

711 grand ave, #110 san rafael, ca 94901

ph: 415.226.0855 fax: 415.226.0856 marintransit.org

May 15, 2017

Honorable Board of Directors Marin County Transit District 3501 Civic Center Drive San Rafael, CA 94903

board of directors

Third Quarter of FY2016/17

katie rice president

supervisor district 2

Dear Board Members:

RECOMMENDATION: Accept report.

stephanie moulton-peters vice president city of mill valley

damon connolly 2nd vice president supervisor district 1

judy arnold director supervisor district 5

kate colin director city of san rafael

dennis rodoni director supervisor district 4

kathrin sears director supervisor district 3

SUMMARY:

In March 2017, staff presented to your Board a new format for the District's service monitoring reports. This includes a new performance report provided quarterly alongside the quarterly financial report. Staff has attached the quarterly report for the third quarter of FY 2016/17.

SUBJECT: Marin Transit Quarterly Performance Report for the

The quarterly report provides route-level statistics and performance measures with financial data, an in-depth analysis of trends, and a discussion of any relevant external factors such as service changes.

Staff will continue to present an annual system performance report after the end of each fiscal year. The annual report will provide a detailed assessment of system-wide, typology-based, and routelevel performance data.

FISCAL/STAFFING IMPACT: None associated with this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Melody Reebs

Senior Transit Planner

Attachments

Quarterly Performance Report for FY 2016/17 Q3

This report summarizes the operational performance of Marin Transit services for the third quarter of FY 2016/17 from January 1, 2017 through March 31, 2017. The Quarterly Performance Report provides detailed route-level statistics, analyzes trends, and evaluates performance measures established under Measure A.

Report Format

The data presented in this report is generated directly from TransTrack, Marin Transit's data management system. TransTrack enables Marin Transit to consolidate and analyze all operational data from the District's transit programs and contractors as one system. In December 2016, the District upgraded the system to provide a new tool to create custom reports including this Quarterly Performance Report. The new report captures all costs associated with service operations and is not limited to contractor costs. This reporting format most accurately represents the District's actual costs of providing service.

Route performance is presented relative to typology-based targets. The targets were most recently updated in the FY2016-2025 Short Range Transit Plan, and adopted by the Board in July 2015. These typology-based targets aim to match routes and service levels to the markets they are intended to serve. All performance and financial data is consistent with the District's reporting for the National Transit Database.

Performance Goals

Performance goals at the route level are measured in both productivity (unlinked passengers per hour and per trip) and cost effectiveness (subsidy per unlinked passenger trip). These measures follow the fixed-route service typologies updated in the FY 2016-2025 Short Range Transit Plan. **Error! Reference source not found.** below summarizes route level performance goals by typology. Note that there are currently no productivity or cost effectiveness goals identified for the Yellow Bus or Partnership service typologies.

Table 1: Productivity and Subsidy Goals by Service Typology

Service Typology	Routes	Unlinked Passenger Trips per Hour (at or above)	Subsidy per Passenger Trip (at or below)	
Local Trunkline	35, 36, 71	25	\$3.00	
Regular Local	17, 22, 23, 23X, 29, 49	20	\$5.00	
Local Connector	219, 228, 233, 245, 251, 257	8	\$8.00	
Supplemental	113, 115, 117, 119, 125, 139, 145, 151, 154	20 per trip	\$3.00	
Rural	61, 68	4	\$12.00	
Recreational	66 (Muir Woods Shuttle)	25	\$3.00	
Demand Response	Local DAR, Novato DAR, Dillon Beach/Tomales DAR, Point Reyes DAR	2	\$30.00	
•		·		

Performance Summary

In the third quarter of FY 2016/17, Marin Transit carried a total of 744,610 passengers systemwide. This represents a decrease of about 8.1% compared to the third quarter of the previous fiscal year. On fixed-route transit services, including Yellow School

Bus, Marin Transit carried 707,030 riders. This is an 8.2% decrease from the last fiscal year. Marin Access services carried 37,580 trips on demand response and mobility management programs, a decrease of 6.2% compared to last fiscal year. The tables at the end of this report provide a breakdown of all route-level statistics.

Local Trunkline (Routes 35, 36, and 71x)

In the third quarter of FY 2016/17, Local Trunkline services carried 270,406 passengers. This is a 6.7% increase over the third quarter of the previous fiscal year. As part of the June 2016 service changes, a significant amount of service was added to these routes amounting to 60.8% more revenue hours. Of the three Local Trunkline routes, Routes 35 and 36 met the productivity target of 25 passengers per hour. None of the routes met the subsidy target of \$3.00 per passenger.

Local Basic (Routes 17, 22, 23, 23x, 29 and 49)

Local Basic services carried a total of 229,891 passengers during the third quarter of this fiscal year, a 17.5% decrease from the prior year. None of the six routes met the productivity target of 20 passengers per hour or the subsidy target of \$5.00 per passenger.

Local Connector (Routes 219, 228, 233, 245, 251, and 257)

During the third quarter of the fiscal year, Local Connector services carried 89,317 total passengers. This is about 17.6% lower than the previous year. Four of the six routes met the productivity target of 8 passengers per hour: Routes 233, 245, 251, and 257. Only Route 245 met the subsidy target of \$8.00 per passenger.

Supplemental (Routes 113, 115, 117, 119, 125, 139, 145, 151, and 154)

Supplemental school services carried a total of 49,391 passengers during the third quarter of FY 2016/17. This is 11.7% fewer passengers than the previous year. Six of the nine routes met both the productivity target of 20 passengers per trip and subsidy target of \$5.00 per passenger: Routes 113, 117, 119, 145, 151, and 154.

