



YOUR *Safety*



YOUR *Mobility*



YOUR *Economic Opportunity*



# IDAHO PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Appendix D

Estimates of Future Public Transportation Ridership and  
Provider Assessments

DRAFT October 2017





# Contents

- Introduction..... 1
- Estimation of Future Public Transportation Ridership ..... 1
  - Methodology ..... 1
  - Analysis..... 2
- Public Transportation Provider Assessments..... 3
  - Methodology ..... 3
    - Public Transit Providers..... 3
    - Other Public Transportation Providers..... 4
- District Analysis ..... 5
  - District 1 ..... 5
  - District 2 ..... 9
  - District 3 ..... 14
  - District 4 ..... 19
  - District 5 ..... 22
  - District 6 ..... 25



# Table of Figures

Figure 1	Future Transit Ridership by County.....	1
Figure 2	Peer Productivity (Passenger Trips/Vehicle Revenue Hour) Averages for National Peers .....	4
Figure 3	District 1 Estimated Future Public Transit Ridership (2028) .....	5
Figure 4	Citylink Transit Assessment.....	6
Figure 5	Citylink Transit Assessment – Additional Resources Needed .....	6
Figure 6	SPOT Transit Assessment .....	7
Figure 7	SPOT’s Transit Assessment – Additional Resources Needed.....	7
Figure 8	Silver Express Transit Assessment.....	8
Figure 9	Silver Express’s Transit Assessment – Additional Resources Needed .....	8
Figure 10	Valley Vista Care – Benewah Area Transit Assessment.....	9
Figure 11	District 2 Estimated Future Public Transit Ridership (2028) .....	10
Figure 12	SMART Assessment.....	11
Figure 13	SMART – Additional Resources Needed .....	11
Figure 14	Lewiston Transit Assessment .....	12
Figure 15	Lewiston Transit – Additional Resources Needed .....	12
Figure 16	Appaloosa Express Transit Assessment.....	13
Figure 17	District 2 Estimated Future Human Service Transportation and Vanpool Ridership .....	14
Figure 18	District 3 Estimated Future Public Transit Ridership (2028) .....	15
Figure 19	Valley Regional Transit Assessment .....	16
Figure 20	Valley Regional Transit Assessment – Additional Resources Needed.....	16
Figure 21	Treasure Valley Transit Assessment.....	17
Figure 22	District 3 Estimated Future Human Service Transportation and Vanpool Ridership .....	18
Figure 23	District 4 Estimated Future Public Transit Ridership (2028) .....	19
Figure 24	Mountain Rides Transit Assessment .....	20
Figure 25	Mountain Rides Transit Assessment – Additional Resources Needed .....	20
Figure 26	CSI / Trans IV Transit Assessment .....	21
Figure 27	CSI / Trans IV Transit Assessment – Additional Resources Needed.....	21
Figure 28	District 4 Estimated Future Human Service Transportation and Vanpool Ridership .....	22
Figure 29	District 5 Estimated Future Public Transit Ridership (2028) .....	23
Figure 30	Pocatello Regional Transit Assessment.....	24
Figure 31	Pocatello Regional Transit Assessment – Additional Resources Needed .....	24
Figure 32	District 5 Estimated Future Human Service Transportation and Vanpool Ridership .....	25
Figure 33	District 6 Estimated Future Public Transit Ridership (2028) .....	26
Figure 34	City of Driggs’ Transit Assessment .....	27



Figure 35 City of Driggs Transit Assessment – Additional Resources Needed.....27

Figure 36 Lemhi Ride Transit Assessment .....28

Figure 37 Lemhi Ride Transit Assessment – Additional Resources Needed .....28

Figure 38 START Assessment .....29

Figure 39 START Assessment – Additional Resources Needed .....29

Figure 40 TRPTA Assessment.....30

Figure 41 TRPTA Assessment – Additional Resources Needed .....30

Figure 42 Valley Vista Care Transit Assessment .....31



# Idaho Public Transportation Plan

Your Safety | Your Mobility | Your Economic Opportunity

## Introduction

This appendix explains in detail the methods used to estimate future public transportation ridership and to assess the ability of public transportation providers to serve those future trips. Results of the two parts of the analysis are also presented.

## Estimation of Future Public Transportation Ridership

Presented below are estimates of future public transportation ridership for each of Idaho's districts, based on estimated ridership in each county and for each public transit provider across Idaho. Future population forecasts and current ridership provided a baseline for the projections of future transit ridership. Estimated future ridership is then analyzed against existing service levels to identify future operational and capital needs for each public transit provider.

### Methodology

To estimate future transit ridership, the project team used multiple data sources, including population data from the US Census ACS 2010-2014 5-year estimates, population forecasts for 2040 at the TAZ level for the entire state (based on forecasts conducted by MPOs and Woods and Poole), and 2015 ITD provider data.

The future ridership was calculated using the following steps.

1. Aggregate all ridership by county—fixed-route, demand-response, and vanpool trips.
2. Calculate transit trip rate (transit trips per capita) for each county.

$$2015 \text{ Transit Trip Rate} = \frac{2015 \text{ county transit ridership}}{2014 \text{ county population}}$$



3. Calculate 2028 county population based on 2014 estimates and 2040 forecast.

$$\begin{aligned} 2028 \text{ county population} &= 2014 \text{ county population} \\ &+ \left[ (2028 - 2014) \times \left( \frac{2040 \text{ county forecast} - 2014 \text{ county population}}{2040 - 2014} \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

4. Calculate future transit ridership based on future population and existing trip rate per capita for each county.

$$2028 \text{ Transit Ridership} = 2015 \text{ Transit Trip Rate} \times 2028 \text{ Population}$$

## Analysis

The analysis shows that transit ridership, as measured by one-way passenger trips, will grow by approximately 28% statewide by 2028. Individual counties will see growth rates as high as 57%, as in Kootenai County. In some cases, counties will see a reduction in ridership, such as the 9% drop in Shoshone County. Nineteen counties will see transit ridership changes of less than 10%. The highest transit ridership will be in Ada and Canyon Counties, where transit ridership will be 1.36 and 1.14 million, respectively. Figure 1 lists the estimated future transit ridership by county, and ITD district.



