis. If total expenses per passenger show an outlier, this measure will show whether this outlier is caused by labor efficiency. Increases in this measure suggest deterioration in performance, while decreases suggest improvements in performance. Thus, a negative outlier for this measure suggests exemplary performance, while a positive outlier suggests poor performance.

Labor Expense Per Passenger is calculated as follows:

Total Labor Expense / Total One-Way Passenger Trips

Subsidy Per Passenger

This is a general measure of cost efficiency, showing the dependence of the transit system on federal, state, and local governments, and other charitable organizations for its total operations. Thus, this measure also reflects revenue efficiency. Positive outliers suggest poor performance, while negative outliers suggest exemplary performance.

Transit systems that are less reliant on subsidies, are more likely to survive government funding cuts or a loss of charitable contributions. However, some care must be used in interpreting this measure, as some systems may have higher subsidies per passenger because they serve a higher percentage of low income or elderly passengers.

Subsidy Per Passenger is calculated as follows:

Total Subsidy / Total One-Way Passenger Trips

Total Subsidy = *Total Revenues - Farebox Revenues - Contract Revenues - Advertising Revenues - Any Other Project Generated Revenue*

Section
Seven

Target Ranges For Performance

This section of the guidebook presents target ranges for all of the performance measures outlined in the previous section, by peer group. All sixty-three of the transit systems that returned fully completed surveys provided information on operational statistics, revenues, and expenses for the 1991-1992 Fiscal Year.[15] Based on the information provided by these transit agencies, quantitative performance measures were calculated for each system. These quantitative measures were used to evaluate individual system outliers from the peer group for various performance measures, group means, and target ranges by peer group.[16]

The target ranges provided in this section have been calculated from the actual performance measure values for transit systems in each peer group. These target ranges are designed to be a quick tool for evaluating current transit performance for agencies that are not included in this guidebook. Ideally, transit systems fitting into a particular peer group can calculate performance measures for their systems and quickly determine whether their performance is significantly different from the peer group.[17] Numbers equal to the high or low of the performance measure range are significantly different from the peer group, while those less than the high and greater than the low are statistically the same as the peer group. Table 13 presents target ranges by peer group.[18]

[15]Transit systems not operating on a fiscal year basis provided these statistics for the calendar year.

[16]Section nine contains tables showing individual performance measure values, performance measure outliers from the peer group, and average peer group performance measure values.

[17]Since transit systems not responding to the survey are not included in the calculation of target ranges, this is only an approximation. However, it should serve as a good barometer for the performance of these systems.

[18]Target ranges are not presented for Peer Group 7, since only two systems fit into the group. The statistical method used to derive target ranges has little meaning with only two observations.

TABLE 13: PERFORMANCE MEASURE TARGET RANGES (BY PEER GROUP)

	PEER GROUP 1		PEER GROUP 2		PEER GROUP 3		PEER GROUP 4		PEER GROUP 5		PEER GROUP 6	
1.COST EFFICIENCY												
	>	<	>	<	>	<	>	<	>	<	>	<
TOTEXP/VHCL MILE	0.97185	1.89682	0.49744	3.10004	1.43502	2.02474	0.94873	3.58878	0.61417	2.99996	1.69769	2.68333
TOTEXP/VHCL HR	13.9444	21.8316	11.6881	28.9454	17.7727	30.5266	15.0213	35.1664	8.95456	22.9920	17.0410	27.7962
DIROPEXP/VHCL MILE	0.72037	1.58771	0.68464	1.99364	1.11564	1.65868	0.70677	2.84887	0.56401	2.91875	1.32616	2.27623
DIROPEXP/VHCL HR	10.7388	17.9903	9.33482	22.2976	14.3221	24.8593	12.6765	26.1615	8.59511	22.3370	13.3875	23.0308
ADMINEXP/VHCL MILE	0.15108	0.40952	0	1.24946	0.22833	0.45711	0.17720	0.80468	0.024570	0.10680	0.24650	0.53213
ADMINEXP/VHCL HOUR	2.14996	4.89688	0	9.84960	2.54500	6.57293	2.05685	9.29279	.0040330	1.01042	2.47316	5.94569
MAINTEXP/VHCL MILE	0.079346	0.18085	0.038988	0.15341	0.077471	0.19321	0	0.32564	0.040611	0.20864	0.081283	0.29784
MAINTEXP/VHCL HOUR	0.92526	2.40246	0.51648	1.78085	0.98215	2.55549	0.067092	2.07732	0	2.29113	0.76800	3.04441
DIROPEXP/TOTEXP	0.73178	0.87108	0.59540	1.01057	0.74434	0.85627	0.71958	0.85031	0.86073	1.01880	0.74003	0.88386
ADMINEXP/TOTEXP	0.12892	0.26822	0	0.40460	0.14373	0.25566	0.14969	0.28042	0	0.13927	0.11614	0.25997
LABOREXP/VHCL MI	0.50820	1.24588	0.44709	1.51806	0.90362	1.37483	0.48902	2.36712	0	2.57767	1.19297	1.93059
LABOREXP/VHCL HR	7.44407	13.8615	4.78560	19.3761	10.7815	21.9390	10.2035	20.3485	5.99216	18.3208	12.0740	19.9806
MAINTEXP/TOTEXP	0.058953	0.13221	0.041289	0.071534	0.052346	0.11006	0	0.094938	0	0.20976	0.044872	0.12962
LABOREXP/TOTEXP	0.48005	0.70478	0.36057	0.83138	0.62346	0.71448	0.54282	0.69732	0.14576	0.98658	0.65139	0.77300
2. OPERATING EFFICIENCY												
DIROPEXP/VHCL MI	0.72037	1.58771	0.68464	1.99364	1.11564	1.65868	0.73677	2.84887	0.56401	2.91875	1.32616	2.27623
DIROPEXP/VHCL HR	10.7388	17.9903	9.33482	22.2976	14.3221	24.8593	12.6765	26.1615	8.59511	22.3370	13.3875	23.0308
DOPSAL&FB/VHCLMI	0.32909	1.05140	0.42173	1.05756	0.73183	1.06810	0.26901	1.94824	0.29675	2.16904	0.89008	1.59429
DOPSAL&FB/VHCLHR	5.31317	11.3106	4.31578	13.9913	8.72014	16.6188	7.63759	15.0814	6.84202	15.4732	9.03552	16.2037
DRIVERSL&FB/VHCLMI	0.28019	0.84723	0.32103	0.87944	0.59951	0.87577	0	2.17960	0.32830	1.99184	0.59931	1.29332
DRIVERSL&FB/VHCLHR	3.76854	9.70928	3.84849	10.7385	7.45439	13.9836	4.20238	12.9205	5.68426	15.7988	5.43330	13.8134
DIROPEXP/TOTEXP	0.73178	0.87108	0.59540	1.01057	0.74434	0.85627	0.71958	0.85031	0.86073	1.01880	0.74003	0.88386
DIROPEXP/VHCL	9065.37	221498.15	1411.21	27628.27	14792.24	24621.13	26740.21	41331.43	349.940	54420.06	20539.11	33293.10

TABLE 13: PERFORMANCE MEASURE TARGET RANGES (BY PEER GROUP)

	PEER GROUP 1		PEER GROUP 2		PEER GROUP 3		PEER GROUP 4		PEER GROUP 5		PEER GROUP 6	
3. ADMINISTRATION EFFICIENCY												
	>	<	>	<	>	<	>	<	>	<	>	<
VHCL MI/OPEREMPL	11767.45	220266.40	0	108057.94	16421.05	43698.14	0	67661.42	0	24489.31	11674.29	17300.15
ADMINEXP/VHCL MI	0.15108	0.40952	0	1.24946	0.22833	0.45711	0.17720	0.80468	0.024570	0.10680	0.24650	0.53213
ADMINEXP/VHCL HR	2.14996	4.89688	0	9.84960	2.54500	6.57293	2.05685	9.29279	.0040330	1.01042	2.47316	5.94569
ADMSAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.090375	0.28321	0	0.51178	0.16829	0.36872	0.15945	0.47944	0	0.051725	0.19863	0.44057
ADMSAL&FB/VHCL HR	1.22871	3.45313	0	6.00736	1.89613	5.39608	1.21391	6.61900	0	0.39573	2.00847	4.80690
ADMINEXP/TOTEXP	0.12892	0.26822	0	0.40460	0.14373	0.25566	0.14969	0.28042	0	0.13927	0.11614	0.25997
ADMINEXP/VHCL	2078.38	5114.71	0	8795.49	2862.68	5736.07	5292.73	13806.32	222.857	1394.48	3220.18	9615.76
VHCL MI/ADMEMPL	34680.39	188989.05	9749.87	80225.51	44513.56	119438.87	0	245583.21	0	1318195.91	44361.78	152628.54
4. LABOR EFFICIENCY												
TOTSAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.50820	1.24588	0.44709	1.51806	0.90362	1.37483	0.48902	2.36712	0	2.57767	1.19297	1.93059
TOTSAL&FB/VHCL HR	7.44407	13.8615	4.78560	19.3761	10.7815	21.9390	10.2035	20.3485	5.99216	18.3208	12.0740	19.9806
DOPSAL&FB/VHCLMI	0.32909	1.05140	0.42173	1.05756	0.73183	1.06810	0.26901	1.94824	0.29675	2.16904	0.89008	1.59429
DOPSAL&FB/VHCLHR	5.31317	11.3106	4.31578	13.9913	8.72014	16.6188	7.63759	15.0814	6.84202	15.4732	9.03552	16.2037
ADMSAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.090375	0.28321	0	0.51178	0.16829	0.36872	0.15945	0.47944	0	0.051725	0.19863	0.44057
ADMSAL&FB/VHCL HR	1.22871	3.45313	0	6.00736	1.89613	5.39608	1.21391	6.61900	0	0.39573	2.00847	4.80690
LABOREXP/TOTEXP	0.48005	0.70478	0.36057	0.83138	0.62346	0.71448	0.54282	0.69732	0.14576	0.98658	0.65139	0.77300
DOPSAL&FB/TOTEXP	0.34515	0.57918	0.28058	0.65189	0.46728	0.56771	0.34605	0.59043	0.17130	0.95447	0.47256	0.64471
ADMSAL&FB/TOTEXP	0.071475	0.18903	0.012518	0.24696	0.10827	0.20311	0.093392	0.21026	0	0.17853	0.090575	0.21655
VHCLMILES/EMPL	8866.23	17679.25	0	37665.54	10593.02	22084.54	0	51542.95	0	44624.22	9724.30	14175.16
VHCLHOURS/EMPL	618.117	1572.95	195.092	2623.56	782.682	1688.29	132.571	2747.22	549.349	3633.65	873.195	1536.86

TABLE 13: PERFORMANCE MEASURE TARGET RANGES (BY PEER GROUP)

	PEER GROUP 1		PEER GROUP 2		PEER GROUP 3		PEER GROUP 4		PEER GROUP 5		PEER GROUP 6	
5. REVENUE EFFICIENCY												
	>	<	>	<	>	<	>	<	>	<	>	<
OPREV/VHCL MILE	0.11414	0.49726	0	0.72259	0.21416	0.50978	0	0.32409	0.11412	0.62736	0.33126	0.80243
OPREV/VHCL HOUR	0.77546	7.56322	0	10.2219	3.03586	7.30699	0	4.82279	0.45560	6.37973	3.08925	8.03098
FAREBOXREV/VHCL MI	0.067604	0.21056	0	0.34121	0.20937	0.33689	0	0.19900	0.11412	0.62736	0.26615	0.72615
FAREBOXREV/VHCL HR	0.81687	2.45434	0	6.28564	2.63876	4.85510	0.053235	2.57851	0.45560	6.37973	2.45082	7.43705
OPREV/PASS	0.40116	1.41808	0	2.87781	0.66568	1.41683	0	1.70347	0	6.09804	0.55216	1.05394
FAREBOXREV/PASS	0.17221	0.75510	0	1.94625	0.54722	1.16251	0.045261	0.090156	0	6.09804	0.44624	0.94864
OPREV/TOTEXP	0.068180	0.36849	0.016701	0.41054	0.13106	0.31802	0.015308	0.14890	0.11756	0.32088	0.17160	0.32591
OPREV/DIROPEXP	0.088065	0.46078	0.013893	0.50050	0.17443	0.38973	0.017328	0.19494	0.12724	0.34099	0.21463	0.39714
FAREBOXREV/TOTEXP	0.045690	0.14472	0	0.26240	0.13045	0.19684	.0078574	0.092566	0.11756	0.32088	0.13779	0.29258
FAREBOXREV/DIOPEXP	0.057682	0.18567	0	0.34480	0.16803	0.24846	0.011352	0.11751	0.12724	0.34099	0.16926	0.34981
OPREV/VHCL	746.411	8401.24	0	12087.39	3192.74	6575.34	505.206	7065.71	0	16392.09	5220.97	12085.44
FAREBOXREV/VHCL	879.930	2632.18	0	9921.31	2676.73	5074.61	232.215	4399.37	0	16392.09	4354.37	11048.60
6. MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY												
MAINTEXP/VHCL MILE	0.079346	0.18085	0.038988	0.15341	0.077471	0.19321	0	0.32564	0.040611	0.20864	0.081283	0.29784
MAINTEXP/VHCL HOUR	0.92526	2.40246	0.51648	1.78085	0.98215	2.55549	0.067092	2.07732	0	2.29113	0.76800	3.04441
MAINTEXP/TOTEXP	0.058953	0.13221	0.041289	0.071534	0.052346	0.11006	0	0.094938	0	0.20976	0.044872	0.12962
MAINTEXP/VHCL	779.888	2840.59	0	2268.92	1052.21	2690.47	204.123	3464.70	0	2893.40	1115.31	4910.50
7. VEHICLE EFFICIENCY												
VHCLMILES/VHCL	9322.67	17968.16	0	28616.11	10847.67	20676.92	4716.62	45487.52	396.610	28857.26	10699.00	23885.85
VHCLHOURS/VHCL	705.833	1450.43	248.449	1494.11	875.714	1490.73	1202.70	2499.90	925.900	3379.93	1099.67	2248.46
MAINTEXP/ACTVHCL	779.888	2840.59	0	2268.92	1052.21	2690.47	204.123	3464.70	0	2893.40	1115.31	4910.50
VHCLBRKDN/VHCL MI	13892.52	135002.30	0	120615.43	6493.64	17992.17	0	197732.07	0	19434.66	7900.79	25236.66

TABLE 13: PERFORMANCE MEASURE TARGET RANGES (BY PEER GROUP)

	PEER GROUP 1		PEER GROUP 2		PEER GROUP 3		PEER GROUP 4		PEER GROUP 5		PEER GROUP 6	
8. SOCIAL EFFECTIVENESS												
	>	<	>	<	>	<	>	<	>	<	>	<
PASS/CAPITA	0.50503	1.51693	0.23431	1.04092	1.28083	3.85665	0	459.721	0	11.8173	2.20871	8.03005
ELDTRIPS/ELDPOP	2.07349	8.25591	0.69005	14.9449	4.79154	14.8436	0	9.22015	0	28.3278	6.40833	21.4831
VHCLMILES/CAPITA	1.56190	4.35168	0.71199	3.40684	3.09280	6.99304	0	80.6198	0	45.9302	3.63644	7.63683
VHCLHOURS/CAPITA	0.12808	0.30865	0.064545	0.26468	0.27263	0.52548	0	13.9057	0	6.80454	0.34593	0.75999
VHCLMILES/ELDPOP	3.34814	43.8705	0.58790	70.8291	16.7085	36.4556	0	2671.55	0	136.638	28.6328	60.7041
VHCLHOURS/ELDPOP	0.45448	2.84392	0	5.74885	1.45790	2.73405	0	462.739	0	19.9828	2.85882	5.67203
9. SERVICE EFFECTIVENESS												
PASS/VHCLMILE	0.24074	0.44948	0	1.00658	0.32325	0.78408	0	4.39628	0	1.11602	0.51536	1.18223
PASS/VHCLHOUR	2.62581	6.91662	1.00321	8.64306	4.21685	9.19271	0	25.7008	0	9.32619	3.97542	15.0451
ELD/HANDPAS/VHCLMI	0.16657	0.35591	0	0.95792	0.21417	0.66549	0.020402	0.27804	0	0.99871	0.21961	0.44813
ELD/HANDPAS/VHCLHR	1.69693	5.57809	0.73658	7.93230	3.05578	7.90131	0.59866	3.46539	0	7.93134	2.11949	4.49537
PASS/VHCL	3151.54	5818.35	686.964	6624.85	4261.54	8357.57	0	45004.36	0	16429.83	6728.36	22144.96
ACCDNTS/VHCL MI	58012.90	197118.76	0	110022.22	20039.01	55523.36	0	608237.08	0	674675.43	13141.01	84501.15
10. COST EFFECTIVENESS												
TOTEXP/PASS	2.60266	6.57825	1.17574	10.8186	3.27474	8.54185	2.02518	13.6195	0	38.1435	2.21865	4.11920
DIROPEXP/PASS	1.83313	5.63368	0.54653	9.31801	2.67976	6.25410	1.74385	10.2050	0	37.1990	1.77271	3.36850
ADMINEXP/PASS	0.43778	1.27633	0.089389	2.04046	0.43462	2.44811	0.19999	3.49592	0	0.96469	0.31862	0.87801
MAINTEXP/PASS	0.27557	0.57932	0.016122	0.70225	0.15222	0.68671	0	0.59578	0	2.19358	0.11719	0.48765
LABOREXP/PASS	1.27547	4.34849	0	8.27012	1.86675	6.41863	1.33868	7.94158	0	36.3470	1.53219	3.04128
SUBSIDY/PASS	1.83070	3.34781	0.96147	8.44150	1.55364	8.93544	0	26.9279	0	35.6226	1.51557	3.35521

Section
Eight

Methods For Improving Performance

This section of the guidebook presents recommended strategies for improving the performance of rural transit systems. An evaluation system is useless if attempts are not made to improve performance in those areas where the quantitative performance evaluation suggests improvements are necessary. Moreover, in order to maintain exemplary performance in a given area, the reasons for such performance must be identified. In the following paragraphs recommended strategies for identifying causes for poor or exemplary performance, and for improving performance are presented.[19] In all cases, these categories of performance must be looked at simultaneously, as examining one area will not provide a complete or accurate picture of the situation.

Cost Efficiency

The cost efficiency area of performance measures is very broad, encompassing the administration of the system and its operations. Moreover, within the operations and administration of the system, exemplary or poor performance could be caused by several factors including wage levels, labor productivity, vehicle efficiency, maintenance efficiency, and other factors. The general performance measure for cost efficiency of total expense per vehicle mile merely sheds light on the fact that there is a problem area or exemplary area in the system, but tells little about the causes for it. However, the detailed cost efficiency indicators that examine operations, administration, maintenance, and labor may help to further identify the problem. Recommended strategies for identifying the causes of exemplary or poor cost efficiency include:

- Examine the detailed cost efficiency measures to try to identify the area where the problem exists

[19]Many of these strategies have been abstracted from various studies, including the *Kentucky Section 18 Transit Evaluation Study*, *Rural Public Transportation Guide*, *Evaluation of Public Transit Services: The Level-of-Service Concept*, *Georgia State Management Plan and Administrative Guide for Rural and Small Urban Areas, Section 18*, *Colorado Statewide Public Transit Assessment*, and *An Analysis of the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Selected Rural Transit Systems in North Dakota*.

- Once the problem area is identified, examine detailed indicators in that area

Operations Efficiency

Operations efficiency is more narrow than cost efficiency, as it only examines the direct operations of the transit system. Recommended strategies for identifying the sources of exemplary or poor operations efficiency, and for making improvements include:

- Examine the size of the operations staff - You may want to consider increasing the use of part-time or volunteer employees
- Examine employee policies concerning sick leave, vacation, and fringe benefits - are employee policies encouraging high productivity? - How much could your system save in fringe benefits and still retain qualified employees?
- Examine nearby transit systems for possible duplication of service or other inefficient routing and scheduling - You should consider coordinating your routing, scheduling, and dispatching activities with other nearby systems
- Examine vehicle maintenance activities - You may want to consider contracting your maintenance activities to other agencies or to the private sector
- Examine routine maintenance of vehicles - By assuring regularly scheduled maintenance on all vehicles, major repairs may be avoided in the long run
- Examine purchases of vehicle parts and supplies - You may want to consider joint-purchases of these items with other nearby transit systems, as some volume discounts might apply

Administrative Efficiency

Recommended strategies to find the foundations of exemplary or poor performance in the administrative efficiency category, and to make improvements include the following:

- Examine the size of the administrative staff - One way to reduce administrative wages and fringe benefits would be to increase the use of part-time or volunteer administrative employees
- Examine employee policies concerning sick leave, vacation, and fringe benefits - are employee policies encouraging high productivity? - How much could your system save in fringe benefits and still retain qualified employees?

- Examine the job descriptions of administrative employees - You may want to increase the scope of duties performed by individual staff, thereby reducing the number of administrative employees

- Examine your insurance policies - Are you getting the best deal you can on insurance? Could you realize savings on insurance by pooling resources with other transit systems?

Labor Efficiency

High productivity of labor is an essential element to the success of any transit system. Recommended strategies for identifying the causes of exemplary or poor performance, along with improvement strategies include the following:

- Examine the size of the operations staff, the administrative staff, and the overall staff - You may be able to improve labor efficiency by reducing the number of full time employees through hiring more part time employees and recruiting more volunteer labor

- Examine the job descriptions of all employees, along with the tasks that they perform - Labor efficiency may be improved through combining functions of administrative staff, operations staff, or combing functions between the two

- Examine employee policies concerning sick leave, vacation, and fringe benefits - are employee policies encouraging high productivity? - How much could your system save in fringe benefits and still retain qualified employees?

- Examine employee training policies - Are new employees trained procedures that save time and increase productivity? - Moreover, is the learning curve lengthened for new employees due to a lack of training?

- Examine employee rewards and incentives - Are employees rewarded for exemplary performance? - Are there incentives to be productive?

Revenue Efficiency

Some transit systems may have a low cost structure, but still require a large subsidy due to inefficient revenue collection. Revenue efficiency is a very important part of the success of any transit system. Recommended strategies for identifying sources of exemplary or poor revenue efficiency, and methods for improving revenue efficiency include the following:

- Examine your current fare structure, and your passengers' price elasticity of demand for transportation services - Are prices currently at a level where a one percent increase would

lead to less than a one percent decrease in ridership (if so revenues could be increased by increasing prices)? - Conversely, are prices at a level where a one percent decrease would lead to more than a one percent increase in ridership (if so, revenues could be increased by decreasing prices)? -When experimenting with fares, differential pricing between low income groups and others must be considered

- Examine your contracting activity - If your system is not contracting its services out, you should consider doing so for a nursing home, the local school district, special interest groups, and others - Full cost fares (or a premium) should be collected for contract services

- Examine your routing - For systems that operate fixed (or semi-fixed) routes, a revenue-inefficient system may reflect poor scheduling and routing - It may be useful to consider new routes and/or new schedules

- Examine other possible revenue generating activities - For example, would any local businesses pay to advertise on the bus?

Maintenance Efficiency

The maintenance efficiency of a transit system can greatly affect the efficiency of the entire system. Cost efficiency, revenue efficiency, labor efficiency, vehicle efficiency, and effectiveness measures can all be affected by maintenance efficiency. Recommended strategies for identifying the sources of exemplary or poor performance, and for improving performance include the following:

- Examine preventive maintenance strategies - Regularly scheduled routine maintenance can prevent large future maintenance expenditures and add to the useful life of vehicles

- Examine the age and condition of the vehicle fleet - Replacement of deteriorated vehicles could greatly improve the maintenance efficiency of the system

- Examine the expenses associated with vehicle maintenance activities - You may want to consider contracting your maintenance activities to other agencies or to the private sector

- Examine purchases of vehicle parts and supplies - You may want to consider joint-purchases of these items with other nearby transit systems, as some volume discounts might apply

- Examine driver training practices - Heavy wear and tear on transit vehicles could be the result of poorly trained drivers - You may want to consider more driver training

- Examine maintenance employee training - untrained mechanics may have low productivity levels and make critical errors in vehicle maintenance - You may want to consider improved maintenance employee training

Vehicle Efficiency

An efficient vehicle fleet, along with efficient utilization of those vehicles is crucial to the success of any transit system. Recommended methods for identifying causes of exemplary or poor performance, along with recommended improvement methods include the following:

- Consider the need for a backup vehicle - If reliability of the vehicles is a recurring problem, a backup vehicle may greatly improve the reliability of the system
- Examine the age and condition of the vehicle fleet - Replacement of deteriorated vehicles could greatly improve the reliability and maintenance efficiency of the system
- Examine driver training practices - Heavy wear and tear on transit vehicles could be the result of poorly trained drivers - You may want to consider more driver training
- Examine maintenance employee training - untrained mechanics may have low productivity levels and make critical errors in vehicle maintenance - You may want to consider improved maintenance employee training
- Examine preventive maintenance strategies - Regularly scheduled routine maintenance can prevent large future maintenance expenditures and add to the useful life of vehicles

Social Effectiveness

While efficiency is critical to the success of rural and small urban transit systems, they must also be effective at providing service to the targeted population. Methods for identifying causes for exemplary or poor performance in the social effectiveness category, along with recommended improvements include:

- Examine the level of services you are providing in relation to peers - Is this amount adequate to meet the needs of your targeted population?
- Examine marketing and promotion activities - Your ability to reach the targeted population may depend heavily on these activities
- Examine fare structure - Can you adjust this structure to more adequately serve the needs of the targeted population?

Service Effectiveness

Service effectiveness is another area that is critical to the success of rural and small urban transit systems. If high levels of service are provided in areas where the need for such service is low, or if the

service is not being consumed by the targeted population, then the transit system may not be filling its role in the community. Methods for identifying the causes for poor or exemplary performance in the service effectiveness category, along with recommended improvement methods include the following:

- Examine your systems marketing policies - Are your schedules well known in the community? (in particular are they well known in the targeted community?) - If your system is demand responsive, do people know about your system and how to request a ride? - You may want to consider posting schedules at areas where riders are located (senior centers, schools, shopping malls, etc.)

- Look for ways to improve the comfort and safety of your system - Are your drivers courteous? - Are your vehicles on time? - Are your vehicles clean and safe? - You may consider administering a passenger survey to gain information about their perceptions regarding some of these issues, and other ways to make the system more comfortable for them

- Examine your contracting activities - Does your system contract its services to the fullest extent possible - Contracting your services to organizations affiliated with the targeted population (e.g. senior centers) is often a good way to increase service effectiveness and revenue efficiency

- Examine your dispatching practices - Is dispatching performed efficiently to minimize circuitous routing and to maximize vehicle utilization by passengers?

- Examine nearby transit systems for possible duplication of service or other inefficient routing and scheduling - You should consider coordinating your routing, scheduling, and dispatching activities with other nearby systems

- Examine your fare structure - Could you increase the utilization of vehicles by the targeted population (without sacrificing revenues) with a different fare structure?

- Examine your routes - Are there some routes where ridership is low? - Is there potential to move these routes to areas where ridership may increase? - Are the time schedules of your service appropriate? (i.e. could you attract more riders at different times?)

Cost Effectiveness

The cost effectiveness category of performance measures places expenses on a per passenger basis. Interpretation of cost effectiveness measures is complicated by the fact that the measures reflect service effectiveness and cost efficiency. Methods for identifying the causes for exemplary or poor performance in the cost effectiveness category include the following:

- Examine service effectiveness measures to determine whether ridership is adequate - If it is not, then make improvements in service effectiveness

- If service effectiveness measures are adequate, an in depth analysis of cost efficiency should be performed

Section
Nine

Performance Measure Averages, Outliers, and Values

This section of the guidebook presents averages of performance measures for each peer group, t-statistics (explained in Section 4) showing the performance measure values for each system that are significantly different than the peer group, and values of performance measures by peer group.

Table 14 presents t-statistics for each performance measure and each transit system. The t-statistics with asterisks represent outliers, suggesting an area where performance is exemplary or needs improvement. Transit systems that are included in this guidebook should use these t-statistics to evaluate their overall systems and specific parts of the systems. In addition, Table 15 presents verbal analysis of outliers.

Average performance measure values for each peer group are presented in Table 16. These averages provide a broad overview of the performance measure values of each peer group. Finally, Table 17 presents raw values of each performance measure for each system. Transit systems not included in this guidebook that wish to perform a complete statistical analysis of performance (as shown in Section 4) should use the values for all of the systems in the appropriate peer group.

APPENDIX A
SURVEY

Survey

Date _____ Agency _____

Contact Person _____

Address _____

Telephone # _____

Please answer the following questions carefully. Reported statistics should only include those due to passenger transportation operations. If your agency operates a meal delivery service, try to separate the passenger operations from this service.

1. What types of service are provided by your agency? (please check all that apply.)

   Fixed Route _____ Demand Responsive / Dial-a-Ride _____
   Unscheduled Fixed Route _____ Other (specify) _____

2. What percentage of your service is provided to the following people?

   Elderly/Handicapped _____ Youth (under 16) _____
   General Population _____ Low Income (not elderly or youth) _____

3. What restrictions are there (if any) on who can use your service (if no restrictions, write none)?

   _____

   _____

4. What percentages (estimated) of each kind of trip do you provide?

   Shopping _____ Medical _____ Employment _____
   Education _____ Recreation _____ Senior Center _____
   General Purpose _____ Other (specify) _____

5. How many active vehicles are in your fleet? _____

6. Please list the make, age, and odometer readings of all the vehicles in your fleet.

Make	Year	Odometer Reading (Mileage)	Describe Condition

7. Does your agency expand its vehicle fleet in busy periods? If so, by how many?

_____

8. Approximately how many miles did your vehicles travel during the 1991-1992 (July 1 to June 30) fiscal year (total of all vehicles, including deadhead or non-revenue miles)?

