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# TRANSIT ASSISTANCE DISTRIBUTION FORMULA STUDY 

## PURPOSE OF THE FUNDING

LEGISLATIVE: To provide assistance to public transit for the development, improvement, and maintenance of public transit systems.

FUND RECIPIENTS:

- To maintain and support public transit operations
- To offset the impact of declining federal support
- To encourage innovation
- To subsidize transportation services for the transit dependent
- To reward efficient operation


## Transit Assistance Distribution Formula

## History

1977 State Transit Assistance Initiated, Total of \$1.34 Million Distributed on a Discretionary Basis

1979 Proposal to Create a Formula for the Distribution of State Transit Assistance Funds Circulated for Comment, A Total of \$2.26 Million Distributed on a Discretionary Basis

1981 State Transit Assistance Distributed Based on the New Formula. A Total of \$2.25 Million Distributed

1982 Minor Adjustments Made to the Model, Primarily in
to Definitions of Model Inputs (LDI) and Communication
1988 of Specific Project Emphasis Areas, Funding Increased From \$2.1 Million in 1982 to \$4 Million in 1988

State Transit Assistance Funding Study Initiated

## Transit Funding Formula



## IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING DISTRIBUTION FORMULA STUDY CALCULATION OF REGIONAL SYSTEMS' SHARE

Step 1: A portion of the funding is set aside exclusively for regional systems. This is done by determining the ratio of 75 percent of the regional's operating expenses to the total operating expenses of all systems. This ratio, multiplied by 100 , becomes the percentage of total funds available exclusively for regional systems. (For the period between 1982 and 1987, this amounted to approximately 14 percent.)

Step 2: The portion of funding set aside exclusively for regional systems is distributed among those systems based on the percentage of each system's locally deter mined income (LDI) relative to the total regional LDI.

Step 3: The portion of funding remaining from Step 1 is distributed between regional and urban systems based on revenue miles. The regional revenue miles are divided by total revenue miles to determine the percentage going to regional systems.

Step 4: Fifty percent of the regional system's portion is distributed among systems based on the percentage each systems' LDI makes up of the total regional LDI.

Step 5: Twenty-five percent of the regional system's portion is distributed among systems based on the ratio of each system's number of passengers per operating expense dollar to average number of passengers per operating expense dollar for all regional systems.

Step 6: Twenty-five percent of the regional system's portion is distributed among systems based on the ratio of each system's number of revenue miles per operating dollar to the average number of revenue miles per operating expense dollar for all regional systems.

## Transit Funding Formula

## REGIONAL SYSTEMS



## IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING DISTRIBUTION FORMULA STUDY CALCULATION OF URBAN SYSTEMS' SHARE

Step 1: A portion of the funding is set aside exclusively for regional systems. This is done by determining the ratio of 75 percent of the regional's operating expenses to the total operating expenses of all systems. This ratio, multiplied by 100, becomes the percentage of total funds available exclusively for regional systems. (For the period between 1982 and 1987, this amounted to approximately 14 percent.)

Step 2: The portion of funding remaining from Step 1 is distributed between regional and urban systems based on revenue miles. The urban revenue miles are divided by total revenue miles to determine the percentage going to urban systems.

Step 3: Fifty percent of the urban system's portion is distributed among systems based on the percentage each systems' LDI makes up of the total urban LDI.

Step 4: Twenty-five percent of the urban system's portion is distributed among systems based on the ratio of each system's number of passengers per operating expense dollar to average number of passengers per operating expense dollar for all urban systems.

Step 5: Twenty-five percent of the urban system's portion is distributed among systems based on the ratio of each system's number of revenue miles per operating expense dollar to the average number of revenue miles per operating expense dollar for all urban systems.

## Transit Funding Formula

## URBAN SYSTEMS



## TRANSIT ASSISTANCE DISTRIBUTION FORMULA STUDY

PERCEPTION: The formula does not distinguish between systems based on their ability to contribute to locally determined income from tax revenues.

FINDINGS:

- Managers of three systems said that their local governments contribute the full \$.54 per \$1000 assessed property value for transit. All three represent urban systems.
- Four systems received very little or no local tax support; ten systems are experienced declining tax revenue support; and sixteen systems recieved widely varying amounts of tax support over the last four years.
- Among regional systems, local tax support made up an average of 22 per cent of operating expenses and ranged from 0 to 63 percent in 1987. Among urban systems, local tax support made up an average of 49 percent of operating expenses and ranged from 0 to 73 percent in 1987.
- Systems that report that their local government is contributing the maximum amount of tax revenue do not stand out from other systems in terms of financial characteristics collected by the State.
- Systems that do not receive local tax support draw their LDI contribution from other sources of revenue.


## IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING DISTRIBUTION STUDY

PERCEPTION: The formula may disproportionately benefit some systems that are growing relative to those that are stable or declining.

## FINDINGS:

- Fourteen of the sixteen regional recipients have experienced growth in ridership and revenue miles between 1982 and 1987; two have declined.
- Three small urban recipients and three large urban recipients have experienced growth in riders and/or revenue miles. The remainder have experienced declines.
- Those recipients that have experienced growth in riders and revenue miles have also experienced growth in share of funding. Those that have experienced declines in riders and revenue miles have also experienced declines in share of funding.


## IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING DISTRIBUTION FORMULA STUDY

PERCEPTION: Counting of Federal and State contract funds as LDI biases the distribution of funds.

## FINDINGS:

- Not counting contract funds as LDI would have practically no effect on the distributions to small and large urban recipients.
- Not counting contract funds as LDI would reduce some regional recipients' distribution, and increase others, by as much as 47 percent.
- The fiscal impact on recipients ranges from a change in distribution of $\mathbf{\$ 1 9}$ to a change in distribution of $\$ 37,213$. (This represents less than 1 percent of this recipient's total operating expenses.)
- There would be no shift in distribution between regional and urban recipients.


## IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING DISTRIBUTION FORMULA STUDY

PERCEPTION: Because performance is viewed relative to others, who may also improve, improved performance is not necessarily rewarded.

FINDINGS:

- Performance in terms of passengers per expenditure dollar ranged from declines of 43 percent to improvements of 104 percent between 1982 and 1987.
- Performance in revenue miles per expenditure dollar ranged from declines of 42 percent to improvements of 132 percent between 1982 and 1987.
- For the most part, those recipients with declining performance between 1982 and 1987 received declining percentages of the transit funds.
- For the most part, those recipients with improving performance between 1982 and 1987 received increasing percentages of the transit funds.


## IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING DISTRIBUTION FORMULA STUDY

PERCEPTION: The formula provides too great a percentage of the funding to either urban or regional recipients.

FINDINGS:

- Regional recipients received an average of $\$ .50$ per passenger in State assistance compared to $\$ .11$ per passenger for small urban recipients and $\$ .05$ per passenger for large urban recipients.
- Regional recipients received an average of $\$ .17$ per revenue mile in State assistance compared to $\$ .18$ per revenue mile for small urban recipients and $\$ .10$ per revenue mile for large urban recipients.
- Regional recipients recieved an average of 22.3 percent of operationg expenses from State assistance compared to 10.3 percent for the small urbans and 4.2 percent for the large urbans.
- Regional recipients covered an average of 79 percent of operating expenses from locally determined income compared to 80 percent for the small urbans and 72 percent for the large urbans.


## IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING DISTRIBUTION FORMULA STUDY

PERCEPTION: The formula does not place a minimum threshold on farebox return and therefore does not discourage noncost-beneficial service.

FINDINGS:

- Among regional recipients, farebox return represented between 0 and 32 percent of operating expenses in 1987. The average was 10 percent.
- Among urban recipients, farebox return represented between 0 and 43 percent of operating expenses in 1987. The average was 27 percent.
- When mileage and operating costs are increased and the number of passengers is held constant (i.e. density is reduced), a systems's allocation (either regional or urban) decreases. Urban recipients are affected more severely by reduced density.


## IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING DISTRIBUTION FORMULA STUDY

PERCEPTION: The formula distribution based on two year old data biases the allocation.

FINDINGS:

Using 1987 data to make 1987 allocations would have resulted in:

- Seven regional recipients receiving between 2 percent and 13 percent less funding
- Nine regional recipients receiving between ten percent and 35 percent more funding
- Seventeen urban recipients receiving between 2 percent and 21 percent less funding
- Two urban recipients receiving between 8 percent and 21 percent more funding


## IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING DISTRIBUTION FORMULA STUDY

PERCEPTION: Some systems are receiving more in state assistance than they contribute in LDI.

FINDINGS:

- No system receives more in state assistance than it contributes in LDI.
- Among regional recipients, average state assistance is 29 percent of LDI. The range in percentages runs from 22 percent to 52 percent.
- Among small urban recipients, average state assistance is 13 percent of LDI. The range in percentages runs from 6 percent to 58 percent.
- Among large urban recipients, average state assistance is 6 percent of LDI. The range in percentages runs from 5 percent to 21 percent.


## IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING DISTRIBUTION FORMULA STUDY

PERCEPTION: Systems that provide demand response service (elderly and handicapped) are disadvantaged when compared to systems that provide only fixed route service.

FINDINGS:

- Demand response service is assumed to be more costly to provide than fixed route service. However, it does not appear those systems offering demand response service are any worse or better off than other systems.


IOWA TRANSIT FURDING STUDY
STATE ASSISTANCE: 1977 to 1988
Total Assistance

|  | 11 |  | Percent | cent |  | Percent | Percent |  |  |  | Total State | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| year | 11 | REGIONAL | of Total | Change | small urban | of Total | Change | large urban | of Total | Change | Assistance | Change |
| 1977 | 11 | \$286,071 | 21\% | 1 | \$500,281 | 377 | -- | \| \$552,575 | 41\% | -- 1 | \$1,338,927 | -- |
| 1978 | 11 | \$653,265 | 34\% | 128\% \\| | \$585,414 | 31\% | 17x | \| \$677,149 | 35\% | 23\% \| | \$1,915,828 | $43 \%$ |
| 1979 | 11 | \$847,460 | 37\% | 30x \| | \$668,580 | 30\% | 14X | \| \$745,189 | 33\% | 10\% \| | \$2,261,229 | 188 |
| 1980 | 11 | \$1,029,211 | 41\% | 21\% \| | \$615,093 | 24x | -8x | \| \$894,008 | 35\% | 20\% 1 | \$2,538,312 | 12x |
| 1981 | 11 | \$923,017 | 41\% | -10x \| | \$626,820 | 28x | 2\% | \| \$700,105 | 31\% | -22x 1 | \$2,249,942 | -11\% |
| 1982 | 11 | \$725,308 | 34\% | -21\% \| | \$455,405 | 22x | -27\% | \$928,994 | 44\% | 33x \| | \$2,109,707 | -6\% |
| 1983 | 11 | \$857,205 | 40\% | 18\% \| | \$397,597 | 19\% | -13x | \| \$863,125 | 41\% | -7\% \| | \$2,117,927 | 0\% |
| 1984 | 11 | \$832,672 | 39\% | -3\% \| | \$313,534 | 15\% | -21\% | \| 5972,852 | 46x | 13\% \| | \$2,119,058 | 0\% |
| 1985 | 11 | \$794,714 | 43\% | -5\% \| | \$303,893 | 16\% | -3x | \$755,852 | 41\% | -22x \| | \$1,854,459 | -12\% |
| 1986 | 11 | \$799,737 | 46\% | 1\% 1 | \$253,016 | 15\% | -17\% | \$669,163 | 39\% | -11x \| | \$1,721,916 | -7\% |
| 1987 | 11 | \$1,177,754 | 52\% | 47\% \| | \$334,607 | 15\% | 32\% | \| \$755,837 | 33x | 13\% \| | \$2,268,198 | 32\% |
| 1988 | 11 | \$2,027,107 | 51\% | 72\% 1 | \$563,633 | 14\% | 68\% | \| \$1,367,148 | 35\% | 81\% \| | \$3,957,888 | 74\% |

## IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING STUDY STATE ASSISTANCE: 1977 TO 1988 Total Assistance

Thousands of Dollars



IOWA TRANSIt funding study
STATE ASSISTANCE: 1977 To 1988
Formula Based Assistance