**Figure 1 Future Transit Ridership by County**

District	County	Ridership (2015)				Population 2014	Transit Trips per Capita	Population 2028 (rounded to nearest 100)	Transit Demand 2028 (rounded to nearest 100)
		Fixed Route	Demand Response	Vanpool	Total				
1	Benewah		6,107		6,107	9,149	0.67	9,800	6,500
	Bonner	72,002	4,850		76,852	40,899	1.88	51,400	96,500
	Boundary		2,078		2,078	10,903	0.19	12,600	2,400
	Kootenai	347,170	8,148		355,318	142,783	2.49	224,200	558,000
	Shoshone	12,912	1,637		14,549	12,629	1.15	11,500	13,300
2	Clearwater		77		77	8,600	0.01	8,600	100
	Idaho		146		146	16,315	0.01	17,400	200
	Latah	159,483	10,716	5,814	176,013	37,989	4.63	39,200	181,600
	Lewis		34		34	3,822	0.01	3,800	30
	Nez Perce	73,908	11,927		85,835	39,655	2.16	42,400	91,700
3	Ada	821,830	43,600	139,970	1,005,399	409,239	2.46	552,900	1,358,300
	Adams		1,366		1,366	3,908	0.35	4,300	1,500
	Boise		932	2,353	3,286	6,880	0.48	8,800	4,200
	Canyon	618,894	121,966	66,815	807,676	195,353	4.13	275,700	1,139,900
	Elmore		5,817	9,012	14,829	26,349	0.56	26,800	15,100
	Gem		4,965	5,723	10,688	16,732	0.64	18,900	12,100
	Owyhee	30,432	14,673		45,105	11,412	3.95	12,000	47,500
	Payette		7,166		7,166	22,658	0.32	24,800	7,800
	Valley		1,169		1,169	9,662	0.12	10,700	1,300
	Washington		3,535		3,535	10,068	0.35	10,600	3,700
4	Blaine	454,038	3,553	39,990	497,581	21,269	23.39	26,200	612,200
	Cassia		4,447		4,447	23,275	0.19	23,900	4,600
	Jerome		4,314		4,314	22,580	0.19	24,200	4,600
	Minidoka		1,830		1,830	20,191	0.09	22,800	2,100
	Twin Falls		52,583		52,583	78,933	0.67	102,000	67,900
5	Bannock	218,894	40,074		258,968	83,394	3.11	97,900	304,000
	Bear Lake		2,855		2,855	5,941	0.48	6,100	2,900
	Bingham	12,161	21,892		34,053	45,558	0.75	51,100	38,200
	Caribou		3,295		3,295	6,857	0.48	6,900	3,300
	Franklin	12,161	8,143		20,304	12,853	1.58	14,800	23,500



District	County	Ridership (2015)				Population 2014	Transit Trips per Capita	Population 2028 (rounded to nearest 100)	Transit Demand 2028 (rounded to nearest 100)
		Fixed Route	Demand Response	Vanpool	Total				
	Oneida		2,606		2,606	4,241	0.61	4,500	2,800
	Power		3,720		3,720	7,742	0.48	8,300	4,000
6	Bonneville	22,880	57,211		80,091	106,703	0.75	135,500	101,700
	Butte		3,690		3,690	2,734	1.35	3,100	4,300
	Custer		5,783		5,783	4,284	1.35	4,700	6,300
	Fremont	3,269	8,173		11,442	13,024	0.88	14,000	12,300
	Lemhi		9,049		9,049	7,828	1.16	8,800	10,200
	Madison	3,269	8,173		11,442	37,754	0.30	56,300	17,100
	Teton	46,480	8,173		54,653	10,212	5.35	11,900	63,500
<b>Total</b>		<b>2,909,781</b>	<b>500,476</b>	<b>269,677</b>	<b>3,679,934</b>	<b>1,550,378</b>	<b>2.37</b>	<b>1,989,400</b>	<b>4,827,200</b>





# Public Transportation Provider Assessments

This section presents public transportation provider assessments that quantify the operational and capital needs for public transit agencies in Idaho based on the future needs identified above. The assessments attempt to identify which providers will need to increase service from existing levels by 2028 in order to serve the growth in ridership that is expected by that year.

Estimating future transit ridership is an inexact science, as the actual decision to ride public transportation is the result of numerous factors that cannot be predicted. Population growth, in combination with current ridership patterns, can at least be used as a way of estimating levels of growth. This growth must then be translated into service hours and vehicles so transportation stakeholders can understand the financial needs for public transportation in the future. Productivity levels in terms of one-way passenger trips per vehicle revenue hour were used to assess whether a provider would require additional hours of service or vehicles to meet demand. Some new riders will be accommodated on existing vehicles during existing service hours; however, as ridership grows demand may expand beyond existing capacity or hours. Thus the productivity of national provider peers was used to benchmark at what point an agency will have to add hours or vehicles.

Some agencies will not need any additional vehicle revenue hours, despite the growth in population and ridership, because their projected productivity will remain at or below that of their peers.

## Methodology

### Public Transit Providers

With future county ridership estimates calculated above, ridership for each public transit provider was estimated based on the existing ratio of county ridership by provider. Additionally, the existing ratio of a provider's ridership by mode (fixed-route, demand-response, vanpool) was used to estimate future ridership by mode for each provider. The following steps outline the process to calculate future ridership by mode for each provider and to determine if a provider needs additional revenue hours and/or vehicles to serve the future ridership.

