To: James L. App, City Manager
From:
Mike Compton, Director of Administrative Services (His)
Subject: $\quad$ Transit Operations Recommendations - Ad Hoc Fiscal Policy Committee
DATE: June 6, 2000

Needs:
For the Council to consider recommendations made by their ad hoc fiscal policy (FPC) committee relating to transit operations.

## Facts:

1. The Transit Advisory Committee (TAC) met Wednesday, April 5, 2000. A copy of their meeting agenda is attached.
2. The TAC made a number of recommendations for Council consideration:
a. Reduce fixed route fares from the current $\$ 2.00$ per one way trip fare to $\$ 1.00$ per one way trip.
b. Reduce dial-a-ride fares from the current $\$ 3.00$ per one way trip fare to $\$ 1.50$ per one way trip.
c. Eliminate extended dial-a-ride service hours.
d. Provide free Saturday fixed route service.
3. TAC's recommendations were presented to FPC for their review and consideration at their meeting of May 8, 2000.
4. The FPC has modified the TAC's recommendations and recommends that the Council consider implementation of the following transit system modifications:
a. Reduce fixed route fares from the current $\$ 2.00$ per one way fare to $\$ 1.25$ per one way fare.
b. Price the fixed route ten coupon fare books at $\$ 10.00$ each to provide for a discounted one way fare of $\$ 1.00$.
c. Eliminate the fixed route punch pass.
d. Reduce dial-a-ride fares from the current $\$ 3.00$ per one way fare to $\$ 2.50$ per one way fare.
e. Other than retaining the existing "golden senior" free ride pass, no dial-a-ride discounted fare is proposed.
f. Eliminate the dial-a-ride punch pass.
g. Eliminate Saturday dial-a-ride services and reduce Monday through Friday service from 2:00 arm. to 8:00 ppm.
h. Evaluate option with Pass Robles Cab Service to provide subsidized taxi service from 8:00 p.m. to 2:00 am. , Monday through Saturday.

Analysis
and
Conclusion:
There has been a lot of publicity regarding transit fares in Pas Robles. As previously reported to the Council, since the fare increases, ridership has declined by $39 \%$. On the other hand, there has been a very slight increase in the fare box ratio from $20.12 \%$ to $20.86 \%$ when comparing last year with the current fiscal year. In other words, the loss of fare revenues resulting from the decline in ridership has been completely offset by the increase in fares. The questions facing the Council include; a) will ridership retum as the public adjust to the new fares, particularly in light of recent increases in fuel prices, and b) is it better to have more riders paying less fares or less riders paying higher fares for 1) Dial-A-Ride and/or 2) Fixed Route? The first question has been answered. Nearly one year after the fare increases were implemented, ridership has NOT returned. The second question is a policy question that the Council must consider. The following statistics, for all transit services combined, comparing pre-fare increase with post-fare increase:

| Gross Cost per Passenger | $\$ 3.75$ | $\$ 7.25$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Net Cost per Passenger | 2.98 | 5.77 |
|  |  |  |
| Gross Cost per Service Hour | 2.61 | 3.11 |
| Net Cost per Service Hour | 2.07 | 2.47 |
|  |  |  |
| Revenue per Passenger | 0.77 | 1.48 |
| Revenue per Service Hour | 0.54 | 0.64 |

With regard to providing free Saturday service, this recommendation was made by the TAC given their perception that Saturday ridership is significantly less than that of weekly service. It was their thought that by offering free Saturday service, ridership would improve. However, Saturday ridership is doing quite well In February, nonSaturday ridership averaged 120 riders per day while Saturday service averaged 94 riders. It is the nature of weekend service that it will not achieve the same levels as weekday service. The Council may wish to wait and see how any fare reduction will impact Saturday ridership before considering free service since Saturday service generates approximately $\$ 200$ day in revenues. The FPC has NOT recommended free Saturday service.

As noted above in the fact \# 4, the FPC is recommending the elimination of the sale of punch pass. The punch pass has not been positively received by the riding public since they can purchase a discounted book of ten tickets at the same effective per ride cost and spend less in the short term.

As the attached ridership report illustrates, a majority of dial-a-ride passengers has transitioned to free riders, mainly seniors older than 70 years of age using the "golden senior" passes.

