

City of Jefferson Transit Development Plan

Summary of Prioritization Exercise January 31, 2006

At the December 19, 2005 Steering Committee meeting for the Jefferson City Transit Development Plan (TDP), the Steering Committee was asked to assist with developing priorities for the transit service modifications and fare structure modifications included in the draft TDP.

Questionnaires were distributed at the meeting requesting committee members to rank each potential service modification and indicate preference for each fare structure modification option. It was explained that the rankings and input would be compiled and summarized, and included as input to the TDP. City staff distributed the questionnaire to those members who were absent and once all responses were received the results were compiled.

The questionnaire listed information on costs, ridership impacts and pros and cons for various options developed during the course of the TDP. The forms also showed the results of public involvement and consultant team's recommendations.

Potential Transit Service Modifications

Each committee member was asked to rank each service modification as a priority based on the following categories:

1. High
2. Medium
3. Low
4. Do not pursue

For the exercise, the implementation time period was assumed to be six years from 2006 through 2011.

Nine committee members completed this exercise. The rankings were compiled and summarized as shown in Table 1.

Fare Structure Modification Options

Each committee member was asked to indicate preference for each fare structure modification by marking "yes" or "no" to indicate their preferred action.

For the exercise, the implementation time period was assumed to be six years from 2006 through 2011.

Nine committee members completed this exercise. The input will be compiled and summarized as shown in Table 2.

**City of Jefferson
Transit Development Plan**

Table 1: Potential Service Modifications Prioritization Results

Potential Service Modification	Annual Funding Requirement	Capital Cost	Daily Ridership Change	Consultant Conclusion	Public Input	Pros	Cons	Cumulative Rating
Extend service span by 1.5 hrs.	\$134,000	\$0	+80	Yes – very important	Important	Helps existing riders; attract new riders	Cost Change to JEFFTRAN	1.4
Evening service (5 days to 9 PM)	\$122,000	\$0	+70	Medium	Important	Helps existing riders	Cost Change to JEFFTRAN	2.4
Evening service (1 day to 9 PM)	\$29,000	\$0	+40	Low – ineffective	Important	Helps existing riders	Cost Change to JEFFTRAN	2.3
Saturday service - selected routes	\$88,000	\$0	+360	Medium	Most important	Helps existing riders	Cost Change to JEFFTRAN	1.9
Route revisions for transfer center change; downtown shuttle	\$99,000	\$300,000	+50	Yes – most important	Support	Corrects operations problem Helps existing riders	Cost	1.0
West Area Flex Route	\$129,000	\$80,000	+50	Low	Low	Expands service area	Cost High per rider cost	3.1
West Area Express	\$53,000	\$150,000	+40	Low	Low	Expands service area	Cost	3.2
Holts Summit Flex Route	\$128,000	\$80,000	+60	Low	Low	Expands service area	Cost High per rider cost	3.7
Holts Summit Express	\$51,000	\$150,000	+60	Low	Low	Expands service area	Cost	3.6
Algoa Area Shuttle	\$130,000	\$150,000	+30	Low	Low	Expands service area	Cost High per rider cost	3.1
Southwest Area Flex Route	\$130,000	\$150,000	+30	Low	Low	Expands service area	Cost High per rider cost	3.3
Improve Frequency to 15 min. Peak and 30 min. base	\$906,000	\$2,400,000	+320	Low	Low	Substantial ridership increase	Very High cost High per rider cost	3.1
Downtown Area Circulator	\$267,000	\$750,000	+480	Low	Low	Substantial ridership increase	High cost	2.1
Capital Mall Flex Route	\$130,000	\$150,000	+40	Low	Low	Better service	Cost High per rider cost	3.1

**City of Jefferson
Transit Development Plan**

Table 2: Fare Structure Modification Options – Decision Results

Potential Fare Structure Modification	Annual Revenue Impact	Daily Ridership Change	Consultant Conclusion	Public Input	Pros	Cons	Preference
Increase base fare to 75 cents.	+\$36,250	-10%	Fares should be increased to at least 75 cents.	Acceptable to most	Minimizes ridership loss while generating additional revenue.	Does not maximize revenue increase potential	6 Yes/ 3 No
Increase base fare to 75 cents, then to \$1.00	+\$36,250 +\$35,250	-10% -7%	Increase to 75 cents, then to \$1.00 in 3 years	Acceptable to many	Introduces \$1.00 fare in two steps in an attempt to minimize adverse reaction	Requires two fare increases	5 Yes/ 4 No
Increase base fare to \$1.00.	+\$59,500	-25%	An increase to \$1.00 may be too much initially.	Acceptable to many	Assuming \$1.00 is the appropriate level for the next several years this accomplishes that and avoids needing to have a second fare increase. This action generates the most revenue.	Would result in the greatest ridership reduction.	5 Yes/ 4 No
No fare increase	None	None	Fares should be increased.	Fares should be increased.	Avoids ridership reduction. Avoids work associated with a fare increase.	Keeps fares artificially low. Fails to generate revenue.	0 Yes/ 9 No

City of Jefferson Transit Development Plan

Prioritization Exercise Results

Service Improvements

The results of the service improvements prioritization exercise show the highest priority (cumulative ranking between 1 and 2) assigned for the following improvements:

- Route revisions for transfer center change; downtown shuttle
- Extend service span by 1.5 hours
- Saturday service -selected routes

Improvements given medium priority (with ranking between 2 and 3) include:

- Downtown Area Circulator
- Evening service (1 day to 9 PM)
- Evening service (5 days to 9 PM)

The rest of the improvements were assigned low priority (with ranking between 3 and 4) and include:

- West Area Flex Route
- Alcoa Area Shuttle
- Improve Frequency to 15 min. Peak and 30 min. base
- Capital Mall Flex Route
- West Area Express
- Southwest Area Flex Route
- Holts Summit Express
- Holts Summit Flex Route

Fare Structure Modification Options

The results of the prioritization exercise on the various fare structure modification options show the strongest support for increasing the base fare to 75 cents. The other fare increase options (increasing the base fare to 75 cents followed by increase to \$1.00; and increasing the base fare to \$1.00) ranked equally with only slightly less support. There was no support for keeping fares the same.

It is important to recognize that the prioritization exercises are input from the Steering Committee, and will be considered as final recommendations are developed for the Transit Development Plan. The determination to proceed with any action rests with the City Council.