1. Calculate provider ridership based on existing ratio of provider ridership to county ridership.

$$2028 \text{ Provider Ridership} = 2028 \text{ County Ridership} \times \frac{2015 \text{ Provider Ridership}}{2015 \text{ County Ridership}}$$

2. Allocate future provider ridership between fixed-route (FR), demand-response (DR) and vanpool (VP) based on existing ratio of modal ridership to total provider ridership.

$$2028 \text{ FR Provider Ridership} = 2028 \text{ Provider Ridership} \times \frac{2015 \text{ FR Provider Ridership}}{2015 \text{ Total Provider Ridership}}$$



$$2028 \text{ DR Provider Ridership} = 2028 \text{ Provider Ridership} \times \frac{2015 \text{ DR Provider Ridership}}{2015 \text{ Total Provider Ridership}}$$

$$2028 \text{ VP Provider Ridership} = 2028 \text{ Provider Ridership} \times \frac{2015 \text{ VP Provider Ridership}}{2015 \text{ Total Provider Ridership}}$$

3. Calculate passenger trips per vehicle revenue hour (productivity) for each mode by provider, based on existing revenue hours.

$$2028 \text{ Rides per Vehicle Revenue Hour (by mode)} = \frac{2028 \text{ Provider Ridership (by mode)}}{2015 \text{ Provider Vehicle Revenue Hours (by mode)}}$$

4. Compare each agency's productivity for each mode to the national peer average for agencies in the same classification (large, medium, small urban and small rural). The peer averages are listed in Figure 2.

**Figure 2 Peer Productivity (Passenger Trips/Vehicle Revenue Hour) Averages for National Peers**

Peer Classification	Fixed-Route	Demand-Response
Large	19.47	2.33
Medium	14.12	2.58
Small Urban	4.48	3.37
Small Rural	2.2	6.04

If a provider has a future productivity level less than the peer average, this indicates the provider can accommodate future riders within existing service levels. If a provider's future productivity will exceed the peer average, this suggests additional service will be necessary to mitigate crowding or reduced service quality that might arise with the increase in ridership.

5. For providers whose productivity exceeds the peer average, calculate the minimal amount of service that would be required to bring the provider's productivity down to the peer average.

$$\text{Revenue hours to meet peer productivity} = \frac{2028 \text{ Provider Ridership (by mode)}}{\text{Peer Productivity}}$$

6. Apply the percent increase in revenue hours to the number of existing vehicles to estimate the number of additional vehicles an agency may need to provide the additional service.

*Additional vehicles*

*= Existing vehicles*

$$\times \frac{\text{Vehicle revenue hours to meet peer productivity} - 2015 \text{ Provider Vehicle Revenue Hours}}{2015 \text{ Provider Vehicle Revenue Hours}}$$

### Other Public Transportation Providers

The trips currently delivered by human service agencies and vanpool providers identified as part of the transportation provider inventory detailed in Technical Report #1, if known, were included in the baseline number of trips used to project 2028 ridership for each district.



However, unlike public transit trips, future numbers of these other types of public transportation trips are not allocated to individual providers, but are presented by mode for each district as a whole.

### District Analysis


The following section analyzes the public transit providers for each district, assessing their ability to serve the number of trips estimated to be needed by 2028 and identifying the additional levels of service and numbers of vehicles they will need by that date using the methodology outlined above.

As explained above, the number of human services transportation and vanpool trips estimated for each district by 2028 are presented by mode, but not by individual provider.....

#### District 1

District 1 is covered by eight public and human services transportation providers, of which four provide transit services available to the general public (Citylink, SPOT, Silver Express, and Valley Vista Care – Benewah Area Transit). As shown in Figure 3, future transit ridership in District 1 in 2028 will total nearly 700,000 riders. Over 80% of the future ridership in District 1 is attributed to Kootenai County.

**Figure 3 District 1 Estimated Future Public Transit Ridership (2028)**



#### Public Transit Providers

##### Citylink

Citylink’s ridership is projected to grow by approximately 198,000 one-way passenger trips for fixed-route services and 4,000 one-way passenger trips for demand-response services if



trips per capita rates remain the same as today. Based on existing vehicle revenue hours, this would lead to a productivity of 23.20 and 5.41 for fixed-route and demand-response services, respectively. Both values are above the peer average for medium agencies, meaning Citylink would likely need to increase service hours and fleet size to meet demand. Figure 4 displays Citylink ridership and productivity by mode today and in 2028, assuming no change in service levels.

**Figure 4 Citylink Transit Assessment**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028)	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Ridership	Fixed-Route	347,170	545,249	198,079	57%
	Demand-Response	6,872	10,793	3,921	57%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Productivity (Passengers per Hour)	Fixed-Route	14.77	23.20	8.43	57%
	Demand-Response	3.44	5.41	1.97	57%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-

To provide service on par with its medium system peers, Citylink would need to increase by approximately 64% for fixed-route and more than double (110% increase) for demand-response service. The fleet would need to grow to 25 fixed-route vehicles and 32 demand-response vehicles. See Figure 5 for additional details.

**Figure 5 Citylink Transit Assessment – Additional Resources Needed**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028) with Increase	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Revenue Hours	Fixed-Route	23,499	38,615	15,116	64%
	Demand-Response	1,995	4,188	2,193	110%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Fleet Size	Fixed-Route	15	25	10	67%
	Demand-Response	15	32	17	113%

**SPOT**

SPOT’s ridership is projected to grow by over 18,000 one-way passenger trips for fixed-route services and nearly 2,000 for demand-response services. With existing vehicle revenue hours,

this would result in a productivity of 9.39 and 2.54 one-way passenger trips per hour on fixed-route and demand-response services, respectively, as shown in Figure 6.