_____

9. How many vehicle breakdowns occurred on your system during the 1991-1992 fiscal year?

_____

10. How many vehicle accidents occurred on your system during the 1991-1992 fiscal year?

_____

11. Approximately how many hours did your vehicles operate during the 1991-1992 fiscal year (total of all vehicles, including deadhead or non-revenue hours)?

_____

12. Approximately how many one-way passenger trips did you supply during the 1991-1992 fiscal year (every time a person boards the bus and gets off the bus at a different location a one-way passenger trip is made; for example, if you take a person from their home to the doctor and then back home, there have been two one-way passenger trips)?

_____

13. How many gallons of fuel did your vehicles consume in Fiscal Year 1991-1992?

_____

14. How many square miles is your service area (service area is defined as the area for whose residents you provide service; if you serve a particular county's residents by taking them to a retail center several counties away, but don't provide service for anyone in between, then your service area is just the county from which riders are drawn)? _____

15. Please describe the boundaries of your service area. (e.g. our service area encompasses all of Cass and Clay counties)

_____

_____

16. Please specify the hours of each day that you provide each category of service.

Type of Service	Day of the Week						
	Mon	Tues	Wed	Thur	Fri	Sat	Sun
Fixed Route							
Dial-a-Ride/ Demand Res							
Unscheduled Fixed Route							
Other (spec.)							

17. What types of performance evaluation does your system use? (check all that apply)

Examine ratios, such as operating expense per vehicle hour _____
Administer rider surveys _____
Meet with staff _____
Other (specify) _____

18. Please include all of your expenses and revenues resulting from your passenger transportation operations in the following tables. Expenses and revenues from delivering meals should not be included.

Direct Operating Expenses	FY 91-92 (cash)	FY 91-92 (in-kind)	FY 91-92 (total)
Wages and Fringe Ben. (direct operating):			
Drivers			
Helpers			
Dispatchers and Schedulers			
Supervisors			
Total Direct Wages and Fringe			
Maintenance and Fuel:			
Gas and Oil			
Tires			
Spare Parts			
Routine Maintenance			
Other Maintenance and Repairs			
Total Maintenance and Fuel			
Advertising and Promotion:			
Scheduling			
Maps			
Signs			
Other			

Total Advertising and Promotion			
Parking (Storage)			
Inspections			
Insurance			
Vehicle Depreciation			
Other Expenses (specify)			
Total Direct Operating Expenses (add all bold items)			

Indirect Operating Expenses (Administrative)	FY 91-92 (cash)	FY 91-92 (in-kind)	FY 91-92 (total)
Wage and Fringe Benefits:			
Office Staff			
Guards and Security			
Total Wage and Fringe (Indirect)			
Office Supplies			
Telephone			
Utilities			
Taxes (license)			
Data Processing (record keeping)			
Rent (or facility depreciation)			
Office Equipment (depreciation)			
Other Expenses (specify)			
Total Indirect Operating Expenses (Administrative, add all bold items)			

Capital Expenditures	FY 91-92 (cash)	FY 91-92 (in-kind)	FY 91-92 (total)
Vehicles			
Radios			
Office Equipment			
Other (please specify)			
Total Capital Expenditures (add all bold items)			

Revenues	FY 91-92
Farebox Revenue	
Local Revenue:	
Local Mill Levy	
Other (specify)	
Total Local Revenue	
State Funding	
Charitable Contributions (specify)	
In-Kind Contributions (specify)	
Federal Revenues:	
Section 18	
Section 16	
Title III	
Other (specify)	
Total Federal Revenues	
Other Revenues (specify)	
Total Revenues (add all bold items)	

19. How many full, part time, and volunteer employees do you have?

Total

Full Time _____ Part Time _____
Hours per Week for Part Time _____
Volunteer (list hrs. per week) _____

Administrative

Full Time _____ Part Time _____
Hours per Week for Part Time _____
Volunteer (list hrs. per week) _____

Operating

Full Time _____ Part Time _____
Hours per Week for Part Time _____
Volunteer (list hrs. per week) _____

20. Are there other operators in your service area? If so, what attempts have you made to coordinate with them?

_____

_____

APPENDIX B
TABLES

TABLE 14A: PEER GROUP ONE
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	BLUE PEAKS DEVEL	NE. CO. TRANSP.	ROCS	SOURIS BASIN TRANSP.	SOUTH CENTRAL SEN.SERV	SWEET-WATER CO TRANSP.	TRI-VALLEY HEART. EXP.	WEST RIVER
1.COST EFFICIENCY								
TOT EXP/VHCL MI	-4.134*	2.184	-1.152	-0.507	-2.872*	0.769	4.781*	0.931
TOT EXP/VHCL HR	-2.557*	0.062	1.459	0.798	-4.556*	4.352*	2.079	-1.636
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	-3.357*	1.473	-1.160	-1.068	-2.270	0.841	5.841*	-0.300
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	-1.726	-0.391	0.950	-0.374	-3.695*	4.170*	3.712*	-2.646*
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	-3.529*	2.872*	-0.229	1.771	-2.659*	-0.070	-2.494*	4.338*
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	-2.788*	1.210	1.682	3.279*	-3.326*	1.487	-3.832*	2.288
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	-1.581	-1.230	NA	-1.208	-3.460*	3.054*	0.564	3.861*
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	1.503	-2.163	NA	-0.503	-3.234*	4.656*	-1.278	1.018
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	1.996	-1.233	-0.777	-2.847*	1.490	0.818	4.678*	-4.124*
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	-1.996	1.233	0.777	2.847*	-1.490	-0.818	-4.678*	4.124*
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI	-4.122*	1.567	0.412	-0.712	-1.998	-1.043	5.538*	0.358
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR	-4.096*	0.137	3.808*	0.275	-2.937*	0.503	3.712*	-1.403
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	3.999*	-2.632*	NA	-1.130	-1.920	1.769	-2.387	2.301
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	-4.597*	0.212	3.917*	-0.393	1.169	-2.981*	2.995*	-0.322
2. OPERATING EFFICIENCY								
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	-3.357*	1.473	-1.160	-1.068	-2.270	0.841	5.841*	-0.300
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	-1.726	-0.391	0.950	-0.374	-3.695*	4.170*	3.712*	-2.646*
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-3.119*	1.247	0.187	-1.159	-1.348	-1.013	6.250*	-0.964
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-3.093*	0.158	2.972*	-0.729	-2.050	0.146	5.136*	-2.539*
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-3.814*	1.249	1.338	NA	-1.486	-1.456	4.439*	-0.270
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-3.368*	0.089	4.400*	NA	-1.748	-0.388	2.452*	-1.437
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	1.996	-1.233	-0.777	-2.847*	1.490	0.818	4.678*	-4.124*
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL	-3.445*	0.082	-2.136	-1.778	0.482	4.914*	3.205*	-1.323

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-Value.

TABLE 14A: PEER GROUP ONE
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	BLUE PEAKS DEVEL	NE. CO. TRANSP.	ROCS	SOURIS BASIN TRANSP.	SOUTH CENTRAL SEN.SERV	SWEET-WATER CO TRANSP.	TRI-VALLEY HEART. EXP.	WEST RIVER
3. ADMINISTRATION EFFICIENCY								
VHCL MILE/OPR EMPL	NA	NA	-2.922*	-1.950	3.390*	0.263	2.246	-1.027
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	-3.529*	2.872*	-0.229	1.771	-2.659*	-0.070	-2.494*	4.338*
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	-2.788*	1.210	1.682	3.279*	-3.326*	1.487	-3.832*	2.288
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-3.786*	1.325	0.876	1.619	-2.593*	-0.195	-2.225	4.981*
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-3.477*	-0.029	2.974*	2.760*	-2.945*	1.056	-3.136*	2.797*
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	-1.996	1.233	0.777	2.847*	-1.490	-0.818	-4.678*	4.124*
ADMIN EXP/VHCL	-4.027*	1.809	-1.319	0.901	-0.885	3.681*	-3.212*	3.052*
VHCL MILE/ADMIN EMPL	NA	-2.223	-0.646	-1.329	2.680*	3.455*	NA	-1.937
4. LABOR EFFICIENCY								
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-4.122*	1.567	-0.411	-0.712	-1.998	-1.043	5.538*	0.358
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-4.096*	0.137	3.808*	0.275	-2.937*	0.503	3.712*	-1.403
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-3.199*	1.247	0.187	-1.159	-1.348	-1.013	6.250*	-0.964
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-3.093*	0.158	2.972*	-0.729	-2.050	0.146	5.136*	-2.539*
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-3.786*	1.325	0.876	1.619	-2.593*	-0.195	-2.225	4.981*
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-3.477*	-0.029	2.974*	2.760*	-2.945*	1.056	-3.136*	2.797*
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	-4.597*	0.212	3.917*	-0.393	1.169	-2.981*	2.995*	-0.322
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP	-2.829*	0.221	2.674*	-1.572	1.878	-2.511*	4.689*	-2.551*
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP	-3.156*	-0.036	2.164	2.377*	-1.503	-0.700	-3.609*	4.464*
VHCL MILES/EMPL	NA	NA	-1.922	-1.406	4.020*	1.174	0.656	-2.522*
VHCL HOURS/EMPL	NA	NA	-2.702*	-1.835	3.308*	-0.712	2.702*	-0.761

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-Value.

TABLE 14A: PEER GROUP ONE
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	BLUE PEAKS DEVEL	NE. CO. TRANSP.	ROCS	SOURIS BASIN TRANSP.	SOUTH CENTRAL SEN.SERV	SWEET-WATER CO TRANSP.	TRI-VALLEY HEART. EXP.	WEST RIVER
5. REVENUE EFFICIENCY								
OPR REV/VHCL MI	-3.774*	-0.745	3.897*	-1.855	-0.331	4.552*	-0.543	-1.202
OPR REV/VHCL HR	-2.905*	-1.253	4.372*	-1.346	-0.614	4.551*	-1.261	-1.544
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI	-4.602*	-0.513	1.282	0.542	0.232	-3.292*	4.059*	2.292
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR	-4.725*	-1.274	3.909*	1.739	0.252	-2.911*	2.090	0.920
OPR REV/PASS	-4.231*	-1.859	0.875	-0.941	1.843	5.203*	0.586	-1.476
FAREBOX REV/PASS	-3.762*	-1.678	-1.213	1.977	1.788	-2.797*	4.641*	1.044
OPR REV/TOT EXP	-3.439*	-1.363	4.656*	-1.605	1.595	3.264*	-1.699	-1.409
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP	-3.483*	-1.296	4.894*	-1.423	1.315	3.060*	-1.990	-1.0770
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP	-4.547*	-1.376	2.478*	1.014	3.448*	-3.354*	0.730	1.610
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP	-4.497*	-1.290	2.485*	1.450	2.821*	-3.379*	-0.150	2.509*
OPR REV/VHCL	-2.826*	-1.177	1.117	-1.763	1.039	6.156*	-1.103	-1.444
FAREBOX REV/VHCL	-4.740*	-1.110	0.190	-0.094	4.105*	-2.438*	2.787*	1.300
6. MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY								
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	-1.581	-1.230	NA	-1.208	-3.460*	3.054*	0.564	3.861*
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	1.503	-2.163	NA	-0.503	-3.234*	4.656*	-1.278	1.018
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	3.999*	-2.632*	NA	-1.130	-1.921	1.769	-2.387	2.301
MAINT EXP/VHCL	-1.627	-1.596	NA	-1.537	-1.192	5.603*	-0.711	1.061
7. VEHICLE EFFICIENCY								
VHCL MILES/VHCL	-1.140	-1.512	-1.846	-1.408	4.806*	4.326*	-1.637	-1.590
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	-3.474*	0.303	-2.967*	-1.962	5.235*	1.780	0.660	0.425
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL	-1.627	-1.596	NA	-1.537	1.192	5.603*	-0.711	1.061
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN	5.934*	-0.413	-1.471	-1.411	-1.101	NA	-0.948	-0.589

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-Value.

TABLE 14A: PEER GROUP ONE
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	BLUE PEAKS DEVEL	NE. CO. TRANSP.	ROCS	SOURIS BASIN TRANSP.	SOUTH CENTRAL SEN.SERV	SWEET-WATER CO TRANSP.	TRI-VALLEY HEART. EXP.	WEST RIVER
8. SOCIAL EFFECTIVENESS								
PASS/CAPITA	2.657*	2.192	0.912	-3.095*	-0.538	3.903*	-2.909*	-3.121*
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP	4.414*	0.644	0.031	-2.368*	-1.776	3.917*	-2.729*	-2.133
VHCL MILES/CAPITA	2.788*	0.201	-1.401	-2.322	2.099	4.399*	-2.407*	-3.358*
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA	-0.182	2.615*	-2.399*	-2.832*	3.599*	3.445*	-1.252	-2.994*
VHCL MILES/ELD POP	1.376	-0.644	-1.447	-1.521	-0.627	6.501*	-1.759	-1.880
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP	-0.046	0.441	-1.944	-1.810	-0.203	6.630*	-1.389	-1.680
9. SERVICE EFFECTIVENESS								
PASS/VHCL MI	-0.042	3.083*	5.007*	-2.839*	-2.981*	-0.285	-2.092	0.151
PASS/VHCL HR	2.976*	-0.133	5.227*	-1.772	-2.483*	0.556	-2.748*	-1.623
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI	1.191	1.768	5.069*	-1.639	-2.631*	-3.286*	-1.853	1.382
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR	3.761*	-0.522	5.074*	-1.002	-2.193	-1.925	-2.378*	-0.814
PASS/VHCL	-0.916	1.332	2.357	-3.638*	0.542	4.757*	-3.178*	-1.255
VHCL MILES/ACCDNTS	-0.936	5.278*	-3.008*	-0.345	2.687*	-1.230	-3.008*	-0.561
10. COST EFFECTIVENESS								
TOT EXP/PASS	-3.292*	-0.859	-2.920*	1.766	-0.600	0.209	5.690*	0.006
DIR OPR EXP/PASS	-2.694*	-0.963	-2.577*	0.779	-0.347	0.250	6.310*	-0.758
ADMIN EXP/PASS	-3.396*	0.291	-2.166	4.843*	-1.268	-0.144	-1.620	3.461*
MAINT EXP/PASS	-2.320	-3.385*	NA	0.813	-2.487*	2.486*	2.152	2.740*
LABOR EXP/PASS	-3.278*	-0.741	-1.769	1.036	-0.253	-1.021	6.272*	-0.246
SUBSIDY/PASS	-1.453	0.495	-3.943*	NA	1.383	0.344	NA	3.173*

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-Value.

TABLE 14B: PEER GROUP TWO
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATSTICS)

	CAMPBELL SEN. CIT.	EAGLE TRANSIT	SUBLETTE HI-C	SHERBURNE HEART	UNITA SENIOR CIT.
1.COST EFFICIENCY					
TOT EXP/VHCL MI	-0.827	0.624	3.593*	-1.330	-2.061
TOT EXP/VHCL HR	-1.366	2.133	1.247	1.230	-3.243*
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	0.209	1.921	2.411	-1.993	-2.547
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	-0.004	3.115*	-1.100	0.874	-2.885*
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	-1.534	-0.563	3.923*	-0.540	-1.285
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	-2.200	-0.334	3.344*	0.925	-1.735
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	-1.693	2.228	2.609	-1.115	-2.029
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	-1.979	2.997*	-0.470	1.561	-2.109
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	2.417	0.721	-3.415*	-0.846	1.124
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	-2.417	-0.721	3.415*	0.846	-1.124
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI	-2.409	1.947	2.619	-0.297	-1.861
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR	-2.353	2.062	-0.665	2.636	-1.680
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	-2.381	2.120	-2.451	1.082	1.631
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	-2.700	0.630	-1.991	2.258	1.803
2. OPERATING EFFICIENCY					
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	0.209	1.921	2.411	-1.993	-2.547
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	-0.004	3.115*	-1.100	0.874	-2.885*
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-1.936	3.055*	1.671	-1.049	-1.740
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-1.868	2.802*	-1.542	2.049	-1.442
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-2.813*	0.734	3.289*	-0.613	-0.596
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-2.966*	1.121	-0.667	3.037*	-0.526
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	2.417	0.721	-3.415*	-0.846	1.124
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL	-0.677	1.163	-2.200	3.295*	-1.581

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-Value.

TABLE 14B: PEER GROUP TWO
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATSTICS)

	CAMPBELL SEN. CIT.	EAGLE TRANSIT	SUBLETTE HI-C	SHERBURNE HEART	UNITA SENIOR CIT.
3. ADMINISTRATION EFFICIENCY					
VHCL MILE/OPR EMPL	NA	-0.966	-1.301	2.978*	-0.712
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	-1.534	-0.563	3.923*	-0.540	-1.285
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	-2.200	-0.334	3.344*	0.925	-1.735
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-2.508	0.266	3.240*	0.650	-1.648
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-2.638	0.481	0.847	3.025*	-1.715
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	-2.417	-0.721	3.415*	0.846	-1.124
ADMIN EXP/VHCL	-1.900	-0.186	-0.147	3.747*	-1.514
VHCL MILE/ADMIN EMPL	1.596	1.734	2.406	1.567	-2.491
4. LABOR EFFICIENCY					
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-2.409	1.947	2.619	-0.297	-1.861
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-2.353	2.062	-0.665	2.636	-1.680
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-1.936	3.055*	1.671	-1.049	-1.740
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-1.868	2.802*	-1.542	2.049	-1.442
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-2.508	0.266	3.240*	0.650	-1.648
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-2.638	0.481	0.847	3.025*	-1.715
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	-2.700	0.630	-1.991	2.258	1.803
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP	-1.484	0.818	-2.975*	0.911	2.730
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP	-3.072*	-0.030	0.713	3.092*	-0.702
VHCL MILES/EMPL	2.034	-0.743	-1.703	2.689	-2.277
VHCL HOURS/EMPL	3.328*	-0.783	-0.844	0.904	-2.604

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-Value.

TABLE 14B: PEER GROUP TWO
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATSTICS)

	CAMPBELL SEN. CIT.	EAGLE TRANSIT	SUBLETTE HI-C	SHERBURNE HEART	UNITA SENIOR CIT.
			5. REVENUE EFFICIENCY		
OPR REV/VHCL MI	-1.162	3.730*	-1.951	0.300	-0.918
OPR REV/VHCL HR	-1.397	3.202*	-2.122	1.432	-1.115
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI	-0.189	1.195	-2.170	3.146*	-1.982
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR	-0.648	0.377	-1.819	3.685*	-1.596
OPR REV/PASS	-1.880	0.025	-2.562	1.935	2.482
FAREBOX REV/PASS	-0.860	-0.864	-1.736	3.911*	-0.451
OPR REV/TOT EXP	-1.480	2.789*	-2.853*	1.363	0.181
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP	-1.675	2.544	-2.700	1.852	-0.022
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP	-0.179	-0.052	-2.114	3.697*	-1.352
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP	-0.506	-0.169	-1.848	3.822*	-1.300
OPR REV/VHCL	-1.513	1.795	-1.974	2.986*	-1.295
FAREBOX REV/VHCL	-0.915	-0.302	-1.421	3.924*	-1.286
			6. MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY		
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	-1.693	2.228	2.609	-1.115	-2.029
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	-1.979	2.997*	-0.470	1.561	-2.109
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	-2.381	2.120	-2.451	1.082	1.631
MAINT EXP/VHCL	-1.400	1.666	-1.813	3.400*	-1.354
			7. VEHICLE EFFICIENCY		
VHCL MILES/VHCL	-0.891	-0.352	-1.965	3.849*	-0.641
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	-0.691	-0.021	-2.493	3.624*	-0.420
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL	-1.400	1.166	-1.813	3.400*	-1.354
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN	-0.667	-0.973	-1.264	-1.077	3.981*

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-Value.

TABLE 14B: PEER GROUP TWO
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATSTICS)

	CAMPBELL SEN. CIT.	EAGLE TRANSIT	SUBLETTE HI-C	SHERBURNE HEART	UNITA SENIOR CIT.
8. SOCIAL EFFECTIVENESS					
PASS/CAPITA	1.506	0.355	2.655	-1.832	-2.684
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP	3.793*	-1.290	0.210	-1.019	-1.694
VHCL MILES/CAPITA	0.334	-1.912	-2.399	0.856	3.122*
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA	0.846	-2.131	-0.992	-1.225	3.502*
VHCL MILES/ELD POP	1.567	-2.135	-2.233	-0.028	2.828*
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP	1.946	-2.054	-1.675	-1.058	2.841*
9. SERVICE EFFECTIVENESS					
PASS/VHCL MI	-0.446	0.714	3.486*	-1.668	-2.087
PASS/VHCL HR	-0.315	2.200	2.267	-1.264	-2.886*
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI	-0.599	0.462	3.632*	-1.488	-2.006
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR	-0.567	1.803	2.661	-1.013	-2.884*
PASS/VHCL	-0.479	2.942*	-1.101	1.438	-2.799*
VHCL MILES/ACCDNTS	-0.901	-1.248	3.968*	-1.248	-0.572
10. COST EFFECTIVENESS					
TOT EXP/PASS	-1.345	-1.476	-1.699	1.055	3.466*
DIR OPR EXP/PASS	-0.842	-1.260	-2.066	0.544	3.625*
ADMIN EXP/PASS	-2.861*	-1.632	0.891	2.769	0.833
MAINT EXP/PASS	-1.620	-1.019	-1.845	1.041	3.443*
LABOR EXP/PASS	-1.735	-1.158	-1.763	1.405	3.251*
SUBSIDY/PASS	-1.112	-1.834	-1.254	0.518	3.682*

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-Value.

TABLE 14C: PEER GROUP THREE
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	HEARTLAND EXPRESS	COTTONWOOD COUNTY	CITY OF MONTEVIDEO	ANNANDALE HEARTLAND EXPRESS	LINCOLN COUNTY TRANSP.	MAHNOMEN COUNTY HEARTLAND	LESUEUR PARATRANSIT
1. Cost Efficiency							
TOT EXP/VHCL MI	-0.948	-1.717	4.247*	-5.819*	6.659*	-5.961*	6.965*
TOT EXP/VHCL HR	-3.525*	-1.014	-1.682	-4.198*	1.234	-1.621	0.075
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	1.371	0.142	3.555*	-4.046*	2.957*	-4.677*	5.357*
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	-2.562*	0.128	-1.781	-3.502*	-0.424	-1.080	-0.344
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	-5.698*	-4.763*	2.510*	-5.398*	10.146*	-4.265*	5.239*
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	-4.458*	-3.545*	-0.665	-4.131*	5.015*	-2.306*	1.137
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	0.153	-1.470	-0.887	-2.091*	-4.026*	-4.765*	0.021
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	-1.596	-1.148	-2.301*	-2.135*	-4.047*	-4.563*	-1.459
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	6.742*	5.410*	-0.240	5.586*	-5.081*	2.903*	-1.203
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	-6.742*	-5.410*	0.240	-5.586*	5.081*	-2.903*	1.203
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI	NA	-0.811	2.233*	-5.242*	9.169*	-5.178*	9.511*
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR	NA	-0.571	-1.892	-3.576*	2.378*	-1.616	1.303
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	0.456	-1.272	-2.428*	0.310	-5.210*	-5.666*	-2.243*
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	NA	1.665	-3.333*	-2.857*	6.556*	-1.842	6.608*
2. Operating Efficiency							
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	1.371	0.142	3.555*	-4.046*	2.957*	-4.677*	5.357*
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	-2.562*	0.128	-1.781	-3.502*	0.424	-1.080	-0.344
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	3.631*	1.081	3.732*	-4.364*	5.680*	-4.850*	9.096*
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-1.415	0.697	-1.518	-3.076*	0.805	-0.867	1.056
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL MI	6.854*	3.129*	2.929*	-2.897*	2.352*	-7.573*	7.227*
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-0.476	1.714	-1.998	-2.491*	-0.886	-3.605*	0.127
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	6.742*	5.410*	-0.240	5.586*	-5.081*	2.903*	-1.203
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL	8.827*	-3.251*	0.102	-1.102	1.548	12.077*	2.853*

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-value.

TABLE 14C: PEER GROUP THREE
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	HEARTLAND EXPRESS	COTTONWOOD COUNTY	CITY OF MONTEVIDEO	ANNANDALE HEARTLAND EXPRESS	LINCOLN COUNTY TRANSP.	MAHNOMEN COUNTY HEARTLAND	LESUEUR PARATRANSIT
3. Administration Efficiency							
VHCL MILE/OPR EMPL	2.203*	-2.198*	-2.227*	13.549*	-1.568	7.857*	-2.434*
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	-5.698*	-4.763*	2.510*	-5.398*	10.146*	-4.265*	5.239*
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	-4.458*	-3.545*	-0.665	-4.131*	5.015*	-2.306*	1.137
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	NA	-4.340*	-1.658	-5.557*	11.357*	-4.586*	6.389*
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	NA	-3.353*	-2.525*	-4.346*	5.803*	-3.125*	1.806
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	-6.742*	-5.410*	0.240	-5.586*	5.081*	-2.903*	1.203
ADMIN EXP/VHCL	-5.183*	-5.211*	1.266	-4.932*	10.945*	3.396*	5.344*
VHCL MILE/ADMIN EMPL	-3.108*	14.326*	4.998*	2.111*	-3.113*	-0.182	-2.442*
4. Labor Efficiency							
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI	NA	-0.811	2.233*	-5.242*	9.169*	-5.178*	9.511*
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR	NA	-0.571	-1.892	-3.576*	2.378*	-1.616	1.303
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	3.631*	1.081	3.732*	-4.364*	5.680*	-4.850*	9.096*
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-1.415	0.697	-1.518	-3.076*	0.805	-0.867	1.056
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	NA	-4.340*	-1.658	-5.557*	11.357*	-4.586*	6.389*
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	NA	-3.353*	-2.525*	-4.346*	5.803*	-3.125*	1.806
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	NA	1.665	-3.333*	-2.857*	6.556*	-1.842	6.608*
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP	9.555*	6.087*	-0.092	3.642*	-0.380	2.361*	3.479*
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP	NA	-5.076*	-3.285*	-6.809*	6.513*	-4.470*	2.449*
VHCL MILES/EMPL	-0.032	-0.989	0.311	15.760*	-1.852	8.305*	-2.140*
VHCL HOURS/EMPL	3.292*	-1.269	4.075*	16.421*	-0.736	2.604*	-0.328

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-value.

TABLE 14C: PEER GROUP THREE
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	HEARTLAND EXPRESS	COTTONWOOD COUNTY	CITY OF MONTEVIDEO	ANNANDALE HEARTLAND EXPRESS	LINCOLN COUNTY TRANSP.	MAHNOMEN COUNTY HEARTLAND	LESUEUR PARATRANSIT
5. Revenue Efficiency							
OPR REV/VHCL MI	1.358	-2.421*	2.766*	-2.459*	-1.697	-4.315*	2.991*
OPR REV/VHCL HR	-1.301	-2.427*	-0.605	-2.764*	-2.585*	-3.902*	-0.015
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI	6.019*	-2.743*	9.283*	-5.415*	-1.063	-7.133*	9.804*
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR	0.152	-2.017	1.494	-4.533*	-2.323*	-4.860*	2.630*
OPR REV/PASS	-3.097*	-2.205*	-2.200*	-0.625	9.700*	-3.153*	-1.709
FAREBOX REV/PASS	-2.530*	-1.442	-1.435	-2.196*	13.092*	-2.598*	-0.835
OPR REV/TOT EXP	1.402	-2.153*	0.335	-0.390	-2.975*	-3.632*	-0.288
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP	0.209	-2.836*	0.382	-1.241	-2.811*	-4.098*	-0.127
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP	7.728*	-2.284*	4.722*	-2.855*	-4.599*	-6.450*	2.967*
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP	4.342*	-3.808*	4.803*	-4.337*	-3.741*	-7.188*	3.443*
OPR REV/VHCL	8.600*	-4.000*	1.390	-1.430	-2.095*	-1.935	2.947*
FAREBOX REV/VHCL	13.865*	-3.910*	3.693*	-3.033*	-1.223	-0.998	5.890*
6. Maintenance Efficiency							
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	0.153	-1.470	-0.887	-2.091*	-4.026*	-4.765*	0.021
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	-1.596	-1.148	-2.301*	-2.135*	-4.047*	-4.563*	-1.459
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	0.456	-1.272	-2.428*	0.310	-5.210*	-5.666*	-2.243*
MAINT EXP/VHCL	4.431*	-2.700*	-1.723	-0.849	-3.970*	-4.438*	-0.377
7. Vehicle Efficiency							
VHCL MILES/VHCL	4.291*	-3.044*	-2.101*	1.776	-1.087	19.780*	-1.298
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	13.031*	-3.924*	0.954	2.804*	0.544	11.423*	1.571
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL	4.431*	-2.700*	-1.723	-0.849	-3.970*	-4.438*	-0.377
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN	0.230	6.878*	2.207*	NA	-3.000*	-3.000*	8.048*

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-value.

