PERFORMANCE MEASURES

RTA staff has undertaken the development of a performance measurement and reporting program to evaluate the impact and effectiveness of public transit in Northeastern Illinois. Overall regional performance is a function of five major areas:

- **Service Coverage** monitors both how much service is available to people in the region (in terms of population and land area) and how much of that service capacity is used.

- **Service Efficiency and Effectiveness** evaluates the level of resources spent on delivering service in relation to the level of service provided and the extent to which passengers are using that service.

- **Service Delivery** reflects the quality of the service delivered.

- **Service Maintenance and Capital Investment** indicates the allocation of capital funds and the replacement and maintenance of infrastructure components on a schedule consistent with their life expectancy.

- **Service Level Solvency** assesses financial condition to ensure that there are sufficient resources to meet current and ongoing budgetary needs (both operating and capital).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Coverage</th>
<th>Service Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness</th>
<th>Service Delivery</th>
<th>Service Maintenance &amp; Capital Investment</th>
<th>Service Level Solvency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Capacity per Capita</td>
<td>Operating Cost per Unit of Transit Capacity</td>
<td>On-Time Performance</td>
<td>Percent of Assets in a State of Good Repair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Revenue Miles per Square Mile</td>
<td>Operating Cost per Vehicle Revenue Mile</td>
<td>Reportable Incidents per 100,000 Passenger Trips</td>
<td>Capital Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Trips</td>
<td>Operating Cost per Passenger Trip</td>
<td>Ten-Year Capital Funding Needs</td>
<td>Fare Revenue per Passenger Trip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Trips per Capita</td>
<td>Operating Cost per Passenger Mile</td>
<td>Percent of Vehicles Beyond Useful Life</td>
<td>Fare Revenue Shortfall per Passenger Trip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Trips per Vehicle Revenue Mile</td>
<td></td>
<td>Miles Between Major Mechanical Failures</td>
<td>Operations Funding Sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Miles Traveled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The regional report card was created in response to the enactment of the 2008 RTA Act amendment. In the interest of increased public accountability and transparency, the Act amendment required the development of performance measures for regional transit that are reported on an annual basis. With cooperation and input from the region’s Service Boards (CTA, Metra, and Pace), a set of 24 measures were selected for reporting across five service areas: coverage, efficiency and effectiveness, delivery, maintenance and capital investment, and solvency. The results from each Service Board are aggregated for the purpose of describing the performance level of the Chicagoland transit system as a whole for the five-year period 2012-2016. Key points of 2016 performance include:

• Ridership was down for the fourth consecutive year; each Service Board and mode reported decreases that totaled a system-wide 3.3% drop, the largest single-year decline in the past decade and the lowest recorded annual ridership since 2006
• Significant progress toward fleet modernization was achieved in 2016; the percent of vehicles in service beyond useful life dropped to 24.7%, the lowest percentage since performance reporting began with 2005 data
• Capital investment continues to be significantly and negatively impacted by the lack of state funding and growing capital needs of the region; 2016 capital expenditures of $712 million was less than one-third what is needed annually to bring the system to a state of good repair within the next twenty years

Service coverage indicators monitor how much service is available to the region’s residents (supply) and how much of that supply is actually used by the public (consumption). This report describes supply in terms of transit capacity per area resident, which takes into account the number of seats available to be filled as well as the total number of vehicle revenue miles of service offered by the transit agencies. Both measures of service coverage decreased in 2016, and over the five-year period, transit capacity per resident fell by 1.7% while vehicle revenue miles increased by 5.1% as new service was introduced to the region. Lower capacity per resident resulted from the introduction of smaller vehicles. In 2012, the system-wide average vehicle capacity was 78.3 passengers. In 2016, average vehicle capacity fell to 74.5 passengers. The region’s population decreased by about 0.1% over the past five years and passengers have been taking trip lengths that were about 2% longer compared to 2012.