Staff has met with Central Coast Cab to investigate the possibility of providing subsidized evening taxi service to Paso Robles. Central Coast Cab is prepared to enter into an agreement with the City to provide said services Monday through Saturday. The fiscal policy committee has recommended service till 2:00 a.m. but the Council may wish to consider shorter hours Monday through Thursday given ridership statistics indicate fewer calls for service on these evenings. While the fiscal policy recommends a $\$ 3.00$ one way fare plus $\$ 1.00$ person for each person going to the same destination, Joe Brady, owner and operator of Central Coast Cab recommends only a single fare since the City would only be charged for a single fare. If the Council approves implementation, the City would sell punch passes for ten rides for $\$ 30$ representing the recommended $\$ 3.00$ per ride fare. Central Coast Cab would bill the City for the value of the full fare. The rate of subsidy for evening taxi service is unknown since the amount of the subsidy is dependent upon the amount of the taxi fare which varies with distance. When staff last analyzed fare records for Central Coast Cab, it is staff's recollection that the average fare was around $\$ 10$ to $\$ 12$. This would result in a subsidy of $\$ 7$ to $\$ 9$ which is higher than the City's current fare subsidy. However, there is an advantage. With City provided evening transit service the cost is fixed and ongoing while with subsidized taxi service, the City only incurs a cost when Central Coast Cab actually provides service to a fare paying passenger. Staff would recommend that, should the council move forward with implementation of subsidized taxi service, the service not be eligible for the use of golden senior passes.

## Fiscal

Impact:
During the current fiscal year through $2 / 29 / 00$, for all transit services, the City is collecting $\$ 1.50$ per passenger against a gross cost per passenger of $\$ 7.19$ representing a net subsidy of $\$ 5.69$ per passenger. Last year, for the twelve month period ending $6 / 30 / 99$, the City collected $\$ 0.87$ per passenger against a gross cost per passenger of $\$ 4.11$ representing a net subsidy of $\$ 3.24$ per passenger. While the city is currently collecting more per passenger with the increased fares, the net subsidy per passenger has risen dramatically due to the increased cost of expanded dial-a-ride services and expanded Saturday fixed route service, free transit services to seniors over 70 years of age and significant decline in ridership.

Last year, the City collected $\$ 62,078$ in fare revenues against $\$ 294,717$ in total system costs. It is projected at current service and fare levels that the City will collect $\$ 66,200$ against $\$ 317,400$ in total system costs.

Given sufficient time to attract back ridership that discontinued the use of public transit due to the farc increases, it is expected that fare box ratios would remain consistent with current ratios. However, the elimination of extended dial-a-ride services would save $\$ 155.84$ per day or $\$ 4,021$ per month (based upon 4.3 weeks per month) or $\$ 48,000$ annually. Should the Council concur with FPC recommendations to reduce rather than eliminate extended dial-a-nide services, the savings would be reduced proportionally.

Rather than spend any savings that might arise from a reduction in extended service (should the Council be so inclined to reduce extended service) staff would recommend maintaining the savings until fixed route expansion and/or bus acquisition options are evaluated.

## Options:

a. That the Council consider approval of the following transit modifications as recommended by their ad hoc fiscal policy committee; or

1. Reduce fixed route fares from the current $\$ 2.00$ per one way fare to $\$ 1.25$ per one way fare.
2. Price the fixed route ten coupon fare books at $\$ 10.00$ each to provide for a discounted one way fare of $\$ 1.00$.
3. Eliminate the fixed route punch pass.
4. Reduce dial-a-ride fares from the current $\$ 3.00$ per one way fare to $\$ 2.50$ per one way fare.
5. Eliminate the dial-a-ride punch pass.
6. Eliminate Saturday dial-a-ride services and reduce Monday through Friday service from 2:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.
7. Negotiate a contract with Paso Robles Cab Service to provide subsidized taxi service from 8:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m. , Monday through Saturday.
b. Amend, modify, or reject the above option.