**Figure 6 SPOT Transit Assessment**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028)	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Ridership	Fixed-Route	72,002	90,243	18,241	25%
	Demand-Response	6,928	8,638	1,775	25%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Productivity (Passengers per Hour)	Fixed-Route	7.49	9.39	1.90	25%
	Demand-Response	2.03	2.54	0.51	25%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-

SPOT’s future productivity forecast for demand-response is below the peer average for small urban agencies, indicating that SPOT would not need to add demand-response service and would be able to maintain its current demand-response fleet size. However, SPOT’s fixed-route productivity is higher than the peer average for small urban agencies. To provide fixed-route service on par with its small urban peers, an increase in service hours would be needed and SPOT’s fixed-route fleet would need to grow to 11 vehicles. See Figure 7 for details.

**Figure 7 SPOT’s Transit Assessment – Additional Resources Needed**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028) with Increase	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Revenue Hours	Fixed-Route	9,614	20,157	10,542	110%
	Demand-Response	3,416	3,416	-	-
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Fleet Size	Fixed-Route	5	11	6	120%
	Demand-Response	1	1	-	-

**Silver Express**

Silver Express ridership is not projected to grow by 2028 (for the purposes of this analysis), because Census population projections indicate a population decline in Shoshone County. With existing vehicle revenue hours, Silver Express would have a future productivity of 4.62 and 1.53 one-way passenger trips per hour on fixed-route and demand-response services, respectively, as shown in Figure 8.

**Figure 8 Silver Express Transit Assessment**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028)	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Ridership	Fixed-Route	12,912	11,798	(1,114)	-9%
	Demand-Response	1,637	1,496	(141)	-9%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Productivity (Passengers per Hour)	Fixed-Route	5.05	4.62	(0.44)	-9%
	Demand-Response	1.68	1.53	(0.14)	-9%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-

Silver Express’s productivity forecast for demand-response service is below the peer average for small rural systems, indicating that Silver Express would not need to add demand-response service hours. However, even with a slight decline in ridership by 2028, Silver Express’ future fixed-route ridership is still higher than the peer average for small rural agencies. To provide service on par with its peers, Silver Express would need to add fixed-route service hours and its fixed-route fleet would need to grow to three vehicles. See Figure 9 for details.

**Figure 9 Silver Express’s Transit Assessment – Additional Resources Needed**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028) with Increase	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Revenue Hours	Fixed-Route	2,556	5,370	2,814	110%
	Demand-Response	977	977	-	-
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Fleet Size	Fixed-Route	1	3	2	200%
	Demand-Response	1	1	-	-

**Valley Vista Care – Benewah Area Transit**

Valley Vista Care Benewah Area Transit (BAT) ridership is projected to grow by over 400 one-way demand-response trips. With existing vehicle revenue hours, this would result in a productivity of 1.47 one-way demand-response passenger trips per hour. BAT’s future productivity forecast for demand-response is below the peer average for small rural agencies, indicating that Valley Vista would not need to add service hours and would be able to maintain its current demand-response fleet size for BAT. See Figure 10.

**Figure 10 Valley Vista Care – Benewah Area Transit Assessment**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028)	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Ridership	Fixed-Route	-	-	-	-
	Demand-Response	6,025	6,453	428	7%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Productivity (Passengers per Hour)	Fixed-Route	-	-	-	-
	Demand-Response	1.38	1.47	0.10	7%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-

**Other Public Transportation Providers**

Human service transportation providers in District 1 include the following:

- Disabled American Veterans
- Veterans Transportation Service
- Kootenai Health Transportation Services
- Home and Away Medical Transport and Shuttle
- Post Falls Senior Center, Post Falls
- Lake City Center, Coeur d’Alene
- Sandpoint Senior and DayBreak Centers, Sandpoint


No ridership data was available for these human service agencies in District 1, and no vanpool providers were identified. Therefore, no estimated future public transportation trips are allocated to human service agencies or vanpool services.

**District 2**

District 2 is covered by four public transportation providers (Regional Public Transportation, Lewiston Transit, Appaloosa Express, and City of Moscow). As shown in Figure 1 and Figure 11, future transit ridership in District 2 in 2028 will total nearly 300,000 riders.



**Figure 11 District 2 Estimated Future Public Transit Ridership (2028)**



### **Public Transit Providers**

#### **Regional Public Transportation**

Regional Public Transportation (SMART) ridership is projected to grow by approximately 5,068 one-way passenger trips for fixed-route services and 330 one-way passenger trips for demand-response services if trips per capita rates remain the same as today. Based on existing vehicle revenue hours, this would lead to a productivity of 28.42 and 3.46 for fixed-route and demand-response services, respectively. Both values are above the peer average for Small Urban agencies, meaning SMART would likely need to increase service hours and fleet size to meet demand. Figure 12 displays ridership and productivity by mode today and in 2028, assuming no change in service levels.



**Figure 12 SMART Assessment**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028)	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Ridership	Fixed-Route	159,483	164,551	5,068	3%
	Demand-Response	10,376	10,706	330	3%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Productivity (Passengers per Hour)	Fixed-Route	27.54	28.42	0.88	3%
	Demand-Response	3.36	3.46	0.11	3%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-

To bring SMART’s productivity down to the average of its small urban peers, it would need to add service hours. The increase in service hours would be approximately 535% for fixed-route and 3% for demand-response service. The fleet would need to grow to 20 fixed-route vehicles and eight demand-response vehicles. See Figure 13 for additional details.