Service consumption, as expressed by unlinked passenger trips and passenger miles traveled, decreased in 2016. Unlinked passenger trips, which peaked in 2012, decreased each year 2013-2016, ending the five-year period with an 8.1% net loss. In 2016, each regional resident took an average of 72 trips on transit, compared to the peak of 79 trips in 2012. Fewer trips, spread over more service being supplied (as described above) resulted in reduced effectiveness as the region saw fewer passenger trips per vehicle revenue mile each year 2013-16, ending the five-
year period 12.6% lower compared to 2012. Passenger miles traveled followed the same
general trend as ridership, with a peak in 2012 followed by four years of declines; however, this
indicator ended the five-year period 6.5% lower, signifying that riders are traveling longer
average distances in the transit trips they are taking.

**Service efficiency and effectiveness** measures evaluate the cost of supplying transit services. In
2016, regional operating costs increased by approximately $63 million, a 2.6% increase that
occurred in a year of 0.8% inflation. Despite significant savings for fuel expenses in 2016,
operating costs increased primarily due to increased labor costs. The regional inflation-
adjusted operating cost per vehicle revenue mile was 2.0% higher than 2015 as costs increased
at a steeper rate compared to the increase in units of service; over the five-year period, the
operating cost per vehicle revenue mile increased 2.2%. The inflation-adjusted operating cost
per unit of transit capacity was 2.7% higher in 2016 than 2015; compared to 2012, this adjusted
cost was 7.3% higher, due to the combination of increased operating cost and decreased
average vehicle capacity.

Cost effectiveness measures trended unfavorably over one- and five-year bases as ridership and
passenger miles traveled were down in 2016. After adjusting for inflation, the regional
operating cost per passenger trip increased 5.4% in 2016, an increase of $0.21 for the year.
With the overall five-year ridership loss of 8.1%, the operating cost per passenger trip rose
16.9% since 2012 after adjusting for inflation. Since passenger miles traveled decreased at a
less steep rate over the five-year period, the result of longer average passenger trip lengths, the
cost effectiveness measure operating cost per passenger mile increased at a lower rate of
14.8%, after an inflation adjustment. Cost effectiveness results were negatively impacted by
cost increases and ridership losses, while cost efficiency measures were unfavorable, to a lesser
degree, as more service was introduced to the region.

**Service delivery** indicators focus on customer service and safety. On-time performance is a key
indicator of service delivery, and although the Service Boards use different methodologies to
assess on-time performance for each mode, weighting their values by ridership provides a
regional measure that shows an on-time performance of 85.5% in 2016, a 0.4 percentage point
increase from 2015. The number of reportable safety and security incidents increased slightly
in 2016, to roughly one incident per million passenger trips.

Customer satisfaction surveys were conducted in late 2016/early 2017 and show favorable
satisfaction levels compared to 2011 and 2013/14 results along three key dimensions: loyalty,
value of service for fare paid, and overall satisfaction. In 2016, satisfaction ratings for likelihood
to recommend service to a friend (loyalty) improved by four percentage points, value of service
for fare paid increased by seven percentage points, and overall satisfaction scores increased by
eight percentage points. 2016 results were also more favorable to the baseline year, 2011, for
overall satisfaction and value of service for fare paid, with the loyalty score returning to a 91%
rating. The most significant drivers of customer satisfaction, as in prior years, are on-time
performance for CTA and Metra, and the waiting time and reliability of transfers for Pace riders.
On a system-wide basis, customer satisfaction is most influenced by the availability of transit when and where it is needed.