Mike Compton
From:
MSoltyPB@aol.com
Sent:
Monday, April 17, 2000 11:58 AM
To:
Mike@prcity.com
Subject:
Re: Meeting/Transit
Mike,
I have a meeting at 1:00 on Wednesday. Can we get together around 11:15?
You name the place.
Your understanding about our senior taxi service is correct. They buy a 10 ride pass for 30 dollars. The City pays the full cost of the taxi service to any location in the 5 Cities area.
Mary
L\$3.00 par are way trip on

# TRANSIT ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA 

April 5, 2000 at 10:00 A.M.
Meeting Location: Library Conference Room 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles

## PLEASE SUBMIT ALL CORRESPONDENCE FOR ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA TWO WEEKS PRIOR TO THE MEETING

## CALL TO ORDER

## ROLL CALL

Committee members Joe Dutra, Terry Gillespie, Pat Mackie, Justin Malone, James Martin, Sandee McLaughlin, and Robert Slenes

## PUBLIC COMMENT

## CONSENT AGENDA

Items on the Consent Agenda are considered routine, and, therefore do not require separate discussion. However, if discussion is necessary, or if a member of the public wishes to comment on any item, the item may be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered separately. Questions of clarification may be made by the Advisory members without removal from the Agenda.

1. Minutes of March 1,2000
2. Transit Report for the month of February, 2000

## DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Committee By-Laws - Article 1. - Purpose - Director of Administrative Services Review by-laws and forward any recommended changes to City Counc̣il for their consideration and adoption.
2. Purpose, Philosophy and Vision of Transit - Committee Discuss "Mission Statement" for Transit Advisory Committee.
3. Rider Survey - Director of Administrative Services Present draft "on board" survey to TAC for their review.
4. Routes-Director of Administrative Services

Council approval of recommended route change.
5. Cuesta College Student Survey Update - Committee Member Sander McLaughlin
6. Extended DAR Service - Director of Administrative Services

Presentation of YTD ridership, costs and revenues.
7. Transit Fares -Committee

Open Discussion

## COMMITTEE COMMUNICATIONS

1. Memo to Paso Robles Youth Commission

## STAFF COMMUNICATIONS

1. Memo from Director of Administrative Services regarding May 3, 2000 meeting.
2. Memo from Director of Administrative Services regarding DAR extended hours.
3. Memo from Director of Administrative Services regarding transit fares.
4. Application for bus acquisition grant was rejected by SLOCOG. It was the first time ever that the City's application had been denied.

## WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None.

## ADJOURNMENT

Deadline for submitting items for the next regular Transit Advisory Committee Agenda is Wednesday, April 19, 2000

## City of Bl Paso de Robles

TRANSIT RIDERSEIP REPORT
All Transit Services
Fiscal Year 1999-00

Total AlL Transit Services

|  | Operator contract | $\begin{gathered} \text { Vehicle } \\ M \& 0 \end{gathered}$ | Operating Expenses | Total <br> Expenses | Fare <br> Revenues | Net Cost | Fare Box Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| July | \$ 23,364.81 | \$ 3,867.61 | \$ 552.15 | \$ 27,784.57 | \$ 7,675.46 | \$ 20,109.11 | 27.62\% |
| August | 24,180.54 | 7,549.77 | 1,456.66 | 33,186.97 | 5,697.93 | 27,489.04 | $17.17 \%$ |
| September | 23,324.44 | 7,238.20 | 1,439.26 | 32,001.90 | 6,140.95 | 25,860.95 | $19.19 \%$ |
| October | 24,017.71 | 6,207. 82 | 897.46 | 31,122.99 | 7.308.54 | 23,814.45 | $23.48 \%$ |
| November | 23,373.61 | 4,210.21 | 713.23 | 28,297.05 | 4.840.03 | 23,457.02 | 17.108 |
| December | 24,543.06 | 4,423.89 | 1.051.68 | 30,018.63 | 5,790.94 | 24,227.69 | 19.298 |
| January | 22,503.28 | 4,941.31 | 968.17 | 28.412.76 | 7,034. 39 | 21,378.37 | 24.768 |
| February | 22,377.15 | 3,978,45 | 891.45 | 27,247.05 | 5,166.23 | 22,080.82 | $18.96 \%$ |
| March | . | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| April | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| May | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| June | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Total | \$ 187,684.60 | \$42,417.26 | \$7.970.06 | \$238,071.92 | \$49,654.47 | \$188,417.45 | 20.868 |