Rural (West Marin Stagecoach Routes 61 and 68)

In the third quarter of the fiscal year, those routes carried 22,393 passengers total, and this is about 2.6% fewer than the prior year. Both routes met the productivity goal of 4 passengers per hour. Neither route met the subsidy goal of \$12.00 per passenger.

Partnership Services (Route 122 – College of Marin Express)

Express Route 122 service to College of Marin resumed for the Spring semester on January 17, 2017. During the first three months of the semester, the service carried a total of 5,123 passengers or 27.0% less than the prior year. Service on this route was reduced by about 50% compared to last year in response to the June 2016 changes. These changes expanded service to the campus on other Marin Transit local routes. There are no performance targets established for Partnership services.

Yellow Bus

Ross Valley School District yellow bus service carried 39,007 passengers during the third quarter of FY 2016/17 for a decrease of about 9.2% compared to the prior year. There are no performance targets established for Yellow Bus services.

Recreational (Route 66-Muir Woods Shuttle)

During the third quarter of the fiscal year, the Muir Woods Shuttle operated two days of service in January. The service carried a total of 1,502 passengers, an increase of 4.7% over last year. The service did not meet its productivity target of 25 passengers per hour or its subsidy target of \$3.00 per passenger.

Marin Access

Mobility Management programs offered by Marin Access include demand response services, Catch-A-Ride, and Volunteer Driver programs.

In the third quarter of FY 2016/17, local paratransit carried 28,867 passengers. The service productivity average of 2.1 passengers per hour met the 2.0 standard. The number of passengers represents a 5.6% decrease in ridership compared to the prior fiscal year.

The Novato Dial-a-Ride service carried 1,044 passengers, and met its productivity standard at 2.1 passengers per hour. Ridership was 4.2% lower than in the previous fiscal year.

The Dillon Beach/Tomales Dial-a-Ride provides curb-to-curb pick-up and drop-off between Dillon Beach, Tomales, and Petaluma and operates on Wednesdays only. During the third quarter of the fiscal year, the service carried 78 passengers with 0.7 passengers per hour. This is below the productivity target.

In July 2016, Marin Transit added a new general public dial-a-ride service between Point Reyes Station and Novato. The service runs once per month on the second Monday. In the third quarter of the fiscal year, the service carried 30 passengers with 1.0 passengers per hour. This new service did not meet its productivity target.

The Volunteer Driver Program completed 4,025 trips in the third quarter of FY 2016/17. This represents a 1.9% decrease compared to the previous fiscal year.

The Catch-a-Ride program provided 3,536 one-way trips. This is a decrease of 16.0% compared to the prior year.

Ridership Trends

Despite a 14.8% increase in service levels, fixed-route ridership experienced an overall 8.2% decline compared to the same quarter of the previous fiscal year. This decline is relatively consistent with trends among bus transit agencies throughout the country and in the Bay Area. According to the National Transit Database, bus ridership declined 6.0% nationwide during the third quarter of FY 2016/17 compared to the prior year.

There are several factors that can impact ridership such as the number of weekdays in a month and the weather. Weather likely had the most significant impact on ridership during the third quarter of FY 2016/17, which had about twice as much rainfall as the prior year. Weather can influence travel decisions, affecting whether a person makes a trip, as well as how that person ultimately makes the trip. There were also a number of days with relatively severe weather that resulted in flooding, road and stop closures, service detours, and trip cancellations. On these days, service was either cancelled or truncated based on roadway conditions. Several schools, including College of Marin, were closed for two days in February due to the heavy rains, and this resulted in fewer students using transit.

Table 2 below compares these factors, and qualitatively evaluates their potential impact on ridership.

Weather likely had the most significant impact on ridership during the third quarter of FY 2016/17, which had about twice as much rainfall as the prior year. Weather can influence travel decisions, affecting whether a person makes a trip, as well as how

that person ultimately makes the trip. There were also a number of days with relatively severe weather that resulted in flooding, road and stop closures, service detours, and trip cancellations. On these days, service was either cancelled or truncated based on roadway conditions. Several schools, including College of Marin, were closed for two days in February due to the heavy rains, and this resulted in fewer students using transit.

Table 2: Factors Impacting Ridership Comparison

Factor		FY 2015/16 Q3	FY 2016/17 Q3	Impact
	School Days	55	52	▼▼
Calendar	Weekdays	63	63	
Calendar	Weekends & Holidays	28	27	▼
	Muir Woods Shuttle	3	2	▼
Transfers (ratio of tra	Transfers (ratio of transfers to cash fares)		0.31	▼
C : D: .:	Canceled service (trips)	64	130	**
Service Disruptions	Major detour/closure (days)	2	13	▼▼
Rainfall (inches)		20.42	40.89	▼▼
Gas Prices		\$3.15	\$2.86	▼
Unemployment Rate		3.33%	3.07%	▼

In June 2016, Marin Transit implemented major service changes. One of the main goals of the service restructuring was to provide faster and more direct connections that reduce the need to transfer. While this improves the system for riders, the emphasis on direct service has implications in terms of ridership and performance metrics. Ridership is measured in terms of unlinked passenger trips. Each time a person boards a bus that boarding is counted as a trip, regardless of whether that person is transferring from another bus. By reducing the number of transfers needed to complete a rider's journey, the number of unlinked trips is also reduced. Replacing trips requiring a transfer with direct trips does not change the number of individual riders using the system.