TABLE 14C: PEER GROUP THREE
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	HEARTLAND EXPRESS	COTTONWOOD COUNTY	CITY OF MONTEVIDEO	ANNANDALE HEARTLAND EXPRESS	LINCOLN COUNTY TRANSP.	MAHNOMEN COUNTY HEARTLAND	LESUEUR PARATRANSIT
8. Social Effectiveness							
PASS/CAPITA	8.879*	-3.485*	6.841*	-2.315*	-3.330*	-1.878	8.828*
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP	6.564*	-3.664*	3.924*	-0.310	-4.032*	-1.227	1.730
VHCL MILES/CAPITA	3.582*	-3.912*	2.933*	0.611	0.730	7.857*	5.481*
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA	10.031*	-4.984*	9.243*	0.829	2.476*	2.817*	12.197*
VHCL MILES/ELD POP	2.452*	-4.276*	1.252	6.422*	-0.761	8.921*	5.689*
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP	8.119*	-5.403*	6.225*	8.084*	0.342	3.493*	12.733*
9. Service Effectiveness							
PASS/VHCL MI	3.654*	-2.325*	2.873*	-3.168*	-4.193*	-3.957*	2.112*
PASS/VHCL HR	1.090	-2.116*	0.325	-3.505*	-4.846*	-3.550*	0.295
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI	2.133*	-2.678*	1.416	-2.578*	-4.023*	-3.122*	-1.640
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR	0.112	-2.907*	-0.560	-2.999*	-4.690*	-2.847*	-2.696*
PASS/VHCL	18.836*	-3.839*	3.115*	-2.328*	-5.223*	0.743	3.719*
VHCL MILES/ACCDNTS	2.590*	-1.831	0.842	-1.831	-1.831	-1.831	-1.831
10. Cost Effectiveness							
TOT EXP/PASS	-3.331*	-0.676	-2.535*	-1.116	19.932*	1.507	-1.924
DIR OPR EXP/PASS	-3.276*	0.362	-2.708*	-0.228	18.813*	2.792*	-2.097*
ADMIN EXP/PASS	-2.899*	-2.410*	-1.825	-2.514*	18.745*	-1.015	-1.310
MAINT EXP/PASS	-2.123*	-0.770	-2.269*	-0.278	-1.217	-3.127*	-1.915
LABOR EXP/PASS	NA	-0.533	-2.330*	-1.301	19.496*	0.712	-1.217
SUBSIDY/PASS	NA	-0.484	-1.855	-0.681	13.447*	NA	-1.453

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-value.

TABLE 14C: PEER GROUP THREE
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	BUTTE - SILVER BOW TRANSIT	DICKEY COUNTY SENIOR CIT.	DUNN COUNTY COA	KIDDER COUNTY COA	SOUTHWEST SENIOR SEVICES	CAVALIER COUNTY SEN.	RANSOM COUNTY COA
1. Cost Efficiency							
TOT EXP/VHCL MI	3.912*	-5.342*	-6.438*	-5.847*	5.626*	0.675	-0.263
TOT EXP/VHCL HR	0.786	-3.879*	-3.081*	1.339	-3.304*	-2.691*	3.145*
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	6.672*	-3.998*	-5.094*	-4.980*	6.079*	-1.712	1.520
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	2.636*	-3.426*	-2.599*	1.394	-2.959*	-3.734*	4.775*
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	-5.753*	-4.278*	-4.503*	-3.251*	0.072	5.802*	-4.287*
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	-4.406*	-3.319*	-2.957*	0.593	-2.722*	1.246	-2.533*
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	0.488	-1.835	-2.496*	2.088*	18.691*	-0.632	7.210*
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	-0.104	-1.869	-1.540	11.522*	4.913*	-1.971	13.133*
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	6.977*	3.341*	3.130*	0.665	2.317*	-6.049*	5.074*
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	-6.977*	-3.341*	-3.130*	-0.665	-2.317*	6.049*	-5.074*
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI	3.358*	-4.450*	-6.341*	-5.739*	2.312*	2.597*	-2.601*
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR	0.481	-3.124*	-3.278*	-0.348	-3.230*	-1.462	0.193
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	-1.153	0.409	-0.025	9.722*	12.796*	-1.202	8.458*
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	-0.220	-0.568	-6.872*	-5.619*	-5.286*	5.298*	-7.763*
2. Operating Efficiency							
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	6.672*	-3.998*	-5.094*	-4.980*	6.079*	-1.712	1.520
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	2.636*	-3.426*	-2.599*	1.394	-2.959*	-3.734*	4.775*
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	7.395*	-4.385*	-6.776*	-6.936*	4.504*	1.864	-1.837
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	2.504*	-3.050*	-3.343*	-1.099	-2.979*	-1.853	1.221
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL MI	8.908*	-2.922*	-6.394*	-6.034*	NA	-1.011	0.185
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL HR	3.024*	-2.459*	-3.242*	-0.094	NA	-3.115*	2.720*
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	6.977*	3.341*	3.130*	0.665	2.317*	-6.049*	5.074*
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL	10.741*	0.850	-5.759*	3.379*	0.498	-6.054*	2.387*

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-value.

TABLE 14C: PEER GROUP THREE
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	BUTTE - SILVER BOW TRANSIT	DICKEY COUNTY SENIOR CIT.	DUNN COUNTY COA	KIDDER COUNTY COA	SOUTHWEST SENIOR SEVICES	CAVALIER COUNTY SEN.	RANSOM COUNTY COA
3. Administration Efficiency							
VHCL MILE/OPR EMPL	NA	-0.686	-2.751*	1.350	-4.177*	NA	1.293
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	-5.753*	-4.278*	-4.503*	-3.251*	0.072	5.802*	-4.287*
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	-4.406*	-3.319*	-2.957*	0.593	-2.722*	1.246	-2.533*
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-5.202*	-3.660*	-4.068*	-2.382*	-2.779*	2.351*	-3.617*
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-4.109*	-2.966*	-2.791*	1.444	-3.465*	-0.392	-2.111*
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	-6.977*	-3.341*	-3.130*	-0.665	-2.317*	6.049*	-5.074*
ADMIN EXP/VHCL	-5.498*	-2.355*	-5.056*	2.672*	-1.418	-1.845	-3.763*
VHCL MILE/ADMIN EMPL	1.667	4.801*	4.709*	-0.332	-3.993*	NA	7.293*
4. Labor Efficiency							
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI	3.358*	-4.450*	-6.341*	-5.739*	2.312*	2.597*	-2.601*
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR	0.481	-3.124*	-3.278*	-0.348	-3.230*	-1.462	0.193
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	7.395*	-4.385*	-6.776*	-6.936*	4.504*	1.864	-1.837
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	2.504*	-3.050*	-3.343*	-1.099	-2.979*	-1.853	1.221
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-5.202*	-3.660*	-4.068*	-2.382*	-2.779*	2.351*	-3.617*
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-4.109*	-2.966*	-2.791*	1.444	-3.465*	-0.392	-2.111*
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	-0.220	-0.568	-6.872*	-5.619*	-5.286*	5.298*	-7.763*
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP	5.708*	1.808	-3.623*	-5.891*	-0.717	2.401*	-3.047*
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP	-6.481*	-2.656*	-2.916*	0.704	-4.493*	2.341*	-4.386*
VHCL MILES/EMPL	0.955	2.033	-3.389*	3.247*	-4.949*	NA	5.653*
VHCL HOURS/EMPL	1.844	2.320*	-3.926*	-2.006	-3.494*	NA	1.679

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-value.

TABLE 14C: PEER GROUP THREE
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	BUTTE - SILVER BOW TRANSIT	DICKEY COUNTY SENIOR CIT.	DUNN COUNTY COA	KIDDER COUNTY COA	SOUTHWEST SENIOR SEVICES	CAVALIER COUNTY SEN.	RANSOM COUNTY COA
5. Revenue Efficiency							
OPR REV/VHCL MI	0.729	-3.298*	-0.718	-1.268	-0.179	-0.571	-2.181*
OPR REV/VHCL HR	-0.352	-3.476*	0.443	3.304*	-3.147*	-2.311*	-1.028
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI	4.560*	-4.775*	1.206	-0.069	2.454*	1.546	-2.185*
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR	1.981	-4.039*	3.513*	9.027*	-3.405*	-1.793	0.678
OPR REV/PASS	NA	-3.454*	2.849*	9.281*	-2.924*	-3.534*	3.313*
FAREBOX REV/PASS	NA	-2.967*	4.728*	12.581*	-2.319*	-3.064*	5.294*
OPR REV/TOT EXP	-0.961	-2.087*	3.516*	1.740	-1.913	-1.075	-2.272*
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP	-1.900	-2.609*	2.904*	1.699	-2.345*	-0.110	-2.921*
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP	1.073	-2.098*	13.679*	8.679*	-1.610	0.751	-2.619*
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP	-1.304	-3.203*	11.554*	8.329*	-2.496*	3.488*	-4.036*
OPR REV/VHCL	4.143*	-2.091*	-2.795*	6.594*	-1.889	-4.177*	-1.944
FAREBOX REV/VHCL	7.577*	-1.218	-2.211*	11.035*	-0.932	-4.160*	-1.010
6. Maintenance Efficiency							
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	0.488	-1.835	-2.496*	2.088*	18.691*	-0.632	7.210*
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	-0.104	-1.869	-1.540	11.522*	4.913*	-1.971	13.133*
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	-1.153	0.409	-0.025	9.722*	12.796*	-1.202	8.458*
MAINT EXP/VHCL	2.794*	0.627	-3.342*	13.848*	11.149*	-3.372*	8.891*
7. Vehicle Efficiency							
VHCL MILES/VHCL	1.776	3.984*	-3.112*	9.321*	-2.605*	-4.708*	0.100
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	3.635*	5.496*	-4.866*	0.113	3.701*	-4.449*	-2.578*
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL	2.794*	0.627	-3.342*	13.848*	11.149*	-3.372*	8.891*
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN	0.199	-1.892	-3.000*	-1.527	-3.000*	-3.000*	0.499

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-value.

TABLE 14C: PEER GROUP THREE
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	BUTTE - SILVER BOW TRANSIT	DICKEY COUNTY SENIOR CIT.	DUNN COUNTY COA	KIDDER COUNTY COA	SOUTHWEST SENIOR SEVICES	CAVALIER COUNTY SEN.	RANSOM COUNTY COA
8. Social Effectiveness							
PASS/CAPITA	NA	-2.103*	-3.452*	-1.619	-1.287	-2.186*	-3.575*
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP	NA	-1.803	-3.111*	-1.471	-0.443	-1.682	-3.559*
VHCL MILES/CAPITA	-0.891	-0.956	-3.128*	11.260*	-2.606*	-3.748*	-2.473*
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA	-0.608	-1.171	-4.651*	1.584	1.121	-3.713*	-4.320*
VHCL MILES/ELD POP	-0.392	-1.622	-2.991*	10.835*	-2.859*	-3.687*	-2.983*
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP	0.106	-1.969	-4.606*	1.243	0.784	-4.005*	-4.805*
9. Service Effectiveness							
PASS/VHCL MI	NA	-2.239*	-3.177*	-4.071*	1.181	2.261*	-3.840*
PASS/VHCL HR	NA	-2.391*	-2.581*	-2.969*	-2.441*	0.244	-3.505*
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI	NA	-1.384	-2.348*	-3.297*	2.185*	2.981*	-3.165*
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR	NA	-1.570	-1.848	-2.537*	-1.490	1.001	-3.085*
PASS/VHCL	NA	1.375	-4.686*	-2.557*	0.238	-2.678*	-4.343*
VHCL MILES/ACCDNTS	-0.189	-1.831	-1.831	-1.831	-1.831	-1.831	-1.831
10. Cost Effectiveness							
TOT EXP/PASS	NA	-2.140*	-1.448	2.420*	-1.732	-2.855*	5.979*
DIR OPR EXP/PASS	NA	-1.888	-1.007	3.343*	-1.472	-3.495*	9.508*
ADMIN EXP/PASS	NA	-2.245*	-2.000	0.395	-1.918	-1.264	-1.238
MAINT EXP/PASS	NA	-1.109	-0.706	11.873*	4.199*	-2.118*	17.656*
LABOR EXP/PASS	NA	-1.879	-1.863	0.700	-1.917	-2.160*	2.383*
SUBSIDY/PASS	NA	-1.431	-1.125	0.707	-1.187	-1.906	3.839*

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-value.

TABLE 14C: PEER GROUP THREE
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	JAMES RIVER SENIOR CIT.	GOLDEN VALLEY COUNTY COA	SENIOR MEALS & SERVICES	ARROW TRANSIT	CODY COA	SPINK COUNTY PUB.
1. Cost Efficiency						
TOT EXP/VHCL MI	-1.113	-1.380	-2.281*	-3.620*	-0.472	-3.041*
TOT EXP/VHCL HR	-1.627	0.681	-2.211*	7.792*	-3.160*	-4.599*
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	-0.156	-4.330*	-2.067*	-4.656*	-0.158	-2.822*
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	-1.155	-2.201*	-2.286*	4.380*	-3.042*	-4.622*
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	-2.498*	6.719*	-0.973	1.721	-0.843	-1.140
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	-2.130*	7.914*	-1.020	13.214*	-2.048	-2.472*
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	7.589*	-3.474*	-2.400*	-2.147*	-2.068*	-1.746
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	6.518*	-2.949*	-2.447*	3.210*	-2.895*	-2.908*
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	2.570*	-9.845*	-0.221	-5.963*	0.798	-0.595
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	-2.570*	9.845*	0.221	5.963*	-0.798	0.595
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI	-0.766	-3.645*	NA	-2.279*	1.897	-2.093*
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR	-1.324	-1.472	NA	6.968*	-1.726	-3.520*
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	10.046*	-4.037*	-2.340*	-1.373	-2.479*	-1.034
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	0.046	-8.918*	NA	2.625*	6.653*	1.247
2. Operating Efficiency						
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	-0.156	-4.330*	-2.067*	-4.656*	-0.158	-2.822*
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	-1.115	-2.201*	-2.286*	4.380*	-3.042*	-4.622*
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.885	-7.450*	-2.556*	-4.771*	2.061*	-3.078*
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-0.432	-4.018*	-2.164*	3.995*	-1.786	-4.019*
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-2.604*	-6.661*	-0.692	-3.393*	1.472	-1.328
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-2.449*	-3.633*	-1.385	6.084*	-2.205*	-3.634*
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	2.570*	-9.845*	-0.221	-5.963*	0.798	-0.595
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL	-2.777*	-5.194*	-1.778	-3.106*	-3.097*	-4.720*

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-value.

TABLE 14C: PEER GROUP THREE
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	JAMES RIVER SENIOR CIT.	GOLDEN VALLEY COUNTY COA	SENIOR MEALS & SERVICES	ARROW TRANSIT	CODY COA	SPINK COUNTY PUB.
3. Administration Efficiency						
VHCL MILE/OPR EMPL	-1.155	NA	NA	-0.960	NA	-3.301*
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	-2.498*	6.719*	-0.973	1.721	-0.843	-1.140
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	-2.130*	7.914*	-1.020	13.214*	-2.048	-2.472*
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-3.901*	3.411*	NA	2.097*	0.373	-0.327
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-3.184*	4.502*	NA	13.176*	-1.385	-2.025
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	-2.570*	9.845*	0.221	5.963*	-0.798	0.595
ADMIN EXP/VHCL	-3.365*	3.031*	-0.422	3.827*	-2.339*	-2.831*
VHCL MILE/ADMIN EMPL	-2.151*	NA	NA	-1.835	-4.203*	-3.165*
4. Labor Efficiency						
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-0.766	-3.645*	NA	-2.279*	1.897	-2.093*
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-1.324	-1.472	NA	6.968*	-1.726	-3.520*
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.885	-7.450*	-2.556*	-4.771*	2.061*	-3.078*
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-0.432	-4.018*	-2.164*	3.995*	-1.786	-4.019*
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-3.901*	3.411*	NA	2.097*	0.373	-0.327
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-3.184*	4.502*	NA	13.176*	-1.385	-2.025
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	0.046	-8.918*	NA	2.625*	6.653*	1.247
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP	4.165*	-13.414*	-1.020	-3.943*	5.132*	-0.671
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP	-4.580*	5.559*	NA	6.539*	0.730	1.729
VHCL MILES/EMPL	-0.806	NA	-2.321*	-0.271	-4.229*	-3.526*
VHCL HOURS/EMPL	-0.357	NA	-1.996	-3.885*	-3.235*	-1.764

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-value.

TABLE 14C: PEER GROUP THREE
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	JAMES RIVER SENIOR CIT.	GOLDEN VALLEY COUNTY COA	SENIOR MEALS & SERVICES	ARROW TRANSIT	CODY COA	SPINK COUNTY PUB.
5. Revenue Efficiency						
OPR REV/VHCL MI	22.111*	-2.431*	4.900*	-1.045	-2.572*	-1.689
OPR REV/VHCL HR	17.989*	-1.898	3.529*	6.041*	-3.520*	-3.213*
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI	3.386*	-2.766*	-0.101	-6.522*	-3.091*	-1.045
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR	1.601	-0.998	-0.769	-1.708	-4.123*	-3.532*
OPR REV/PASS	14.209*	3.845*	2.296*	-2.583*	-4.431*	-2.615*
FAREBOX REV/PASS	-1.016	5.945*	-2.031	-4.784*	-4.158*	-1.942
OPR REV/TOT EXP	22.391*	-2.251*	6.256*	0.271	-2.595*	-0.850
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP	21.886*	-1.003	6.851*	1.702	-2.912*	-0.859
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP	4.778*	-2.561*	1.784	-6.506*	-3.530*	1.387
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP	3.499*	1.097	1.740	-5.948*	-4.014*	1.482
OPR REV/VHCL	16.770*	-3.903*	6.109*	-0.391	-4.000*	-3.508*
FAREBOX REV/VHCL	-0.443	-3.773*	-0.223	-4.713*	-3.910*	-3.216*
6. Maintenance Efficiency						
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	7.589*	-3.474*	-2.400*	-2.147*	-2.068*	-1.746
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	6.518*	-2.949*	-2.447*	3.210*	-2.895*	-2.908*
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	10.046*	-4.037*	-2.340*	-1.373	-2.479*	-1.034
MAINT EXP/VHCL	3.681*	-3.859*	-2.336*	-1.705	-2.958*	-2.904*
7. Vehicle Efficiency						
VHCL MILES/VHCL	-2.595*	-2.852*	-0.792	0.058	-2.828*	-3.119*
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	-2.675*	-4.442*	-0.404	-5.270*	-0.964	-0.695
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL	3.681*	-3.859*	-2.336*	-1.705	-2.958*	-2.904*
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN	-3.000*	-3.000*	NA	-1.944	-3.000*	-3.000*

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-value.

TABLE 14C: PEER GROUP THREE
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	JAMES RIVER SENIOR CIT.	GOLDEN VALLEY COUNTY COA	SENIOR MEALS & SERVICES	ARROW TRANSIT	CODY COA	SPINK COUNTY PUB.
8. Social Effectiveness						
PASS/CAPITA	-1.574	-3.636*	-1.294	12.159*	-1.354	-1.982
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP	-0.082	-3.314*	-0.487	13.247*	-0.076	-1.959
VHCL MILES/CAPITA	-2.208*	-2.384*	-1.522	16.031*	-2.915*	-2.023
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA	-2.564*	-3.869*	-1.759	1.794	-2.220*	0.113
VHCL MILES/ELD POP	-1.695	-2.127*	-1.789	14.542*	-2.744*	-2.111*
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP	-1.884	-3.694*	-2.069*	1.058	-1.772	0.132
9. Service Effectiveness						
PASS/VHCL MI	-0.147	-3.995*	-0.579	-0.460	1.803	-1.145
PASS/VHCL HR	-0.133	-4.051*	-0.554	11.055*	-0.133	-2.854*
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI	0.744	-3.048*	0.361	-0.026	2.537*	-1.219
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR	0.745	-3.126*	0.378	10.180*	0.633	-2.668*
PASS/VHCL	-1.176	-5.386*	0.479	1.690	0.501	-2.788*
VHCL MILES/ACCDNTS	3.316*	23.830*	1.483	1.061	-1.831	-1.831
10. Cost Effectiveness						
TOT EXP/PASS	-2.339*	6.519*	-2.381*	-2.740*	-2.905*	-2.248*
DIR OPR EXP/PASS	-2.221*	3.596*	-2.526*	-3.381*	-3.069*	-2.406*
ADMIN EXP/PASS	-2.177*	10.670*	-1.745	-1.166	-2.151*	-1.610
MAINT EXP/PASS	1.769	-0.520	-2.170*	-2.089*	-2.454*	-1.677
LABOR EXP/PASS	-1.996	2.367	NA	-2.184*	-2.146*	-1.851
SUBSIDY/PASS	-3.434*	NA	NA	-1.774	NA	NA

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-value.

TABLE 14C: PEER GROUP THREE
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	NIOBRARA TRANSIT	WALSH COUNTY TRANSP.	DAKOTA TRANSIT ASSOC.	SEMCAC HEARTLAND EXPRESS	RED WING TRANSIT SERV.	MAHUBE TRANSIT
1. Cost Efficiency						
TOT EXP/VHCL MI	-0.877	-5.777*	2.977*	-1.222	13.449*	7.611*
TOT EXP/VHCL HR	-4.861*	NA	NA	16.715*	6.987*	2.698*
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	-1.315	-6.986*	-0.574	-0.974	16.910*	3.982*
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	-4.969*	NA	NA	16.361*	10.057*	0.953
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	0.860	1.691	9.035*	-0.838	-5.473*	10.166*
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	-2.391*	NA	NA	10.123*	-4.185*	6.049*
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	0.790	-4.490*	-0.196	-4.827*	NA	2.520*
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	-2.291*	NA	NA	-4.663*	NA	1.591
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	-1.609	-10.447*	-7.067*	0.340	6.960*	-4.494*
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	1.609	10.447*	7.067*	-0.340	-6.960*	4.494*
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI	-0.945	-4.404*	3.070*	0.804	NA	9.543*
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR	-3.913*	NA	NA	16.272*	NA	3.455*
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	1.214	-5.059*	-1.500	-5.808*	NA	-0.582
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	-1.176	1.761	0.967	5.577*	NA	5.451*
2. Operating Efficiency						
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	-1.315	-6.986*	-0.574	-0.974	16.910*	3.982*
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	-4.969*	NA	NA	16.361*	10.057*	0.953
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-1.569	-7.438*	-0.452	1.807	7.167*	7.560*
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-4.327*	NA	NA	20.065*	3.087*	2.514*
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-0.822	-6.646*	1.875	0.863	11.166*	2.017*
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-4.332*	NA	NA	17.779*	4.982*	-0.426
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	-1.609	-10.447*	-7.067*	0.340	6.960*	-4.494*
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL	-6.225*	-4.418*	-1.444	-3.125*	6.897*	1.892

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-value.

TABLE 14C: PEER GROUP THREE
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	NIOBRARA TRANSIT	WALSH COUNTY TRANSP.	DAKOTA TRANSIT ASSOC.	SEMCAC HEARTLAND EXPRESS	RED WING TRANSIT SERV.	MAHUBE TRANSIT
3. Administration Efficiency						
VHCL MILE/OPR EMPL	NA	3.130*	-2.083*	-3.344*	NA	-2.497*
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	0.860	1.691	9.035*	-0.838	-5.473*	10.166*
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	-2.391*	NA	NA	10.123*	-4.185*	6.049*
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-0.176	1.606	7.376*	-1.768	NA	9.060*
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-2.575*	NA	NA	6.273*	NA	5.348*
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	1.609	10.447*	7.067*	-0.340	-6.960*	4.494*
ADMIN EXP/VHCL	-3.925*	6.139*	8.849*	-2.032	-5.608*	10.312*
VHCL MILE/ADMIN EMPL	-4.157*	-2.369*	-2.830*	-2.980*	NA	-3.045*
4. Labor Efficiency						
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-0.945	-4.404*	3.070*	0.804	NA	9.543*
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-3.913*	NA	NA	16.272*	NA	3.455*
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-1.569	-7.438*	-0.452	1.807	7.167*	7.560*
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-4.327*	NA	NA	20.065*	3.087*	2.514*
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-0.176	1.606	7.376*	-1.768	NA	9.060*
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-2.575*	NA	NA	6.273*	NA	5.348*
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	-1.176	1.761	0.967	5.577*	NA	5.451*
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP	-1.493	-7.924*	-4.806*	6.404*	-4.562*	0.845
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP	0.279	9.954*	5.868*	-1.660	NA	4.147*
VHCL MILES/EMPL	-4.093*	1.985	-1.635	-5.444*	NA	-2.573*
VHCL HOURS/EMPL	-1.661	NA	NA	-5.573*	NA	-2.006

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-value.

TABLE 14C: PEER GROUP THREE
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	NIOBRARA TRANSIT	WALSH COUNTY TRANSP.	DAKOTA TRANSIT ASSOC.	SEMCAC HEARTLAND EXPRESS	RED WING TRANSIT SERV.	MAHUBE TRANSIT
5. Revenue Efficiency						
OPR REV/VHCL MI	-3.808*	-3.186*	-0.662	-1.639	-2.638*	3.921*
OPR REV/VHCL HR	-4.519*	NA	NA	6.510*	-2.919*	2.167*
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI	-5.957*	-4.515*	1.335	-0.929	-3.246*	11.960*
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR	-6.049*	NA	NA	15.206*	-2.966*	6.835*
OPR REV/PASS	-5.551*	2.852*	-3.814*	-2.965*	-4.163*	0.675
FAREBOX REV/PASS	-5.526*	4.732*	-3.405*	-2.369*	-3.831*	2.075*
OPR REV/TOT EXP	-3.729*	-1.694	-1.734	-1.485	-3.907*	0.080
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP	-3.999*	0.074	-0.810	-1.683	-4.484*	1.040
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP	-6.722*	-0.990	-1.104	-0.403	-7.223*	4.005*
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP	-6.921*	3.980*	1.614	-0.723	-8.221*	6.567*
OPR REV/VHCL	-5.516*	-2.756*	-1.200	-3.052*	-3.846*	3.976*
FAREBOX REV/VHCL	-6.049*	-2.156*	0.040	-2.573*	-3.692*	7.342*
6. Maintenance Efficiency						
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	0.790	-4.490*	-0.196	-4.827*	NA	2.520*
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	-2.291*	NA	NA	-4.663*	NA	1.591
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	1.214	-5.059*	-1.500	-5.808*	NA	-0.582
MAINT EXP/VHCL	-3.128*	-4.247*	-0.658	-4.715*	NA	1.860
7. Vehicle Efficiency						
VHCL MILES/VHCL	-4.930*	1.631	-1.409	-2.528*	-2.415*	-1.298
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	-3.251*	NA	NA	-6.615*	-2.578*	-0.560
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL	-3.128*	-4.247*	-0.658	-4.715*	NA	1.860
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN	17.991*	-1.576	-2.097*	1.314	1.665	-3.000*

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-value.

TABLE 14C: PEER GROUP THREE
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	NIOBRARA TRANSIT	WALSH COUNTY TRANSP.	DAKOTA TRANSIT ASSOC.	SEMCAC HEARTLAND EXPRESS	RED WING TRANSIT SERV.	MAHUBE TRANSIT
8. Social Effectiveness						
PASS/CAPITA	10.505*	-3.922*	0.812	-3.939*	-2.184*	-2.910*
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP	15.491*	-3.772*	-0.313	-3.777*	-3.158*	-2.717*
VHCL MILES/CAPITA	-1.945	-3.827*	-1.739	-5.087*	-3.233*	-3.887*
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA	2.638*	NA	NA	-6.454*	-3.936*	-4.594*
VHCL MILES/ELD POP	-2.031*	-3.987*	-1.609	-5.267*	-3.113*	-3.769*
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP	2.765*	NA	NA	-6.707*	-3.772*	-4.398*
9. Service Effectiveness						
PASS/VHCL MI	20.570*	-4.194*	3.151*	-0.597	0.490	-0.009
PASS/VHCL HR	7.987*	NA	NA	14.168*	0.750	-0.284
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI	21.784*	-3.249*	0.367	0.209	-2.354*	-0.586
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR	9.112*	NA	NA	14.584*	-2.737*	-0.986
PASS/VHCL	5.130*	-4.666*	4.957*	-1.582	-0.228	0.696
VHCL MILES/ACCDNTS	-1.831	-1.831	0.023	-1.831	-1.831	-1.831
10. Cost Effectiveness						
TOT EXP/PASS	-4.189*	3.649*	-2.764*	-2.128*	0.078	-0.632
DIR OPR EXP/PASS	-4.667*	1.142	-3.486*	-2.174*	1.706	-1.163
ADMIN EXP/PASS	-2.674*	7.517*	-1.043	-1.708	-2.824*	0.411
MAINT EXP/PASS	-2.820*	-2.390*	-2.137*	-3.247*	NA	-0.362
LABOR EXP/PASS	-3.455*	3.045*	-2.284*	-1.477	NA	-0.109
SUBSIDY/PASS	-2.711*	1.903	-1.854	NA	NA	NA

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-value.