|  | Fixed Route Transit Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Operator <br> Contract | Vehicle $M \& 0$ |  | operating <br> Expenses | Total Expenses | Fare <br> Revenues |  | Net Cost | Fare Box Ratio |
| July | \$ 14, 200.94 | \$ 2.451 .05 | \$ | 226.07 | \$ 16,878.06 | \$ 3.784 .17 | \$ | 13.093.89 | 22.42\% |
| August | 14,170.83 | 4,516.71 |  | 641.12 | 19,328.66 | 4,115.28 |  | 15,213.38 | $21.29 \%$ |
| September | 13,627.88 | 4,701.89 |  | 634.26 | 18,964.03 | 4,031.51 |  | 14.932.52 | $21.26 \%$ |
| October | 14.167.57 | 3.909.71 |  | 466.93 | 18,544.21 | 4,534.39 |  | 14,009.82 | 24.458 |
| November | 13,672.54 | 3,160.55 |  | 230.42 | 17,063.51 | 3,691.40 |  | 13,372.11 | 21.638 |
| December | 14,288.50 | 2.773 .20 |  | 498.32 | 17,560.02 | 4,520.77 |  | 13.039.25 | $25.74 \%$ |
| January | 12,456.20 | 2,862.68 |  | 394.96 | 15,713.84 | 4,779.15 |  | 10,934.69 | 30.418 |
| February | 16,070.70 | 3,229.24 |  | 321.94 | 19,621.88 | 3,671.89 |  | 15,949.99 | 18.718 |
| March |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |
| April |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |
| May |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |
| June |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |
| Total | \$ 112,655.16 | \$27,605.03 |  | 3,414.02 | \$143,674:21 | \$33,128.56 |  | 10,545.65 | 23.068 |



Note: Operating expenses do NOT include depreciation.

| July | 5,443 | (0.27) | 7,461 | 10.01) | 7,558 | 27.13 | 5,943 | 0.18 | 5,022 | 0.25 | 4,033 | 4,946 | 5,160 | 3,918 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| August | 4,552 | (0.23) | 5,878 | 0.03 | 5,701 | (3.75) | 5,923 | 0.04 | 5,706 | 0.26 | 4,546 | 4,587 | 4,212 | 3,813 | 0 |
| September | 4,014 | (0.38) | 6,489 | 0.02 | 6,343 | 4.77 | 6,054 | 0.18 | 5,114 | (0.08) | 5,582 | 4,775 | 5,276 | 3,620 | 1,792 |
| October | 3,948 | (0.38) | 6,341 | (0.16) | 7,556 | 2.48 | 7,373 | 0.21 | 6,087 | 0.02 | 5,957 | 4,811 | 5,430 | 4,342 | 2,267 |
| November | 3,674 | (0.39) | 6,003 | 0.13 | 5,298 | (19.58) | 6,588 | 0.12 | 5,867 | 0.09 | 5,378 | 5,036 | 4,905 | 3,708 | 2,631 |
| December | 4,193 | (0.33) | 6,284 | 0.04 | 6,051 | (4.81) | 6,357 | 0.29 | 4,922 | (0.08) | 5,346 | 4,557 | 4,916 | 3,838 | 3,066 |
| January | 3,733 | (0.37) | 5,951 | 0.07 | 5,367 | (25.62) | 7,485 | 0.25 | 6,006 | 0.31 | 4,598 | 5,079 | 5,136 | 4,424 | 3,849 |
| February | 3,573 | (0.40) | 5,950 | 0.08 | 5,515 | (25.07) | 7,360 | 0.26 | 5,863 | (0.04) | 6,094 | 4,905 | 5,736 | 3,943 | 3,495 |
| March | 0 |  | 7,092 | 0.06 | 6,676 | (14.20) | 7,781 | 0.24 | 6,274 | (0.09) | 6,904 | 5,727 | 7,086 | 4,771 | 3,693 |
| April | 0 |  | 6,741 | 0.14 | 5,905 | (28.01) | 8,202 | 0.30 | 6,324 | 0.09 | 5,790. | 4,457 | 6,215 | 4,424 | 4,659 |
| May | 0 |  | 3,581 | (0.39) | 5,899 | (32.21) | 8,702 | 0.22 | 7,122 | 0.07 | 6,685 | 4,890 | 5,786 | 3,943 | 4,097 |
| June | 0 |  | 3,877 | (0.41) | 6,519 | (12.46) | 7.447 | 0.36 | 3,489 | (0.07) | 5,927 | 4,694 | 5,908 | 4,771 | 3,542 |
| YTD Totals | 33,130 | 0.39 | 71,648 | (0.04) | 74,588 | (12.47) | 85,217 | 0.22 | 69,796 | 0.04 | 66,840 | 50,464 | 65,766 | 49,515 | 33,093 |