When comparing this quarterly period to the prior year, the ratio of transfers to cash fares dropped from 0.35 to 0.31, affirming that riders are making fewer transfers on average. The total number of transfers also declined about 18.9%, significantly more than the overall decline in ridership.

Compared to the prior year, demand for Marin Access mobility management programs declined an overall 3.2% during the third quarter of FY 2016/17. Ridership on these programs may have declined due to many of the same external factors as fixed route transit, particularly weather. It is also possible that paratransit clients have started shifting some or all of their trips to other services that are not provided by Marin Transit. Services that may be fulfilling some or all of the needs of paratransit riders include:

- Non-Emergency Medical Transportation services arranged by managed care organizations;
- Private transportation providers hired under contract to institutions typically served by paratransit (such as adult day care centers);
- Trips taken on Uber or Lyft; and

•	Volunteer transportation services that may be supported by Marin Transit, though their ridership is not reported in the District's performance statistics.

QUARTER **Fixed-Route** FY2017 Q3

Fixed-Route Passenger Statistics by Route

1- Logal Trumbling 35 194.48 A 370% 5,890 A 167.6% 27.1 ₹259 4- Logal Park 368,873 A 170.5% 3.35 A 203% 25.7 ₹718 71 20.074 ₹53.0% 11.98 A 20.8% 15.1 ₹71.7 2- Logal Basia 77 55.0% ₹1.4% 3.60 ₹4.2% 15.0 ₹71.7 2- Logal Basia 77 55.0% ₹1.6% 3.0% 4.4% 4.20 15.0 ₹71.7 ₹71.7 2- Logal Basia 74.7% 4.4% 4.20 15.0 11.4 ₹74.2 15.0 ₹71.4% 16.7 ₹74.2 2- Completor 4.0 4.4% 4.4% 4.24 16.0 ₹75.0 4.4% 4.7% 16.0 ₹75.0 4.4% 4.7%	Typology	Route	Passengers	%Change*	Revenue Hours	%Change*	Productivity**	Change*
Problem (Problem (Probl	1. Local Trunkline	35	154,459	▲37.0%	5,690	▲ 167.6%	27.1	▼25.9
Post		36	86,873	▲ 179.5%	3,375	▲373.3%	25.7	▼17.8
2. Local Basic Park Local Basic Park Local Basic Park Local Basic Park Park Park Park Park Park Park Park		71	29,074	▼53.0%	1,926	▲2.0%	15.1	▼17.7
Pach Pach Pach Pach Pach Pach Pach Pach		Rollup	270,406	▲ 6.7%	10,991	▲60.8%	24.6	▼12.5
Part	2. Local Basic	17	58,158	▼13.4%	3,650	▼4.2%	15.9	▼1.7
Part		22	50,850	▼15.1%	4,450	▲21.1%	11.4	▼4.9
Performance 29 9,628 ▼60,0% 926 ▼65,4% 10.4 ▼7.6 49 53,520 A70,0% 3,613 A130,1% 14.8 ₹6.9 Rollup 229,81 ▼17,5% 16,231 A70,0 14.2 ₹4.0 3. Local 29 11,416 ▼12,2% 16,19 ₹1,2% 7.1 ₹4.0 Connector 228 17,438 A366,3% 2,501 A249,8% 7.0 A2.0 24 233 9,787 ₹17,3% 10,77 ₹0.9% 9.1 ₹1.8 245 11,628 ₹1,073 10,073 10.8 ₹1.0 ₹1.0 ₹1.0 257 15,951 ₹14,1% 1,908 A22,2% 8.4 ₹1.0 A15 15,951 ₹14,1% 1,908 A22,2% 8.4 ₹3.0 A15 14,94 \$1,918 \$1,404 \$1,908 \$1,544 \$1,546 \$1,546 A14 4,477 4,438 18 \$		23	45,739	▼34.1%	2,733	▼17.4%	16.7	▼4.2
Mathematical Registry Mat		23X	11,996		859		14.0	
Rollup 229,891		29	9,628	▼80.0%	926	▼65.4%	10.4	▼7.6
3. Local 219		49	53,520	▲ 57.0%	3,613	▲130.1%	14.8	▼6.9