**Service maintenance and capital investment** indicators evaluate reliability and State of Good Repair of transit assets. Following a large uptick in the capital program in 2014, 2015 capital program dollars dropped 24.5% and decreased another 41.7% in 2016, which negatively affected each Service Board: CTA by 49%, Metra by 24%, and Pace by 9%. However, the 2014 gain was largely attributable to Illinois Jump Start Bond funds, which were not fully funded by the State and therefore not received by the Service Boards. The 2016 capital program included major projects such as: for CTA, the Red and Purple Modernization and Your New Blue improvements, bus replacements, and a multi-year rail car overhaul program; for Metra, new rolling stock, track and structures, and positive train control (PTC) investments; and for Pace, new rolling stock for fixed-route buses, paratransit vehicles, vanpool vans, and community transit vehicles, reconstruction of the Northwest Garage, and passenger facility renovations. Ten-year capital funding needed to achieve and maintain a state of good repair for all of the region’s assets was reported in 2016 to be $37.7 billion. A significant portion of that total, $19.3 billion, is needed to address already past-due projects; known as the backlog, this amount illustrates the severity of deferred capital projects that has occurred over the years as federal and state funding has been inconsistent and inadequate. The region requires another $11.1 billion for regular replacement of assets and $7.1 billion for capital maintenance projects over the next ten years. The region has set a funding goal of $2 to $3 billion annually to achieve a state of good repair and provide enhancements to the transit system over the next twenty years. Programmed annual funding averaged $1.4 billion over the past five years, but relied in part on Illinois state bond funding, which has fallen short because of the state’s financial difficulties. Actual levels of capital expenditures averaged $770 million per year, which does not fulfill annual needs for regular replacement and maintenance costs, and does not address backlog projects.

**Service level solvency measures** reflect the region’s financial condition to ensure there are sufficient resources to meet current and ongoing budgetary needs. Regionally, there were annual improvements in fare revenues from 2012-2015, followed by a 0.7% decrease in 2016, with a net 5-year gain of 8.7%. Fare and pass price increases were last implemented at CTA (in 2013), Metra (in 2012, 2015, and 2016); each Service Board has also made fare policy adjustments within the past five years that contributed to increased fare revenue receipts. Additionally, improved fare revenue has occurred since the implementation of the Ventra fare payment system as riders have relied more heavily on pay-as-you-go fare options in lieu of discounted monthly passes. CTA rail, Metra, and ADA Paratransit were the only modes to report improved fare revenue for 2016, and all three Service Boards reported improved fare revenue for the five-year period under review. The average regional fare paid in 2016 was $1.61, an increase of 2.7% from 2015 and 18.3% or $0.25 higher compared to 2012. However, the fare revenue shortfall per passenger trip continued to increase, ending the five-year period 22.2% higher; compared to 2012, this represents an increase of $0.46 that was required from public funding subsidies to cover the cost of each trip.
Capital expenditure is another measure of service level solvency. This indicator reached a ten-year high in 2008, the only year expenditures exceeded $1 billion. The capital funding received year to year is inconsistent and has dropped by as much as 38% from one year to the next. Capital expenditure, totaling $712 million in 2016, must be considered in relation to the $37.7 billion 10-year need to achieve and maintain a state of good repair for the region’s assets. Capital program funding remains a critical issue for each Service Board and for the RTA system as a whole.
### SNAPSHOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2016 Value</th>
<th>1-Year Trend</th>
<th>5-Year Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERVICE COVERAGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Capacity per Capita (trips)</td>
<td>324.2</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Revenue Miles per Service Area Square Mile</td>
<td>64,787</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlinked Passenger Trips (Ridership)</td>
<td>605.3 million</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Trips per Capita</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Trips per Vehicle Revenue Mile</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Miles Traveled</td>
<td>3.96 billion</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERVICE EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost per Unit of Transit Capacity</td>
<td>$0.142</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost per Vehicle Revenue Mile</td>
<td>$10.59</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost per Passenger Trip</td>
<td>$4.17</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost per Passenger Mile</td>
<td>$0.64</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERVICE DELIVERY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Time Performance</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reportable Incidents per 100,000 Passenger Trips</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Loyalty Rating</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Value of Service Rating</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Overall Satisfaction Rating</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERVICE MAINTENANCE AND CAPITAL INVESTMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Program</td>
<td>$842.5 million</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-Year Capital Funding Needs</td>
<td>$37.7 billion</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Vehicles Beyond Useful Life</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles Between Major Mechanical Failures</td>
<td>22,015</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERVICE LEVEL SOLVENCY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare Revenue per Passenger Trip</td>
<td>$1.61</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare Revenue Shortfall per Passenger Trip</td>
<td>$2.56</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>$712.2 million</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Direction of arrows indicates 2016 value in comparison to 2015 (1-year) and to 2012 (5-year) figures. Arrow color indicates whether the change is favorable (green), unfavorable (red), or is equal (black) to comparison figure; operating cost changes totaling less than 1% are considered to be equal to the comparison data and are given black arrow. Operating costs for the 5-year trend have been adjusted for inflation.*
NOTES/METHODOLOGY