## City of Paso Robles

Transit Ridership Report
Year to Date thru 2/29/00

ALL Transit Services


# City of Paso Robles <br> Transit Ridership Report <br> Year to Date thru 2/29/00 

Fixed Route Transit Services

|  | Number of Operating Days | In-Service Vehicle Miles | In-Service <br> Vehicle <br> Hours | Total <br> Paid <br> Fares | Total <br> Free <br> Eares | Total <br> CATS <br> Fares | PY <br> Total <br> Fares |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| July | 26 | 7,027 | 566 | 4,292 | 448 |  | 6,375 |
| August | 26 | 7,023 | 592 | 3,353 | 442 |  | 4,890 |
| September | 25 | 6,730 | 569 | 2,840 | 506 |  | 5,572 |
| October | 26 | 6,998 | 592 | 2,731 | 544 | W3, 2755 | 5,480 |
| November | 25 | 6,749 | 545 | 2,825 | 214 | W3.0339 | 5,295 |
| December | 26 | 7,034 | 596 | 3,269 | 260 |  | 5,440 |
| January | 25 | 6,751 | 570 | 2,877 | 216 | 第3,093楽 | 5,170 |
| February | 25 | 6,576 | 544 | 2,712 | 182 |  | 5,110 |
| March |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| April |  |  |  |  |  | 6ke |  |
| May <br> June |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total - YTD | 204 | 54,888 | 4,574 | 24,899 | 2,812 | 27,711 | 43,332 |
| Average Per Mont | 26 | 6,861 | 572 | 3,112 | 352 | 3,464 | 5,094 |
| Average Per Day |  | 269 | 22 | 122 | 14 | 136 | 238 |

## Dial-a-Ride Transit Services



|  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  | City of El <br> TRANBIT RID <br> Dial-a-Rid <br> Fiecal |  <br> Re88IP ide 8ervi ear 1999- | $\begin{aligned} & \text { grobles } \\ & \text { anport } \\ & \text { 1eea } \\ & -\infty 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | i <br> Incr. <br> 1Decs.l |  | $\theta$ <br> Inct. <br> SDecrel |  | 8 <br> Incr. <br> 1Decrel |  | b <br> Incr. <br> (Decr.) |  | Incr. (Dactel |  | 8 <br> Incr. <br> iDecrel |  | 4 <br> Incr. Dectel |  | 1 Incr. 18ect. 1 |  | 8 <br> Incr. (00ctel) |  |
| July | 703 | (0.35) | 1,086 | (0.48) | 2,085 | 10.131 | 2,417 | 10.301 | 3,437 | 10.15) | 4,033 | (0.18) | 4,946 | (0.04) | 5,160 | 0.32 | 3,918 | n/a | 0 |
| August | 757 | (0.23) | 988 | (0.38) | 1,597 | 10.37) | 2,537 | (0.30) | 3, 621 | (0.03) | 3,722 | (0.19) | 4.587 | 0.09 | 4,212 | 0.10 | 3,813 | n/a | $\bigcirc$ |
| September | 868 | (0.27) | 917 | (0.07) | 982 | (0.63) | 2,680 | (0.18) | 3,255 | (0.30) | 4,671 | (0.02) | 4,775 | (0.09) | 5,276 | 0.46 | 3,620 | 1.02 | 1,792 |
| nctober | 673 | (0.22) | 861 | (0.22) | 1,203 | (0.65) | 3,164 | (0.14) | 3,671 | (0.23) | 4,795 | (0.00) | 4,811 | (0.11) | 5,430 | 0.25 | 4,342 | 0.92 | 2,267 |
| november | 635 | (0.10) | 708 | (0.22) | 908 | (0.66) | 2,683 | (0.22) | 3,455 | (0.21) | 4,384 | (0.13) | 5,036 | 0.03 | 4,905 | 0.32 | 3,700 | 0.41 | 2,631 |
| December | 664 | 10.21) | 844 | (0.16) | 999 | (0.58) | 2,354 | (0.15) | 2,784 | (0.30) | 3,950 | (0.13) | 4,587 | 10.07) | 4,926 | 0.28 | 3,839 | 0.25 | 3,056 |
| January | 640 | (0.18) | 781 | (0.16) | 927 | (0.70) | 3,068 | (0.15) | 3,628 | 0.09 | 3,331 | (0.34) | 5,070 | (0.02) | 5,236 | 0.16 | 4,424 | 0.15 | 3, 849 |
| February | 679 | (0.19) | 840 | (0.07) | 206 | (0.67) | 2,785 | (0.14) | 3,228 | 10.30) | 4,605 | (0.06) | 4,905 | (0.14) | 8,736 | 0.45 | 3,943 | 0.13 | 3,495 |
| March | 0 |  | 980 | 10.08) | 1,072 | 10.63) | 2,886 | (0.14) | 3,347 | (0.39) | 5,500 | (0.04) | 5,727 | (0.19) | 7,008 | 0.49 | 4,771 | 0.29 | 3,695 |
| April | 0 |  | 992 | (0.01) | 898 | (0.69) | 3,189 | 0.05 | 3,029 | (0.31) | 4,393 | (0.01) | 4,457 | (0.28) | 6,213 | 0.40 | 4,424 | (0.05) | 4,659 |
| May | 0 |  | 621 | (0.29) | 975 | (0.73) | 3,261 | (0.03) | 3,375 | (0.34) | 5,136 | 0.05 | 4,890 | (0.15) | 5,785 | 0.47 | 3,943 | (0.04) | 4,097 |
| June | 0 |  | 524 | (0.47) | 993 | (0.60) | 2,506 | 0.03 | 2,434 | (0.37) | 3,885 | (0.17) | 4,694 | (0.21) | 5,909 | 0.24 | 4,771 | 0.35 | 3,542 |
| YTD Totals | 5,419 | (0.23) | 10,252 | (0.23) | 13,455 | (0.60) | 33,531 | 10.15) | 39,264 | (0.25) | 52,406 | (0.10) | 58,464 | 10.11) | 65,766 | 0.33 | 49,515 | 0.50 | 33,093 |