Connector 228 17,438 A 386.3% 2,501 A 249.8% 7,0 A 2.0 233 9,787 ▼17.3% 1,077 ▼0.9% 9.1 ▼1.8 245 11,628 1,073 10.8 10.8 251 23,097 ▼5.8% 2,369 A 3.5% 9.8 ▼1.0 257 15,951 ▼14.1% 1,908 A 22.2% 8.4 ▼3.5 Rollup 89,317 ▼17.6% 10,546 A 7.4% 8.5 ▼2.6 4. Supplemental 113 4,475 A 3.3% 88 ▼3.3% 30.2** A 15.1 115 4,045 ▼14.9% 186 A.5.8% 18.8** A 22.7 117 9,845 ▼14.9% 186 A.5.8% 18.8** A 22.7 119 6,645 ▼28.7% 107 ▼11.3% 26.9** ▼2.15 125 3,625 ▼7.3% 169 ♥6.6% 18.1** A 2.0 125 3,625		Rollup	229,891	▼17.5%	16,231	▲7.9%	14.2	▼4.4
233 9,787 17,3% 1,077 1,09% 9,1 1,88 245 11,628 1,073 1,08 251 23,097 75,8% 2,369 A3,5% 9,8 1,0 257 15,961 14,1% 1,908 A2,22% 8,4 73,5 Rollup 88,317 71,6% 10,546 A7,4% 8,5 72,6 4. Supplemental 113 4,475 A3,3% 88 73,4% 30,2** A15,1 116 4,045 714,9% 186 A6,8% 18,8** A22,7 117 9,845 73,4% 184 70,9% 27,8** A14,1 119 6,645 728,7% 107 711,3% 26,9** 721,5 125 3,625 77,3% 169 76,6% 18,1** A2,0 139 1,552 78,4% 73 77,8% 14,9** A0,4 145 4,777 44,58% 55 A4,9% 37,3** 77,7 151 10,397 721,2% 178 725,2% 40,3** 79,9 154 4,030 723,6% 107 76,1% 24,9** 71,4 154 4,030 723,6% 107 76,1% 24,9** 71,4 154 4,030 723,6% 107 76,1% 24,9** 71,4 154 4,030 723,6% 107 76,1% 24,9** 71,4 154 4,030 723,6% 107 76,1% 24,9** 71,4 154 4,030 723,6% 107 76,1% 24,9** 71,4 155 10,397 721,2% 11,68 73,3% 27,2** 70,0 156 61 5,496 71,0% 11,150 70,4% 4,8 71,0 157 Rollup 22,393 72,6% 3,796 A0,3% 5,9 70,2 158 Rollup 5,123 72,0% 440 75,0% 11,7 A3,7 159 Rollup 39,007 78,4% 436 A29,8% 89,5 73,3 157 Rollup 39,007 78,4% 436 A29,8% 89,5 73,3 158 Rollup 1,502 A4,7% 70 73,29% 21,5 A7,7 150 Rollup 1,502 A4,7% 70 73,29% 21,5 A7,7 150 70,000 78,4% 70 73,29% 21	3. Local	219	11,416	▼12.2%	1,619	▼1.2%	7.1	▼0.9
245 11,628 1,073 10.8 261 23,097 ▼5.8% 2,369 A3.5% 9.8 ▼1.0 267 15,961 ▼14.1% 1,908 A22.2% 8.4 ▼3.5 A. Supplemental Rollup 89.317 ▼17.6% 10,546 A.7.4% 8.5 ▼2.8 4. Supplemental 115 4,045 ▼14.9% 186 A5.8% 18.8** A2.27 115 4,045 ▼14.9% 186 A5.8% 18.8** A2.27 117 9.845 ▼3.4% 184 ▼0.9% 27.8** A14.1 119 6,645 ▼28.7% 107 ▼11.3% 26.9** ₹21.5 125 3,625 ₹7.3% 169 ₹6.6% 18.1** A2.0 125 3,625 ₹7.3% 75 4.9% 14.9** A0.4 126 3,625 ₹7.3% 75 4.9% 37.3** ₹7.2* 126 4,077 45.8% 55	Connector	228	17,438	▲386.3%	2,501	▲ 249.8%	7.0	▲2.0
Part		233	9,787	▼17.3%	1,077	▼0.9%	9.1	▼1.8
No. No.		245	11,628		1,073		10.8	
Rollup 89,317 ▼17.6% 10,546 A 7.4% 8.5 ▼2.6 4. Supplemental 113 4,475 A 3.3% 88 ▼3.4% 30.2** A 15.1 1 115 4,045 ▼14.9% 186 A 5.8% 18.8*** A 22.7 117 9,845 ▼3.4% 194 ▼0.9% 27.8*** A 14.1 119 6,645 ▼28.7% 107 ▼11.3% 26.9*** ₹21.5 125 3,625 ₹7.3% 169 ₹6.6% 18.1*** A 2.0 145 4,777 A 45.8% 55 A 4.9% 37.3** ₹7.7 151 10,397 ₹21.2% 178 ₹25.2% 40.3** ₹9.9 154 4,030 ₹23.6% 107 ₹6.1% 24.9** ₹14.2 Rollup 49,391 ₹11.7% 1,148 ₹7.3% 27.2*** ₹0.0 5. Rural 61 5,496 ₹17.0% 1,150 ₹0.4% 4.8 ₹1.0		251	23,097	▼5.8%	2,369	▲3.5%	9.8	▼1.0
4. Supplemental In 13 4.475 ∆ 3.3% 88 ▼ 3.4% 30.2** ▲ 15.1 1 115 4,045 ▼ 14.9% 186 ∆ 5.8% 18.8** ∆ 22.7 1117 9,845 ▼ 3.4% 184 ▼ 0.9% 27.8** ▲ 14.1 119 6,645 ▼ 28.7% 107 ▼ 11.3% 26.9** ▼ 21.5 125 3,625 ▼ 7.3% 169 ▼ 6.6% 18.1** △ 2.0 139 1,552 ▼ 8.4% 73 ▼ 7.8% 14.9** △ 0.4 145 4,777 ▲ 45.8% 55 ▲ 4.9% 37.3** ▼ 7.7 151 10,397 ▼ 21.2% 178 ▼ 25.2% 40.3** ▼ 9.9 154 4,030 ▼ 23.8% 107 ▼ 6.1% 24.9** ▼ 14.2 5. Rural 61 5,496 ▼ 17.0% 1,150 ▼ 0.4% 4.8 ▼ 1.0 5. Rural 61 5,496 ▼ 17.0% 1,150 ▼ 0.4% 4.8 ▼ 1.0		257	15,951	▼14.1%	1,908	▲22.2%	8.4	▼3.5