TABLE 14D: PEER GROUP FOUR
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	CARVER COUNTY TRANS.	MOUNTAIN EXPRESS	SENIOR RESOURCE CENTER	SENIOR TRANS.	SPECIAL TRANSIT
			1.COST EFFICIENCY		
TOT EXP/VHCL MI	-3.252*	2.231	0.836	-1.274	1.459
TOT EXP/VHCL HR	-3.038*	-1.630	0.952	2.250	1.466
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	-3.064*	2.613	0.96	-1.423	0.914
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	-3.220*	-1.387	1.475	2.124	1.009
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	-3.219*	0.464	0.241	-0.504	3.018*
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	-2.455	-1.952	-0.097	2.306	2.199
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	-1.654	2.681	NA	-1.394	0.367
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	-2.214	1.965	NA	-1.142	1.391
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	1.664	2.201	0.880	-1.951	-2.794*
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	-1.664	-2.201	-0.880	1.951	2.794*
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI	-2.864*	2.780*	0.373	-1.538	1.250
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR	-3.466*	-0.893	0.747	1.575	2.037
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	-1.311	2.744	NA	-1.646	0.213
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	0.554	3.282*	-1.336	-2.666	0.167
			2. OPERATING EFFICIENCY		
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	-3.064*	2.613	0.960	-1.423	0.914
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	-3.220*	-1.387	1.475	2.124	1.009
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-2.546	2.986*	0.528	-1.872	0.904
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-3.554*	0.171	1.656	-0.383	2.110
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-1.548	2.762	NA	-1.393	0.179
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-2.154	2.210	NA	-1.140	1.084
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	1.664	2.201	0.880	-1.951	-2.794*
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL	-1.033	-2.279	3.583*	-0.794	0.523

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-Value.

TABLE 14D: PEER GROUP FOUR
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	CARVER COUNTY TRANS.	MOUNTAIN EXPRESS	SENIOR RESOURCE CENTER	SENIOR TRANS.	SPECIAL TRANSIT
3. ADMINISTRATION EFFICIENCY					
VHCL MILE/OPR EMPL	3.819*	-1.832	-0.610	-0.081	-1.297
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	-3.219*	0.464	0.241	-0.504	3.018*
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	-2.455	-1.952	-0.097	2.306	2.199
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-3.451*	0.648	-0.582	0.797	2.588
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-1.611	-1.912	-0.879	3.483*	0.918
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	-1.664	-2.201	-0.880	1.951	2.794*
ADMIN EXP/VHCL	-1.868	-2.66	0.608	1.131	2.790*
VHCL MILE/ADMIN EMPL	3.791*	0.188	-1.479	-1.622	-0.878
4. LABOR EFFICIENCY					
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-2.864*	2.780*	0.373	-1.538	1.250
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-3.466*	-0.893	0.747	1.575	2.037
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-2.546	2.986*	0.528	-1.872	0.904
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-3.554*	0.171	1.656	-0.383	2.110
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-3.451*	0.648	-0.582	0.797	2.588
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-1.611	-1.912	-0.879	3.483*	0.918
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	0.554	3.282*	-1.336	-2.666	0.167
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP	0.009	3.090*	0.169	-3.228*	-0.039
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP	0.714	-2.122	-2.119	3.226*	0.301
VHCL MILES/EMPL	3.938*	-1.565	-0.711	-0.555	-1.107
VHCL HOURS/EMPL	3.924*	-1.249	-0.265	-1.385	-1.026

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-Value.

TABLE 14D: PEER GROUP FOUR
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	CARVER COUNTY TRANS.	MOUNTAIN EXPRESS	SENIOR RESOURCE CENTER	SENIOR TRANS.	SPECIAL TRANSIT
5. REVENUE EFFICIENCY					
OPR REV/VHCL MI	-2.057	NA	2.277	1.021	-1.241
OPR REV/VHCL HR	-1.638	NA	0.867	2.419	-1.647
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI	-1.261	-2.566	3.394*	0.543	-0.110
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR	-0.812	-2.893*	2.333	2.200	-0.828
OPR REV/PASS	-1.453	NA	0.532	2.603	-1.682
FAREBOX REV/PASS	-0.441	-3.069*	1.935	2.431	-0.855
OPR REV/TOT EXP	-0.707	NA	1.029	2.118	-2.440
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP	-0.879	NA	0.809	2.334	-2.264
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP	1.117	-3.291*	2.166	1.274	-1.267
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP	0.898	-3.370*	2.035	1.560	-1.124
OPR REV/VHCL	-1.193	NA	1.753	1.636	-2.197
FAREBOX REV/VHCL	-0.320	-3.085*	2.898*	0.927	-1.059
6. MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY					
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	-1.654	2.681	NA	-1.394	0.367
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	-2.214	1.965	NA	-1.142	1.391
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	-1.311	2.744	NA	-1.646	0.213
MAINT EXP/VHCL	-1.615	2.194	NA	-1.775	1.196
7. VEHICLE EFFICIENCY					
VHCL MILES/VHCL	3.744*	-2.047	-0.664	0.122	-1.155
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	3.636*	-0.444	0.162	-2.360	-0.994
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL	-1.615	2.194	NA	-1.775	1.196
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN	-1.844	-1.596	NA	1.459	1.981

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-Value.

TABLE 14D: PEER GROUP FOUR
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	CARVER COUNTY TRANS.	MOUNTAIN EXPRESS	SENIOR RESOURCE CENTER	SENIOR TRANS.	SPECIAL TRANSIT
8. SOCIAL EFFECTIVENESS					
PASS/CAPITA	-0.996	4.000*	-1.002	-1.003	-1.000
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP	3.769*	-1.923	-1.086	-0.942	0.182
VHCL MILES/CAPITA	-0.748	3.992*	-1.094	-1.098	-1.051
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA	-0.933	3.999*	-1.028	-1.035	-1.004
VHCL MILES/ELD POP	-0.910	3.999*	-1.039	-1.027	-1.023
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP	-0.976	4.000*	-1.011	-1.010	-1.002
9. SERVICE EFFECTIVENESS					
PASS/VHCL MI	-1.074	3.998*	-0.923	-1.059	-0.941
PASS/VHCL HR	-1.064	3.999*	-0.941	-0.999	-0.995
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI	-0.710	-3.216*	2.363	-0.303	1.866
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR	0.450	-3.935*	1.433	1.300	0.752
PASS/VHCL	-0.879	3.996*	-0.925	-1.139	-1.054
VHCL MILES/ACCDNTS	-1.126	2.905*	-0.294	-1.486	NA
10. COST EFFECTIVENESS					
TOT EXP/PASS	-0.859	-3.469*	0.693	2.086	1.549
DIR OPR EXP/PASS	-0.660	-3.603*	0.980	1.985	1.297
ADMIN EXP/PASS	-1.327	-2.954*	-0.078	2.241	2.118
MAINT EXP/PASS	-0.892	-1.908	NA	0.050	2.750
LABOR EXP/PASS	-0.681	-3.555*	0.642	1.688	1.906
SUBSIDY/PASS	NA	NA	-1.000	NA	1.000

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-Value.

TABLE 14E: PEER GROUP FIVE
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	FOSSTON CITY TRANSIT	VIRGINIA DIAL-A-RIDE	PELICAN RAPIDS TRANSIT	ORTONVILLE AREA TRANSIT	CITY OF APPLETON
1. COST EFFICIENCY					
TOT EXP/VHCL MI	-0.016	0.022	-3.578*	2.425	1.148
TOT EXP/VHCL HR	-2.050	1.330	NA	-1.338	2.058
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	-0.074	0.126	-3.579*	2.454	1.073
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	-2.125	1.490	NA	-1.274	1.909
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	1.642	-2.983*	-1.329	0.095	2.575
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	0.413	-1.792	NA	-1.269	2.648
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	1.088	NA	-2.683	-0.285	1.880
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	-0.156	NA	NA	-1.649	1.805
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	0.360	1.700	-3.878*	1.289	0.530
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	-0.360	-1.700	3.878*	-1.289	-0.530
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI	NA	0.123	-2.789*	1.905	0.761
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR	NA	0.820	NA	-1.990	1.170
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	-0.442	NA	2.884*	-1.725	-0.717
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	NA	1.051	-2.994*	1.124	0.819
2. OPERATING EFFICIENCY					
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	-0.074	0.126	-3.579*	2.454	1.073
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	-2.125	1.490	NA	-1.274	1.909
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.253	0.078	-3.656*	2.382	0.944
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-2.045	1.437	NA	-1.365	1.973
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.527	0.331	-3.872*	1.709	1.305
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-1.483	1.488	NA	-1.950	1.945
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	0.360	1.700	-3.878*	1.289	0.530
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL	-0.617	3.472*	-2.709	-0.402	0.255

* Indicates performance values that are higher or lower than the critical T-value.

TABLE 14E: PEER GROUP FIVE ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)					
	FOSSTON CITY TRANSIT	VIRGINIA DIAL-A-RIDE	PELICAN RAPIDS TRANSIT	ORTONVILLE AREA TRANSIT	CITY OF APPLETON
3. ADMINISTRATION EFFICIENCY					
VHCL MILE/OPR EMPL	1.000	NA	NA	-1.000	NA
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	1.642	-2.983*	-1.329	0.095	2.575
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	0.413	-1.792	NA	-1.269	2.648
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	NA	0.423	2.659	-1.541	-1.541
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	NA	2.000	NA	-1.000	-1.000
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	-0.360	-1.700	3.878*	-1.289	-0.53
ADMIN EXP/VHCL	1.499	-0.357	-2.851*	-1.150	2.859*
VHCL MILE/ADMIN EMPL	1.000	NA	NA	-1.000	NA
4. LABOR EFFICIENCY					
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI	NA	0.123	-2.789*	1.905	0.761
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR	NA	0.820	NA	-1.990	1.170
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.253	0.078	-3.656*	2.382	0.944
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-2.045	1.437	NA	-1.365	1.973
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	NA	0.423	2.659	-1.541	-1.541
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	NA	2.000	NA	-1.000	-1.000
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	NA	1.051	-2.994*	1.124	0.819
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP	1.201	0.924	-3.990*	1.076	0.790
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP	NA	-0.809	2.993*	-1.092	-1.092
VHCL MILES/EMPL	-0.779	1.985	NA	-1.206	NA
VHCL HOURS/EMPL	-1.068	1.998	NA	-0.930	NA

* Indicates performance values that are higher or lower than the critical T-value.

TABLE 14E: PEER GROUP FIVE
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	FOSSTON CITY TRANSIT	VIRGINIA DIAL-A-RIDE	PELICAN RAPIDS TRANSIT	ORTONVILLE AREA TRANSIT	CITY OF APPLETON
5. REVENUE EFFICIENCY					
OPR REV/VHCL MI	1.089	2.383	-3.340*	0.926	-1.059
OPR REV/VHCL HR	-0.450	2.938*	NA	-1.431	-1.057
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI	1.089	2.383	-3.340*	0.926	-1.059
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR	-0.450	2.938*	NA	-1.431	-1.057
OPR REV/PASS	-1.329	-0.555	-1.504	3.922*	-0.534
FAREBOX REV/PASS	-1.329	-0.555	-1.504	3.922*	-0.534
OPR REV/TOT EXP	1.165	2.900*	0.295	-1.613	-2.747
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP	1.080	2.473	1.123	-1.821	-2.854*
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP	1.165	2.900*	0.295	-1.613	-2.747
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP	1.080	2.473	1.123	-1.821	-2.854*
OPR REV/VHCL	-0.255	3.862*	-1.876	-0.845	-0.885
FAREBOX REV/VHCL	-0.255	3.862*	-1.876	-0.845	-0.885
6. MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY					
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	1.088	NA	-2.683	-0.285	1.880
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	-0.156	NA	NA	-1.649	1.805
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	-0.442	NA	2.884*	-1.725	-0.717
MAINT EXP/VHCL	1.130	NA	-2.390	-0.822	2.082
7. VEHICLE EFFICIENCY					
VHCL MILES/VHCL	-0.415	3.798*	-1.976	-1.208	-0.200
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	-0.487	2.912*	NA	-0.796	-1.628
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL	1.130	NA	-2.390	-0.822	2.082
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN	-0.965	-0.509	-1.919	-0.919	3.383*

* Indicates performance values that are higher or lower than the critical T-value.

TABLE 14E: PEER GROUP FIVE
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	FOSSTON CITY TRANSIT	VIRGINIA DIAL-A-RIDE	PELICAN RAPIDS TRANSIT	ORTONVILLE AREA TRANSIT	CITY OF APPLETON
8. SOCIAL EFFECTIVENESS					
PASS/CAPITA	2.319	-0.468	-1.861	-2.334	2.344
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP	3.131*	-1.050	-1.482	-2.133	1.533
VHCL MILES/CAPITA	-0.813	-0.557	-1.363	-1.226	3.958*
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA	-0.831	-1.006	NA	-1.157	2.993*
VHCL MILES/ELD POP	-0.876	-0.341	-1.445	-1.266	3.928*
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP	-0.910	-0.910	NA	-1.173	2.994*
9. SERVICE EFFECTIVENESS					
PASS/VHCL MI	3.695*	-0.423	0.185	-2.015	-1.442
PASS/VHCL HR	2.657	0.350	NA	-1.891	-1.115
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI	3.669*	-1.189	0.592	-1.695	-1.377
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR	2.952*	-0.573	NA	-1.445	-0.934
PASS/VHCL	2.792*	2.043	-1.424	-2.010	-1.401
VHCL MILES/ACCDNTS	-1.055	-0.832	3.996*	-1.055	-1.055
10. COST EFFECTIVENESS					
TOT EXP/PASS	-1.342	-0.999	-1.439	3.888*	-0.108
DIR OPR EXP/PASS	-1.338	-0.985	-1.439	3.893*	-0.131
ADMIN EXP/PASS	-1.475	-1.550	-1.398	3.569*	0.853
MAINT EXP/PASS	-1.502	NA	-1.542	2.691	0.352
LABOR EXP/PASS	NA	-1.070	-1.458	2.927*	-0.400
SUBSIDY/PASS	-1.312	-1.079	-1.386	3.896*	-0.119

TABLE 14F: PEER GROUP SIX
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	LA JUNTA TRAN	HASTINGS TRAN	HUTCHINSON TRAN	ST. PETER TRAN	NORTHFIELD TRAN	ELDER CARE	LOGAN TRAN	WINONA TRAN	HELENA DIAL-A-RIDE	DURANGO LIFT	MORRIS TRANSIT
1. COST EFFICIENCY											
TOT EXP/VHCL MI	-1.085	-0.401	3.885*	-4.192*	0.782	0.341	-4.565*	-3.036*	3.373*	5.812*	-0.233
TOT EXP/VHCL HR	-0.770	1.162	2.088	-1.874	-0.691	-4.758*	-1.770	-2.881*	4.923*	6.220*	-1.649
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	-2.656*	-0.554	4.146*	-4.421*	1.791	0.236	-4.261*	-1.513	1.744	6.215*	-0.727
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	-2.399*	0.919	2.756*	-2.794*	0.442	-3.991*	-2.074	-1.458	3.314*	7.142*	-1.857
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	5.091*	0.460	-0.384	0.240	-3.258*	-1.960	-1.581	-5.444*	5.839*	-0.618	1.615
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	4.279*	1.048	-1.188	1.955	-3.368*	-3.652*	0.278	-4.874*	6.043*	-0.569	0.050
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	1.373	NA	-0.626	-1.497	4.674*	-2.116	NA	-1.693	3.281*	NA	-3.400*
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	1.568	NA	-0.951	-0.398	3.401*	-2.965*	NA	-1.591	4.285*	NA	-3.350*
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	-5.540*	-0.347	2.121	-4.096*	3.461*	1.964	-1.731	5.003*	-2.229*	2.709*	-1.311
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	5.540*	0.347	-2.121	4.099*	-3.461*	1.964	1.731	-5.003*	2.229*	-2.709*	1.311
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI	-1.555	0.686	5.324*	-3.968*	-0.010	-2.055	-5.134*	-1.925	3.651*	3.723*	1.244
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR	-1.283	2.298*	3.363*	-1.807	-1.297	-5.474*	-2.866*	-1.900	5.226*	4.186*	-0.445
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	2.354*	NA	-1.925	0.479	4.660*	-2.424*	NA	-0.753	1.588	NA	-4.000*
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	-1.592	3.109*	3.255*	0.155	-1.858	-4.935*	-4.003*	3.891*	0.931	-3.136*	4.183*
2. OPERATING EFFICIENCY											
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	-2.656*	-0.554	4.146*	-4.421*	-1.791	0.236	-4.261*	-1.513	1.744	6.215*	-0.727
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	-2.399*	0.919	2.756*	-2.794*	0.442	-3.991*	-2.074	-1.458	3.314*	7.142*	-1.857
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-3.664*	0.377	5.526*	-4.310*	1.094	-1.531	-4.435*	-0.141	2.487*	4.214*	0.382
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-3.499*	1.866	3.994*	-2.904*	-0.121	-4.630*	-2.674*	-0.125	4.028*	4.929*	-0.865
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-1.997	1.952	4.008*	-2.717*	-2.283*	-1.064	NA	NA	2.101	NA	NA
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-1.537	2.952*	2.343*	-0.978	-2.428*	-3.218*	NA	NA	2.867*	NA	NA
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	-5.540*	-0.347	2.121	-4.099*	3.461*	1.964	-1.731	5.003*	-2.229*	2.709*	-1.311
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL	-4.923*	2.063	-6.439*	3.344*	2.944*	1.436	-2.907*	1.002	1.681	2.356*	-0.559

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-Value.

TABLE 14F: PEER GROUP SIX
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	LA JUNTA TRAN	HASTINGS TRAN	HUTCHINSON TRAN	ST. PETER TRAN	NORTHFIELD TRAN	ELDER CARE	LOGAN TRAN	WINONA TRAN	HELENA DIAL-A-RIDE	DURANGO LIFT	MORRIS TRANSIT
3. ADMINISTRATION EFFICIENCY											
VHCL MILE/OPR EMPL	-1.343	0.912	-1.822	4.714*	2.602*	0.335	-0.098	NA	NA	-6.032*	0.731
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	-5.091*	0.460	-0.384	0.240	-3.258*	-1.960	-1.581	-5.444*	5.839*	-0.618	1.615
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	4.279*	1.048	-1.188	1.955	-3.368*	-3.652*	0.278	-4.874*	6.043*	-0.569	0.05
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	5.923*	0.994	0.148	0.448	-3.156*	-1.811	-2.743*	-5.457*	3.890*	-0.917	2.680*
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	5.337*	1.712	-0.729	2.332*	-3.354*	-3.605*	-1.250	-5.049*	4.446*	-0.799	0.958
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	5.540*	0.347	-2.121	4.099*	-3.461*	-1.964	1.731	-5.003*	2.229*	-2.709*	1.311
ADMIN EXP/VHCL	0.707	1.219	-3.668*	7.511*	-2.436*	1.393	-0.291	-3.905*	3.296*	-1.848	0.809
VHCL MILE/ADMIN EMPL	-2.868*	6.028*	0.472	3.046*	-2.634*	1.158	-1.265	NA	NA	-2.361*	-1.575
4. LABOR EFFICIENCY											
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-1.555	0.686	5.324*	-3.968*	-0.010	-2.055	-5.134*	-1.925	3.651*	3.723*	1.244
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-1.283	2.298*	3.363*	-1.807	-1.297	-5.474*	-2.866*	-1.900	5.226*	4.186*	-0.445
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	-3.664*	0.377	5.526*	-4.310*	1.094	-1.531	-4.435*	-0.141	2.487*	4.214*	0.382
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	-3.499*	1.866	3.994*	-2.904*	-0.121	-4.630*	-2.674*	-0.125	4.028*	4.929*	-0.865
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	5.923*	0.994	0.148	0.448	-3.156*	-1.811	-2.743*	-5.457*	3.890*	-0.917	2.680*
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	5.337*	1.712	-0.729	2.332*	-3.354*	-3.605*	-1.250	-5.049*	4.446*	-0.799	0.958
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	-1.592	3.109*	3.255*	0.155	-1.858	-4.935*	-4.003*	3.891*	0.931	-3.136*	4.183*
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP	-5.659*	1.571	3.494*	-2.963*	1.039	-2.219	-2.594*	6.327*	-0.046	-0.25	1.302
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP	6.196*	0.855	-1.632	4.199*	-3.213*	-1.732	-0.319	-4.890	0.962	-2.686*	2.259*
VHCL MILES/EMPL	-2.899*	2.269*	-1.156	6.139*	-0.196	-0.123	1.418	NA	-0.274	-5.929*	0.359
VHCL HOURS/EMPL	-2.331*	-0.158	-0.027	0.442	1.213	7.382*	-2.295*	NA	-1.398	-4.343*	1.515

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-Value.

TABLE 14F: PEER GROUP SIX
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	LA JUNTA TRAN	HASTINGS TRAN	HUTCHINSON TRAN	ST. PETER TRAN	NORTHFIELD TRAN	ELDER CARE	LOGAN TRAN	WINONA TRAN	HELENA DIAL-A-RIDE	DURANGO LIFT	MORRIS TRANSIT
5. REVENUE EFFICIENCY											
OPR REV/VHCL MI	-0.979	-0.283	0.163	-1.995	-0.963	2.355*	-5.361*	-0.672	-1.069	8.235*	0.568
OPR REV/VHCL HR	-0.610	0.796	-0.272	-0.468	-1.332	-1.210	-5.014*	-0.462	-0.235	8.946*	-0.14
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI	-3.964*	0.395	0.852	-1.530	-0.301	-0.380	-4.806*	-0.003	-0.411	8.121*	1.267
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR	-3.600*	1.340	0.281	-0.136	-0.769	-1.945	-4.418*	0.093	0.318	8.425*	0.412
OPR REV/PASS	-0.721	4.138*	0.762	-0.416	-0.445	4.651*	-7.131*	-3.126*	-0.290	2.982*	-0.404
FAREBOX REV/PASS	-4.985*	5.070*	1.698	0.189	-0.492	1.536	6.186*	-2.186	0.647	3.191*	0.534
OPR REV/TOT EXP	-0.324	0.193	-1.653	0.951	-1.501	3.955*	-7.183*	2.242*	-2.721*	4.760*	1.280
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP	1.692	0.320	-2.157	2.651*	-2.267*	3.290*	-7.468*	0.719	-2.370*	3.759*	1.83
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP	-4.912*	1.159	-0.681	1.513	-0.531	1.092	-6.195*	3.202*	-1.747	4.857*	2.243*
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP	-4.669*	1.468	-1.037	3.317*	-1.148	0.731	-6.406*	1.870	-1.252	4.130*	2.994*
OPR REV/VHCL	-2.493*	1.179	-4.419*	4.200*	-0.730	3.258*	-5.617*	0.866	-1.317	4.431*	0.642
FAREBOX REV/VHCL	-4.526*	1.843	-3.898*	4.442*	-0.115	0.846	-5.126*	1.521	-0.717	4.438*	1.291
6. MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY											
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	1.373	NA	-0.626	-1.497	4.674*	-2.116	NA	-1.693	3.281*	NA	-3.396*
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	1.568	NA	-0.951	-0.398	3.401*	-2.965*	NA	-1.591	4.285*	NA	-3.350*
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	2.354*	NA	-1.925	0.479	4.660*	-2.424*	NA	-0.753	1.588	NA	-3.980*
MAINT EXP/VHCL	-0.487	NA	-3.121*	2.657*	4.388*	-1.820	NA	-0.942	2.428*	NA	-3.102*
7. VEHICLE EFFICIENCY											
VHCL MILES/VHCL	-2.334*	0.746	-4.775*	8.518*	-0.373	-0.181	1.197	0.963	-0.91	-2.205	-0.647
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	-2.672*	-0.190	-5.132*	5.143*	0.659	6.079*	-1.235	1.181	-1.645	-2.615*	0.426
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL	-0.487	NA	-3.121*	2.657*	4.388*	-1.820	NA	-0.942	2.428*	NA	-3.102*
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN	-0.279	-2.475*	NA	NA	-1.935	NA	-0.606	5.274*	-1.38	1.402	NA

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-Value.

TABLE 14F: PEER GROUP SIX
ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS (T-STATISTIC)

	LA JUNTA TRAN	HASTINGS TRAN	HUTCHINSON TRAN	ST. PETER TRAN	NORTHFIELD TRAN	ELDER CARE	LOGAN TRAN	WINONA TRAN	HELENA DIAL-A-RIDE	DURANGO LIFT	MORRIS TRANSIT
8. SOCIAL EFFECTIVENESS											
PASS/CAPITA	-1.914	-2.283*	-2.125	-0.880	-2.355*	-2.449*	5.427*	0.277	-2.847*	6.125*	3.023*
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP	-1.390	-1.596	-1.649	-4.122*	-2.009	-0.148	3.898*	-1.793	-1.905	4.281*	6.433*
VHCL MILES/CAPITA	-1.734	-0.653	-2.307*	3.118*	-2.594*	-2.800*	0.096	-0.724	-3.631*	5.300*	5.929*
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA	-1.785	-1.422	-1.688	0.458	-1.896	0.550	-1.943	-0.680	-3.761*	4.437*	7.731*
VHCL MILES/ELD POP	-2.872*	0.810	-2.668*	3.401*	-1.611	-3.107*	2.629*	-1.876	-3.847*	5.829*	3.310*
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP	-3.150*	-0.090	-2.275*	0.975	-0.769	0.078	-0.202	-1.907	-4.459*	5.985*	5.830*
9. SERVICE EFFECTIVENESS											
PASS/VHCL MI	-1.383	-2.845*	-1.281	-2.527*	-1.544	-1.563	8.583*	1.674	-1.736	2.763*	-0.142
PASS/VHCL HR	-1.105	-1.785	-1.447	-1.145	-1.645	-2.549*	9.370*	0.677	-1.059	1.644	-0.957
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI	0.999	-3.210*	-0.103	-6.510*	-2.295*	5.241*	1.810	-1.580	2.104	-0.110	3.656*
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR	1.411	-2.394*	-0.655	-6.203*	-2.643*	-0.360	6.095*	-1.376	3.475*	0.426	2.226
PASS/VHCL	-2.246*	-1.788	-3.572*	1.608	-1.282	-1.194	8.673*	2.227	-1.687	-0.244	-0.494
VHCL MILES/ACCDNTS	NA	2.270*	NA	NA	-1.909	NA	NA	1.687	0.745	-2.793*	NA
10. COST EFFECTIVENESS											
TOT EXP/PASS	-0.305	4.219*	3.452*	-1.186	-1.542	0.635	-6.132*	-4.190*	4.259*	-0.974	-1.370
DIR OPR EXP/PASS	-1.806	3.931*	4.232*	-2.084	2.691*	1.230	-6.010*	-3.422*	3.123*	-0.263	-1.623
ADMIN EXP/PASS	4.115*	3.120*	-0.345	2.084	2.439*	-1.350	-3.691*	-4.474*	5.560*	-2.559*	-0.022
MAINT EXP/PASS	1.160	NA	-0.735	-0.577	-4.480*	-1.937	NA	-2.560*	3.504*	NA	-3.335*
LABOR EXP/PASS	-0.751	4.940*	4.226*	-1.074	0.722	-0.887	-5.767*	-3.413*	4.106*	-1.657	-0.445
SUBSIDY/PASS	-1.113	3.249*	NA	-1.286	NA	-0.240	1.013	-3.909*	4.576*	-2.291*	NA

* Indicates performance measures that are higher or lower than the critical T-Value.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15A: PEER GROUP ONE
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	BLUE PEAKS	NE. CO. TRANSP.	ROCS	SOURIS BASIN TRANSP.	SOUTH CENTRAL SEN. SERV.	SWEETWATER CO. TRANSP.	TRI-VALLEY HEART. EXP.	WEST RIVER
1.COST EFFICIENCY								
TOT EXP/VHCL MI	EX				EX		NI	
TOT EXP/VHCL HR	EX				EX	NI		
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	EX						NI	
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR					EX	NI	NI	EX
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	EX	NI			EX		EX	NI
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	EX			NI	EX		EX	
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI					EX	NI		NI
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR					EX	NI		
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP*								
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP*								
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI	EX						NI	
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR	EX		NI		EX		NI	
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP*								
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP*								
2. OPERATING EFFICIENCY								
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	EX						NI	
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR					EX	NI	NI	EX
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	EX						NI	
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	EX		NI				NI	EX
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL MI	EX						NI	
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL HR	EX		NI				NI	
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP*								
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL	EX					NI	NI	

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleasding. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same systems administrative expense as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15A: PEER GROUP ONE
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	BLUE PEAKS	NE. CO. TRANSP.	ROCS	SOURIS BASIN TRANSP.	SOUTH CENTRAL SEN. SERV.	SWEETWATER CO. TRANSP.	TRI-VALLEY HEART. EXP.	WEST RIVER
3. ADMINISTRATION EFFICIENCY								
VHCL MI/OPR EMPL			NI		EX			
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	EX	NI			EX		EX	NI
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	EX			NI	EX		EX	
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	EX				EX			NI
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	EX		NI	NI	EX		EX	NI
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP*								
ADMIN EXP/VHCL	EX					NI	EX	NI
VHCL MI/ADMIN EMPL					EX	EX		
4. LABOR EFFICIENCY								
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI	EX						NI	
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR	EX		NI		EX		NI	
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	EX						NI	
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	EX		NI				NI	EX
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	EX				EX			NI
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	EX		NI	NI	EX		EX	NI
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP*								
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP*								
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP*								
VHCL MILES/EMPL					EX			NI
VHCL HOURS/EMPL			NI		EX		EX	