**Figure 13 SMART – Additional Resources Needed**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028) with Increase	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Revenue Hours	Fixed-Route	5,790	36,754	30,964	535%
	Demand-Response	3,092	3,174	82	3%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Fleet Size	Fixed-Route	3	20	17	567%
	Demand-Response	7	8	1	14%

**Lewiston Transit**

Lewiston Transit’s ridership is projected to grow by approximately 3,908 one-way passenger trips for fixed-route services and 323 for demand-response services. With existing vehicle revenue hours, this would result in a productivity of 9.54 and 2.85 one-way passenger trips per hour on fixed-route and demand-response services, respectively. The productivity for fixed-route services is above the peer average, while the productivity for demand-response is below the peer average for small urban providers, indicating that Lewiston Transit would likely need to increase service hours and fleet size to serve fixed-route ridership, while existing service hours and fleet size should be sufficient to meet demand-response needs. See Figure 14 for more details.

**Figure 14 Lewiston Transit Assessment**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028)	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Ridership	Fixed-Route	57,149	61,057	3,908	7%
	Demand-Response	4,722	5,045	323	7%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Productivity (Passengers per Hour)	Fixed-Route	8.93	9.54	0.61	7%
	Demand-Response	2.67	2.85	0.18	7%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-

To bring Lewiston Transit’s fixed-route productivity down to the average of its small urban peers, it would need to add fixed-route service hours. The increase in service hours would be approximately 113%. The fleet would need to grow to 11 fixed-route vehicles. Lewiston Transit’s future productivity forecast for demand-response service is below the peer average for small urban agencies, indicating that it would not need to add demand-response service hours and would be able to maintain its current demand-response fleet size. See Figure 15 for additional details.

**Figure 15 Lewiston Transit – Additional Resources Needed**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028) with Increase	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Revenue Hours	Fixed-Route	6,401	13,638	7,237	113%
	Demand-Response	1,768	-	-	-
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Fleet Size	Fixed-Route	5	11	6	120%
	Demand-Response	3	-	-	-

**Nez Perce Tribe, Appaloosa Express**

Appaloosa Express’s ridership is projected to grow by approximately 1,146 one-way passenger trips for fixed-route services and 7 for demand-response services. With existing vehicle revenue hours, this would result in a productivity of 2.12 and 0.14 one-way passenger trips per hour on fixed-route and demand-response services, respectively. Both values are below the peer average for small rural agencies, indicating Appaloosa Express would not need to add service, and would be able to maintain its current fleet size. See Figure 16 for more details.

**Figure 16 Appaloosa Express Transit Assessment**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028)	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Ridership	Fixed-Route	16,759	17,905	1,146	7%
	Demand-Response	101	108	7	7%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Productivity (Passengers per Hour)	Fixed-Route	1.99	2.12	0.13	7%
	Demand-Response	0.13	0.14	0.01	7%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-

**Other Public Transportation Providers**

Some estimated future public transportation trips in District 2 will be served by human service agencies and/or vanpool services.

The other public transportation providers identified for District 2 include:

- City of Moscow vanpool services
- Disability Action Center (DAC)
- Idaho County Rideshare
- Coast (Grangeville)
- Nimipu Health
- Disabled American Veterans
- Gretton Medical Center
- Prairie Medicaid
- Interlink Volunteer Caregivers

Figure 17 provides the existing and future ridership by county for demand-response and vanpool services.



**Figure 17 District 2 Estimated Future Human Service Transportation and Vanpool Ridership**


County	Ridership (2015)	Ridership (2028)	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
<b>Demand Response</b>				
Benewah County	82	88	6	7%
Clearwater County	77	77	0	0%
Idaho County	146	155	10	7%
Kootenai County	1,276	2,005	728	57%
Latah County	340	350	10	3%
Lewis County	34	34	0	0%
Nez Perce County	7,104	7,590	486	7%
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>9,059</b>	<b>10,299</b>	<b>1,240</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>Vanpool</b>				
Benewah County	-	-	-	-
Clearwater County	-	-	-	-
Idaho County	-	-	-	-
Kootenai County	-	-	-	-
Latah County	5,814	5,999	185	2%
Lewis County	-	-	-	-
Nez Perce County	-	-	-	-
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>5,814</b>	<b>5,999</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>14,873</b>	<b>16,298</b>	<b>1,425</b>	<b>10%</b>

**District 3**

District 3 is covered by 30 public transportation providers, of which two provide public transit services (Valley Regional Transit and Treasure Valley Transit). As shown in Figure 1, future transit ridership in District 3 in 2028 will total nearly 2.6 million riders. More than three-quarters of ridership will be carried on District 3’s two public transit providers, as shown in Figure 18.



**Figure 18** District 3 Estimated Future Public Transit Ridership (2028)



**Public Transit Providers**

**Valley Regional Transit**

Valley Regional Transit’s ridership is projected to grow by approximately 514,000 one-way passenger trips for fixed-route services and 22,000 one-way passenger trips for demand-response services if trips per capita rates remain the same as today. Based on existing vehicle revenue hours, this would lead to a productivity of 19.81 and 3.14 for fixed-route and demand-response services, respectively. Both of these values are above the peer average for large agencies, meaning Valley Regional Transit would likely need to increase service hours and fleet size to serve future ridership. Figure 19 displays ridership and productivity by mode today and in 2028, assuming no change in service levels.

**Figure 19 Valley Regional Transit Assessment**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028)	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Ridership	Fixed-Route	1,369,716	1,883,541	513,825	38%
	Demand-Response	58,045	79,820	21,775	38%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Productivity (Passengers per Hour)	Fixed-Route	14.41	19.81	5.40	38%
	Demand-Response	2.28	3.14	0.86	38%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-

To bring Valley Regional Transit’s productivity down to the average of its large peers, it would need to add service hours. The increase in service hours would be approximately 2% for fixed-route and 35% for demand-response services. The fleet would need to grow to 59 fixed-route vehicles and 36 demand-response vehicles. See Figure 20 for additional details.