115		Rollup	89,317	▼17.6%	10,546	▲7.4%	8.5	▼2.6
117	4. Supplemental	113	4,475	▲3.3%	88	▼3.4%	30.2**	▲15.1
119		115	4,045	▼14.9%	186	▲ 5.8%	18.8**	▲22.7
125 3,625 V7.3% 169 V6.6% 18.1** A2.0 139		117	9,845	▼3.4%	184	▼0.9%	27.8**	▲14.1
139		119	6,645	▼28.7%	107	▼11.3%	26.9**	▼21.5
145 4,777 A 45.8% 55 A 4.9% 37.3** ▼7.7 151 10,397 ▼21.2% 178 ▼25.2% 40.3** ▼9.9 154 4,030 ▼23.6% 107 ▼6.1% 24.9** ▼14.2 Rollup 49,391 ▼11.7% 1,148 ▼7.3% 27.2** ▼0.0 5. Rural 61 5,496 ▼17.0% 1,150 ▼0.4% 4.8 ▼1.0 68 16,897 A 3.3% 2,646 A 0.7% 6.4 A 0.2 Rollup 22,393 ▼2.6% 3,796 A 0.3% 5.9 ▼0.2 6. Partnership 122 5,123 ▼27.0% 440 ▼50.0% 11.7 A 3.7 Services Rollup 5,123 ▼27.0% 440 ▼50.0% 11.7 A 3.7 7. Yellow Bus Hdn Valley 2,775 A 3.5% 63 ▼3.8% 44.0 A 3.1 White Hill 36,232 ▼9.2% 373 A 37.9% 97.1 ▼50.4 Rollup 39,007 ▼8.4% 436 A		125	3,625	▼7.3%	169	▼6.6%	18.1**	▲2.0
151 10,397 ▼21.2% 178 ▼25.2% 40.3*** ▼9.9 154 4,030 ▼23.6% 107 ▼6.1% 24.9*** ▼14.2 Rollup 49,391 ▼11.7% 1,148 ▼7.3% 27.2** ▼0.0 5. Rural 61 5,496 ▼17.0% 1,150 ▼0.4% 4.8 ▼1.0 68 16,897 △3.3% 2,646 △0.7% 6.4 △0.2 Rollup 22,393 ▼2.6% 3,796 △0.3% 5.9 ▼0.2 6. Partnership 122 5,123 ▼27.0% 440 ▼50.0% 11.7 △3.7 Services Rollup 5,123 ▼27.0% 440 ▼50.0% 11.7 △3.7 7. Yellow Bus Hdn Valley 2,775 △3.5% 63 ▼3.8% 44.0 △3.1 White Hill 36,232 ▼9.2% 373 △37.9% 97.1 ▼50.4 Rollup 39,007 ▼8.4% 436 △29.8% 89.5 ▼37.3 8. Recreational Rollup 1,502 △4.7% 70 ▼32.9% 21.5 △7.7		139	1,552	▼8.4%	73	▼7.8%	14.9**	▲0.4
154 4,030 ▼23.6% 107 ▼6.1% 24.9** ▼14.2 Rollup 49,391 ▼11.7% 1,148 ▼7.3% 27.2** ▼0.0 5. Rural 61 5,496 ▼17.0% 1,150 ▼0.4% 4.8 ▼1.0 68 16,897 ∆3.3% 2,646 △0.7% 6.4 △0.2 Rollup 22,393 ▼2.6% 3,796 △0.3% 5.9 ▼0.2 6. Partnership 122 5,123 ▼27.0% 440 ▼50.0% 11.7 △3.7 Services Rollup 5,123 ▼27.0% 440 ▼50.0% 11.7 △3.7 7. Yellow Bus Hdn Valley 2,775 △3.5% 63 ▼3.8% 44.0 △3.1 White Hill 36,232 ▼9.2% 373 △37.9% 97.1 ▼50.4 Rollup 39,007 ▼8.4% 436 △29.8% 89.5 ▼37.3 8. Recreational 66 1,502 △4.7% 70 ▼32.9% 21.5 △7.7 Rollup 1,502 △4.7% 70 </td <td></td> <td>145</td> <td>4,777</td> <td>▲45.8%</td> <td>55</td> <td>▲4.9%</td> <td>37.3**</td> <td>▼7.7</td>		145	4,777	▲45.8%	55	▲ 4.9%	37.3**	▼7.7
Rollup 49,391 ▼11.7% 1,148 ▼7.3% 27.2** ▼0.0 5. Rural 61 5,496 ▼17.0% 1,150 ▼0.4% 4.8 ▼1.0 68 16,897 ▲3.3% 2,646 ▲0.7% 6.4 ▲0.2 Rollup 22,393 ▼2.6% 3,796 ▲0.3% 5.9 ▼0.2 6. Partnership 122 5,123 ▼27.0% 440 ▼50.0% 11.7 ▲3.7 Services Rollup 5,123 ▼27.0% 440 ▼50.0% 11.7 ▲3.7 7. Yellow Bus Hdn Valley 2,775 ▲3.5% 63 ▼3.8% 44.0 ▲3.1 White Hill 36,232 ▼9.2% 373 ▲37.9% 97.1 ▼50.4 Rollup 39,007 ▼8.4% 436 ▲29.8% 89.5 ▼37.3 8. Recreational 66 1,502 ▲4.7% 70 ▼32.9% 21.5 ▲7.7 Rollup 1,502 ▲4.7% 70		151	10,397	▼21.2%	178	▼25.2%	40.3**	▼9.9