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleasding. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same systems administrative expense as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15A: PEER GROUP ONE
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	BLUE PEAKS	NE. CO. TRANSP.	ROCS	SOURIS BASIN TRANSP.	SOUTH CENTRAL SEN. SERV.	SWEETWATER CO. TRANSP.	TRI-VALLEY HEART. EXP.	WEST RIVER
5. REVENUE EFFICIENCY								
OPR REV/VHCL MI	NI		EX			EX		
OPR REV/VHCL HR	NI		EX			EX		
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI	NI					NI	EX	
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR	NI		EX			NI		
OPR REV/PASS	NI					EX		
FAREBOX REV/PASS	NI					NI	EX	
OPR REV/TOT EXP*								
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP	NI		EX			EX		
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP*								
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP	NI		EX		EX	NI		EX
OPR REV/VHCL	NI					EX		
FAREBOX REV/VHCL	NI				EX	NI	EX	
6. MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY								
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI					EX	NI		NI
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR					EX	NI		
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP*								
MAINT EXP/VHCL						NI		
7. VEHICLE EFFICIENCY								
VHCL MILES/VHCL					EX	EX		
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	NI		NI		EX			
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL						NI		
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN	EX							

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleasding. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same systems administrative expense as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15A: PEER GROUP ONE
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	BLUE PEAKS	NE. CO. TRANSP.	ROCS	SOURIS BASIN TRANSP.	SOUTH CENTRAL SEN. SERV.	SWEETWATER CO. TRANSP.	TRI-VALLEY HEART. EXP.	WEST RIVER
8. SOCIAL EFFECTIVENESS								
PASS/CAPITA	EX			NI		EX	NI	NI
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP	EX			NI		EX	NI	
VHCL MILES/CAPITA	EX					EX	NI	NI
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA		EX	NI	NI	EX	EX		NI
VHCL MILES/ELD POP						EX		
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP						EX		
9. SERVICE EFFECTIVENESS								
PASS/VHCL MI		EX	EX	NI	NI			
PASS/VHCL HR	EX		EX		NI		NI	
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI			EX		NI	NI		
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR	EX		EX				NI	
PASS/VHCL				NI		EX	NI	
VHCL MILES/ACCDNTS		EX	NI		EX		NI	
10. COST EFFECTIVENESS								
TOT EXP/PASS	EX		EX				NI	
DIR OPR EXP/PASS	EX		EX				NI	
ADMIN EXP/PASS	EX			NI				NI
MAINT EXP/PASS		EX			EX	NI		NI
LABOR EXP/PASS	EX						NI	
SUBSIDY/PASS			EX					NI

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleasding. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same systems administrative expense as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15B: PEER GROUP TWO
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	CAMPBELL SEN. CIT.	EAGLE TRANSIT	SUBLETTE HI-C	SHERBURNE HEART	UNITA SENIOR CIT.
1.COST EFFICIENCY					
TOT EXP/VHCL MI			NI		
TOT EXP/VHCL HR					EX
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI					
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR		NI			EX
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI			NI		
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR			NI		
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI					
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR		NI			
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP*					
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP*					
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI					
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR					
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP*					
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP*					
2. OPERATING EFFICIENCY					
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI					
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR		NI			EX
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI		NI			
DIR OPR SAL&FB/HCL HR		NI			
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL MI	EX		NI		
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL HR	EX			NI	
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP					
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL				NI	

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same systems administrative expense as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15B: PEER GROUP TWO
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	CAMPBELL SEN. CIT.	EAGLE TRANSIT	SUBLETTE HI-C	SHERBURNE HEART	UNITA SENIOR CIT.
3. ADMINISTRATION EFFICIENCY					
VHCL MI/OPR EMPL				EX	
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI			NI		
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR			NI		
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI			NI		
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR				NI	
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP*					
ADMIN EXP/VHCL				NI	
ADMIN EMP/VHCL					
4. LABOR EFFICIENCY					
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI					
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR					
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI		NI			
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR		NI			
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI			NI		
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR				NI	
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP*					
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP*					
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP*					
VHCL MILES/EMPL					
VHCL HOURS/EMPL	EX				

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same systems administrative expense as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15B: PEER GROUP TWO
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	CAMPBELL SEN. CIT.	EAGLE TRANSIT	SUBLETTE HI-C	SHERBURNE HEART	UNITA SENIOR CIT.
5. REVENUE EFFICIENCY					
OPR REV/VHCL MI		EX			
OPR REV/VHCL HR		EX			
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI				EX	
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR				EX	
OPR REV/PASS					
FAREBOX REV/PASS				EX	
*OPR REV/TOT EXP**					
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP					
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP*					
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP				EX	
OPR REV/VHCL				EX	
FAREBOX REV/VHCL				EX	
6. MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY					
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI					
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR		NI			
*MAINT EXP/TOT EXP**					
MAINT EXP/VHCL				NI	
7. VEHICLE EFFICIENCY					
VHCL MILES/VHCL				EX	
VHCL HOURS/VHCL				EX	
MAINT EXP/VHCL				NI	
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN					EX

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same systems administrative expense as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

TABLE 15B: PEER GROUP TWO
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	CAMPBELL SEN. CIT.	EAGLE TRANSIT	SUBLETTE HI-C	SHERBURNE HEART	UNITA SENIOR CIT.
8. SOCIAL EFFECTIVENESS					
PASS/CAPITA					
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP	EX				
VHCL MILES/CAPITA					EX
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA					EX
VHCL MILES/ELD POP					EX
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP					EX
9. SERVICE EFFECTIVENESS					
PASS/VHCL MI			EX		
PASS/VHCL HR					NI
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI			EX		
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR					NI
PASS/VHCL		EX			NI
VHCL MILES/ACCDNTS			EX		
10. COST EFFECTIVENESS					
TOT EXP/PASS					NI
DIR OPR EXP/PASS					NI
ADMIN EXP/PASS	EX				
MAINT EXP/PASS					NI
LABOR EXP/PASS					NI
SUBSIDY/PASS					NI

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same systems administrative expense as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15C: PEER GROUP THREE
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	HEARTLAND EXPRESS	COTTONWOOD COUNTY	CITY OF MONTEVIDEO	ANNANDALE HEARTLAND EXPRESS	LINCOLN COUNTY TRANSP.	MAHNOMEN COUNTY HEARTLAND	LESUEUR PARATRANSIT
1. Cost Efficiency							
TOT EXP/VHCL MI			NI	EX	NI	EX	NI
TOT EXP/VHCL HR	EX			EX			
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI			NI	EX	NI	EX	NI
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	EX			EX			
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	EX	EX	NI	EX	NI	EX	NI
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	EX	EX		EX	NI	EX	
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI				EX	EX	EX	
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR			EX	EX	EX	EX	
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP*							
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP*							
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI			NI	EX	NI	EX	NI
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR				EX	NI		
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP*							
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP*							
2. Operating Efficiency							
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI			NI	EX	NI	EX	NI
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	EX			EX			
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	NI		NI	EX		EX	NI
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR				EX			
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL MI	NI	NI	NI	EX	NI	EX	NI
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL HR				EX		EX	
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP*							
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL	NI	EX				NI	NI

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same system administrative expenses as a portion of total expenses may be well aabve the group average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15C: PEER GROUP THREE
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	HEARTLAND EXPRESS	COTTONWOOD COUNTY	CITY OF MONTEVIDEO	ANNANDALE HEARTLAND EXPRESS	LINCOLN COUNTY TRANSP.	MAHNOMEN COUNTY HEARTLAND	LESUEUR PARATRANSIT
3. Administration Efficiency							
VHCL MILE/OPR EMPL	EX	NI	NI	EX		EX	NI
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	EX	EX	NI	EX	NI	EX	NI
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	EX	EX		EX	NI	EX	
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI		EX		EX	NI	EX	NI
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR		EX	EX	EX	NI	EX	
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP*							
ADMIN EXP/VHCL	EX	EX		EX	NI	NI	NI
VHCL MILE/ADMIN EMPL	NI	EX	EX	EX	NI		NI
4. Labor Efficiency							
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI			NI	EX	NI	EX	NI
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR				EX	NI		
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	NI		NI	EX	NI		NI
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR				EX			
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI		EX		EX	NI	EX	NI
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR		EX	EX	EX	NI	EX	
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP*							
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP*							
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP*							
VHCL MILES/EMPL				EX		EX	EX
VHCL HOURS/EMPL	EX		EX	EX		EX	

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same system administrative expenses as a portion of total expenses may be well aabve the group average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15C: PEER GROUP THREE
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	HEARTLAND EXPRESS	COTTONWOOD COUNTY	CITY OF MONTEVIDEO	ANNANDALE HEARTLAND EXPRESS	LINCOLN COUNTY TRANSP.	MAHNOMEN COUNTY HEARTLAND	LESUEUR PARATRANSIT
5. Revenue Efficiency							
OPR REV/VHCL MI		NI	EX	NI		NI	EX
OPR REV/VHCL HR		NI		NI	NI	NI	
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI	EX	NI	EX	NI		NI	EX
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR				NI	NI	NI	EX
OPR REV/PASS	NI	NI	NI		EX	NI	
FAREBOX REV/PASS	NI			NI	EX	NI	
*OPR REV/TOT EXP**							
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP				NI	NI	NI	
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP*							
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP	EX	NI	EX	NI	NI	NI	EX
OPR REV/VHCL	EX	NI		NI	NI		EX
FAREBOX REV/VHCL	EX	NI	EX	NI	NI		EX
6. Maintenance Efficiency							
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI				EX	EX	EX	
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR			EX	EX	EX	EX	
*MAINT EXP/TOT EXP**							
MAINT EXP/VHCL	NI	EX			EX	EX	
7. Vehicle Efficiency							
VHCL MILES/VHCL	EX	NI	NI			EX	
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	EX	NI		EX		EX	
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL	NI	EX			EX	EX	
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN		EX	EX		NI	NI	EX

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same system administrative expenses as a portion of total expenses may be well aabve the group average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15C: PEER GROUP THREE
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	HEARTLAND EXPRESS	COTTONWOOD COUNTY	CITY OF MONTEVIDEO	ANNANDALE HEARTLAND EXPRESS	LINCOLN COUNTY TRANSP.	MAHNOMEN COUNTY HEARTLAND	LESUEUR PARATRANSIT
8. Social Effectiveness							
PASS/CAPITA	EX	NI	EX	NI	NI		EX
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP	EX	NI	EX		NI		
VHCL MILES/CAPITA	EX	NI	EX			EX	EX
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA	EX	NI	EX		EX	EX	EX
VHCL MILES/ELD POP	EX	NI		EX		EX	EX
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP	EX	NI	EX	EX		EX	EX
9. Service Effectiveness							
PASS/VHCL MI	EX	NI	EX	NI	NI	NI	EX
PASS/VHCL HR		NI		NI	NI	NI	
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI	EX	NI		NI	NI	NI	NI
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR		NI		NI	NI	NI	EX
PASS/VHCL	EX	NI	EX	NI	NI		
VHCL MILES/ACCDNTS	EX						
10. Cost Effectiveness							
TOT EXP/PASS	EX		EX		NI		
DIR OPR EXP/PASS	EX		EX		NI	NI	EX
ADMIN EXP/PASS	EX	EX		NI	NI		
MAINT EXP/PASS	EX		EX			EX	
LABOR EXP/PASS			EX		NI		
SUBSIDY/PASS					NI		

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same system administrative expenses as a portion of total expenses may be well aabve the group average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15C: PEER GROUP THREE
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	BUTTE - SILVER BOW TRANSIT	DICKEY COUNTY SENIOR CIT.	DUNN COUNTY DOA	KIDDER COUNTY COA	SOUTHWEST SENIOR SEVICES	CAVALIER COUNTY SENIOR	RANSOM COUNTY COA
1. Cost Efficiency							
TOT EXP/VHCL MI	NI	EX	EX	EX	NI		
TOT EXP/VHCL HR		EX	EX		EX	EX	NI
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	NI	EX	EX	EX	NI		
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	NI	EX	EX		EX	EX	NI
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	EX	EX	EX	EX		NI	EX
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	EX	EX	EX		EX		EX
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI			EX	NI	NI		
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR				NI	NI		NI
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP*							
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP*							
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI	NI	EX	EX	EX	NI	NI	EX
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR		EX	EX		EX		
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP*							
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP*							
2. Operating Efficiency							
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	NI	EX	EX	EX	NI		
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	NI	EX	EX		EX	EX	NI
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	NI	EX	EX	EX	NI		
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	NI	EX	EX		EX		
DRIVER SL&FB/VHCL MI	NI	EX	EX	EX			
DRIVER SL&FB/VHCL HR	NI	EX	EX			EX	NI
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP*							
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL	NI		EX	NI		EX	NI

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same system administrative expenses as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor perfomance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15C: PEER GROUP THREE
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	BUTTE - SILVER BOW TRANSIT	DICKEY COUNTY SENIOR CIT.	DUNN COUNTY DOA	KIDDER COUNTY COA	SOUTHWEST SENIOR SEVICES	CAVALIER COUNTY SENIOR	RANSOM COUNTY COA
3. Administration Efficiency							
VHCL MILE/OPR EMPL			NI		NI		
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	EX	EX	EX	EX		NI	EX
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	EX	EX	EX		EX		EX
ADMIN AL&FB/VHCL MI	EX	EX	EX	EX	EX	NI	EX
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	EX	EX	EX		EX		EX
*ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP**							
ADMIN EXP/VHCL	EX	EX	EX	NI			EX
VHCL MILE/ADMIN EMPL		EX	EX		NI		EX
4. Labor Efficiency							
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI	NI	EX	EX	EX	NI	NI	EX
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR		EX	EX		EX		
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	NI	EX	EX	EX	NI		
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	NI	EX	EX		EX		
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	EX	EX	EX	EX	EX	NI	EX
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	EX	EX	EX		EX		EX
*LABOR EXP/TOT EXP**							
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP*							
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP*							EX
VHCL MILES/EMPL			NI	EX	NI		
VHCL HOURS/EMPL		EX	NI		NI		

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same system administrative expenses as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15C: PEER GROUP THREE
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	BUTTE - SILVER BOW TRANSIT	DICKEY COUNTY SENIOR CIT.	DUNN COUNTY DOA	KIDDER COUNTY COA	SOUTHWEST SENIOR SEVICES	CAVALIER COUNTY SENIOR	RANSOM COUNTY COA
5. Revenue Efficiency							
OPR REV/VHCL MI		NI					NI
OPR REV/VHCL HR		NI		EX	NI	NI	
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI	EX	NI			EX		NI
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR		NI	EX	EX	NI		
OPR REV/PASS		NI	EX	EX	NI	NI	EX
FAREBOX REV/PASS		NI	EX	EX	NI	NI	EX
OPR REV/TOT EXP*							
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP			EX		NI		NI
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP*							
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP		NI	EX	EX	NI	EX	NI
OPR REV/VHCL	EX	NI	NI	EX		NI	
FAREBOX REV/VHCL	EX		NI	EX		NI	
6. Maintenance Efficiency							
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI			EX	NI	NI		NI
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR				NI	NI		NI
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP*							
MAINT EXP/VHCL			EX	NI	NI	EX	NI
7. Vehicle Efficiency							
VHCL MILES/VHCL			NI	EX	NI	NI	
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	EX	EX	NI		EX	NI	NI
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL	NI		EX	NI	NI	EX	NI
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN			NI		NI	NI	

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same system administrative expenses as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor perfomance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15C: PEER GROUP THREE
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	BUTTE - SILVER BOW TRANSIT	DICKEY COUNTY SENIOR CIT.	DUNN COUNTY DOA	KIDDER COUNTY COA	SOUTHWEST SENIOR SEVICES	CAVALIER COUNTY SENIOR	RANSOM COUNTY COA
8. Social Effectiveness							
PASS/CAPITA		NI	NI			NI	NI
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP			NI				NI
VHCL MILES/CAPITA			NI	EX	NI	NI	NI
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA			NI			NI	NI
VHCL MILES/ELD POP			NI	EX	NI	NI	NI
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP			NI			NI	NI
9. Service Effectiveness							
PASS/VHCL MI		NI	NI	NI		EX	NI
PASS/VHCL HR		NI	NI	NI	NI		NI
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI			NI	NI	EX	EX	NI
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR				NI			NI
PASS/VHCL			NI	NI		NI	NI
VHCL MILES/ACCDNTS							
10. Cost Effectiveness							
TOT EXP/PASS		EX		NI		EX	NI
DIR OPR EXP/PASS				NI		EX	NI
ADMIN EXP/PASS		EX					
MAINT EXP/PASS				NI	NI	EX	NI
LABOR EXP/PASS						EX	NI
SUBSIDY/PASS							NI

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same system administrative expenses as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor perfomance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15C: PEER GROUP THREE
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	JAMES RIVER SENIOR CIT.	GOLDEN VALLEY COUNTY COA	SENIOR MEALS & SERVICES	ARROW TRANSIT	CODY COA	SPINK COUNTY PUB.
1. Cost Efficiency						
TOT EXP/VHCL MI			EX	EX		EX
TOT EXP/VHCL HR			EX	NI	EX	EX
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI		EX	EX	EX		EX
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR		EX	EX	NI	EX	EX
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	EX	NI				
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	EX	NI		NI		EX
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	NI	EX	EX	EX	EX	
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	NI	EX	EX	NI	EX	EX
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP*						
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP*						
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI		EX		EX		EX
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR				NI		EX
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP*						
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP*						
2. Operating Efficiency						
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI		EX	EX	EX		EX
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR		EX	EX	NI	EX	EX
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI		EX	EX	EX	NI	EX
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR		EX	EX	NI		EX
DRIVER SL&FB/VHCL MI	EX	EX		EX		
DRIVER SL&FB/VHCL HR	EX	EX		NI	EX	EX
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP*						
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL	EX	EX		EX	EX	EX

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same system administrative expenses as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15C: PEER GROUP THREE
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	JAMES RIVER SENIOR CIT.	GOLDEN VALLEY COUNTY COA	SENIOR MEALS & SERVICES	ARROW TRANSIT	CODY COA	SPINK COUNTY PUB.
3. Administration Efficiency						
VHCL MILE/OPR EMPL						NI
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	EX	NI				
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	EX	NI		NI		EX
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	EX	NI		NI		
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	EX	NI		NI		
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP*						
ADMIN EXP/VHCL	EX	NI			EX	EX
VHCL MILE/ADMIN EMPL	NI				NI	NI
4. Labor Efficiency						
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI		EX		EX		EX
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR				NI		EX
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI		EX	EX	EX	NI	EX
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR		EX	EX	NI		EX
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	EX	NI		NI		
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	EX	NI		NI		
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP*						
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP*						
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP*						
VHCL MILES/EMPL			NI		NI	NI
VHCL HOURS/EMPL				NI	NI	

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same system administrative expenses as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15C: PEER GROUP THREE
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	JAMES RIVER SENIOR CIT.	GOLDEN VALLEY COUNTY COA	SENIOR MEALS & SERVICES	ARROW TRANSIT	CODY COA	SPINK COUNTY PUB.
5. Revenue Efficiency						
OPR REV/VHCL MI	EX	NI	EX		NI	
OPR REV/VHCL HR	EX		EX	EX	NI	NI
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI	EX	NI		NI	NI	
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR					NI	NI
OPR REV/PASS	EX	EX	EX	NI	NI	NI
FAREBOX REV/PASS		EX		NI	NI	
*OPR REV/TOT EXP**						
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP	EX		EX		NI	
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP*						
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP	EX			NI	NI	
OPR REV/VHCL	EX	NI	EX		NI	NI
FAREBOX REV/VHCL		NI		NI	NI	NI
6. Maintenance Efficiency						
MAINT EXP/VHCL ME	NI	EX	EX	EX	EX	
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	NI	EX	EX	NI	EX	EX
*MAINT EXP/TOT EXP**						
MAINT EXP/VHCL	NI	EX	EX		EX	EX
7. Vehicle Efficiency						
VHCL MILES/VHCL	NI	NI			NI	NI
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	NI	NI		NI		
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL	NI	EX	EX		EX	EX
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN	NI	NI			NI	NI

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same system administrative expenses as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15C: PEER GROUP THREE
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	JAMES RIVER SENIOR CIT.	GOLDEN VALLEY COUNTY COA	SENIOR MEALS & SERVICES	ARROW TRANSIT	CODY COA	SPINK COUNTY PUB.
8. Social Effectiveness						
PASS/CAPITA		NI		EX		
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP		NI		EX		
VHCL MILES/CAPITA	NI	NI		EX	NI	
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA	NI	NI			NI	
VHCL MILES/ELD POP		NI		EX	NI	NI
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP		NI	NI			
9. Service Effectiveness						
PASS/VHCL MI		NI				
PASS/VHCL HR		NI		EX		NI
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI		NI			EX	
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR		NI		EX		NI
PASS/VHCL		NI				NI
VHCL MILES/ACCDNTS	EX	EX				
10. Cost Effectiveness						
TOT EXP/PASS	EX	NI	EX	EX	EX	EX
DIR OPR EXP/PASS	EX	NI	EX	EX	EX	EX
ADMIN EXP/PASS	EX	NI			EX	
MAINT EXP/PASS			EX	EX	EX	
LABOR EXP/PASS				EX	EX	
SUBSIDY/PASS	EX					

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same system administrative expenses as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15C: PEER GROUP THREE
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	NIOBRARA TRANSIT	WALSH COUNTY TRANSP.	DAKOTA TRANSIT ASSOC.	SEMCAC HEARTLAND EXPRESS	RED WING TRANSIT SERV.	MAHUBE TRANSIT
1. Cost Efficiency						
TOT EXP/VHCL MI		EX	NI		NI	NI
TOT EXP/VHCL HR	EX			NI	NI	NI
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI		EX			NI	NI
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	EX			NI	NI	
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI			NI		EX	NI
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	EX			NI	EX	NI
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI		EX		EX		NI
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	EX			EX		
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP*						
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP*						
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI		EX	EX			NI
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR	EX			NI		NI
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP*						
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP*						
2. Operating Efficiency						
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI		EX			NI	NI
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	EX			NI	NI	
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI		EX			NI	NI
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	EX			NI	NI	NI
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL MI		EX			NI	NI
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL HR	EX			NI	NI	
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP*						
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL	EX	EX		EX	NI	

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same system administrative expenses as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15C: PEER GROUP THREE
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	NIOBRARA TRANSIT	WALSH COUNTY TRANSP.	DAKOTA TRANSIT ASSOC.	SEMCAC HEARTLAND EXPRESS	RED WING TRANSIT SERV.	MAHUBE TRANSIT
3. Administration Efficiency						
VHCL MILE/OPR EMPL		EX	NI	NI		NI
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI			NI		EX	NI
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	EX			NI	EX	NI
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI			NI			NI
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	EX			NI		NI
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP*						
ADMIN EXP/VHCL	EX	NI	NI		EX	NI
VHCL MILE/ADMIN EMPL	NI	NI	NI	NI		NI
4. Labor Efficiency						
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI		EX	NI			NI
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR	EX			NI		NI
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI		EX			NI	NI
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	EX			NI	NI	NI
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI			NI			NI
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	EX			NI		NI
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP*						
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP*						
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP*						
VHCL MILES/EMPL	NI			NI		NI
VHCL HOURS/EMPL				NI		

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same system administrative expenses as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15C: PEER GROUP THREE
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	NIOBRARA TRANSIT	WALSH COUNTY TRANSP.	DAKOTA TRANSIT ASSOC.	SEMCAC HEARTLAND EXPRESS	RED WING TRANSIT SERV.	MAHUBE TRANSIT
5. Revenue Efficiency						
OPR REV/VHCL MI	NI	NI			NI	EX
OPR REV/VHCL HR	NI			EX	NI	EX
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI	NI	NI			NI	EX
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR	NI			EX	NI	EX
OPR REV/PASS	NI	EX	NI	NI	NI	
FAREBOX REV/PASS	NI	EX	NI	NI	NI	EX
*OPR REV/TOT EXP**						
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP	NI				NI	
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP*						
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP	NI	EX			NI	EX
OPR REV/VHCL	NI	NI		NI	NI	EX
FAREBOX REV/VHCL	NI	NI		NI	NI	EX
6. Maintenance Efficiency						
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI		EX		EX		NI
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	EX			EX		
*MAINT EXP/TOT EXP**						
MAINT EXP/VHCL	EX	EX		EX		
7. Vehicle Efficiency						
VHCL MILES/VHCL	NI			NI	NI	
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	NI			NI	NI	
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL	EX	EX		EX		
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN	EX		NI			NI

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same system administrative expenses as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15C: PEER GROUP THREE
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	NIOBRARA TRANSIT	WALSH COUNTY TRANSP.	DAKOTA TRANSIT ASSOC.	SEMCAC HEARTLAND EXPRESS	RED WING TRANSIT SERV.	MAHUBE TRANSIT
8. Social Effectiveness						
PASS/CAPITA	EX	NI		NI	NI	NI
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP	EX	NI		NI	NI	NI
VHCL MILES/CAPITA		NI		NI	NI	NI
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA	EX			NI	NI	NI
VHCL MILES/ELD POP	NI	NI		NI	NI	NI
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP	EX			NI	NI	NI
9. Service Effectiveness						
PASS/VHCL MI	EX	NI	EX			
PASS/VHCL HR	EX			EX		
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI	EX	NI			NI	
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR	EX			EX	NI	
PASS/VHCL	EX	NI	EX			
VHCL MILES/ACCDNTS						
10. Cost Effectiveness						
TOT EXP/PASS	EX	NI	EX	EX		
DIR OPR EXP/PASS	EX		EX	EX		
ADMIN EXP/PASS	EX	NI			EX	
MAINT EXP/PASS	EX	EX	EX	EX		
LABOR EXP/PASS	EX	NI	EX			
SUBSIDY/PASS	EX					

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same system administrative expenses as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15D: PEER GROUP FOUR
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	CARVER COUNTY TRANSP.	MOUNTAIN EXPRESS	SENIOR RESOURCE CENTER	SENIOR TRANSP.	SPECIAL TRANSIT
1.COST EFFICIENCY					
TOT EXP/VHCL MI	EX				
TOT EXP/VHCL HR	EX				
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	EX				
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	EX				
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	EX				NI
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR					
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI					
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR					
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP*					
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP*					
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI	EX	NI			
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR	EX				
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP*					
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP*					
2. OPERATING EFFICIENCY					
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	EX				
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	EX				
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI		NI			
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	EX				
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL MI					
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL HR					
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP*					
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL			NI		

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same system administrative expenses as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15D: PEER GROUP FOUR
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	CARVER COUNTY TRANSP.	MOUNTAIN EXPRESS	SENIOR RESOURCE CENTER	SENIOR TRANSP.	SPECIAL TRANSIT
3. ADMINISTRATION EFFICIENCY					
VHCL MI/OPR EMPL	EX				
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	EX				NI
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR					
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	EX				
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR				NI	
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP*					NI
ADMIN EXP/VHCL					NI
VHCL MI/ADMIN EMPL	EX				
4. LABOR EFFICIENCY					
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI	EX	NI			
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR	EX				
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI		NI			
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	EX				
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	EX				
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR				NI	
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP*					
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP*					
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP*					
VHCL MI/EMPL	EX				
VHCL HR/EMPL	EX				

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same system administrative expenses as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15D: PEER GROUP FOUR
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	CARVER COUNTY TRANSP.	MOUNTAIN EXPRESS	SENIOR RESOURCE CENTER	SENIOR TRANSP.	SPECIAL TRANSIT
5. REVENUE EFFICIENCY					
OPR REV/VHCL MI					
OPR REV/VHCL HR					
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI			EX		
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR		NI			
OPR REV/PASS					
FAREBOX REV/PASS		NI			
OPR REV/TOT EXP*					
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP					
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP*					
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP		NI			
OPR REV/VHCL					
FAREBOX REV/VHCL		NI	EX		
6. MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY					
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI					
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR					
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP*					
MAINT EXP/VHCL					
7. VEHICLE EFFICIENCY					
VHCL MILES/VHCL	EX				
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	EX				
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL					
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN					

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same system administrative expenses as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15D: PEER GROUP FOUR
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	CARVER COUNTY TRANSP.	MOUNTAIN EXPRESS	SENIOR RESOURCE CENTER	SENIOR TRANSP.	SPECIAL TRANSIT
8. SOCIAL EFFECTIVENESS					
PASS/CAPITA		EX			
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP	EX				
VHCL MILES/CAPITA		EX			
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA		EX			
VHCL MILES/ELD POP		EX			
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP		EX			
9. SERVICE EFFECTIVENESS					
PASS/VHCL MI		EX			
PASS/VHCL HR		EX			
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI		NI			
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR		NI			
PASS/VHCL		EX			
VHCL MILES/ACCDNTS		EX			
10. COST EFFECTIVENESS					
TOT EXP/PASS		EX			
DIR OPR EXP/PASS		EX			
ADMIN EXP/PASS		EX			
MAINT EXP/PASS					
LABOR EXP/PASS		EX			
SUBSIDY/PASS					

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same system administrative expenses as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15E: PEER GROUP FIVE
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	FOSSTON CMTY TRANSIT	VIRGINIA DIAL-A-RIDE	PELICAN RAPIDS TRANSIT	ORTONVILLE AREA TRANSIT	APPLETON TRANSIT
1. COST EFFICIENCY					
TOT EXP/VHCL MI			EX		
TOT EXP/VHCL HR					
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI			EX		
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR					
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI		EX			
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR					
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI					
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR					
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP*					
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP*					
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI			EX		
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR					
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP*					
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP*					
2. OPERATING EFFICIENCY					
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI			EX		
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR					
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI			EX		
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR					
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL MI			EX		
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL HR					
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP*					
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL		NI			