1. This analysis is based on 2016 data submitted to the National Transit Database (NTD) by each Service Board. Annual data submission by transit agencies is a requirement of receiving federal funding and thus follows guidelines and procedures established by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

2. Inflation adjustments have been made for operating cost measures utilizing the annual Consumer Price Index (Series ID CUURA207SA0, Chicago-Gary-Kenosha) provided by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

3. Area resident (per capita) data is the sum of populations of the six counties that form the RTA service area (Cook, DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry, and Will). US Census Bureau Annual Estimates of the Resident Population: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2016.

4. Twenty-year annual capital investment need, ten-year capital funding need by asset type, and percent of assets in a state of good repair are taken from the Capital Asset Condition 2016: Year 5 Assessment, released in December 2016.

5. Operating cost measures include those of each Service Board as well as annual operating expenses of the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA), which provides financial oversight, funding, and regional transit planning as well as services such as a Travel Information Center, travel training, and the issuance of reduced and free ride permits.

6. This report includes 2019 targets for several performance measures. Targets were determined by using each Service Board’s projected annual budgetary data for operational (passenger trips, passenger miles, vehicle revenue hours, and vehicle revenue miles) and financial (operating cost and fare revenue) indicators, applied to 2016 data submitted by each Service Board to the National Transit Database. Financial targets include inflation adjustments, using inflation rates of 2.1% for 2017, 2.4% for 2018, and 2.2% for 2019, per the Survey of Professional Forecasters (August 2017). 

   Targets are reported to illustrate the direction of expected performance within the resources of the current year’s operating and financial plan.
RESULTS

Service Coverage

Transit Capacity per Capita
The amount of available service, as measured by average vehicle capacity and vehicle revenue miles, per person in the region.

Vehicle Revenue Miles per Square Mile
The total number of miles traveled annually by CTA, Metra, and Pace per square mile of the six-county region.
Service Coverage

Unlinked Passenger Trips
Also known as ridership, refers to the number of passengers who board public transportation vehicles. Passengers are counted each time they board vehicles no matter how many vehicles they use to travel from their origin to their destination.

![Passenger Trips (Millions)]

Passenger Trips per Capita
The average number of rides taken per resident annually.

![Passenger Trips per Capita]
Service Coverage

Passenger Trips per Vehicle Revenue Mile
The number of passenger trips divided by the miles that vehicles travel while in revenue service.

![Passenger Trips per Vehicle Revenue Mile Chart](chart1)

Passenger Miles Traveled
The cumulative sum of the distances ridden by passengers.

![Passenger Miles Traveled Chart](chart2)
Service Efficiency and Effectiveness

Operating Cost per Unit of Transit Capacity
The average cost of providing a passenger seat (or space) for each mile of an individual trip, whether or not it is taken.

Operating Cost per Vehicle Revenue Mile
The average cost of providing each vehicle revenue mile of service.
Service Efficiency and Effectiveness

Operating Cost per Passenger Trip
The total operating cost divided by the total number of unlinked passenger trips taken on public transit vehicles.

Operating Cost per Passenger Mile
The total operating cost divided by the total number of miles traveled by passengers.
Service Delivery

On-Time Performance
The percentage of time that revenue service vehicles are considered on schedule, based on each Service Board’s on-time performance measurement definition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>On-Time Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reportable Safety and Security
Incidents per 100,000 Passenger Trips
The number of combined major safety and security incidents per 100,000 passenger trips taken.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reportable Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Service Delivery

Customer Satisfaction
Customer satisfaction surveys were conducted in late 2016/early 2017 in an effort to update surveys undertaken in 2011 and 2013/14. Ratings reflect measures of loyalty, value of service, and overall customer satisfaction. Loyalty is the likelihood that a transit customer would recommend the transit service to others. Value of service ratings are a customer’s perception of the quality of service in relation to the fare paid. The overall customer satisfaction rating refers to the customer’s rating of satisfaction with the transit service as a whole. The percentages reflected in the graph below include ratings of “satisfied” or “very satisfied”.