5. Rural 61 5,496 ▼17.0% 1,150 ▼0.4% 4.8 ▼1.0 68 16,897 ▲3.3% 2,646 ▲0.7% 6.4 ▲0.2 Rollup 22,393 ▼2.6% 3,796 ▲0.3% 5.9 ▼0.2 6. Partnership 122 5,123 ▼27.0% 440 ▼50.0% 11.7 ▲3.7 Services Rollup 5,123 ▼27.0% 440 ▼50.0% 11.7 ▲3.7 7. Yellow Bus Hdn Valley 2,775 ▲3.5% 63 ▼3.8% 44.0 ▲3.1 White Hill 36,232 ▼9.2% 373 ▲37.9% 97.1 ▼50.4 Rollup 39,007 ▼8.4% 436 ▲29.8% 89.5 ▼37.3 8. Recreational 66 1,502 ▲4.7% 70 ▼32.9% 21.5 ▲7.7 Rollup 1,502 ▲4.7% 70 ▼32.9% 21.5 ▲7.7		154	4,030	▼23.6%	107	▼6.1%	24.9**	▼14.2
68 16,897 ▲ 3.3% 2,646 ▲ 0.7% 6.4 ▲ 0.2 Rollup 22,393 ▼2.6% 3,796 ▲ 0.3% 5.9 ▼0.2 6. Partnership 122 5,123 ▼27.0% 440 ▼50.0% 11.7 ▲ 3.7 Services Rollup 5,123 ▼27.0% 440 ▼50.0% 11.7 ▲ 3.7 7. Yellow Bus Hdn Valley 2,775 ▲ 3.5% 63 ▼3.8% 44.0 ▲ 3.1 White Hill 36,232 ▼9.2% 373 ▲ 37.9% 97.1 ▼50.4 Rollup 39,007 ▼8.4% 436 ▲ 29.8% 89.5 ▼37.3 8. Recreational 66 1,502 ▲ 4.7% 70 ▼32.9% 21.5 ▲ 7.7 Rollup 1,502 ▲ 4.7% 70 ▼32.9% 21.5 ▲ 7.7		Rollup	49,391	▼11.7%	1,148	▼7.3%	27.2**	▼0.0
Rollup 22,393 ▼2.6% 3,796 ▲0.3% 5.9 ▼0.2 6. Partnership 122 5,123 ▼27.0% 440 ▼50.0% 11.7 ▲3.7 Services Rollup 5,123 ▼27.0% 440 ▼50.0% 11.7 ▲3.7 7. Yellow Bus Hdn Valley 2,775 ▲3.5% 63 ▼3.8% 44.0 ▲3.1 White Hill 36,232 ▼9.2% 373 ▲37.9% 97.1 ▼50.4 Rollup 39,007 ▼8.4% 436 ▲29.8% 89.5 ▼37.3 8. Recreational 66 1,502 ▲4.7% 70 ▼32.9% 21.5 ▲7.7 Rollup 1,502 ▲4.7% 70 ▼32.9% 21.5 ▲7.7	5. Rural	61	5,496	▼17.0%	1,150	▼0.4%	4.8	▼1.0
6. Partnership 122 5,123 ▼27.0% 440 ▼50.0% 11.7 ▲3.7 Services Rollup 5,123 ▼27.0% 440 ▼50.0% 11.7 ▲3.7 7. Yellow Bus Hdn Valley 2,775 ▲3.5% 63 ▼3.8% 44.0 ▲3.1 White Hill 36,232 ▼9.2% 373 ▲37.9% 97.1 ▼50.4 Rollup 39,007 ▼8.4% 436 ▲29.8% 89.5 ▼37.3 8. Recreational 66 1,502 ▲4.7% 70 ▼32.9% 21.5 ▲7.7 Rollup 1,502 ▲4.7% 70 ▼32.9% 21.5 ▲7.7		68	16,897	▲3.3%	2,646	▲0.7%	6.4	▲0.2
Services Rollup 5,123 ▼27.0% 440 ▼50.0% 11.7 ▲3.7 7. Yellow Bus Hdn Valley 2,775 ▲3.5% 63 ▼3.8% 44.0 ▲3.1 White Hill 36,232 ▼9.2% 373 ▲37.9% 97.1 ▼50.4 Rollup 39,007 ▼8.4% 436 ▲29.8% 89.5 ▼37.3 8. Recreational 66 1,502 ▲4.7% 70 ▼32.9% 21.5 ▲7.7 Rollup 1,502 ▲4.7% 70 ▼32.9% 21.5 ▲7.7		Rollup	22,393	▼2.6%	3,796	▲0.3%	5.9	▼0.2
7. Yellow Bus Hdn Valley 2,775 ▲3.5% 63 ▼3.8% 44.0 ▲3.1 White Hill 36,232 ▼9.2% 373 ▲37.9% 97.1 ▼50.4 Rollup 39,007 ▼8.4% 436 ▲29.8% 89.5 ▼37.3 8. Recreational 66 1,502 ▲4.7% 70 ▼32.9% 21.5 ▲7.7 Rollup 1,502 ▲4.7% 70 ▼32.9% 21.5 ▲7.7	6. Partnership	122	5,123	▼27.0%	440	▼50.0%	11.7	▲3.7
White Hill 36,232 ▼9.2% 373 ▲37.9% 97.1 ▼50.4 Rollup 39,007 ▼8.4% 436 ▲29.8% 89.5 ▼37.3 8. Recreational 66 1,502 ▲4.7% 70 ▼32.9% 21.5 ▲7.7 Rollup 1,502 ▲4.7% 70 ▼32.9% 21.5 ▲7.7	Services	Rollup	5,123	▼27.0%	440	▼50.0%	11.7	▲3.7
Rollup 39,007 ▼8.4% 436 ▲29.8% 89.5 ▼37.3 8. Recreational 66 1,502 ▲4.7% 70 ▼32.9% 21.5 ▲7.7 Rollup 1,502 ▲4.7% 70 ▼32.9% 21.5 ▲7.7	7. Yellow Bus	Hdn Valley	2,775	▲3.5%	63	▼3.8%	44.0	▲3.1
8. Recreational 66 1,502 ▲4.7% 70 ▼32.9% 21.5 ▲7.7 Rollup 1,502 ▲4.7% 70 ▼32.9% 21.5 ▲7.7		White Hill	36,232	▼9.2%	373	▲37.9%	97.1	▼50.4
Rollup 1,502 ▲4.7% 70 ▼32.9% 21.5 ▲7.7		Rollup	39,007	▼8.4%	436	▲29.8%	89.5	▼37.3
	8. Recreational	66	1,502	▲ 4.7%	70	▼32.9%	21.5	▲7.7
Rollup 707,030 ▼8.2% 43,658 ▲14.8% 16.2 ▼4.1		Rollup	1,502	▲ 4.7%	70	▼32.9%	21.5	▲7.7
	Rollup		707,030	▼8.2%	43,658	▲14.8%	16.2	▼4.1