**Figure 20 Valley Regional Transit Assessment – Additional Resources Needed**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028) with Increase	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Revenue Hours	Fixed-Route	95,068	96,740	1,672	2%
	Demand-Response	25,440	34,261	8,821	35%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Fleet Size	Fixed-Route	57	59	2	4%
	Demand-Response	26	36	10	38%

**Treasure Valley Transit**

Treasure Valley Transit’s ridership is projected to grow by approximately 31,000 one-way passenger trips for fixed-route services and 13,000 for demand-response services. With existing vehicle revenue hours, this would result in a productivity of 7.84 and 2.40 one-way passenger trips per hour on fixed-route and demand-response services, respectively. Both values are below the peer average for medium agencies, indicating Treasure Valley Transit would not need to add service, and would be able to maintain its current fleet size. See Figure 21 for more details.



**Figure 21 Treasure Valley Transit Assessment**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028)	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Ridership	Fixed-Route	101,439	132,281	30,842	30%
	Demand-Response	43,302	56,468	13,166	30%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Productivity (Passengers per Hour)	Fixed-Route	6.01	7.84	1.83	30%
	Demand-Response	1.84	2.40	0.56	30%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-

**Other Public Transportation Providers**

Some estimated future public transportation trips in District 3 will be served by human service agencies and/or vanpool services.

These other public transportation providers in District 3 include the organizations listed below, plus 22 senior centers:

- ACHD Commuteride
- CCOA-Aging, Weatherization, and Human Services Inc.
- Boise Good Samaritan
- Western Idaho Training Company (WITCO)

Figure 22 provides the existing and future ridership by county for both demand-response and vanpool services.



**Figure 22 District 3 Estimated Future Human Service Transportation and Vanpool Ridership**

County	Ridership (2015)	Ridership (2028)	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
<b>Demand Response</b>				
Ada County	8,773	11,853	3,080	35%
Adams County	1,366	1,496	130	9%
Boise County	932	1,186	253	27%
Canyon County	68,437	96,585	28,148	41%
Elmore County	5,817	5,921	104	2%
Gem County	4,965	5,623	658	13%
Owyhee County	1,683	1,773	91	5%
Payette County	7,166	7,844	678	9%
Valley County	1,169	1,299	129	11%
Washington County	3,535	3,727	192	5%
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>103,844</b>	<b>137,307</b>	<b>33,463</b>	<b>32%</b>
<b>Vanpool</b>				
Ada County	139,970	189,102	49,132	35%
Adams County	-	-	-	-
Boise County	2,353	2,993	640	27%
Canyon County	66,815	94,297	27,481	41%
Elmore County	9,012	9,174	162	2%
Gem County	5,723	6,481	758	13%
Owyhee County	-	-	-	-
Payette County	-	-	-	-
Valley County	-	-	-	-
Washington County	-	-	-	-
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>223,873</b>	<b>302,046</b>	<b>78,173</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>327,717</b>	<b>439,353</b>	<b>111,636</b>	<b>34%</b>


District 3’s future transit demand will largely be served by Valley Regional Transit (accounting for approximately 41% of all future demand in the district). However, public transportation providers in the district will also see large growth that will require significant operational and capital investments to meet their own future demand. Canyon, Ada and Boise Counties are projected to have the largest percent increase in ridership for public transportation providers, though the district’s demand will be concentrated in Ada and Canyon Counties, as it is today.



### District 4

District 4 is covered by six public transportation providers, two of which provide public transit services (Mountain Rides Transportation Authority and College of Southern Idaho/Trans IV). As shown in Figure 1, future transit ridership in District 4 in 2028 will total about 691,350 riders. Nearly 95 percent of ridership will be carried on District 4’s two public transit providers, as shown in Figure 23.

**Figure 23** District 4 Estimated Future Public Transit Ridership (2028)



### Public Transit Providers

#### Mountain Rides Transportation Authority

Mountain Rides Transportation Authority’s ridership is projected to grow by approximately 104,500 one-way passenger trips for fixed-route services and 9,200 one-way passenger trips for vanpool if trips per capita rates remain the same as today. Based on existing vehicle revenue hours, this would lead to a productivity of 19.95 and 6.62 for fixed-route and vanpool services, respectively. Both of these values are above the peer average for medium agencies, meaning Mountain Rides Transportation Authority would likely need to increase service hours and fleet size to serve future trips. Figure 24 displays ridership and productivity by mode today and in 2028, assuming no change in service levels.

**Figure 24 Mountain Rides Transit Assessment**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028)	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Ridership	Fixed-Route	454,038	558,606	104,568	23%
	Demand-Response	391	481	90	23%
	Vanpool	39,990	49,200	9,210	23%
Productivity (Passengers per Hour)	Fixed-Route	16.21	19.95	3.73	23%
	Demand-Response	2.40	2.95	0.55	23%
	Vanpool	5.38	6.62	1.24	23%

To bring Mountain Rides Transportation Authority’s productivity down to the average of its large peers, it would need to add service hours. The increase in service hours would be approximately 41% for fixed-route and 15% for demand-response. The fleet would need to grow to 27 fixed-route vehicles and eight demand-response vehicles. See Figure 25 for additional details.

**Figure 25 Mountain Rides Transit Assessment – Additional Resources Needed**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028) with Increase	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Revenue Hours	Fixed-Route	28,004	39,561	11,557	41%
	Demand-Response	163	187	24	15%
	Vanpool	7,431	-	-	-
Fleet Size	Fixed-Route	19	27	8	42%
	Demand-Response	1	2	1	100%

**College of Southern Idaho (CSI) / Trans IV**

College of Southern Idaho (CSI) / Trans IV ridership is projected to grow by approximately 10,565 one-way passenger trips for demand-response services. With existing vehicle revenue hours, this would result in a productivity of 3.48 one-way passenger trips per hour on demand-response services if trips per capita rates remain the same as today. This value is above the peer average for medium agencies, meaning CSI / Trans IV would likely need to increase service hours and fleet size to serve future trips. Figure 26 displays ridership and productivity by mode today and in 2028, assuming no change in service levels.