![CUSTOMER SATISFACTION](image-url)

- Loyalty: 2011 - 91%, 2013/14 - 85%, 2016 - 80%
- Value: 2011 - 80%, 2013/14 - 85%, 2016 - 80%
- Overall: 2011 - 85%, 2013/14 - 80%, 2016 - 85%
Service Maintenance and Capital Investment

Percent of Assets in a State of Good Repair
The general physical condition of the region’s capital assets, based on analysis of the current physical condition and age distribution of each Service Board’s transit assets from inventory data reported as of December 2015. The condition rating levels established by the RTA for purposes of categorizing physical condition are numbered 1 (worn) through 5 (excellent), consistent with the rating system used by the Federal Transit Administration; assets rated 2.5 or better are considered in this report to be in a State of Good Repair. Subway tunnel structures are considered permanent assets and are excluded from this asset rating exercise, as they are not intended to be replaced, but rather rehabilitated indefinitely. Metra guideway data are under development and are also excluded from this year’s report, but will be included in future reports as a more complete dataset becomes available. Adjustments were also made to exclude Pace maintenance facilities which may still be within their useful life, but which Pace categorized as functionally obsolete.

PERCENT OF ASSETS IN A STATE OF GOOD REPAIR

![Bar Chart]

Guideway Elements: 64%
Facilities: 73%
Systems: 56%
Stations: 79%
Vehicles: 63%

NOTE: All assets are maintained in safe operating condition through additional capital and operating expenditures on maintenance and rehabilitation.
Service Maintenance and Capital Investment

Capital Program
Each year’s capital program is the sum of new, de-obligated, and reprogrammed funding available to maintain, enhance, and expand service. The annual need is the average yearly amount needed to achieve and maintain a state of good repair within twenty years. Capital expenditures are shown to illustrate the difference between the anticipated capital program, the annual need, and actual spending by the Service Boards.

Ten-Year Capital Funding Needs
The estimated cost of bringing RTA system-wide assets into a state of good repair over the next ten years. In 2015, capital needs were calculated to be $37.7 billion, consisting of $19.3 billion for backlog (already overdue) projects, and $18.3 billion for regular replacement and maintenance projects.
Service Maintenance and Capital Investment

Percent of Vehicles beyond Useful Life
The percentage of vehicles in the total vehicle fleet that have reached the end of their minimum useful life as defined by the Federal Transit Administration (4 years for new automobiles or vans, 12 years for new buses, and 25 years for new rail cars). This figure does not take into account rehabilitations that may be undertaken to keep vehicles in service beyond FTA guidelines.

Miles between Major Mechanical Failures
The average number of miles that vehicles travel while in revenue service between failures of some mechanical element or a safety concern that prevents a vehicle from completing a scheduled trip or from starting the next scheduled trip.
Service Level Solvency

Fare Revenue per Passenger Trip
The average fare paid by customers per trip.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fare Revenue per Passenger Trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 Target</td>
<td>$1.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fare Revenue Shortfall per Passenger Trip
The average cost of each trip that is not covered by the fare paid by customers. The balance of operating costs is covered by other directly-generated revenue (advertising, concessions, etc.) and public funding (local, state, and federal).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fare Revenue Shortfall per Passenger Trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 Target</td>
<td>$2.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service Level Solvency

Operations Funding Sources
Operating costs are covered through the balance between fare revenue, other directly-generated revenue (advertising, concessions, etc.) and all other revenue (local, state, and federal).

Capital Expenditures
The expenses related to purchasing or upgrading physical assets such as property, buildings, or equipment. Expenditures are shown over a 10-year time frame to illustrate the wide variability from year to year and over time.