^{*} Change compared to same quarter of prior year ** Productivity measured in passengers per hour, except for Supplemental services, which use passengers per trip

Fixed-Route

Fixed-Route Financial Statistics by Route

Typology	Route	Operating Cost	%Change*	Passenger Revenue	%Change*	Average Subsidy	Change*	Farebox Recovery	Change*
1. Local Trunkline	35	\$809,299	▲ 192.3%	\$169,800	▲32.0%	\$4.14	▲\$2.83	21.0%	▼25.5%
	36	\$476,735	▲401.2%	\$87,731	▲198.9%	\$4.48	▲\$2.36	18.4%	▼12.5%
	71	\$283,475	▲8.6%	\$39,236	▼ 45.8%	\$8.40	▲\$5.35	13.8%	▼13.9%
	Rollup	\$1,569,509	▲72.6 %	\$296,767	▲8.7%	\$4.71	▲\$2.20	18.9%	▼11.1%
2. Local Basic	17	\$520,032	▲2.6%	\$72,710	▲0.2%	\$7.69	▲\$1.22	14.0%	▼0.3%
	22	\$419,094	▼14.1%	\$66,930	▲0.6%	\$6.93	▼\$0.11	16.0%	▲2.3%
	23	\$377,283	▼12.3%	\$56,136	▼28.0%	\$7.02	▲ \$1.94	14.9%	▼3.2%
	23X	\$119,477		\$13,933		\$8.80		11.7%	
	29	\$129,079	▼63.3%	\$11,822	▼79.3%	\$12.18	▲\$6.07	9.2%	▼7.1%
	49	\$329,806	▲ 57.7%	\$61,069	▲ 79.4%	\$5.02	▼\$0.12	18.5%	▲2.2%
	Rollup	\$1,894,770	▼4.6%	\$282,600	▼8.3%	\$7.01	▲\$0.99	14.9%	▼0.6%
3. Local	219	\$152,655	▲ 5.5%	\$14,759	▼15.4%	\$12.08	▲\$2.29	9.7%	▼2.4%
Connector	228	\$229,076	▲267.3%	\$25,186	▲327.1%	\$11.69	▼\$4.06	11.0%	▲1.5%
	233	\$100,330	▲ 5.6%	\$11,785	▼16.8%	\$9.05	▲\$2.21	11.7%	▼3.1%
	245	\$98,265		\$12,868		\$7.34		13.1%	
	251	\$223,156	▲9.9%	\$24,195	▼16.8%	\$8.61	▲\$1.52	10.8%	▼3.5%
	257	\$177,104	▲28.2%	\$18,426	▼12.4%	\$9.95	▲ \$3.64	10.4%	▼4.8%
	Rollup	\$980,585	▲12.9 %	\$107,218	▼18.2%	\$9.78	▲\$2.98	10.9%	▼4.2%
4. Supplemental	113	\$13,724	▲4.3%	\$3,140	▼9.8%	\$2.37	▲\$0.13	22.9%	▼3.6%
	115	\$29,672	▲12.5%	\$2,589	▼26.9%	\$6.70	▲\$1.89	8.7%	▼ 4.7%
	117	\$27,570	▲4.0%	\$4,656	▼25.9%	\$2.33	▲ \$0.34	16.9%	▼6.8%
	119	\$18,508	▼2.9%	\$4,383	▼ 42.8%	\$2.13	▲\$0.90	23.7%	▼16.6%
	125	\$24,111	▼0.4%	\$2,989	▼14.9%	\$5.83	▲\$0.53	12.4%	▼2.1%
	139	\$11,262	▼0.1%	\$1,544	▲0.6%	\$6.26	▲\$0.51	13.7%	▲0.1%
	145	\$8,627	▲23.3%	\$1,975	▲13.8%	\$1.39	▼\$0.21	22.9%	▼1.9%
	151	\$25,995	▼19.6%	\$5,084	▼28.2%	\$2.01	▲\$0.10	19.6%	▼2.3%
	154	\$14,866	▼0.9%	\$2,434	▼37.3%	\$3.08	▲\$0.98	16.4%	▼9.5%
	Rollup	\$174,335	▼0.3%	\$28,793	▼25.6%	\$2.95	▲\$0.51	16.5%	▼5.6%
5. Rural	61	\$102,083	▲20.2%	\$5,822	▼ 27.3%	\$17.51	▲ \$5.90	5.7%	▼3.7%
	68	\$240,151	▲20.4%	\$17,861	▼10.7%	\$13.16	▲\$2.18	7.4%	▼2.6%
	Rollup	\$342,235	▲20.3%	\$23,683	▼15.4%	\$14.23	▲\$3.07	6.9%	▼2.9%
6. Partnership	122	\$58,641	▼44.3%	\$33,713	▼1.3%	\$4.87	▼\$5.26	57.5%	▲25.0%
Services	Rollup	\$58,641	▼44.3%	\$33,713	▼1.3%	\$4.87	▼\$5.26	57.5%	▲ 25.0%
7. Yellow Bus	Hdn Valley	\$31,918	▼18.5%	\$9,314	▲24.1%	\$8.15	▼\$3.66	29.2%	▲ 10.0%
	White Hill	\$188,954	▲16.8%	\$121,931	▲9.0%	\$1.85	▲\$0.60	64.5%	▼ 4.7%
	Rollup	\$220,872	▲9.9%	\$131,245	▲ 9.9%	\$2.30	▲\$0.38	59.4%	▼0.0%
8. Recreational	66	\$9,584	▼15.9%	\$3,127	▼2.5%	\$4.30	▼\$1.40	32.6%	▲4.5%
	Rollup	\$9,584	▼15.9%	\$3,127	▼2.5%	\$4.30	▼\$1.40	32.6%	▲ 4.5%
Rollup		\$5,250,532	▲15.6%	\$907,147	▼3.1%	\$6.14	▲\$1.46	17.3%	▼3.3%