# All Transit Services 

Fiscal Year 1999-00


| July | 4,740 | (0.26) | 6,375 | 0.17 | 5,463 | 0.55 | 3,528 | 1.23 | 1,585 | n/a | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| August | 3,795 | \{0.22) | 4,890 | 0.19 | 4,104 | 0.21 | 3,386 | 0.62 | 2,085 | 1.53 | 824 |
| September | 3,346 | (0.40) | 5,572 | 0.04 | 5,361 | 0.59 | 3,374 | 0.91 | 1,859 | 1.04 | 911 |
| October | 3,275 | (0.40) | 5,480 | (0.15) | 6,453 | 0.53 | 4,209 | 0.74 | 2,416 | 1.08 | 1,162 |
| November | 3,039 | (0.43) | 5,295 | 0.21 | 4,390 | 0.12 | 3,903 | 0.62 | 2,412 | 1.43 | 994 |
| December | 3,529 | (0.35) | 5,440 | 0.08 | 5,052 | 0.26 | 4,003 | 0.87 | 2,138 | 0.53 | 1,396 |
| January | 3,093 | (0.40) | 5,170 | 0.11 | 4,640 | 0.05 | 4,417 | 0.86 | 2,378 | 0.88 | 1,267 |
| February | 2,894 | (0.43) | 5,110 | 0.11 | 4,609 | 0.01 | 4,575 | 0.74 | 2,635 | 0.77 | 1,489 |
| March | 0 |  | 6,102 | 0.09 | 5,604 | 0.14 | 4,895 | 0.67 | 2,927 | 1.08 | 1,404 |
| April | 0 |  | 5,749 | 0.17 | 4,907 | (0.02) | 5,014 | 0.52 | 3,295 | 1.36 | 1,397 |
| May | 0 |  | 2,960 | (0.41) | 5,024 | (0.08) | 5,441 | 0.45 | 3,747 | 1.42 | 1,549 |
| June | 0 |  | 3,353 | (0.39) | 5,526 | 0.12 | 4,941 | 0.62 | 3,055 | 0.50 | 2,041 |
| YTD Totals | 27,711 | (0.36) | 61,496 | 0.01 | 61,133 | 0.18 | 51,686 | 0.69 | 30,532 | 1.12 | 14,434 |

## City of el Pasco de Robles

 EXIENDED Dial-a-Ride Service 6:00 P.M. to 2:00 A.M. YTD thru 2/29/00

Note: Cost does not include vehicle fuel or maintenance.