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same system administrative expense as a portion of total expenses may be well above the average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15E: PEER GROUP FIVE
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	FOSSTON CMTY TRANSIT	VIRGINIA DIAL-A-RIDE	PELICAN RAPIDS TRANSIT	ORTONVILLE AREA TRANSIT	APPLETON TRANSIT
3. ADMINISTRATION EFFICIENCY					
VHCL MI/OPR EMPL					
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI		EX			
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR					
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI					
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR					
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP*					
ADMIN EXP/VHCL			EX		NI
VHCL MI/ADMIN EMPL					
4. LABOR EFFICIENCY					
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI			EX		
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR					
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI			EX		
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR					
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI					
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR					
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP*					
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP*					
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP*					
VHCL MILES/EMPL					
VHCL HOURS/EMPL					

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same system administrative expense as a portion of total expenses may be well above the average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15E: PEER GROUP FIVE
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	FOSSTON CMTY TRANSIT	VIRGINIA DIAL-A-RIDE	PELICAN RAPIDS TRANSIT	ORTONVILLE AREA TRANSIT	APPLETON TRANSIT
5. REVENUE EFFICIENCY					
OPR REV/VHCL MI			NI		
OPR REV/VHCL HR		EX			
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI			NI		
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR		EX			
OPR REV/PASS				EX	
FAREBOX REV/PASS				EX	
*OPR REV/TOT EXP**					
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP					NI
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP*					
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP					NI
OPR REV/VHCL		EX			
FAREBOX REV/VHCL		EX			
6. MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY					
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI					
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR					
*MAINT EXP/TOT EXP**					
MAINT EXP/VHCL					
7. VEHICLE EFFICIENCY					
VHCL MILES/VHCL		EX			
VHCL HOURS/VHCL		EX			
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL					
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN					EX

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same system administrative expense as a portion of total expenses may be well above the average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15E: PEER GROUP FIVE
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	FOSSTON CMTY TRANSIT	VIRGINIA DIAL-A-RIDE	PELICAN RAPIDS TRANSIT	ORTONVILLE AREA TRANSIT	APPLETON TRANSIT
8. SOCIAL EFFECTIVENESS					
PASS/CAPITA					
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP	EX				
VHCL MILES/CAPITA					EX
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA					EX
VHCL MILES/ELD POP					EX
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP					EX
9. SERVICE EFFECTIVENESS					
PASS/VHCL MI	EX				
PASS/VHCL HR					
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI	EX				
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR	EX				
PASS/VHCL	EX				
VHCL MILES/ACCDNTS			EX		
10. COST EFFECTIVENESS					
TOT EXP/PASS				NI	
DIR OPR EXP/PASS				NI	
ADMIN EXP/PASS				NI	
MAINT EXP/PASS					
LABOR EXP/PASS				NI	
SUBSIDY/PASS				NI	

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same system administrative expense as a portion of total expenses may be well above the average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15F: PEER GROUP SIX
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	LA JUNTA TRANP.	HASTINGS TRANP.	HUTCHINSON TRANP.	ST. PETER TRANP.	NORTHFIELD TRANP.	ELDER CARE	LOGAN TRANP.	WINONA TRANP.	HELENA DIAL-A-RIDE	DURANGO LIFT	MORRIS TRANSIT
1. COST EFFICIENCY											
TOT EXP/VHCL MI			NI	EX			EX	EX	NI	NI	
TOT EXP/VHCL HR						EX		EX	NI	NI	
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	EX		NI	EX			EX			NI	
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	EX		NI	EX		EX			NI	NI	
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	NI				EX			EX	NI		
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	NI				EX	EX		EX	NI		
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI					NI				NI		EX
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR					NI	EX			NI		EX
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP*											
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP*											
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI			NI	EX			EX		NI	NI	
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR		NI	NI			EX	EX		NI	NI	
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP*											
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP*											
2. OPERATING EFFICIENCY											
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	EX		NI	EX			EX			NI	
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	EX		NI	EX		EX			NI	NI	
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	EX		NI	EX			EX		NI	NI	
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	EX		NI	EX		EX	EX		NI	NI	
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL MI			NI	EX	EX						
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL HR		NI	NI		EX	EX			NI		
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP											
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL	EX		EX	NI	NI		EX			NI	

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same systems administrative expense as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15F: PEER GROUP SIX
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	LA JUNTA TRANP.	HASTINGS TRANP.	HUTCHINSON TRANP.	ST. PETER TRANP.	NORTHFIELD TRANP.	ELDER CARE	LOGAN TRANP.	WINONA TRANP.	HELENA DIAL-A-RIDE	DURANGO LIFT	MORRIS TRANSIT
3. ADMINISTRATION EFFICIENCY											
VHCL MI/OPR EMPL				EX	EX					NI	
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	EX				EX			EX	NI		
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	NI				EX	EX		EX	NI		
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	NI				EX		EX	EX	NI		NI
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	NI			NI	EX	EX		EX	NI		
*ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP**											
ADMIN EXP/VHCL			EX	NI	EX			EX	NI		
VHCL MI/ADMIN EMP	NI	EX		EX	NI					NI	
4. LABOR EFFICIENCY											
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI			NI	EX			EX		NI	NI	
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR		NI	NI			EX	EX		NI	NI	
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	EX		NI	EX			EX		NI	NI	
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	EX		NI	EX		EX	EX		NI	NI	
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	NI				EX		EX	EX	NI		NI
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	NI			NI	EX	EX		EX	NI		
*LABOR EXP/TOT EXP**											
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP*											
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP*											
VHCL MILES/EMPL	NI	EX		EX						NI	
VHCL HOURS/EMPL	NI					EX	NI			NI	

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same systems administrative expense as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15F: PEER GROUP SIX
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	LA JUNTA TRANP.	HASTINGS TRANP.	HUTCHINSON TRANP.	ST. PETER TRANP.	NORTHFIELD TRANP.	ELDER CARE	LOGAN TRANP.	WINONA TRANP.	HELENA DIAL-A-RIDE	DURANGO LIFT	MORRIS TRANSIT
5. REVENUE EFFICIENCY											
OPR REV/VHCL MI						EX	NI			EX	
OPR REV/VHCL HR							NI			EX	
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI	NI						NI			EX	
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR	NI						NI			EX	
OPR REV/PASS		EX				EX	NI	NI		EX	
FAREBOX REV/PASS		EX					EX			EX	
OPR REV/TOT EXP											
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP				EX	NI	EX	NI		NI	EX	
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP*											
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP	NI			EX			NI			EX	EX
OPR REV/VHCL	NI		NI	EX		EX	NI			EX	
FAREBOX REV/VHCL	NI		NI	EX			NI			EX	
6. MAINTENANCE EFFICIENCY											
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI					NI				NI		EX
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR					NI	EX			NI		EX
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP											
MAINT EXP/VHCL			EX	NI	NI				NI		EX
7. VEHICLE EFFICIENCY											
VHCL MILES/VHCL	NI		NI	EX							
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	NI		NI	EX		EX				NI	
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL			EX	NI	NI				NI		EX
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN		NI						EX			

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same systems administrative expense as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

NI = Needs Improvement
EX = Exemplary

TABLE 15F: PEER GROUP SIX
VERBAL ANALYSIS OF OUTLIERS

	LA JUNTA TRANP.	HASTINGS TRANP.	HUTCHINSON TRANP.	ST. PETER TRANP.	NORTHFIELD TRANP.	ELDER CARE	LOGAN TRANP.	WINONA TRANP.	HELENA DIAL-A-RIDE	DURANGO LIFT	MORRIS TRANSIT
8. SOCIAL EFFECTIVENESS											
PASS/CAPITA		NI			NI	NI	EX		NI	EX	EX
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP				NI			EX			EX	EX
VHCL MILES/CAPITA			NI	EX	NI	NI			NI	EX	EX
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA									NI	EX	EX
VHCL MILES/ELD POP	NI		NI	EX		NI	EX		NI	EX	EX
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP	NI		NI						NI	EX	EX
9. SERVICE EFFECTIVENESS											
PASS/VHCL MI		NI		NI			EX			EX	
PASS/VHCL HR						NI	EX				
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI		NI		NI	NI	EX					EX
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR		NI		NI	NI		EX		EX		
PASS/VHCL	NI		NI				EX				
VHCL MILES/ACCDNTS		EX								NI	
10. COST EFFECTIVENESS											
TOT EXP/PASS		NI	NI				EX	EX	NI		
DIR OPR EXP/PASS		NI	NI		NI		EX	EX	NI		
ADMIN EXP/PASS	NI	NI			NI		EX	EX	NI	EX	
MAINT EXP/PASS					EX			EX	NI		EX
LABOR EXP/PASS		NI	NI				EX	EX	NI		
SUBSIDY/PASS		NI						EX	NI	EX	

No verbal analysis of outliers is present for performance measures that are expressed as a portion of total expenses. Verbal analysis for these measures would be misleading. For example a transit system may have operating expenses as a portion of total expenses that are well below the group average. However, the same systems administrative expense as a portion of total expenses may be well above the group average. Since the two expenses add to total expenses, exemplary performance in one area is likely to coincide with poor performance in the other. Thus, it is difficult to tell whether the outliers were caused by exemplary or poor performance.

TABLE 16: MEAN PERFORMANCE MEASURES BY PEER GROUP

	PEER GROUP ONE	PEER GROUP TWO	PEER GROUP THREE	PEER GROUP FOUR	PEER GROUP FIVE	PEER GROUP SIX
1. Cost Efficiency						
TOT EXP/VHCL MILE	1.434	1.799	1.730	2.269	1.807	2.191
TOT EXP/VHCL HR	17.888	20.317	24.150	25.094	15.973	22.419
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MILE	1.154	1.339	1.387	1.778	1.741	1.801
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	14.365	15.816	19.591	19.419	15.466	18.209
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MILE	0.280	0.460	0.343	0.491	0.066	0.389
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	3.523	4.501	4.559	5.675	0.507	4.209
MAINT EXP/VHCL MILE	0.130	0.096	0.135	0.124	0.125	0.190
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	1.664	1.149	1.769	1.072	1.022	1.906
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	0.801	0.803	0.800	0.785	0.940	0.812
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	0.199	0.197	0.200	0.215	0.060	0.188
LABOR EXP/VHCL MILE	0.877	0.983	1.139	1.428	1.228	1.562
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR	10.653	12.081	16.360	15.276	12.157	16.027
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	0.096	0.056	0.081	0.046	0.100	0.087
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	0.592	0.596	0.669	0.620	0.566	0.712
2. Operating Efficiency						
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MILE	1.154	1.339	1.387	1.778	1.741	1.801
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	14.365	15.816	19.591	19.419	15.466	18.209
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.690	0.740	0.900	1.109	1.233	1.242
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	8.312	9.154	12.670	11.360	11.158	12.620
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.564	0.60	0.738	0.907	1.160	0.946
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL HR	6.739	7.293	10.719	8.561	10.742	9.623
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	0.801	0.803	0.800	0.785	0.940	0.812
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL	15281.760	14519.740	19706.690	34035.820	27385.000	26916.100

TABLE 16: MEAN PERFORMANCE MEASURES BY PEER GROUP

	PEER GROUP ONE	PEER GROUP TWO	PEER GROUP THREE	PEER GROUP FOUR	PEER GROUP FIVE	PEER GROUP SIX
3. Administration Efficiency						
VHCL MILE/OPR EMPL	16016.920	41608.070	29559.590	29981.950	10242.360	14487.220
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	0.280	0.460	0.343	0.491	0.066	0.389
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	3.523	4.501	4.559	5.675	0.507	4.209
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.187	0.243	0.269	0.319	0.017	0.320
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	2.341	2.927	3.646	3.916	0.075	3.408
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	0.199	0.197	0.200	0.215	0.060	0.188
ADMIN EXP/VHCL	3596.550	3685.370	4299.380	9549.520	808.667	6417.970
VHCL MILE/ADMIN EMPL	111834.720	44987.690	81976.210	111749.050	158748.000	98495.160
4. Labor Efficiency						
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.877	0.983	1.139	1.428	1.228	1.562
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR	10.653	12.081	16.360	15.276	12.157	16.027
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.690	0.740	0.900	1.109	1.233	1.242
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	8.312	9.154	12.670	11.360	11.158	12.620
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.187	0.243	0.269	0.319	0.017	0.320
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	2.341	2.927	3.646	3.916	0.075	3.408
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	0.592	0.596	0.669	0.620	0.566	0.712
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP	0.462	0.466	0.517	0.468	0.563	0.559
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP	0.130	0.130	0.156	0.152	0.046	0.154
VHCL MILES/EMPL	13272.740	18796.560	16338.780	21719.610	16043.790	11949.730
VHCL HOURS/EMPL	1095.530	1409.320	1235.490	1439.890	2091.500	1205.030

TABLE 16: MEAN PERFORMANCE MEASURES BY PEER GROUP

	PEER GROUP ONE	PEER GROUP TWO	PEER GROUP THREE	PEER GROUP FOUR	PEER GROUP FIVE	PEER GROUP SIX
5. Revenue Efficiency						
OPR REV/VHCL MILE	0.306	0.321	0.362	0.157	0.371	0.567
OPR REV/VHCL HOUR	4.169	4.583	5.171	2.264	3.418	5.560
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI	0.139	0.165	0.273	0.096	0.371	0.496
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR	1.636	2.604	3.747	1.316	3.418	4.944
OPR REV/PASS	0.910	1.399	1.041	0.812	2.216	0.803
FAREBOX REV/PASS	0.464	0.764	0.855	0.473	2.216	0.697
OPR REV/TOT EXP	0.218	0.214	0.225	0.082	0.219	0.249
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP	0.274	0.257	0.282	0.106	0.234	0.306
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP	0.095	0.118	0.164	0.050	0.219	0.215
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP	0.122	0.147	0.208	0.064	0.234	0.260
OPR REV/VHCL	4573.830	5072.690	4884.040	3785.460	6777.400	8653.210
FAREBOX REV/VHCL	1756.060	3399.550	3875.670	2315.790	6777.400	7701.490
6. Maintenance Efficiency						
MAINT EXP/VHCL MILE	0.130	0.096	0.135	0.124	0.125	0.190
MAINT EXP/VHCL HOUR	1.664	1.149	1.769	1.072	1.022	1.906
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	0.096	0.056	0.081	0.046	0.100	0.087
MAINT EXP/VHCL	1810.240	1092.950	1871.340	1834.410	1379.250	3012.900
7. Vehicle Efficiency						
VHCL MILES/VHCL	13645.410	13128.230	15762.300	25102.070	14626.930	17292.420
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	1078.130	871.279	1183.220	1851.300	2152.920	1674.060
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL	1810.240	1092.950	1871.340	1834.410	1379.250	3012.900
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN	74447.410	51784.170	12242.900	64156.720	7478.880	16568.730

TABLE 16: MEAN PERFORMANCE MEASURES BY PEER GROUP

	PEER GROUP ONE	PEER GROUP TWO	PEER GROUP THREE	PEER GROUP FOUR	PEER GROUP FIVE	PEER GROUP SIX
			8. Social Effectiveness			
PASS/CAPITA	1.011	0.638	2.569	122.024	5.521	5.119
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP	5.165	7.817	9.818	3.773	12.751	13.946
VHCL MILES/CAPITA	2.957	2.059	5.043	23.160	16.726	5.637
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA	0.218	0.165	0.399	3.792	2.428	0.553
VHCL MILES/ELD POP	23.609	35.709	26.582	732.026	52.185	44.669
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP	1.649	2.833	2.096	124.005	7.568	4.265
			9. Service Effectiveness			
PASS/VHCL MI	0.345	0.472	0.554	1.313	0.504	0.849
PASS/VHCL HR	4.771	4.823	6.705	8.808	3.646	9.510
ELD/HAND PAS/VHCL MI	0.261	0.430	0.440	0.149	0.414	0.334
ELD/HAND PAS/VHCL MI	3.638	4.334	5.479	2.032	2.657	3.307
PASS/VHCL	4484.940	3655.910	6309.550	15609.270	7189.670	14436.660
VHCL MILES/ACCDNTS	127565.830	34336.670	37781.190	169875.330	53396.500	48821.080
			10. Cost Effectiveness			
TOT EXP/PASS	4.590	5.997	5.908	7.822	13.351	3.169
DIR OPR EXP/PASS	3.733	4.932	4.467	5.974	12.971	2.571
ADMIN EXP/PASS	0.857	1.065	1.441	1.848	0.379	0.598
MAINT EXP/PASS	0.427	0.359	0.419	0.255	0.782	0.302
LABOR EXP/PASS	2.812	4.008	4.143	4.640	11.480	2.287
SUBSIDY/PASS	2.589	4.701	5.245	9.350	12.118	2.435

TABLE 17A: PEER GROUP ONE
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	BLUE PEAKS DEVL	SOURIS BASIN TRANSP	WEST RIVER TRANSP	SOUTH CENTRAL SR SERV	TRI-VALLEY HEARLAND XPRESS	SWEETWATER COUNTY TRANSP	ROCS TRANSIT	NE COLORADO TRANSP AUTH
1. Cost Efficiency								
TOT EXP/VHCL MI	0.626	1.335	1.616	0.873	2.369	1.585	1.209	1.861
TOT EXP/VHCL HR	13.624	19.218	15.160	10.291	21.354	25.145	20.320	17.991
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	0.538	0.958	1.099	0.738	2.225	1.308	0.941	1.424
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	11.719	13.791	10.309	8.699	20.056	20.758	15.820	13.765
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	0.084	0.377	0.517	0.135	0.144	0.277	0.268	0.437
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	1.905	5.428	4.852	1.592	1.298	4.387	4.500	4.226
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	0.097	0.105	0.210	0.058	0.142	0.193	NA	0.105
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	2.118	1.512	1.971	0.688	1.278	3.069	NA	1.011
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	0.86	0.718	0.68	0.845	0.939	0.826	0.779	0.765
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	0.14	0.282	0.320	0.155	0.061	0.174	0.221	0.235
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI	0.234	0.766	0.933	0.565	1.741	0.714	0.941	1.121
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR	5.096	11.026	8.750	6.668	15.689	11.335	15.820	10.839
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	0.155	0.079	0.130	0.067	0.060	0.122	NA	0.056
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	0.374	0.574	0.577	0.648	0.735	0.451	0.779	0.602
2. Operating Efficiency								
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	0.538	0.958	1.099	0.738	2.225	1.308	0.941	1.424
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	11.719	13.791	10.309	8.699	20.056	20.758	15.820	13.765
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.202	0.513	0.543	0.484	1.645	0.536	0.719	0.881
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	4.390	7.388	5.093	5.712	14.824	8.497	12.080	8.512
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.122	NA	0.532	0.392	1.078	0.395	0.719	0.708
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL HR	2.650	NA	4.994	4.617	9.716	6.268	12.080	6.847
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	0.860	0.718	0.680	0.845	0.939	0.826	0.779	0.765
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL	6225.750	10608.310	11803.200	16547.500	23706.000	28197.600	9667.940	15497.760

TABLE 17A: PEER GROUP ONE
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	BLUE PEAKS DEVL	SOURIS BASIN TRANSP	WEST RIVER TRANSP	SOUTH CENTRAL SR SERV	TRI-VALLEY HEARLAND XPRESS	SWEETWATER COUNTY TRANSP	ROCS TRANSIT	NE COLORADO TRANSP AUTH
3. Administration Efficiency								
VHCL MILE/OPR EMPL	NA	12794.130	14319.070	21619.920	19728.890	16452.370	11187.170	NA
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	0.088	0.377	0.517	0.135	0.144	0.277	0.268	0.437
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	1.905	5.428	4.852	1.592	1.298	4.387	4.500	4.226
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.032	0.253	0.390	0.081	0.096	0.179	0.223	0.241
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	0.706	3.639	3.657	0.956	0.866	2.837	3.740	2.327
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	0.140	0.282	0.320	0.155	0.061	0.174	0.221	0.235
ADMIN EXP/VHCL	1011.810	4175.080	5555.400	3028.330	1534.400	5959.300	2750.060	4758.000
VHCL MILE/ADMIN EMPL	NA	71967.000	53696.500	192262.860	NA	215526.000	92434.000	45121.950
4. Labor Efficiency								
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.234	0.766	0.933	0.565	1.741	0.714	0.941	1.121
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR	5.096	11.026	8.750	6.668	15.689	11.335	15.820	10.839
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.202	0.513	0.543	0.484	1.645	0.536	0.718	0.881
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	4.390	7.388	5.093	5.712	14.824	8.497	12.080	8.512
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.032	0.253	0.390	0.081	0.096	0.179	0.223	0.241
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	0.706	3.639	3.657	0.955	0.866	2.837	3.740	2.327
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	0.374	0.574	0.577	0.648	0.735	0.451	0.779	0.602
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP	0.322	0.384	0.336	0.555	0.694	0.338	0.594	0.473
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP	0.052	0.189	0.241	0.093	0.041	0.113	0.184	0.129
VHCL MILES/EMPL	NA	10862.940	8949.420	20162.400	14396.760	15285.530	9979.380	NA
VHCL HOURS/EMPL	NA	754.720	954.170	1709.810	1597.300	963.400	593.790	NA

TABLE 17A: PEER GROUP ONE
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	BLUE PEAKS DEVL	SOURIS BASIN TRANSP	WEST RIVER TRANSP	SOUTH CENTRAL SR SERV	TRI-VALLEY HEARLAND XPRESS	SWEETWATER COUNTY TRANSP	ROCS TRANSIT	NE COLORADO TRANSP AUTH
5. Revenue Efficiency								
OPR REV/VHCL MI	0	0.155	0.208	0.279	0.262	0.674	0.621	0.245
OPR REV/VHCL HR	0	2.238	1.954	3.289	2.359	10.701	10.443	2.371
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI	0	0.155	0.208	0.146	0.262	0.040	0.178	0.124
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR	0	2.238	1.954	1.723	2.359	0.628	2.989	1.194
OPR REV/PASS	0	0.707	0.592	1.306	1.036	2.028	1.098	0.510
FAREBOX REV/PASS	0	0.707	0.592	0.684	1.036	0.119	0.314	0.257
OPR REV/TOT EXP	0	0.116	0.129	0.320	0.110	0.426	0.514	0.132
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP	0	0.162	0.190	0.378	0.118	0.516	0.660	0.172
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP	0	0.116	0.129	0.167	0.110	0.025	0.147	0.066
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP	0	0.162	0.190	0.198	0.118	0.030	0.189	0.087
OPR REV/VHCL	0	1721.310	2237.500	6255.830	2788.600	14535.900	6381.780	2669.710
FAREBOX REV/VHCL	0	0	2237.500	3276.830	2788.600	853.000	1826.440	1344.760
6. Maintenance Efficiency								
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	0.097	0.105	0.210	0.058	0.142	0.193	NA	0.105
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	2.118	1.512	1.971	0.688	1.278	3.069	NA	1.011
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	0.155	0.079	0.130	0.067	0.060	0.122	NA	0.056
MAINT EXP/VHCL	1125.000	1163.080	02257.100	1308.330	1510.700	4169.300	NA	1138.180
7. Vehicle Efficiency								
VHCL MILES/VHCL	11562.500	11071.850	10739.300	22430.670	10653.600	21552.600	10270.440	10882.350
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	531.250	769.230	1145.000	1902.170	1182.000	1358.400	611.110	1125.880
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL	1125.000	1163.080	2257.100	1308.330	1510.700	4169.300	NA	1138.180
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN	5138.39	143934	35797.67	67292	53268	NA	184868	30833

TABLE 17A: PEER GROUP ONE
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	BLUE PEAKS DEVL	SOURIS BASIN TRANSP	WEST RIVER TRANSP	SOUTH CENTRAL SR SERV	TRI-VALLEY HEARLAND XPRESS	SWEETWATER COUNTY TRANSP	ROCS TRANSIT	NE COLORADO TRANSP AUTH
8. Social Effectiveness								
PASS/CAPITA	1.579	0.349	0.343	0.896	0.389	1.846	1.206	1.480
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP	10.934	2.070	2.377	2.844	1.598	10.285	5.205	6.006
VHCL MILES/CAPITA	4.601	1.587	0.976	4.195	1.537	5.552	2.131	3.076
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA	0.211	0.110	0.104	0.356	0.171	0.350	0.127	0.318
VHCL MILES/ELD POP	35.394	10.580	7.508	18.239	8.541	79.307	11.213	18.092
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP	1.626	0.735	0.801	1.547	0.948	4.999	0.667	1.872
9. Service Effectiveness								
PASS/VHCL MI	0.343	0.220	0.352	0.214	0.253	0.333	0.566	0.481
PASS/VHCL HR	7.471	3.164	3.299	2.518	2.278	5.276	9.513	4.651
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI	0.309	0.196	0.317	0.156	0.187	0.130	0.464	0.332
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR	6.724	2.816	2.969	1.838	1.686	2.058	7.801	3.209
PASS/VHCL	3968.750	2433.540	3777.600	4790.330	2692.900	7166.700	5813.610	5236.120
ACCDNTS/VHCL MILES	185000	143934	107393	67272	106536	215526	184868	46250
10. Cost Effectiveness								
TOT EXP/PASS	1.824	6.075	4.595	4.087	9.373	4.766	2.136	3.868
DIR OPR EXP/PASS	1.569	4.359	3.125	3.454	8.803	3.935	1.663	2.960
ADMIN EXP/PASS	0.255	1.716	1.471	0.632	0.570	0.832	0.473	0.909
MAINT EXP/PASS	0.283	0.478	0.598	0.273	0.561	0.582	NA	0.217
LABOR EXP/PASS	0.682	3.485	2.652	2.648	6.887	2.148	1.663	2.331
SUBSIDY/PASS	2.161	NA	3.525	2.997	NA	2.691	1.426	2.735

TABLE 17B: PEER GROUP TWO
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	EAGLE TRANSIT	SUBLETTE HI COUNTRY SR. CTR.	SHERBURNE HEARTLAND XPRESS	UNITA SENIOR CIT.	CAMPBELL COUNTY SENIORS
1. Cost Efficiency					
TOT EXP/VHCL MI	2.091	3.483	1.175	0.833	1.411
TOT EXP/VHCL HR	26.945	24.192	24.140	10.236	16.070
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	1.792	1.907	0.869	0.739	1.388
DIR OPREXP/VHCL HR	23.089	13.248	17.857	9.080	15.808
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	0.299	1.576	0.306	0.094	0.023
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	3.857	10.944	6.283	1.157	0.262
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	0.142	0.150	0.073	0.054	0.061
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	1.831	1.042	1.504	0.668	0.698
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	0.857	0.548	0.740	0.887	0.984
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	0.143	0.452	0.260	0.113	0.016
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI	1.358	1.488	0.925	0.624	0.518
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR	17.499	10.333	19.009	7.666	5.898
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	0.068	0.043	0.062	0.065	0.043
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	0.649	0.427	0.787	0.749	0.367
2. Operating Efficiency					
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	1.792	1.907	0.869	0.739	1.388
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	23.089	13.248	17.857	9.080	15.808
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	1.089	0.931	0.619	0.540	0.518
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	14.037	6.466	12.725	6.641	5.898
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.674	0.931	0.539	0.540	0.317
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL HR	8.685	6.466	11.063	6.641	3.613
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	0.857	0.548	0.740	0.887	0.984
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL	20010.000	4133.500	30076.670	7056.140	11322.380

TABLE 17B: PEER GROUP TWO
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	EAGLE TRANSIT	SUBLETTE HI COUNTRY SR. CTR.	SHERBURNE HEARTLAND XPRESS	UNITA SENIOR CIT.	CAMPBELL COUNTY SENIORS
3. Administration Efficiency					
VHCL MILE/OPR EMPL	21440.000	14446.670	103800.000	26745.600	NA
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	0.299	1.576	0.306	0.094	0.023
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	3.857	10.944	6.283	1.157	0.262
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.269	0.557	0.306	0.083	0
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	3.462	3.867	6.283	1.025	0
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	0.143	0.452	0.260	0.113	0.016
ADMIN EXP/VHCL	3342.670	3414.500	10583.330	898.860	187.500
VHCL MILE/ADMIN EMPL	67000.000	14446.670	64875.000	13372.800	65244.000
4. Labor Efficiency					
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI	1.358	1.488	0.925	0.624	0.518
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR	17.499	10.333	19.009	7.666	5.898
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	1.089	0.931	0.619	0.540	0.518
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	14.037	6.466	12.725	6.641	5.898
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.269	0.557	0.306	0.083	0
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	3.462	3.867	6.283	1.025	0
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	0.649	0.427	0.787	0.749	0.367
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP	0.521	0.267	0.527	0.649	0.367
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP	0.128	0.160	0.260	0.100	0
VHCL MILES/EMPL	13743.590	7223.330	37071.430	3322.430	32622.000
VHCL HOURS/EMPL	1066.670	1040.000	1804.640	270.310	2865.000