|  | 11 |  | Percent | Percent \| |  | Percent | Percent |  | Percent | Percent | Total formula | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| year | 11 | REGIONAL | of Total | Change \| | SMALL URBAN | of Total | Change | large urban | of Total | Change | \|Based Assistance | Change |
| 1977 | 11 | \$271,283 | 21\% | -- \| | \$473,734 | 37\% | -- | \$552,575 | 43\% | -- | \$1,297,592 | - |
| 1978 | 11 | \$639,175 | 34\% | 136\% \| | \$584, 185 | 31\% | 23x | \$676,989 | 36\% | 23\% | \$1,900,349 | 46\% |
| 1979 | 11 | \$828,441 | $37 \%$ | 30\% 1 | \$666,279 | 30x | $14 \times$ | \$734, 276 | 33\% | $8 \%$ | \$2,228,996 | 17\% |
| 1980 | 11 | \$1,025,860 | 44\% | 24x \| | \$615,093 | 26\% | -8\% \| | \$716,308 | 30x | -2x | \$2,357,261 | $6 \times$ |
| 1981 | 11 | \$917,909 | 44\% | -11\% \| | \$614,173 | 29\% | 0x 1 | \| \$558,438 | 277 | -22\% | \| \$2,090,520 | -11\% |
| 1982 | 11 | \$578,349 | 35\% | -37x \| | \$259,676 | 16\% | -58\% \| | \| \$829,009 | 50\% | 48\% | \| $\$ 1,667,034$ | -20\% |
| 1983 | 11 | \$679,669 | 42\% | 18\% \| | \$254,385 | 16\% | -2x | \| \$694,791 | 43\% | -16\% | \| \$1,628,845 | -2\% |
| 1984 | 11 | \$674,342 | 39\% | -1\% \| | \$276,976 | 16\% | 9\% | \$778,029 | 45\% | 12\% | \| \$1,729,347 | 6\% |
| 1985 | 11 | \$701,345 | 45\% | 4x 1 | \$247,263 | 16\% | -11\% | \$605,992 | 39\% | -22x | \$1,554,600 | -10\% |
| 1986 | 11 | \$777,504 | 47\% | 11x \| | \$237,316 | 14\% | -4x | \$650,953 | 39\% | $7 \%$ | \| $\$ 1,665,773$ | 7\% |
| 1987 | II | \$1,036,248 | 52\% | 33\% \| | \$283,952 | 14\% | $20 \% 1$ | \| \$679,800 | $34 \%$ | $4 \%$ | \| \$2,000,000 | 20\% |
| 1988 | 11 | \$1,928,707 | 52\% | 86\% \| | \$531,850 | 14\% | 87\% \| | \| \$1,239,444 | 33\% | 82\% | \| \$3,700,001 | 85\% |

## IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING STUDY STATE ASSISTANCE: 1977 TO 1988 Formula Assistance




Source: Iowa Dept. of Transportation Alr and Transit Division

IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING STUDY
TRANSIT SYSTEM OPERATING REVENUE: 1974 TO 1988


## IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING STUDY OPERATING REVENUE: 1974 TO 1988



IOWA TRANSIT funding study
TRANSIT SYSTEM OPERATING EXPENSES: 1974 to 1988

|  |  |  | Percent | Percent |  | Percent | Percent |  | Percent | Percent | Total Operating | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| year | 11 | REGIONAL | of Total | Change I | Small urban | of Total | Change \| | large urban | of Total | Change \| | \| Expenses | Change |
| 1974 | 11 | N/A | -- | 1 | \$710,227 | 10\% | -- | \$6,250,327 | 90\% | \| | \| $\$ 6,960,554$ |  |
| 1975 | 11 | \$569,829 | 78 | -- 1 | \$947,669 | 12\% | 33x | \$6,687,897 | 82\% | 7\% \| | \| $58,205,395$ | 18\% |
| 1976 | 11 | \$197,236 | 2\% | -65\% \| | \$905,547 | 10\% | -4x | \$7,567,040 | 87\% | 13\% \| | \| $58,669,823$ | $6 \%$ |
| 1977 | 11 | \$566,707 | $5 \%$ | 187\% \| | \$1,067,306 | 10\% | 18\% | \$8,916,273 | 85\% | 188 \| | \| $\$ 10,550,286$ | 22\% |
| 1978 | 11 | \$1,752,267 | 14x | 209\% \| | \$1,326,253 | 11\% | 248 | \$9,438,411 | 75\% | $6 \times 1$ | \| $\$ 12,516,931$ | 19\% |
| 1979 | 11 | \$2,727,399 | 17\% | 56\% \| | \$1,534,964 | 9\% | 16\% \| | \$11,985,181 | 74\% | 27\% \| | \| \$16,247,544 | 30\% |
| 1980 | 11 | \$3,496,674 | 18\% | $28 \%$ \| | \$1,777,077 | 9\% | $16 \times 1$ | \$13,860,336 | 72\% | 16\% \| | \| \$19,134,087 | $18 \%$ |
| 1981 | 11 | 33,256,717 | 15\% | -7\% \| | \$2,001,420 | 9\% | 13\% \| | \$16,721,154 | 76\% | 21\% \| | \| \$21,979,291 | 15\% |
| 1982 | 11 | \$3,804,525 | 16\% | 17\% \| | \$2,638,428 | 11\% | 32\% | \$17,633,653 | 73\% | 5\% \| | \| \$24,076,606 | 10\% |
| 1983 | 11 | \$4,684,497 | 18\% | 23x \| | \$2,871,722 | 11\% | $9 \%$ \| | \$18,264,088 | 71\% | 4\% 1 | \| \$25,820,307 | $7 x$ |
| 1984 | 11 | \$5,113,869 | 18x | $9 \%$ 1 | \$3,389,587 | 12\% | 18\% | \$19,218,122 | 69\% | 5\% \| | \| \$27,721,578 | $7 \%$ |
| 1985 | 11 | 55,596,636 | 19\% | $9 \times 1$ | \$3,466,121 | 12\% | 2x \| | \$19,806,142 | 69\% | 3x 1 | \| \$28,868,899 | 4\% |
| 1986 | 11 | 56,327,716 | 20\% | 13\% \| | \$3,958,801 | 13\% | 14\% | \$20,984,783 | 67\% | $6 \% 1$ | \| $\$ 31,271,300$ | 8\% |
| 1987 | 11 | 56,705,824 | 21\% | 6\% | \$3,767,203 | 12\% | -5\% | \$20,737,247 | 66\% | -1\% \| | \| \$31,210,274 | 0\% |
| 1988 | 11 | \$8,279,458 | 25\% | 23\% \| | \$4,291,874 | 13\% | 14\% \| | \$20,122,781 | 62\% | -3\% \| | \| \$32,694,113 | 5\% |

## IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING STUDY OPERATING EXPENSES: 1974 TO 1988



IOUA TRANSIt Funding stuoy
transit system operating deficit: 1974 to 1988

|  | 11 |  | Percent | Percent |  | Percent | Percent |  | Percent |  | otal Operating | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| year | 11 | REGIONAL | of Total | Change | Small urban | of Total | Change | large urban | of Total | Change | Deficit | Change |
| 1974 | 11 | so | -- | -- \| | \$393,900 | 13\% | -- | \$2,586,863 | 87\% | -- | 2,980,763 | -- |
| 1975 | II | \$314,757 | 8\% | -- \| | \$541,505 | 14\% | 37\% \| | \$3,022,421 | 78\% | $17 \%$ | \| 3,878,683 | 30\% |
| 1976 | 11 | \$163,544 | 4\% | -483 \| | \$620,138 | $14 \%$ | 15\% \| | \$3,707,479 | 83\% | 23\% | \| 4,491,161 | 16\% |
| 1977 | 11 | \$469,762 | 8\% | 1874 \| | \$751,486 | 12\% | 21x \| | \$4,952,462 | 80\% | $34 \%$ | \| 6,173,710 | 37\% |
| 1978 | 11 | \$1,395,035 | 18\% | 197\% \| | \$1,003,929 | 13\% | $34 \times 1$ | \$5,545,166 | 70\% | 12x | \\| 7,944,130 | 29\% |
| 1979 | 11 | \$1,886,460 | 18\% | 35\% \| | \$1,116,661 | 11\% | 11\% \| | \$7,238,022 | 71\% | 31x | \\| 10,241,143 | 29\% |
| 1980 | 11 | \$1,984,134 | 17\% | 5\% \| | \$1,333,734 | 11\% | $19 \%$ \| | \$8,348,361 | 72\% | 15\% | 11,666,229 | $14 \%$ |
| 1981 | 11 | \$1,562,763 | 11\% | -21\% \| | \$1,530,861 | 11\% | 15\% \\| | \$10,764,795 | 78\% | 29\% | \| 13,858,419 | 19\% |
| 1982 | 11 | \$1,772,877 | 13\% | 13x \| | \$1,882,245 | 13\% | 23\% \| | \$10,521,673 | $74 \times$ | -2\% | \| 14,176,795 | 2\% |
| 1983 | 11 | \$2,197,968 | $14 \times$ | 24x \| | \$2,129,872 | 13\% | 13\% | \$11,496,589 | 73\% | $9 \%$ | \\| 15,824,429 | 12x |
| 1984 | 11 | \$2,075,186 | 12\% | -6\% \| | \$1,892,743 | 11\% | -11\% | \$12,668,699 | 76\% | 10\% | 1 16,636,628 | 5\% |
| 1985 | 11 | \$2,065,636 | 12\% | $0 \times 1$ | \$2,421,626 | 14\% | 288 \| | \$12,711,087 | 74\% | $0 \%$ | \| 17,198,349 | 3\% |
| 1986 | 11 | \$2,484,195 | 14\% | 20\% \| | \$2,516,369 | 14\% | 4* \| | \$12,650,301 | 72\% | $0 \%$ | \| 17,650,865 | 3\% |
| 1987 | II | \$2,468,773 | 13\% | -1\% \| | \$2,789,300 | 14\% | 11\% \| | \$14,039,377 | 73\% | $11 \%$ | \| 19,297,450 | 9\% |
| 1988 | 11 | \$3,721,285 | 19\% | 51\% \| | \$3,083,696 | 16\% | $11 \times$ \| | \$12,898,182 | 65\% | -8\% | \| 19,703,163 | 2\% |

## IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING STUDY OPERATING DEFICIT: 1974 TO 1988



Source: Iowa Dept. of Transportation
Alr and Transit Division
Note: 1988 is estimated

IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING STUDY
TRANSIT SYSTEM RIDERSHIP: 1974 TO 1988

|  | 11 | Percent Percent \| |  |  |  | Percent Percent \| |  |  | Percent Percent |  | Total | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| year | 11 | regional | of Total | Change \| | small urban | of Total | Change \| | large urban | of Total | Change I | Ridership | Change |
| 1974 | 11 | N/A | -- | --1 | 1,494,843 | 11\% | 1 | 12,133,524 | $89 \%$ | 1 | 13,628,367 | -- |
| 1975 | 11 | 323,774 | 2\% | -- | 1,513,439 | 11\% | 1\% \| | 12,543,496 | $87 \%$ | 3x \| | 14,380,709 | 6\% |
| 1976 | 11 | 93,425 | 18 | -71\% \| | 1,199,169 | 9\% | -21x \| | 11,849,945 | 90\% | -6x \| | 13,142,539 | -9\% |
| 1977 | 11 | 276,014 | 2\% | 195\% \| | 1,253,969 | 9\% | $5 \% 1$ | 11,875,217 | 89\% | 0\% 1 | 13,405,200 | 27 |
| 1978 | 11 | 835,458 | 5\% | 203\% \| | 1,241,507 | $8 \%$ | -18 \| | 13,143,980 | 86\% | 11\% \\| | 15,220,945 | 14\% |
| 1979 | 11 | 1,386,541 | 8\% | -71\% \| | 1,436,974 | 8\% | 16\% \| | 14,287,960 | 83\% | 9\% \| | 17,111,475 | 12\% |
| 1980 | 11 | 1,653,916 | 9\% | 195x \| | 1,627,337 | 8\% | 13\% | 16,128,412 | 83\% | 13\% \| | 19,409,665 | 13\% |
| 1981 | 11 | 1,479,081 | 7\% | 203\% \\| | 1,721,596 | 8\% | $6 \times 1$ | 17,970,570 | 85\% | 11\% \| | 21,171,247 | $9 \%$ |
| 1982 | 11 | 1,661,931 | 8\% | 66\% \| | 2,284,206 | 11\% | 33\% 1 | 15,950,249 | 80\% | -11\% \| | 19,896,386 | -6\% |
| 1983 | 11 | 1,989,025 | 10\% | 19\% \| | 2,567,566 | 12\% | 12\% | 16,265,788 | 78\% | 2\% \| | 20,822,379 | 5\% |
| 1984 | 11 | 2,366,168 | 11\% | -11\% \| | 3,340,684 | 16\% | 30\% 1 | 15,574,726 | 73\% | -4x 1 | 21,281,578 | $2 x$ |
| 1985 | 11 | 2,621,460 | 11\% | 12\% \| | 3,549,267 | 15\% | 6\% 1 | 17,616,847 | 74\% | 13x \| | 23,787,574 | 12\% |
| 1986 | 11 | 2,771,329 | 12\% | 20\% \| | 3,838,610 | 16\% | $8 \times 1$ | 17,107,689 | 72x | -3x \| | 23,717,628 | 0\% |
| 1987 | 11 | 2,965,533 | 14\% | 19\% \\| | 3,508,003 | 17x | -9x 1 | 14,779,317 | 70\% | -14\% \| | 21,252,853 | -10\% |
| 1988 | 11 | 3,049,967 | 13\% | 11x \| | 3,843,500 | $16 \%$ | 10x | 16,744,264 | 71\% | 13\% \| | 23,637,731 | 11\% |

## IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING STUDY TRANSIT SYSTEM RIDERSHIP: 1974 TO 1988



IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING STUDY
TRANSIT SYSTEM COST PER RIDER: 1974 TO 1988


## IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING STUDY COST PER RIDER: 1974 TO 1988



Source: Iowa Dept. of Transportation
Air and Transit Division
Note: 1988 is estimated