**Figure 26 CSI / Trans IV Transit Assessment**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028)	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Ridership	Fixed-Route	-	-	-	-
	Demand-Response	36,214	46,779	10,565	29%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Productivity (Passengers per Hour)	Fixed-Route	-	-	-	-
	Demand-Response	2.7	3.48	0.79	29%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-

To bring CSI / Trans IV’s productivity down to the average of its large peers, it would need to add service hours. The increase in service hours would be approximately 35% for demand-response service. The fleet would need to grow to 21 demand-response vehicles. See Figure 27 for additional details.

**Figure 27 CSI / Trans IV Transit Assessment – Additional Resources Needed**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028) with Increase	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Revenue Hours	Fixed-Route	-	-	-	-
	Demand-Response	13,424	18,153	4,729	35%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Fleet Size	Fixed-Route	-	-	-	-
	Demand-Response	15	21	6	40%

**Other Public Transportation Providers**

Some estimated future public transportation trips in District 4 will be served by human service agencies and/or vanpool services.

These other types of public transportation providers in District 4 include:

- Living Independence Network Corporation (LINC)
- Minidoka Memorial Hospital
- North Canyon Medical Center
- Blaine County Senior Center
- West End Senior Center

Figure 28 provides the existing and future ridership by county for both demand-response and vanpool services.


**Figure 28 District 4 Estimated Future Human Service Transportation and Vanpool Ridership**

County	Ridership (2015)	Ridership (2028)	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
<b>Demand Response</b>				
Blaine County	3,162	3,890	728	23%
Camas County	-	-	-	-
Cassia County	4,447	4,574	127	3%
Gooding County	-	-	-	-
Jerome County	4,314	4,617	303	7%
Lincoln County	-	-	-	-
Minidoka County	1,830	2,062	232	13%
Twin Falls County	16,369	21,145	4,776	29%
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>30,112</b>	<b>36,288</b>	<b>6,116</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>Vanpool</b>				
Blaine County	-	-	-	-
Camas County	-	-	-	-
Cassia County	-	-	-	-
Gooding County	-	-	-	-
Jerome County	-	-	-	-
Lincoln County	-	-	-	-
Minidoka County	-	-	-	-
Twin Falls County	-	-	-	-
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>30,122</b>	<b>36,288</b>	<b>6,166</b>	<b>20%</b>

**District 5**

District 5 is covered by six public transportation providers, one of which provides public transit services (Pocatello Regional Transit). As shown in Figure 1, future transit ridership in District 5 in 2028 will total just over 375,000 riders. Approximately 75 percent of ridership will be carried by Pocatello Regional Transit (PTR), as shown in Figure 29.

**Figure 29** District 5 Estimated Future Public Transit Ridership (2028)



**Public Transit Providers**

**Pocatello Regional Transit**

PTR’s ridership is projected to grow by approximately 39,500 one-way passenger trips for fixed-route services and 13,000 one-way passenger trips for demand-response services if trips per capita rates remain the same as today. Based on existing vehicle revenue hours, this would lead to a productivity of 12.04 and 2.81 for fixed-route and demand-response services, respectively. This value for demand-response service is above the peer average for medium agencies, meaning PTR would likely need to increase service hours and fleet size to serve future trips. Projected fixed-route productivity is below the peer average, indicating no additional service is needed to meet future demand. Figure 30 displays ridership and productivity by mode today and in 2028, assuming no change in service levels.

**Figure 30 Pocatello Regional Transit Assessment**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028)	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Ridership	Fixed-Route	243,216	282,695	39,479	16%
	Demand-Response	80,051	93,045	12,994	16%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Productivity (Passengers per Hour)	Fixed-Route	10.36	12.04	1.68	16%
	Demand-Response	2.42	2.81	0.39	16%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-

To bring PRT’s productivity down to the average of its large peers, it would need to add demand-response service hours. The increase in service hours would be approximately 9%. The fleet would need to grow to 26 demand-response vehicles. PRT’s future productivity forecast for fixed-route service is below the peer average for, indicating that it would not need to add service hours and would be able to maintain its current fixed-route fleet size. See Figure 31 for additional details.

**Figure 31 Pocatello Regional Transit Assessment – Additional Resources Needed**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028) with Increase	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Revenue Hours	Fixed-Route	23,483	23,483	-	-
	Demand-Response	33,084	36,107	3,023	9%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Fleet Size	Fixed-Route	18	18	-	-
	Demand-Response	23	26	3	13%

**Other Public Transportation Providers**

Some estimated future public transportation trips in District 5 will be served by human service agencies and/orvanpool services.

These other types of public transportation providers in District 5 include:

- Franklin County Medical Center
- Oneida County Medical Center
- Shoshone Bannock Tribes Public Transit Program

- HOPE Recovery
- SouthEastern Idaho Community Action Agency (SEICAA)
- Services for veterans with disabilities (run by SEICAA)
- Blackfoot Senior Center

Figure 32 provides the existing and future ridership by county for both demand-response and vanpool services.