TABLE 17B: PEER GROUP TWO
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	EAGLE TRANSIT	SUBLETTE HI COUNTRY SR. CTR.	SHERBURNE HEARTLAND XPRESS	UNITA SENIOR CIT.	CAMPBELL COUNTY SENIORS
5. Revenue Efficiency					
OPR REV/VHCL MI	0.860	0.039	0.365	0.189	0.153
OPR REV/VHCL HR	11.087	0.272	7.492	2.318	1.745
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI	0.241	0.028	0.365	0.040	0.153
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR	3.105	0.192	7.492	0.487	1.745
OPR REV/PASS	1.413	0.034	2.430	2.721	0.398
FAREBOX REV/PASS	0.396	0.024	2.430	0.572	0.398
OPR REV/TOT EXP	0.411	0.011	0.310	0.226	0.109
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP	0.480	0.021	0.420	0.255	0.110
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP	0.115	0.008	0.310	0.048	0.109
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP	0.134	0.015	0.420	0.054	0.110
OPR REV/VHCL	9608.830	85.000	12618.330	1801.290	1250.000
FAREBOX REV/VHCL	2690.830	60.000	12618.330	378.570	1250.000
6. Maintenance Efficiency					
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	0.142	0.150	0.073	0.054	0.061
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	1.831	1.042	1.504	0.668	0.698
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	0.068	0.043	0.062	0.065	0.043
MAINT EXP/VHCL	1587.000	325.000	2533.330	519.430	500.000
7. Vehicle Efficiency					
VHCL MILES/VHCL	11166.670	2167.000	34600.000	9552.000	8155.500
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	866.670	312.000	1684.330	777.140	716.250
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL	1587.000	325.000	2533.330	519.430	500.000
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN	67000	4334	103800	3714.62	32622

TABLE 17B: PEER GROUP TWO
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	EAGLE TRANSIT	SUBLETTE HI COUNTRY SR. CTR.	SHERBURNE HEARTLAND XPRESS	UNITA SENIOR CIT.	CAMPBELL COUNTY SENIORS
8. Social Effectiveness					
PASS/CAPITA	0.689	1.023	0.371	0.248	0.856
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP	4.506	8.357	5.200	3.468	17.555
VHCL MILES/CAPITA	1.131	0.895	2.475	3.575	2.221
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA	0.088	0.129	0.120	0.291	0.195
VHCL MILES/ELD POP	8.703	7.458	35.352	71.493	55.536
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP	0.675	1.074	1.721	5.817	4.878
9. Service Effectiveness					
PASS/VHCL MI	0.609	1.144	0.150	0.069	0.385
PASS/VHCL HR	7.849	7.942	3.083	0.852	4.389
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI	0.518	1.121	0.147	0.049	0.316
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR	6.672	7.784	3.022	0.596	3.599
PASS/VHCL	6802.330	2478.000	5193.330	662.000	3143.880
ACCDNTS/VHCL MILES	67000	4334	103800	33432	65244
10. Cost Effectiveness					
TOT EXP/PASS	3.433	3.046	7.829	12.017	3.661
DIR OPR EXP/PASS	2.942	1.668	5.791	10.659	3.601
ADMIN EXP/PASS	0.491	1.378	2.038	1.358	0.060
MAINT EXP/PASS	0.233	0.131	0.488	0.785	0.159
LABOR EXP/PASS	2.229	1.301	6.165	8.999	1.344
SUBSIDY/PASS	2.230	3.012	5.400	9.662	3.204

TABLE 17C: PEER GROUP THREE
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	HEARTLAND EXPRESS	COTTONWOOD COUNTY	CITY OF MONTEVIDEO	ANNANDALE HEARTLAND EXPRESS	LINCOLN COUNTY TRANSP.	MAHNOMEN COUNTY HEARTLAND	LESUEUR PARATRANSIT
1. Cost Efficiency							
TOT EXP/VHCL MI	1.594	1.484	2.338	0.897	2.683	0.877	2.727
TOT EXP/VHCL HR	13.285	21.025	18.967	11.212	27.952	19.155	24.381
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	1.568	1.406	1.856	0.854	1.777	0.771	2.093
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	13.066	19.917	15.056	10.674	18.512	16.840	18.716
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	0.026	0.078	0.482	0.043	0.906	0.106	0.634
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	0.220	1.108	3.911	0.538	9.440	2.315	5.666
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	0.140	0.094	0.110	0.077	0.022	0.002	0.136
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	1.163	1.333	0.896	0.959	0.234	0.038	1.215
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	0.983	0.947	0.794	0.952	0.662	0.879	0.768
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	0.017	0.053	0.206	0.048	0.338	0.121	0.232
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI	NA	1.047	0.393	0.544	2.181	0.551	2.220
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR	NA	14.833	11.301	6.797	22.721	12.040	19.846
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	0.088	0.063	0.047	0.086	0.008	0.002	0.050
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	NA	0.706	0.596	0.606	0.813	0.629	0.814
2. Operating Efficiency							
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	1.568	1.406	1.856	0.854	1.777	0.771	2.093
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	13.066	19.917	15.056	10.674	18.512	16.840	18.716
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	1.196	0.988	1.205	0.544	1.364	0.504	1.642
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	9.970	14.000	9.773	6.797	14.206	11.015	14.685
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL MI	1.196	0.947	0.934	0.544	0.895	0.231	1.221
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL HR	9.970	13.417	7.575	6.797	9.325	5.045	10.920
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	0.983	0.947	0.794	0.952	0.662	0.879	0.768
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL	40765.000	11950.000	19948.750	17078.670	23399.330	48517.000	26513.670

TABLE 17C: PEER GROUP THREE
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	HEARTLAND EXPRESS	COTTONWOOD COUNTY	CITY OF MONTEVIDEO	ANNANDALE HEARTLAND EXPRESS	LINCOLN COUNTY TRANSP.	MAHNOMEN COUNTY HEARTLAND	LESUEUR PARATRANSIT
3. Administration Efficiency							
VHCL MILE/OPR EMPL	43333.330	15813.950	15636.360	114285.710	19753.000	78691.250	14339.620
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	0.026	0.078	0.482	0.043	0.906	0.106	0.634
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	0.220	1.108	3.911	0.538	9.440	2.315	5.666
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	NA	0.059	0.188	0.000	0.817	0.047	0.577
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	NA	0.833	1.528	0.000	8.514	1.025	5.161
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	0.017	0.053	0.206	0.048	0.338	0.121	0.232
ADMIN EXP/VHCL	685.000	665.000	5182.500	860.000	11932.330	6668.000	8026.330
VHCL MILE/ADMIN EMPL	26000.000	340000.000	172000.000	120000.000	25905.570	78691.250	38000.000
4. Labor Efficiency							
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI	NA	1.047	1.393	0.544	2.181	0.551	2.220
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR	NA	14.833	11.301	6.797	22.721	12.040	19.846
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	1.196	0.988	1.205	0.544	1.364	0.504	1.642
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	9.970	14.000	9.773	6.797	14.206	11.015	14.685
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	NA	0.059	0.188	0.000	0.817	0.047	0.577
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	NA	0.833	1.528	0.000	8.514	1.025	5.161
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	NA	0.706	0.596	0.606	0.813	0.629	0.814
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP	0.750	0.666	0.515	0.606	0.508	0.575	0.602
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP	NA	0.040	0.081	0.000	0.304	0.053	0.212
VHCL MILES/EMPL	16250.000	13600.000	17200.000	60000.000	11207.380	39345.630	10410.960
VHCL HOURS/EMPL	1950.000	960.000	2120.000	4800.000	1075.740	1800.630	1164.380

TABLE 17C: PEER GROUP THREE
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	HEARTLAND EXPRESS	COTTONWOOD COUNTY	CITY OF MONTEVIDEO	ANNANDALE HEARTLAND EXPRESS	LINCOLN COUNTY TRANSP.	MAHNOMEN COUNTY HEARTLAND	LESUEUR PARATRANSIT
5. Revenue Efficiency							
OPR REV/VHCL MI	0.459	0.188	0.560	0.186	0.240	0.052	0.577
OPR REV/VHCL HR	3.829	2.667	4.547	2.319	2.503	1.144	5.156
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI	0.459	0.188	0.560	0.106	0.240	0.052	0.577
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR	3.829	2.667	4.547	1.319	2.503	1.144	5.156
OPR REV/PASS	0.478	0.640	0.641	0.928	2.806	0.468	0.730
FAREBOX REV/PASS	0.478	0.640	0.641	0.528	2.806	0.468	0.730
OPR REV/TOT EXP	0.288	0.127	0.240	0.207	0.090	0.060	0.211
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP	0.293	0.134	0.302	0.217	0.135	0.068	0.275
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP	0.288	0.127	0.240	0.118	0.090	0.060	0.211
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP	0.293	0.134	0.302	0.124	0.135	0.068	0.275
OPR REV/VHCL	11945.000	1600.000	6025.000	3710.330	3163.670	3295.000	7303.670
FAREBOX REV/VHCL	11945.000	1600.000	6025.000	2110.330	3163.670	3295.000	7303.670
6. Maintenance Efficiency							
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	0.140	0.094	0.110	0.077	0.022	0.002	0.136
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	1.163	1.333	0.896	0.959	0.234	0.038	1.215
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	0.088	0.063	0.047	0.086	0.008	0.002	0.050
MAINT EXP/VHCL	3630.000	800.000	1187.500	1534.330	295.670	110.000	1721.670
7. Vehicle Efficiency							
VHCL MILES/VHCL	26000.000	8500.000	10750.000	20000.000	13168.670	62953.000	12666.670
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	3120.000	600.000	1325.000	1600.000	1264.000	2881.000	1416.670
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL	3630.000	800.000	1187.500	1534.330	295.670	110.000	1721.670
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN	8666.67	2833	5375	NA	39506	62953	2533

TABLE 17C: PEER GROUP THREE
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	HEARTLAND EXPRESS	COTTONWOOD COUNTY	CITY OF MONTEVIDEO	ANNANDALE HEARTLAND EXPRESS	LINCOLN COUNTY TRANSP.	MAHNOMEN COUNTY HEARTLAND	LESUEUR PARATRANSIT
8. Social Effectiveness							
PASS/CAPITA	8.109	0.394	6.838	1.124	0.491	1.397	8.078
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP	25.801	0.895	19.373	9.064	0.000	6.830	14.029
VHCL MILES/CAPITA	8.433	1.339	7.820	5.622	5.724	12.481	10.232
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA	1.012	0.095	0.964	0.450	0.550	0.571	1.144
VHCL MILES/ELD POP	38.333	6.087	32.582	57.364	22.935	69.338	53.850
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP	4.600	0.430	4.016	4.589	2.201	3.173	6.023
9. Service Effectiveness							
PASS/VHCL MI	0.962	0.294	0.874	0.200	0.086	0.112	0.789
PASS/VHCL HR	8.013	4.167	7.094	2.500	0.892	2.446	7.059
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI	0.673	0.147	0.595	0.158	0.000	0.099	0.261
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR	5.609	2.083	4.824	1.975	0.000	2.153	2.329
PASS/VHCL	25000.000	2500.000	9400.000	4000.000	1127.330	7047.000	10000.000
ACCDNTS/VHCL MILES	26000	17000	43000	60000	39506	62953	38000
10. Cost Effectiveness							
TOT EXP/PASS	1.658	5.046	2.674	4.485	31.341	7.831	3.454
DIR OPR EXP/PASS	1.631	4.780	2.122	4.270	20.756	6.885	2.651
ADMIN EXP/PASS	0.027	0.266	0.551	0.215	10.585	0.946	0.803
MAINT EXP/PASS	0.145	0.320	0.126	0.384	0.262	0.016	0.172
LABOR EXP/PASS	NA	3.560	1.593	2.719	25.475	4.922	2.812
SUBSIDY/PASS	NA	4.406	2.033	4.064	28.534	NA	2.728

TABLE 17C: PEER GROUP THREE
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	BUTTE - SILVER BOW TRANSIT	DICKEY COUNTY SENIOR CIT.	DUNN COUNTY DOA	KIDDER COUNTY COA	SOUTHWEST SENIOR SEVICES	CAVALIER COUNTY SENIOR	RANSOM COUNTY COA
1. Cost Efficiency							
TOT EXP/VHCL MI	2.290	0.965	0.808	0.893	2.535	1.826	1.692
TOT EXP/VHCL HR	26.573	12.196	14.654	28.276	13.965	15.855	33.844
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	2.267	0.860	0.716	0.731	2.188	1.162	1.588
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	26.303	10.867	12.974	23.140	12.055	10.083	31.750
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	0.023	0.105	0.093	0.162	0.347	0.665	0.105
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	0.270	1.329	1.680	5.136	1.910	5.772	2.094
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	0.149	0.084	0.065	0.194	0.659	0.118	0.338
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	1.729	1.060	1.185	6.139	3.632	1.021	6.750
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	0.990	0.891	0.885	0.818	0.863	0.636	0.938
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	0.010	0.109	0.115	0.182	0.137	0.364	0.062
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI	1.521	0.634	0.419	0.487	1.402	1.434	0.844
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR	17.648	8.007	7.594	15.429	7.722	12.450	16.875
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	0.065	0.087	0.081	0.217	0.260	0.064	0.199
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	0.664	0.657	0.518	0.546	0.553	0.785	0.499
2. Operating Efficiency							
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	2.267	0.860	0.716	0.731	2.188	1.162	1.588
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	26.303	10.867	12.974	23.140	12.055	10.083	31.750
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	1.504	0.542	0.347	0.334	1.268	1.052	0.750
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	17.449	6.849	6.289	10.572	6.983	9.133	15.000
DRIVER SL&FB/VHCL MI	1.334	0.542	0.310	0.334	NA	0.670	0.750
DRIVER SL&FB/VHCL HR	15.478	6.849	5.615	10.572	NA	5.816	15.000
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	0.990	0.891	0.885	0.818	0.863	0.636	0.938
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL	45331.140	21734.000	5968.000	27768.000	20895.670	5263.500	25400.000

TABLE 17C: PEER GROUP THREE
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	BUTTE - SILVER BOW TRANSIT	DICKEY COUNTY SENIOR CIT.	DUNN COUNTY DOA	KIDDER COUNTY COA	SOUTHWEST SENIOR SEVICES	CAVALIER COUNTY SENIOR	RANSOM COUNTY COA
3. Administration Efficiency							
VHCL MILE/OPR EMPL	NA	25268.000	12354.070	38000.000	3440.840	NA	37647.060
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	0.023	0.105	0.093	0.162	0.347	0.665	0.105
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	0.270	1.329	1.680	5.136	1.910	5.772	2.094
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.017	0.092	0.072	0.153	0.134	0.382	0.094
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	0.199	1.158	1.304	4.858	0.739	3.317	1.875
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	0.010	0.109	0.115	0.182	0.137	0.364	0.062
ADMIN EXP/VHCL	465.000	2657.000	773.000	6163.000	3310.330	3013.000	1675.000
VHCL MILE/ADMIN EMPL	112000.000	168453.33	166780.000	76000.000	10050.880	NA	213333.330
4. Labor Efficiency							
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI	1.521	0.634	0.419	0.487	1.402	1.434	0.844
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR	17.648	8.007	7.594	15.429	7.722	12.450	16.875
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	1.504	0.542	0.347	0.334	1.268	1.052	0.750
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	17.449	6.849	6.289	10.572	6.983	9.133	15.000
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.017	0.092	0.072	0.153	0.134	0.382	0.094
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	0.199	1.158	1.304	4.858	0.739	3.317	1.875
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	0.664	0.657	0.518	0.546	0.553	0.785	0.499
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP	0.657	0.562	0.429	0.374	0.500	0.576	0.443
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP	0.008	0.095	0.089	0.172	0.053	0.209	0.055
VHCL MILES/EMPL	18983.050	21972.170	6949.170	25333.330	2627.980	NA	32000.000
VHCL HOURS/EMPL	1635.800	1739.130	383.330	800.000	477.060	NA	1600.000

TABLE 17C: PEER GROUP THREE
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	BUTTE - SILVER BOW TRANSIT	DICKEY COUNTY SENIOR CIT.	DUNN COUNTY DOA	KIDDER COUNTY COA	SOUTHWEST SENIOR SEVICES	CAVALIER COUNTY SENIOR	RANSOM COUNTY COA
5. Revenue Efficiency							
OPR REV/VHCL MI	0.414	0.125	0.310	0.271	0.349	0.321	0.206
OPR REV/VHCL HR	4.808	1.534	5.628	8.582	1.923	2.786	4.110
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI	0.414	0.125	0.310	0.271	0.349	0.321	0.206
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR	4.808	1.584	5.628	8.582	1.923	2.786	4.110
OPR REV/PASS	NA	0.413	1.560	2.730	0.509	0.398	1.644
FAREBOX REV/PASS	NA	0.413	1.560	2.730	0.509	0.398	1.644
OPR REV/TOT EXP	0.181	0.130	0.384	0.304	0.138	0.176	0.121
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP	0.183	0.146	0.434	0.371	0.160	0.276	0.129
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP	0.181	0.130	0.384	0.304	0.138	0.176	0.121
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP	0.183	0.146	0.434	0.371	0.160	0.276	0.129
OPR REV/VHCL	8285.710	3167.000	2589.000	10298.000	3333.330	1454.500	3288.000
FAREBOX REV/VHCL	8285.710	3167.000	2589.000	10298.000	3333.330	1454.500	3288.000
6. Maintenance Efficiency							
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	0.149	0.084	0.065	0.194	0.659	0.118	0.338
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	1.729	1.060	1.185	6.139	3.632	1.021	6.750
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	0.065	0.087	0.081	0.217	0.260	0.064	0.199
MAINT EXP/VHCL	2980.290	2120.000	545.000	7367.000	6296.000	533.000	5400.000
7. Vehicle Efficiency							
VHCL MILES/VHCL	20000.000	25268.000	8339.000	38000.000	9548.330	4531.500	16000.000
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	1723.430	2000.000	460.000	1200.000	1733.330	522.000	800.000
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL	2980.290	2120.000	545.000	7367.000	6296.000	533.000	5400.000
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN	8750	25268	8339	19000	28645	9063	8000

TABLE 17C: PEER GROUP THREE
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	BUTTE - SILVER BOW TRANSIT	DICKEY COUNTY SENIOR CIT.	DUNN COUNTY DOA	KIDDER COUNTY COA	SOUTHWEST SENIOR SEVICES	CAVALIER COUNTY SENIOR	RANSOM COUNTY COA
8. Social Effectiveness							
PASS/CAPITA	NA	1.257	0.415	1.559	1.766	1.205	0.338
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP	NA	5.426	2.243	6.235	8.740	5.722	1.152
VHCL MILES/CAPITA	4.200	4.138	2.082	15.703	2.576	1.495	2.702
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA	0.362	0.327	0.115	0.496	0.468	0.172	0.135
VHCL MILES/ELD POP	24.704	18.807	12.248	78.512	12.878	7.473	12.283
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP	2.129	1.489	0.676	2.480	2.338	0.561	0.614
9. Service Effectiveness							
PASS/VHCL MI	NA	0.304	0.199	0.099	0.686	0.806	0.125
PASS/VHCL HR	NA	3.837	3.609	3.143	3.776	6.997	2.500
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI	NA	0.289	0.183	0.079	0.679	0.766	0.094
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR	NA	3.645	3.320	2.515	3.739	6.647	1.875
PASS/VHCL	NA	7674.000	1660.000	3772.000	6545.670	3652.500	2000.000
ACCDNTS/VHCL MILES	70000	25268	8339	38000	28645	9063	16000
10. Cost Effectiveness							
TOT EXP/PASS	NA	3.178	4.061	8.996	3.698	2.266	13.538
DIR OPR EXP/PASS	NA	2.832	3.595	7.362	3.192	1.441	12.700
ADMIN EXP/PASS	NA	0.346	0.466	1.634	0.506	0.825	0.838
MAINT EXP/PASS	NA	0.276	0.328	1.953	0.962	0.146	2.700
LABOR EXP/PASS	NA	2.087	2.104	4.909	2.045	1.779	6.750
SUBSIDY/PASS	NA	2.766	3.296	6.468	3.189	1.944	11.894

TABLE 17C: PEER GROUP THREE
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	JAMES RIVER SENIOR CIT.	GOLDEN VALLEY COUNTY COA	SENIOR MEALS & SERVICES	ARROW TRANSIT	CODY COA	SPINK COUNTY PUB.
1. Cost Efficiency						
TOT EXP/VHCL MI	1.571	1.532	1.403	1.212	1.662	1.295
TOT EXP/VHCL HR	19.135	26.249	17.335	48.165	14.411	9.975
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	1.367	0.817	1.115	0.773	1.366	1.015
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	16.649	13.987	13.769	30.744	11.845	7.822
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	0.204	0.716	0.289	0.438	0.296	0.279
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	2.485	12.262	3.566	17.421	2.565	2.153
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	0.348	0.038	0.068	0.075	0.077	0.086
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	4.241	0.650	0.841	2.987	0.671	0.666
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	0.870	0.533	0.794	0.638	0.822	0.784
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	0.130	0.467	0.206	0.362	0.178	0.216
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI	1.052	0.725	NA	0.880	1.355	0.901
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR	12.820	12.423	NA	34.995	11.744	6.946
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	0.222	0.025	0.048	0.062	0.047	0.067
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	0.670	0.473	NA	0.727	0.815	0.696
2. Operating Efficiency						
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	1.367	0.817	1.115	0.773	1.366	1.015
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	16.649	13.987	13.769	30.744	11.845	7.822
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.972	0.292	0.691	0.511	1.068	0.649
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	11.845	5.000	8.540	20.295	9.260	4.999
DRIVER SL&FB/VHCL MI	0.563	0.292	0.691	0.511	0.836	0.649
DRIVER SL&FB/VHCL HR	6.864	5.000	8.540	20.295	7.249	4.999
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	0.870	0.533	0.794	0.638	0.822	0.784
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL	13081.570	7315.000	15465.400	12297.400	12319.000	8447.670

TABLE 17C: PEER GROUP THREE
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	JAMES RIVER SENIOR CIT.	GOLDEN VALLEY COUNTY COA	SENIOR MEALS & SERVICES	ARROW TRANSIT	CODY COA	SPINK COUNTY PUB.
3. Administration Efficiency						
VHCL MILE/OPR EMPL	22336.000	NA	NA	23555.560	NA	8916.070
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	0.204	0.176	0.289	0.438	0.296	0.279
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	2.485	12.262	3.566	17.421	2.565	2.153
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.080	0.433	NA	0.370	0.287	0.253
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	0.975	7.423	NA	14.700	2.484	1.947
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	0.130	0.467	0.206	0.362	0.178	0.216
ADMIN EXP/VHCL	1952.710	6413.000	4005.000	6968.400	2668.000	2325.330
VHCL MILE/ADMIN EMPL	43230.970	NA	NA	48923.080	6272.000	24965.000
4. Labor Efficiency						
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI	1.052	0.725	NA	0.880	1.355	0.901
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR	12.820	12.423	NA	34.995	11.744	6.946
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.972	0.292	0.691	0.511	1.068	0.649
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	11.845	5.000	8.540	20.295	9.260	4.999
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.080	0.433	NA	0.370	0.287	0.253
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	0.975	7.423	NA	14.700	2.484	1.947
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	0.670	0.473	NA	0.727	0.815	0.696
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP	0.619	0.190	0.493	0.421	0.643	0.501
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP	0.051	0.283	NA	0.305	0.172	0.195
VHCL MILES/EMPL	14106.950	NA	9909.710	15588.240	4623.590	6569.740
VHCL HOURS/EMPL	1157.890	NA	802.290	392.160	533.330	852.630

TABLE 17C: PEER GROUP THREE
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	JAMES RIVER SENIOR CIT.	GOLDEN VALLEY COUNTY COA	SENIOR MEALS & SERVICES	ARROW TRANSIT	CODY COA	SPINK COUNTY PUB.
5. Revenue Efficiency						
OPR REV/VHCL MI	1.949	0.188	0.714	0.287	0.177	0.241
OPR REV/VHCL HR	23.739	3.212	8.814	11.407	1.539	1.856
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI	0.378	0.188	0.270	0.071	0.177	0.241
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR	4.605	3.212	3.335	2.832	1.539	1.855
OPR REV/PASS	3.627	1.741	1.459	0.571	0.235	0.565
FAREBOX REV/PASS	0.703	1.741	0.552	0.142	0.235	0.565
OPR REV/TOT EXP	1.241	0.122	0.508	0.237	0.107	0.186
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP	1.426	0.230	0.640	0.371	0.130	0.237
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP	0.241	0.122	0.192	0.059	0.107	0.186
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP	0.277	0.230	0.242	0.092	0.130	0.237
OPR REV/VHCL	18652.140	1680.000	9899.400	4562.800	1600.000	2003.670
FAREBOX REV/VHCL	3617.860	1680.000	3746.000	1132.800	1600.000	2003.670
6. Maintenance Efficiency						
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	0.348	0.038	0.068	0.075	0.077	0.086
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	4.241	0.650	0.841	2.987	0.671	0.666
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	0.222	0.025	0.048	0.062	0.047	0.067
MAINT EXP/VHCL	3332.290	340.000	944.200	1194.600	697.500	719.000
7. Vehicle Efficiency						
VHCL MILES/VHCL	9572.570	8959.000	13873.600	15900.000	9016.000	8321.670
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	785.710	523.000	1123.200	400.000	1040.000	1080.000
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL	3332.290	340.000	944.200	1194.600	697.500	719.000
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN	67008	8959	NA	26500	18032	24965

TABLE 17C: PEER GROUP THREE
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	JAMES RIVER SENIOR CIT.	GOLDEN VALLEY COUNTY COA	SENIOR MEALS & SERVICES	ARROW TRANSIT	CODY COA	SPINK COUNTY PUB.
8. Social Effectiveness						
PASS/CAPITA	1.587	0.300	1.761	10.156	1.724	1.332
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP	9.618	1.747	8.631	42.074	9.633	5.048
VHCL MILES/CAPITA	2.953	2.786	3.602	20.219	2.283	3.128
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA	0.242	0.163	0.292	0.509	0.263	0.406
VHCL MILES/ELD POP	18.457	16.387	18.001	96.280	13.432	16.463
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP	1.515	0.957	1.458	2.422	1.549	2.137
9. Service Effectiveness						
PASS/VHCL MI	0.537	0.108	0.489	0.502	0.755	0.426
PASS/VHCL HR	6.546	1.845	6.040	19.967	6.545	3.281
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI	0.521	0.107	0.479	0.437	0.717	0.307
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR	6.349	1.827	5.920	17.371	6.218	2.362
PASS/VHCL	5142.860	965.000	6784.600	7986.600	6806.500	3543.670
ACCDNTS/VHCL MI	22336	4479.50	34684	39750	18032	24965
10. Cost Effectiveness						
TOT EXP/PASS	2.923	14.226	2.870	2.412	2.202	3.040
DIR OPR EXP/PASS	2.544	7.580	2.280	1.540	1.810	2.384
ADMIN EXP/PASS	0.380	6.646	0.590	0.873	0.392	0.656
MAINT EXP/PASS	0.648	0.352	0.139	0.150	0.102	0.203
LABOR EXP/PASS	1.959	6.733	NA	1.753	1.795	2.117
SUBSIDY/PASS	-0.704	NA	NA	2.172	NA	NA

TABLE 17C: PEER GROUP THREE
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	NIOBRARA TRANSIT	WALSH COUNTY TRANSP.	DAKOTA TRANSIT ASSOC.	SEMCAC HEARTLAND EXPRESS	RED WING TRANSIT SERV.	MAHUBE TRANSIT
1. Cost Efficiency						
TOT EXP/VHCL MI	1.604	0.903	2.156	1.555	3.655	2.819
TOT EXP/VHCL HR	9.168	NA	NA	75.666	45.686	32.464
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	1.214	0.466	1.312	1.259	3.616	1.912
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	6.936	NA	NA	61.254	45.201	22.018
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	0.391	0.437	0.845	0.296	0.039	0.907
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	2.231	NA	NA	14.413	0.485	10.447
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	0.158	0.009	0.130	0.000	NA	0.206
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	0.900	NA	NA	0.000	NA	2.372
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	0.757	0.516	0.608	0.81	0.989	0.678
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	0.243	0.484	0.392	0.19	0.011	0.322
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI	1.032	0.639	1.488	1.231	NA	2.223
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR	5.896	NA	NA	59.879	NA	25.601
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	0.098	0.01	0.06	0	NA	0.073
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	0.643	0.708	0.69	0.791	NA	0.789
2. Operating Efficiency						
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	1.214	0.466	1.312	1.259	3.616	1.912
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	6.936	NA	NA	61.254	45.201	22.018
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.772	0.293	0.863	1.047	1.485	1.517
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	4.411	NA	NA	50.970	18.561	17.469
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.683	0.293	0.863	0.795	1.485	0.873
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL HR	3.901	NA	NA	38.704	18.561	10.049
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	0.757	0.516	0.608	0.810	0.989	0.678
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL	4855.500	9166.000	16262.8	12250.750	36160.670	24219.330

TABLE 17C: PEER GROUP THREE
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	NIOBRARA TRANSIT	WALSH COUNTY TRANSP.	DAKOTA TRANSIT ASSOC.	SEMCAC HEARTLAND EXPRESS	RED WING TRANSIT SERV.	MAHUBE TRANSIT
3. Administration Efficiency						
VHCL MILE/OPR EMPL	NA	49132.500	16533.330	8650.670	NA	13944.950
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	0.391	0.437	0.844	0.296	0.039	0.907
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	2.231	NA	NA	14.413	0.485	10.447
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.260	0.346	0.625	0.183	NA	0.706
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	1.486	NA	NA	8.909	NA	8.133
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	0.243	0.484	0.392	0.190	0.011	0.322
ADMIN EXP/VHCL	1562.000	8581.000	10471.000	2882.500	388.000	11491.330
VHCL MILE/ADMIN EMPL	7111.110	39306.000	31000.000	28311.270	NA	27142.860
4. Labor Efficiency						
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI	1.032	0.639	1.488	1.231	NA	2.223
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR	5.896	NA	NA	59.879	NA	25.601
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.772	0.293	0.863	1.047	1.485	1.517
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	4.411	NA	NA	50.970	18.561	17.469
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.260	0.346	0.625	0.183	NA	0.706
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	1.486	NA	NA	8.909	NA	8.133
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	0.643	0.708	0.690	0.791	NA	0.789
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP	0.481	0.324	0.4	0.674	0.406	0.538
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP	0.162	0.383	0.290	0.118	NA	0.251
VHCL MILES/EMPL	5000.000	21836.670	11809.520	1255.740	NA	9212.120
VHCL HOURS/EMPL	875.000	NA	NA	25.810	NA	800