^{*} Change compared to same quarter of prior year

Marin Access

Marin Access Passenger Statistics by Service

Typology	Route	Passengers	%Change*	Revenue Hours	%Change*	Productivity (pax/hr)	Change*
9. Demand	Dillon DAR	78	▼32.2%	113	▲73.7%	0.7	▼1.1
Response	Local Para	28,867	▼5.6%	13,465	▼3.5%	2.1	▼0.0
	Novato DAR	1,044	▼0.9%	508	▼4.2%	2.1	▲0.1
	PtReyesDAR	30		30		1.0	
	Rollup	30,019	▼5.4%	14,116	▼3.0%	2.1	▼0.1
Catch-A-Ride	CAR_Gen	3,536	▲ 71.9%	0			
	CAR_LowInc	0	▼100.0%	0			
	Rollup	3,536	▼16.0%	0			
Volunteer Driver	VolDrvr	2,977	▲7.9%	3,087	▲9.6%	1.0	▼0.0
	VolDvrWM	1,048	▲28.4%	1,621	▲25.1%	0.6	▲0.0
	Rollup	4,025	▼1.9%	4,708	▲3.5%	0.9	▼0.0
Rollup		37,580	▼6.2%	18,824	▼1.5%	2.0	▼0.1

Marin Access Financial Statistics by Service

Typology	Route	Operating Cost	%Change*	Passenger Revenue	%Change*	Average Subsidy	Change*	Farebox Recovery	Change*
9. Demand	Dillon DAR	\$2,493	▼34.7%	135.92	▼53.5%	\$30.22	▼\$0.46	5.5%	▼2.2%
Response	Local Para	\$1,113,950	▲ 7.1%	55,414.00	▲0.6%	\$36.67	▲ \$4.44	5.0%	▼0.3%
	Novato DAR	\$36,429	▼9.6%	2,259.62	▼11.5%	\$32.73	▼\$3.11	6.2%	▼0.1%
	PtReyesDAR	\$683		51.59		\$21.07		7.6%	
	Rollup	\$1,153,555	▲ 6.4%	57,861.13	▼0.2%	\$36.50	▲ \$4.16	5.0%	▼0.3%
Catch-A-Ride	CAR_Gen	\$88,615	▲ 100.8%	8,948.90	▲81.1%	\$22.53	▲\$3.47	10.1%	▼1.1%
	CAR_LowInc	\$0	▼100.0%	0.00	▼100.0%				
	Rollup	\$88,615	▲ 5.4%	8,948.90	▼11.4%	\$22.53	▲\$4.97	10.1%	▼1.9%
Volunteer Driver	VolDrvr	\$23,105	▼14.6%	0.00		\$7.76	▼\$2.05	0.0%	-
	VolDvrWM	\$15,733	▼12.0%	0.00		\$15.01	▼\$6.89	0.0%	-
	Rollup	\$38,838	▼46.6%	0.00		\$9.65	▼\$8.09	0.0%	-
Rollup		\$1,281,008	▲3.2%	66,810.03	▼1.8%	\$32.31	▲\$3.02	5.2%	▼0.3%

^{*} Change compared to same quarter of prior year

Systemwide Total

Systemwide Passenger Statistics Summary

	Passengers	%Change*	Revenue Hours	%Change*	Productivity (pax/hr)	Change*
Values	744,610	▼8.1%	62,482	▲9.4%	11.9	▼2.3

Systemwide Financial Statistics Summary

	Operating Cost	%Change*	Passenger Revenue	%Change*	Average Subsidy	Change*	Farebox Recovery	Change*
Values	\$6,531,540	▲13.0%	\$973,957	▼3.0%	\$7.46	▲ \$1.57	14.9%	▼2.4%

^{*} Change compared to same quarter of prior year