

AGENDA ITEM 3 A
Information Item

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 24, 2019

TO: El Dorado County Transit Authority
Transit Advisory Committee

FROM: Brian James, Planning and Marketing Manager

SUBJECT: Six-Month 2018/19 Administrative Operations Report

REQUESTED ACTION:
BY MOTION,

No action. Information item.

BACKGROUND

The El Dorado County Transit Authority (El Dorado Transit) provides public transportation under authority of a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) with the County of El Dorado and the City of Placerville.

The Six-Month 2018/19 Administrative Operations Report (Administrative Operations Report) provides an overview of El Dorado Transit operations for the reporting period July 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018.

As a recipient of Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds, El Dorado Transit is required to report performance measure statistics as defined in the TDA Public Utilities Code Chapter 4, Transportation Development Article 1 – General Provisions and Definitions Section 99247. The Administrative Operations Report includes required statistical analysis and other Board approved performance measures on a route, mode and system wide basis.

El Dorado Transit management provides performance measure reporting by service and mode (type of service) which is above and beyond the mandated reporting format. This reporting format provides the public, policy makers and management a detailed comparison by individual service. For comparison purposes, the Administrative Operations Report also includes data from the same reporting period in the prior fiscal year.

DISCUSSION

As noted in the Administrative Operations Report, El Dorado Transit provides three (3) distinct types of public transportation: Demand Response, Motor Bus (Local Fixed Routes) and Commuter Bus (Commuter Services). The purpose of each service varies, therefore, goals and objectives for efficiency are considered separately.

The report provides statistics, revenues, expenses and performance measures by route, mode and system. To effectively review performance, it is necessary to separate the three (3) modes and compare services within each mode. For example, Demand Response services are considered life-line social support services that historically report a lower Farebox Recovery Ratio (FBR) than the system as a whole. Within each mode, analysis is presented between each service type. Comparisons and considerations might be discussed between the FBR and the cost per passenger by service.

The following sections discuss the general performance of the various service modes providing a snapshot of how the system has performed during the July 2018 to December 2018 reporting period.

Demand Response services ridership decreased by 3,902 one-way passenger trips or 15.4% during the period. The largest year to year change was in the M.O.R.E. client transportation service which showed a decrease of 19.1% or 2,210 passenger trips. M.O.R.E services are contracted and ridership fluctuates according to client enrollment. On-time performance for Demand Response services was 95.4%.

Motor Bus (Local Fixed Route) ridership increased by 2,510 one-way passenger trips or 3.6% during the period. The largest year to year change was in the 50 Express route which showed an increase of 3,664 one-way passenger trips or 21.1%. On-time performance for Motor Bus routes was 87.1%.

Commuter Bus (Commuter Services) ridership increased by 2,510 one-way passenger trips or 3.6% during the period. On-time performance for Commuter Bus routes was 91.3%.

System wide ridership increased by 4,279 one-way passenger trips or 2.4%. System wide farebox recovery was 19.44%.

Additional performance measures discussed in the report include monthly ridership trends, complaints and compliments and road calls.

FISCAL IMPACT

None.