TABLE 17C: PEER GROUP THREE
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	NIOBRARA TRANSIT	WALSH COUNTY TRANSP.	DAKOTA TRANSIT ASSOC.	SEMCAC HEARTLAND EXPRESS	RED WING TRANSIT SERV.	MAHUBE TRANSIT
5. Revenue Efficiency						
OPR REV/VHCL MI	0.089	0.133	0.314	0.244	0.173	0.643
OPR REV/VHCL HR	0.507	NA	NA	11.891	2.158	7.408
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI	0.089	0.133	0.314	0.244	0.173	0.643
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR	0.507	NA	NA	11.891	2.158	7.408
OPR REV/PASS	0.031	1.560	0.347	0.502	0.284	1.164
FAREBOX REV/PASS	0.031	1.560	0.347	0.502	0.284	1.164
OPR REV/TOT EXP	0.055	0.148	0.146	0.157	0.047	0.228
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP	0.073	0.286	0.240	0.194	0.048	0.336
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP	0.055	0.148	0.146	0.157	0.047	0.228
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP	0.073	0.286	0.240	0.194	0.048	0.336
OPR REV/VHCL	355.000	2621.000	3899.200	2378.250	1726.670	8148.670
FAREBOX REV/VHCL	355.000	2621.000	3899.200	2378.250	1726.670	8148.670
6. Maintenance Efficiency						
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	0.158	0.009	0.130	0	NA	0.206
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	0.900	NA	NA	0	NA	2.372
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	0.098	0.010	0.060	0	NA	0.073
MAINT EXP/VHCL	630.000	186.000	1610.200	0	NA	2609.330
7. Vehicle Efficiency						
VHCL MILES/VHCL	4000	19653	12400	9732	10000.000	12666.670
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	700	NA	NA	200	800.000	1100.000
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL	630	186	1610.2	0.000	NA	2609.330
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN	1333.33	19653	31000	6488	6000	38000

TABLE 17C: PEER GROUP THREE
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	NIOBRARA TRANSIT	WALSH COUNTY TRANSP.	DAKOTA TRANSIT ASSOC.	SEMCAC HEARTLAND EXPRESS	RED WING TRANSIT SERV.	MAHUBE TRANSIT
8. Social Effectiveness						
PASS/CAPITA	9.124	0.121	3.076	0.111	1.206	0.753
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP	47.539	0.633	9.056	0.620	2.128	3.201
VHCL MILES/CAPITA	3.201	1.420	3.397	0.228	1.982	1.363
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA	0.560	NA	NA	0.005	0.159	0.118
VHCL MILES/ELD POP	16.849	7.474	18.871	1.340	11.661	8.518
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP	2.949	NA	NA	0.028	0.933	0.740
9. Service Effectiveness						
PASS/VHCL MI	2.850	0.085	0.905	0.487	0.608	0.553
PASS/VHCL HR	16.286	NA	NA	23.700	7.604	6.364
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI	2.822	0.085	0.480	0.463	0.183	0.376
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR	16.123	NA	NA	22.515	2.281	4.327
PASS/VHCL	11400.000	1680.000	11227.800	4740.000	6083.330	7000.000
VHCL MILES/ACCDNTS	8000	19653	62000	38928	30000	38000
10. Cost Effectiveness						
TOT EXP/PASS	0.563	10.564	2.381	3.193	6.008	5.102
DIR OPR EXP/PASS	0.426	5.456	1.448	2.585	5.944	3.46
ADMIN EXP/PASS	0.137	5.108	0.933	0.608	0.064	1.641
MAINT EXP/PASS	0.055	0.111	0.143	0.000	NA	0.373
LABOR EXP/PASS	0.362	7.475	1.643	2.527	NA	4.023
SUBSIDY/PASS	0.549	8.540	2.034	NA	NA	NA

TABLE 17D: PEER GROUP FOUR
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	SPECIAL TRANSIT	MOUNTAIN XPRESS	SENIORS RESOURCE CENTER	CARVER AREA RURAL TRANSP	SENIOR TRANSP PROGRAM
1. Cost Efficiency					
TOT EXP/VHCL MI	2.963	3.329	2.666	0.723	1.663
TOT EXP/VHCL HR	30.412	19.18	28.549	14.072	33.257
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	2.131	2.786	2.148	0.596	1.229
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	21.871	16.049	23.001	11.597	24.577
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	0.832	0.543	0.518	0.127	0.434
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	8.541	3.13	5.548	2.475	8.68
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	0.147	0.294	NA	0.019	0.036
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	1.512	1.693	NA	0.373	0.712
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	0.719	0.837	0.806	0.824	0.739
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	0.281	0.163	0.194	0.176	0.261
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI	1.851	2.369	1.554	0.459	0.908
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR	18.998	13.644	16.641	8.942	18.154
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	0.05	0.088	NA	0.026	0.021
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	0.625	0.711	0.583	0.635	0.546
2. Operating Efficiency					
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	2.131	2.786	2.148	0.596	1.229
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	21.871	16.049	23.001	11.597	24.577
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	1.382	2.012	1.268	0.339	0.542
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	14.188	11.589	13.58	6.595	10.846
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.979	2.012	NA	0.288	0.35
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL HR	10.047	11.589	NA	5.61	7
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	.719	0.837	0.806	0.824	0.739
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL	35410.05	28045.67	43451.36	31322	31950

TABLE 17D: PEER GROUP FOUR
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	SPECIAL TRANSIT	MOUNTAIN XPRESS	SENIORS RESOURCE CENTER	CARVER AREA RURAL TRANSP	SENIOR TRANSP PROGRAM
3. Administration Efficiency					
VHCL MILE/OPR EMPL	12383.41	5113.23	21707.32	81816.89	28888.89
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	0.832	0.543	0.518	0.127	0.434
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	8.541	3.13	5.548	2.475	8.68
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.469	0.357	0.286	0.121	0.365
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	4.81	2.055	3.061	2.348	7.308
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	0.281	0.163	0.194	0.176	0.261
ADMIN EXP/VHCL	13828.11	5470.5	10481.09	6684.43	11283.5
VHCL MILE/ADMIN EMPL	69401.54	120800	40454.55	294540.8	33548.39
4. Labor Efficiency					
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI	1.851	2.369	1.554	0.459	0.908
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR	18.998	13.644	16.641	8.942	18.154
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	1.382	2.012	1.268	0.339	0.542
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	14.188	11.589	13.58	6.595	10.846
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.469	0.357	0.286	0.121	0.365
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	4.81	2.055	3.061	2.348	7.308
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	0.625	0.711	0.583	0.635	0.546
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP	0.467	0.604	0.476	0.469	0.326
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP	0.158	0.107	0.107	0.167	0.22
VHCL MILES/EMPL	9821.99	4905.58	14082.28	64030.61	15757.58
VHCL HOURS/EMPL	956.83	851.57	1315.19	3288	787.88

TABLE 17D: PEER GROUP FOUR
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	SPECIAL TRANSIT	MOUNTAIN XPRESS	SENIORS RESOURCE CENTER	CARVER AREA RURAL TRANSP	SENIOR TRANSP PROGRAM
5. Revenue Efficiency					
OPR REV/VHCL MI	0.092	NA	0.277	0.049	0.21
OPR REV/VHCL HR	0.939	NA	2.961	0.946	4.209
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI	0.092	0	0.222	0.049	0.116
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR	0.939	0	2.377	0.946	2.317
OPR REV/PASS	0.341	NA	0.961	0.405	1.541
FAREBOX REV/PASS	0.341	0	0.772	0.405	0.848
OPR REV/TOT EXP	0.031	NA	0.104	0.067	0.127
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP	0.043	NA	0.129	0.082	0.171
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP	0.031	0	0.083	0.067	0.07
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP	0.043	0	0.103	0.082	0.094
OPR REV/VHCL	1520.74	NA	5593.09	2556	5472
FAREBOX REV/VHCL	1520.74	0	4490.73	2556	3011.5
6. Maintenance Efficiency					
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	0.147	0.294	NA	0.019	0.036
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	1.512	1.693	NA	0.373	0.712
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	0.05	0.088	NA	0.026	0.021
MAINT EXP/VHCL	2447.26	2958.25	NA	1007.14	925
7. Vehicle Efficiency					
VHCL MILES/VHCL	16619.84	10066.67	20227.27	52596.57	26000
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	1619.05	1747.5	1889.09	2700.86	1300
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL	2447.26	2958.25	NA	1007.14	925
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN	5638.88	60400	NA	184088	6500

TABLE 17D: PEER GROUP FOUR
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	SPECIAL TRANSIT	MOUNTAIN XPRESS	SENIORS RESOURCE CENTER	CARVER AREA RURAL TRANSP	SENIOR TRANSP PROGRAM
8. Social Effectiveness					
PASS/CAPITA	0.375	608.619	0.146	0.921	0.058
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP	4.13	0	1.642	11.168	1.925
VHCL MILES/CAPITA	1.401	105.779	0.507	7.684	0.427
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA	0.137	18.363	0.047	0.395	0.021
VHCL MILES/ELD POP	17.52	3525.98	6.34	96.05	14.24
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP	1.706	612.084	0.592	4.932	0.712
9. Service Effectiveness					
PASS/VHCL MI	0.268	5.754	0.288	0.12	0.137
PASS/VHCL HR	2.751	33.145	3.08	2.334	2.731
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI	0.236	0	0.259	0.116	0.135
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR	2.42	0	2.772	2.264	2.703
PASS/VHCL	4453.21	57920.25	5818.18	6304.71	3550
ACCDNTS/VHCL MILES	NA	30200	111250	368176	52000
10. Cost Effectiveness					
TOT EXP/PASS	11.057	0.579	9.27	6.028	12.179
DIR OPR EXP/PASS	7.952	0.484	7.468	4.968	9
ADMIN EXP/PASS	3.105	0.094	1.801	1.06	3.178
MAINT EXP/PASS	0.55	0.051	NA	0.16	0.261
LABOR EXP/PASS	6.907	0.412	5.403	3.831	6.648
SUBSIDY/PASS	10.734	NA	7.967	NA	NA

TABLE 17E: PEER GROUP FIVE PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES					
	FOSSTON TRANSIT	VIRGINIA DIAL-A-RIDE	PELICAN RAPIDS TRANSIT	ORTONVILLE TRANSIT	APPLETON TRANSIT
1. Cost Efficiency					
TOT EXP/VHCL MI	1.800	1.816	0.270	2.849	2.300
TOT EXP/VHCL HR	11.451	18.907	NA	13.022	20.513
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	1.710	1.795	0.224	2.782	2.196
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	10.878	18.683	NA	12.715	19.588
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	0.090	0.215	0.046	0.067	0.104
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	0.573	0.224	NA	0.307	0.926
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	0.153	NA	0.054	0.117	0.174
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	0.976	NA	NA	0.535	1.554
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	0.950	0.988	0.829	0.976	0.955
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	0.050	0.012	0.171	0.024	0.045
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI	NA	1.281	0.046	2.036	1.551
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR	NA	13.331	NA	9.306	13.833
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	0.085	NA	0.200	0.041	0.076
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	NA	0.705	0.171	0.715	0.674
2. Operating Efficiency					
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	1.710	1.795	0.224	2.782	2.196
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	10.878	18.683	NA	12.715	19.588
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	1.318	1.259	0	2.036	1.551
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	8.385	13.107	NA	9.306	13.833
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL MI	1.318	1.259	0	1.672	1.551
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL HR	8.385	13.107	NA	7.642	13.833
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	0.950	0.988	0.829	0.976	0.955
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL	21376.000	61200.000	1006.000	23472.000	29871.000

TABLE 17E: PEER GROUP FIVE PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES					
	FOSSTON TRANSIT	VIRGINIA DIAL-A-RIDE	PELICAN RAPIDS TRANSIT	ORTONVILLE TRANSIT	APPLETON TRANSIT
3. Administration Efficiency					
VHCL MILE/OPR EMPL	11363.640	NA	NA	9121.080	NA
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	0.090	0.022	0.046	0.067	0.104
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	0.573	0.224	NA	0.307	0.926
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	NA	0.022	0.046	0	0
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	NA	0.224	NA	0	0
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	0.050	0.012	0.171	0.024	0.045
ADMIN EXP/VHCL	1125.000	733.330	207.000	566.000	1412.000
VHCL MILE/ADMIN EMPL	250000.000	NA	NA	67496.000	NA
4. Labor Efficiency					
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI	NA	1.281	0.046	2.036	1.551
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR	NA	13.331	NA	9.306	13.833
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	1.318	1.259	0	2.036	1.551
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	8.385	13.107	NA	9.306	13.833
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	NA	0.022	0.046	0	0
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	NA	0.224	NA	0	0
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	NA	0.705	0.171	0.715	0.674
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP	0.732	0.693	0	0.715	0.674
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP	NA	0.012	0.171	0	0
VHCL MILES/EMPL	10869.570	29226.570	NA	8035.240	NA
VHCL HOURS/EMPL	1708.700	2807.710	NA	1758.100	NA

TABLE 17E: PEER GROUP FIVE PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES					
	FOSSTON TRANSIT	VIRGINIA DIAL-A-RIDE	PELICAN RAPIDS TRANSIT	ORTONVILLE TRANSIT	APPLETON TRANSIT
5. Revenue Efficiency					
OPR REV/VHCL MI	0.471	0.591	0.062	0.456	0.273
OPR REV/VHCL HR	2.999	6.153	NA	2.086	2.433
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI	0.471	0.591	0.062	0.456	0.273
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR	2.999	6.153	NA	2.086	2.433
OPR REV/PASS	0.358	1.441	0.114	7.700	1.470
FAREBOX REV/PASS	0.358	1.441	0.114	7.700	1.470
OPR REV/TOT EXP	0.262	0.325	0.230	0.160	0.119
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP	0.276	0.329	0.277	0.164	0.124
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP	0.262	0.325	0.23	0.160	0.119
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP	0.276	0.329	0.277	0.164	0.124
OPR REV/VHCL	5893.000	20154.000	279.000	3850.000	3711.000
FAREBOX REV/VHCL	5893.000	20154.000	279.000	3850.000	3711.000
6. Maintenance Efficiency					
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	0.153	NA	0.054	0.117	0.174
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	0.976	NA	NA	0.535	1.554
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	0.085	NA	0.200	0.041	0.076
MAINT EXP/VHCL	1917.000	NA	242.000	988.000	2370.000
7. Vehicle Efficiency					
VHCL MILES/VHCL	12500.000	34097.670	4500.000	8437.000	13600.000
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	1965.000	3275.670	NA	1846.000	1525.000
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL	1917.000	NA	242.000	988.000	2370.000
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN	6250	12786.63	4500	8437	3400

TABLE 17E: PEER GROUP FIVE PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES					
	FOSSTON TRANSIT	VIRGINIA DIAL-A-RIDE	PELICAN RAPIDS TRANSIT	ORTONVILLE TRANSIT	APPLETON TRANSIT
8. Social Effectiveness					
PASS/CAPITA	10.780	4.460	1.299	0.227	10.837
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP	30.319	6.862	4.435	0.786	21.355
VHCL MILES/CAPITA	8.175	10.871	2.386	3.826	58.369
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA	1.285	1.044	NA	0.837	6.545
VHCL MILES/ELD POP	25.548	41.810	8.228	13.665	171.674
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP	4.016	4.017	NA	2.990	19.250
9. Service Effectiveness					
PASS/VHCL MI	1.319	0.410	0.544	0.059	0.186
PASS/VHCL HR	8.388	4.271	NA	0.270	1.656
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI	1.187	0.164	0.539	0.057	0.124
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI	7.550	1.708	NA	0.263	1.109
PASS/VHCL	16483.000	13990.330	2450.000	500.000	2525.000
ACCDNTS/VHCL MILES	12500	102293	4500	8437	13600
10. Cost Effectiveness					
TOT EXP/PASS	1.365	4.427	0.495	48.076	12.389
DIR OPR EXP/PASS	1.297	4.374	0.411	46.944	11.830
ADMIN EXP/PASS	0.068	0.052	0.084	1.132	0.559
MAINT EXP/PASS	0.116	NA	0.099	1.976	0.939
LABOR EXP/PASS	NA	3.121	0.085	34.358	8.355
SUBSIDY/PASS	1.001	2.986	0.381	45.106	11.110

TABLE 17F: PEER GROUP SIX
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	LAJUNTA TRANSIT	HASTINGS TRANSIT	HUTCHINSON TRANSIT	ST.PETER TRANSIT	NORTHFIELD TRANSIT	ELDER CARE	LOGAN TRANSIT	WINONA TRANSIT	HELENA DIAL-A-RIDE	DURANGO LIFT	MORRIS TRANSIT
1. Cost Efficiency											
TOT EXP/VHCL MI	1.951	2.102	3.050	1.263	2.363	2.115	1.181	1.519	2.937	3.476	2.139
TOT EXP/VHCL HR	20.567	25.223	27.457	17.896	20.751	10.936	18.146	15.464	34.300	37.432	18.439
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	1.235	1.683	2.685	0.859	2.183	1.851	0.893	1.479	2.173	3.126	1.646
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	13.017	20.197	24.174	12.163	19.167	9.572	13.720	15.053	25.381	33.666	14.191
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	0.716	0.419	0.365	0.405	0.180	0.264	0.288	0.040	0.764	0.350	0.493
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	7.544	5.026	3.284	5.733	1.584	1.363	4.426	0.411	8.919	3.766	4.248
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	0.252	NA	0.161	0.121	0.404	0.093	NA	0.112	0.340	NA	0.034
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	2.661	NA	1.449	1.715	3.543	0.479	NA	1.141	3.969	NA	0.294
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	0.633	0.801	0.880	0.68	0.924	0.875	0.756	0.973	0.740	0.899	0.770
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	0.367	0.199	0.120	0.32	0.076	0.125	0.244	0.027	0.260	0.100	0.230
LABOR EXP/VHCL MI	1.304	1.675	2.443	0.905	1.563	1.222	0.712	1.243	2.166	2.178	1.768
LABOR EXP/VHCL HR	13.75	20.104	21.994	12.821	13.726	6.315	10.941	12.656	25.300	23.455	15.238
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	0.129	NA	0.053	0.096	0.171	0.044	NA	0.074	0.116	NA	0.016
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	0.669	0.797	0.801	0.716	0.661	0.578	0.603	0.818	0.738	0.627	0.826
2. Operating Efficiency											
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL MI	1.235	1.683	2.685	0.859	2.183	1.851	0.893	1.479	2.173	3.126	1.646
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL HR	13.017	20.197	24.174	12.163	19.167	9.572	13.720	15.053	25.381	33.666	14.191
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.663	1.302	2.115	0.561	1.415	1.000	0.541	1.220	1.635	1.908	1.303
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	6.991	15.621	19.045	7.948	12.425	5.171	8.318	12.419	19.100	20.549	11.228
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.663	1.223	1.515	0.561	0.623	0.795	NA	NA	1.244	NA	NA
DRIVER SAL&FB/VHCL HR	6.991	14.678	13.636	7.948	5.466	4.112	NA	NA	14.533	NA	NA
DIR OPR EXP/TOT EXP	0.633	0.801	0.880	0.680	0.924	0.875	0.756	0.973	0.740	0.899	0.770
DIR OPR EXP/VHCL	12826.330	32820.250	8486.850	36488.000	35343.000	31026.670	18598.330	29783.710	31726.750	33660.500	25316.750

TABLE 17F: PEER GROUP SIX
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	LAJUNTA TRANSIT	HASTINGS TRANSIT	HUTCHINSON TRANSIT	ST.PETER TRANSIT	NORTHFIELD TRANSIT	ELDER CARE	LOGAN TRANSIT	WINONA TRANSIT	HELENA DIAL-A-RIDE	DURANGO LIFT	MORRIS TRANSIT
3. Administration Efficiency											
VHCL MILE/OPR EMPL	12849.480	15600.000	12265.070	202380.100	17661.820	14895.700	14367.820	NA	NA	7128.500	15378.500
ADMIN EXP/VHCL MI	0.716	0.419	0.365	0.405	0.180	0.264	0.288	0.040	0.764	0.350	0.493
ADMIN EXP/VHCL HR	7.544	5.026	3.284	5.733	1.584	1.363	4.426	0.411	8.919	3.766	4.248
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.641	0.374	0.328	0.344	0.148	0.221	0.171	0.023	0.531	0.270	0.465
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	6.759	4.483	2.950	4.873	1.302	1.144	2.623	0.237	6.200	2.906	4.009
ADMIN EXP/TOT EXP	0.367	0.199	0.120	0.320	0.076	0.125	0.244	0.027	0.260	0.101	0.230
ADMIN EXP/VHCL	7433.000	8167.250	1152.770	17198.500	2921.670	4419.000	6000.000	813.140	11148.250	3765.330	7578.750
VHCL MILE/ADMIN EMPL	31160.000	240000.000	109568.000	170000.000	36656.600	125682.500	68807.340	NA	NA	43068.000	64514.000
4. Labor Efficiency											
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL MI	1.304	1.675	2.443	0.905	1.563	1.222	0.712	1.243	2.166	2.178	1.768
TOT SAL&FB/VHCL HR	13.750	20.104	21.994	12.821	13.726	6.315	10.941	12.656	25.300	23.455	15.238
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.663	1.302	2.115	0.561	1.415	1.000	0.541	1.220	1.635	1.908	1.303
DIR OPR SAL&FB/VHCL HR	6.991	15.621	19.045	7.948	12.425	5.171	8.318	12.419	19.100	20.549	11.228
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL MI	0.641	0.374	0.328	0.344	0.148	0.221	0.171	0.023	0.531	0.270	0.465
ADMIN SAL&FB/VHCL HR	6.759	4.483	2.950	4.873	1.302	1.144	2.623	0.237	6.200	2.906	4.009
LABOR EXP/TOT EXP	0.669	0.797	0.801	0.716	0.661	0.578	0.603	0.818	0.738	0.627	0.826
DIR OPR SAL&FB/TOT EXP	0.340	0.619	0.694	0.444	0.599	0.473	0.458	0.803	0.557	0.549	0.609
ADMIN SAL&FB/TOT EXP	0.329	0.178	0.107	0.272	0.063	0.105	0.145	0.015	0.181	0.078	0.217
VHCL MILES/EMPL	9097.810	14181.820	10812.630	17989.42	12142.500	11828.940	13345.200	NA	11680.000	6116.170	12302.800
VHCL HOURS/EMPL	863.070	1181.820	1201.050	1269.84	1383.000	2288.000	868.330	NA	1000.000	567.950	1427.200

TABLE 17F: PEER GROUP SIX
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	LAJUNTA TRANSIT	HASTINGS TRANSIT	HUTCHINSON TRANSIT	ST.PETER TRANSIT	NORTHFIELD TRANSIT	ELDER CARE	LOGAN TRANSIT	WINONA TRANSIT	HELENA DIAL-A-RIDE	DURANGO LIFT	MORRIS TRANSIT
5. Revenue Efficiency											
OPR REV/VHCL MI	0.463	0.537	0.584	0.356	0.465	0.816	0	0.796	0.454	1.438	0.627
OPR REV/VHCL HR	4.884	6.443	5.259	5.041	4.083	4.218	0	5.048	5.300	15.482	5.404
FAREBOX REV/VHCL MI	0.087	0.537	0.584	0.338	0.465	0.535	0	0.496	0.454	1.335	0.627
FAREBOX REV/VHCL HR	0.916	6.443	5.259	4.792	4.083	2.768	0	5.048	5.300	14.371	5.404
OPR REV/PASS	0.722	1.269	0.889	0.756	0.753	1.327	0	0.451	0.770	1.139	0.758
FAREBOX REV/PASS	0.135	1.269	0.889	0.719	0.753	0.871	0	0.451	0.770	1.057	0.758
OPR REV/TOT EXP	0.238	0.255	0.192	0.282	0.197	0.386	0	0.326	0.155	0.414	0.293
OPR REV/DIR OPR EXP	0.375	0.319	0.218	0.414	0.213	0.441	0	0.335	0.209	0.460	0.381
FAREBOX REV/TOT EXP	0.045	0.255	0.192	0.268	0.197	0.253	0	0.326	0.155	0.384	0.293
FAREBOX REV/DIR OPR EXP	0.070	0.319	0.218	0.394	0.213	0.289	0	0.335	0.209	0.427	0.381
OPR REV/VHCL	4812.330	10469.750	1846.150	15123.500	7529.000	13672.000	0	9986.860	6625.000	15479.170	9641.500
FAREBOX REV/VHCL	902.670	10469.750	1846.150	14374.500	7529.000	8972.000	0	9986.860	6625.000	14368.920	9641.500
6. Maintenance Efficiency											
MAINT EXP/VHCL MI	0.252	NA	0.161	0.121	0.404	0.093	NA	0.112	0.340	NA	0.034
MAINT EXP/VHCL HR	2.661	NA	1.449	1.715	3.543	0.479	NA	1.141	3.969	NA	0.294
MAINT EXP/TOT EXP	0.129	NA	0.053	0.096	0.171	0.044	NA	0.074	0.116	NA	0.016
MAINT EXP/VHCL	2622.000	NA	508.540	5144.500	6533.330	1553.000	NA	2256.860	4960.750	NA	524.250
7. Vehicle Efficiency											
VHCL MILES/VHCL	10386.670	19500	3160.620	42500.000	16190.000	16757.670	20833.330	20142.860	14600.000	10767.000	15378.500
VHCL HOURS/VHCL	985.330	1625	351.080	3000.000	1844.000	3241.330	1355.560	1978.570	1250.000	999.830	1784.000
MAINT EXP/ACT VHCL	2622.000	NA	508.540	5144.500	6533.330	1553.000	NA	22556.860	4960.750	NA	524.250
VHCL MI/VHCL BRKDN	15580	7800	NA	NA	9714	NA	14423.08	35250	0	11680	NA

TABLE 17F: PEER GROUP SIX
PERFORMANCE MEASURE VALUES

	LAJUNTA TRANSIT	HASTINGS TRANSIT	HUTCHINSON TRANSIT	ST.PETER TRANSIT	NORTHFIELD TRANSIT	ELDER CARE	LOGAN TRANSIT	WINONA TRANSIT	HELENA DIAL-A-RIDE	DURANGO LIFT	MORRIS TRANSIT
8. Social Effectiveness											
PASS/CAPITA	2.619	2.137	2.343	3.970	2.043	1.921	12.209	5.482	1.400	13.121	9.069
ELD TRIPS/ELD POP	9.243	8.547	8.368	0	7.151	13.443	27.132	7.880	7.501	28.429	35.710
VHCL MILES/CAPITA	4.080	5.050	3.566	8.436	3.308	3.123	5.723	4.986	2.377	10.395	10.959
VHCL HOURS/CAPITA	0.387	0.421	0.396	0.595	0.377	0.604	0.372	0.490	0.204	0.965	1.271
VHCL MILES/ELD POP	24.000	50.502	25.470	69.147	33.077	22.308	63.590	31.165	16.978	86.621	68.495
VHCL HOURS/ELD POP	2.277	4.208	2.829	4.881	3.767	4.315	4.138	3.061	1.454	8.044	7.946
9. Service Effectiveness											
PASS/VHCL MI	0.642	0.423	0.657	0.471	0.618	0.615	2.133	1.099	0.589	1.262	0.828
PASS/VHCL HR	6.766	5.077	5.916	6.667	5.423	3.179	32.787	11.191	6.880	13.594	7.134
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL MI	0.385	0.169	0.329	0	0.216	0.603	0.427	0.253	0.442	0.328	0.521
ELD/HAND PASS/VHCL HR	4.060	2.031	2.958	0	1.898	3.116	6.557	2.574	5.160	3.534	4.494
PASS/VHCL	6666.670	8250.000	2076.920	20000.000	10000.000	10304.670	44444.440	22142.860	8600.000	13591.420	12726.250
ACCDNTS/VHCL MILES	31160	78000	41088	85000	24285	50273	187500	7055	58400	12920.4	NA
10. Cost Effectiveness											
TOT EXP/PASS	3.039	4.968	4.641	2.684	3.826	3.440	0.553	1.382	4.985	2.754	2.585
DIR OPR EXP/PASS	1.924	3.978	4.086	1.824	3.534	3.011	0.418	1.345	3.689	2.477	1.989
ADMIN EXP/PASS	1.115	0.990	0.555	0.860	0.292	0.429	0.135	0.037	1.296	0.277	0.596
MAINT EXP/PASS	0.393	NA	0.245	0.257	0.653	0.151	NA	0.102	0.577	NA	0.041
LABOR EXP/PASS	2.032	3.960	3.718	1.923	2.531	1.986	0.334	1.131	3.677	1.725	2.136
SUBSIDY/PASS	2.003	3.699	NA	1.935	NA	2.342	2.830	0.915	4.215	1.545	NA