IONA TRANSIT funding study
transit system revenue miles: 1974 to 1988

|  | 11 |  | Percent | rcent |  | Percent | Percent |  | Percent | Percent | Total | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| year | 11 | regional | of Total | Change | Small urban | of Total | Change | large urban | of Total | Change | Revenue Miles | Change |
| 1974 | 11 | N/A | - | -- \| | 981,153 | $14 \%$ | -- | 6,194,040 | 86\% | -- \| | 7,175,193 | - |
| 1975 | 11 | 1,503,951 | 17\% | 1 | 1,085,892 | 12\% | 11\% \| | 6,293,286 | 71\% | 2\% 1 | 8,883,129 | 24\% |
| 1976 | 11 | 289,844 | 4x | -81\% \| | 1,055,999 | 13\% | -3\% \| | 6,685,488 | 83\% | 6\% \| | 8,031,331 | -10\% |
| 1977 | 11 | 727,527 | 8\% | 151\% \| | 1,232,820 | 14\% | 17\% | 7,142,315 | $78 \%$ | $7 \% 1$ | 9,102,662 | 13\% |
| 1978 | II | 2,723,186 | 25\% | 274\% | 1,229,772 | 11\% | $0 \times$ | 7,085,335 | 64\% | -1\% \| | 11,038,293 | $21 \%$ |
| 1979 | 11 | 4,443,341 | 34\% | -81\% \| | 1,285,355 | 10x | 5\% \| | 7,362,514 | 56\% | 4x \| | 13,091,210 | 19\% |
| 1980 | 11 | 4,127,683 | 31\% | 151\% | 1,364,584 | 10\% | 6\% 1 | 7,768,893 | 59\% | 6\% \| | 13,261,160 | 1\% |
| 1981 | 11 | 4,008,886 | 30\% | $274 \%$ | 1,310,259 | 10\% | -4\% \| | 8,131,357 | 60\% | $5 \times 1$ | 13,450,502 | 1\% |
| 1982 | 11 | 4,951,452 | 33\% | 63\% \| | 1,680,250 | 11\% | 28\% | 8,446,708 | 56\% | 4\% \| | 15,078,410 | 12\% |
| 1983 | 11 | 5,842,652 | 36\% | -7\% \| | 1,661,842 | 10\% | -1\% | 8,516,142 | 53\% | 1\% \| | 16,020,636 | 6\% |
| 1984 | 11 | 7,039,361 | 40\% | -3\% | 1,852,074 | 11\% | 117 \| | 8,513,577 | 49\% | $0 \times 1$ | 17,405,012 | 9\% |
| 1985 | 11 | 7,902,035 | 45\% | 24\% \| | 2,015,227 | 11\% | $9 \%$ \| | 7,745,823 | 44\% | -9\% \| | 17,663,085 | 1\% |
| 1986 | 11 | 7,752,082 | 44\% | $18 \%$ | 2,190,742 | 12\% | 9\% \| | 7,852,736 | 44\% | 18 \| | 17,795,560 | 1\% |
| 1987 | 11 | 9,012,828 | $48 \%$ | 20\% \\| | 2,079,040 | 11x | -5x \| | 7,665,827 | 418 | -2x 1 | 18,757,695 | 5\% |
| 1988 | 11 | 9,278,917 | 48\% | 12\% \| | 2,127,416 | 11\% | $2 \times 1$ | 7,816,112 | 41\% | 2* 1 | 19,222,445 | 2\% |

## IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING STUDY REVENUE MILES: 1974 TO 1988


iowa transit funding stuoy
transit system cost per mile: 1974 to 1988

| year | II | gIONAL | Percent Percent 1 |  | Small | Percent Percent \| |  | LargeURBAN | Percent | Percent | rotal Cost Per Mile | Percent Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | of Total | Change \| |  | of Total | Change I |  | of Total | Change \| |  |  |
| 1974 | II | N/A | -- | -- | \$0.72 | 42\% | -- \| | \$1.01 | 58\% | -- 1 | \$1.73 | -- |
| 1975 | 11 | \$0.38 | 16\% | -- 1 | \$0.87 | 38\% | 21\% \| | \$1.06 | 46\% | 5\% \| | \$2.31 | 34x |
| 1976 | 11 | \$0.68 | 25\% | 80\% \| | \$0.86 | 32\% | -2x \| | \$1.13 | 42\% | 7\% \| | \$2.67 | 15\% |
| 1977 | 11 | \$0.78 | $27 \%$ | 14\% | \$0.87 | 30\% | 1x \| | \$1.25 | 43x | 10\% \\| | \$2.89 | $8 \times$ |
| 1978 | 11 | \$0.64 | 21\% | -17x \| | \$1.08 | 35\% | 25x | \$1.33 | $44 \%$ | $7 \times 1$ | \$3.05 | 6x |
| 1979 | 11 | \$0.61 | 18\% | -5\% \| | \$1.19 | 35\% | 11\% \| | \$1.63 | 47\% | 22\% \| | \$3.44 | $13 x$ |
| 1980 | 11 | \$0.85 | 22\% | 38x | \$1.30 | 33\% | 9\% \| | \$1.78 | 45\% | 10\% \| | \$3.93 | $14 \times$ |
| 1981 | 11 | \$0.81 | 18\% | -4\% | \$1.53 | 35\% | 17x \| | \$2.06 | $47 x$ | 15\% \\| | \$4.40 | 12x |
| 1982 | 11 | 50.77 | 17\% | -5x \| | \$1.57 | 35\% | 3x \| | \$2.09 | $47 \%$ | 2\% 1 | \$4.43 | 1x |
| 1983 | 11 | \$0.80 | 17\% | 4\% 1 | \$1.73 | 37x | 10x 1 | \$2.14 | $46 \%$ | 3x \| | \$4.67 | $6 \times$ |
| 1984 | 11 | \$0.73 | 15\% | -9\% \| | \$1.83 | 38\% | 6\% \| | \$2.26 | 47x | 5\% \\| | \$4.81 | $3 x$ |
| 1985 | 11 | \$0.71 | 14\% | -3\% \| | \$1.72 | 35\% | -6\% \| | \$2.56 | 51\% | 13\% \| | \$4.99 | $4 x$ |
| 1986 | II | \$0.82 | 15\% | 15\% \| | \$1.81 | 34\% | 5\% \| | \$2.67 | 50\% | 5\% \\| | \$5.30 | 6x |
| 1987 | II | 50.74 | $14 \times$ | -9\% | \$1.81 | $34 \%$ | 0x \| | \$2.71 | 51\% | 1x \| | \$5.26 | -1x |
| 1988 | 11 | \$0.89 | 16\% | $20 \times 1$ | \$2.02 | 377 | 11\% \| | \$2.57 | 47x | -5x \| | \$5.48 | 4x |

## IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING STUDY COST PER MILE: 1974 TO 1988



Source: lowa Dept. of Transportation
Air and Transit Division
Note: 1988 is estimated
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IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING STUDY
transit system passengers per revenue mile: 1974 to 1988


## IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING STUDY PASSENGERS PER REVENUE MILE: 1974-1988



Source: lowa Dept. of Transportation
Alr and Transit Division
Note: 1988 is estimated

IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING STUDY farebox revenue per passenger: 1983 to 1988

| year | 11 | REGIONAL | Percent of Total | Percent \| Change | SMALL URBAN | Percent of Total | Percent \| <br> Change | LaRGE URBAN | Percent of Total | Percent Change | \|Total Revenue |Per Passenger | Percent Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1983 | 11 | \$0.24 | 28\% | -- \| | \$0.28 | 32x | -- 1 | \$0.34 | 40\% | -- | \$0.86 | - |
| 1984 | 11 | S0. 27 | 30\% | 11\% \| | \$0.27 | 30\% | -4\% 1 | \$0.36 | 40\% | 5\% | \$0.90 | 4\% |
| 1985 | 11 | \$0.24 | 31\% | -9\% \| | \$0.26 | 33\% | -2\% \| | \$0.29 | 36\% | -20\% | \$0.79 | -11x |
| 1986 | 11 | \$0.23 | 30\% | -5\% \| | \$0.24 | 32\% | -6\% 1 | \$0.30 | 38\% | 3\% | \$0.77 | -3\% |
| 1987 | 11 | \$0.21 | $27 \%$ | -8\% 1 | \$0.27 | 34\% | 10\% \| | \$0.31 | 39\% | 4\% | \$0.79 | 2\% |
| 1988 | 11 | \$0.23 | 28\% | $6 \times 1$ | \$0.27 | $34 x$ | 2\% 1 | \$0.31 | 39\% | 2\% | \$0.81 | 3\% |

## IOWA TRANSIT FUNDING STUDY FAREBOX REVENUE PER PASSENGER: 1983-1988