## Fatrick J. (Pat) Mackie <br> $\Delta$ MEMO $\Delta$ <br> To: Mike Compton, Admin. Services Director; Councilman Mecham <br> From: Pat Mackie, Chair, Transit Advisory Committee <br> Subject: Upcoming TAC meeting agenda <br>  <br> Date: April 15, 2000

You are probably aware of the actions taken by TAC at the last meeting but just to recap: We advised the Council to establish new fares:

1) $\$ 1.00$ across the board (no discounts, except for free children's rides) on all oneway PRCATS rides.
2) $\$ 1.50$ for all one-way trips on Dial-a-Ride.

Explanation: It was thought that current fares discouraged ridership. The budgetary effect of lower fares might be balanced, in some measure, by eliminating discounts. Fares that almost everyone can afford would make it unnecessary to choose between deserving groups for special discounts. Additionallv. the suggestion would oroduce an easier-to-understand fare structure.

The TAC also recommended: no charge for Saturday service on PRCATS and that the late-night Dial-a-Ride service be eliminated.
Explanation: TAC member Jim Martin proposed eliminating all fares. The Committee action was to test no-charge ridership, on a day with low usage. Eliminating the late night Dial-a-Ride service would not affect ridership, based on usage. Any savings can be applied to lower fares.

I will, of course, be present to give the Committee's reasoning to the Council and to answer any questions. However, you may wish to include this information in the staff report.

Frank Mecham, as the Council's liaison with the Committee, requested that TAC review our meeting times. The current arrangement clashes with his SLOCOG duties (as it does mine). I told him I would ask you to put that issue on the next agenda.

Joe Dutra and Sandee McLaughlin also requested agendizing routing questions for the next meeting, particularly in the Oak Park area (Dutra) and Cuesta College (McLaughlin).

We have a number of "old business" items to deal with and l'll try to dispose of them quickly.
Please convey my apologies to Cheri for jumping around last meeting's agenda. It won't happen again. Perhaps I could review the order of business before publication?
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# Memo 

To: Jim App, City Manager<br>From Ron De Carl, Executive Director if<br>cc: Walt Macklin/Frank Mecham/Harry Ovitt<br>Date: 4/21/00





Re: Peso Robles Fares

Jim, I spoke with you, Walt and Frank about SLOCOG's role in transit, and one of our technical assistance suggestions seemed to be favorably viewed by all. There is an alternative method for achieving your primary goal of increasing farebox revenues while also reducing costs. This concept would shift riders when possible from using the DAR mode (the most costly) to fixed route (the least cost per rider), and therefore use transit funding more efficiently.

The concept was suggested when a consultant viewed the regional fixed and demand responsive system (CCAT and Runabout) to reach recommendations for increasing efficiency. Runabout can be seen as two services, a Disabled service under the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and a Premium service for people willing to pay more for the door-to-door mode, but who could use a fixed route alternative. The consultant was recommending the ADA service be set, as required, as no more than twice the fixed route fare, but allow Premium service at perhaps twice the ADA rate. In this way an affordable basic service is retained for those who cannot navigate the fixed route system, and the Premium service helps provide the funding.

Runabout is the official ADA service provider, but the parallel may be examined usefully for Past Robles. Ridership on the fixed route should be encouraged as it costs no more to run with seats full than with seats empty. To do this, start with the lowest feasible fare for fixed route, double it for demand responsive service for those with no other choice (this can be ADA-certified clients or elderly/disabled riders) and double again for the premium service. Examples of how this could work are:

ADA/Elderly-Disabled, DAR $1.50 \quad 2.00$

Option 1

Fixed Route Fare
.75
3.00

Premium Service, DAR

Option 2

The reference cited for the change could be new information from regional planning regarding strategies for using premium service revenues funding to write-down the more efficient fixed route.

You may also find there is local enthusiasm for a Safe Ride Home Program to use corporate funding for the 8 PM to 2 PM service. Ride On Transportation operates a successful program in San Luis Obispo City that uses almost entirely donations from Coors and other private funding to offer evening service. I understand Ride-On's service operates three nights a week, while yours is 6 nights a week. If you would like, I am sure Mark Shaffer of Ride-On ( 541 -TRIP) would discuss with you how they established evening service at no cost to SLO City.

We would be happy to attend any meeting, if you plan to discuss this further, to be a technical resource on this and other transit funding strategies. Please call me or Dan Herron of my staff (781-4219) if you have any questions or if we can be of any additional service.
c. Walt Macklin

Frank Mecham
Supervisor Harry Ovitt
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