**Figure 32 District 5 Estimated Future Human Service Transportation and Vanpool Ridership**


County	Ridership (2015)	Ridership (2028)	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
<b>Demand Response</b>				
Bannock County	-	-	-	-
Bingham County	-	-	-	-
Bear Lake County	-	-	-	-
Caribou County	-	-	-	-
Franklin County	1,967	2,272	305	16%
Oneida County	568	608	40	7%
Power County	-	-	-	-
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>2,535</b>	<b>2,881</b>	<b>346</b>	<b>14%</b>
<b>Vanpool</b>				
Bannock County	-	-	-	-
Bingham County	-	-	-	-
Bear Lake County	-	-	-	-
Caribou County	-	-	-	-
Franklin County	-	-	-	-
Oneida County	-	-	-	-
Power County	-	-	-	-
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,535</b>	<b>2,881</b>	<b>346</b>	<b>14%</b>

**District 6**

District 6 is covered by six public transportation providers, five of which provide public transit services (City of Driggs, Lemhi Ride, Targhee Regional Public Transportation Authority, Southern Teton Area Rapid Transit, and Valley Vista Care – Lost River Area Transit). As shown in Figure 1, future transit ridership in District 6 in 2028 will total over 215,000 riders. Figure 33 illustrates the fixed route and demand response ridership in

District 6. Fixed route services account for 42% of total estimated ridership in the year 2028 at 91,486 rides, and demand response is estimated at 58% of the total at 123,909 rides.

**Figure 33** District 6 Estimated Future Public Transit Ridership (2028)



### Public Transit Providers

#### City of Driggs Transit

The City of Driggs’ ridership is projected to grow by approximately 19,300 one-way passenger trips for fixed-route services if trips per capita rates remain the same as today. Based on existing vehicle revenue hours, this would lead to a productivity of 5.52 for fixed-route. This value is above the peer average for small rural agencies, meaning the City of Driggs would likely need to increase service hours and fleet size to meet demand. Figure 34 displays ridership and productivity by mode today and in 2028, assuming no change in service levels.



**Figure 34 City of Driggs Transit Assessment**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028)	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Ridership	Fixed-Route	16,644	19,351	2,707	16%
	Demand-Response	-	-	-	-
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Productivity (Passengers per Hour)	Fixed-Route	4.75	5.52	0.77	16%
	Demand-Response	-	-	-	-
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-

To bring the City of Driggs’ productivity down to the average of its large peers, it would need to add service hours. The increase in service hours would be approximately 151% for fixed-route. The fleet would need to grow to eight fixed-route vehicles. See Figure 35 for additional details.

**Figure 35 City of Driggs Transit Assessment – Additional Resources Needed**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028) with Increase	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Revenue Hours	Fixed-Route	3,506	8,808	5,302	151%
	Demand-Response	-	-	-	-
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Fleet Size	Fixed-Route	3	8	5	167%
	Demand-Response	-	-	-	-

**Lemhi Ride**

Lemhi Ride ridership is projected to grow by approximately 1,100 one-way passenger trips for demand-response services if trips per capita rates remain the same as today. With existing vehicle revenue hours, this would result in a productivity of 9.60 one-way passenger trips per hour for demand-response services. This value is above the peer average for small rural agencies, indicating Lemhi Ride would likely need to increase service hours and fleet size to meet demand. Figure 36 displays ridership and productivity by mode today and in 2028, assuming no change in service levels.

**Figure 36 Lemhi Ride Transit Assessment**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028)	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Ridership	Fixed-Route	-	-	-	-
	Demand-Response	9,049	10,185	1,136	13%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Productivity (Passengers per Hour)	Fixed-Route	-	-	-	-
	Demand-Response	8.53	9.60	1.07	13%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-

To bring Lemhi Ride’s productivity down to the average of its small rural peers, it would need to add service hours. The increase in service hours would be approximately 59% for demand-response. The fleet would need to grow by two demand-response vehicles (for a total of four). See Figure 37 for additional details.

**Figure 37 Lemhi Ride Transit Assessment – Additional Resources Needed**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028) with Increase	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Revenue Hours	Fixed-Route	-	-	-	-
	Demand-Response	1,061	1,686	625	59%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Fleet Size	Fixed-Route	-	-	-	-
	Demand-Response	2	4	2	100%

**Southern Teton Area Rapid Transit (START)**

START operates an intercity fixed route service between Jackson, Wyoming and Driggs, Idaho. While the agency as a whole compares best to peer agencies in the Small category in the ITD peer analysis, START’s routes in Idaho are as productive, on average, as some medium and large Idaho transit agencies. The future needs analysis, therefore, is based on service data for Medium-sized Idaho agencies.

START ridership is projected to grow by approximately 4,300 one-way passenger trips assuming the trips per capita rate remains the same as today. With existing vehicle revenue hours, this would result in a productivity of 20.27 one-way passenger trips per hour. This value is above the peer average for medium agencies, indicating START may need to increase

service hours and fleet size to meet demand. Figure 38 displays ridership and productivity today and in 2028, assuming service at year 2015 levels.

**Figure 38 START Assessment**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028)	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Ridership	Fixed-Route	26,567	30,887	4,320	16%
	Demand-Response	-	-	-	-
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Productivity (Passengers per Hour)	Fixed-Route	17.43	20.27	2.83	16%
	Demand-Response	-	-	-	-
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-

To bring START’s productivity down from 20.27 passengers per hour to the average of Medium-sized Idaho agencies (14.12 passengers per hour), it would need to add approximately 12,500 service hours, or an increase of 44%. The fleet would also need to increase by 2 vehicles, for a total of 5 vehicles. See Figure 41 for additional details.

**Figure 39 START Assessment – Additional Resources Needed**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028) with Increase	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Revenue Hours	Fixed-Route	1,524	2,187	663	44%
	Demand-Response	-	-	-	-
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Fleet Size	Fixed-Route	3	5	2	67%
	Demand-Response	-	-	-	-

**Targhee Regional Public Transportation Authority**

Targhee Regional Public Transportation Authority’s (TRPTA) ridership is projected to grow by approximately 30,000 one-way passenger trips (8,600 for fixed-route and 21,400 for demand-response services) if trips per capita rates remain the same as today. With existing vehicle revenue hours, this would result in a productivity of 2.55 and 3.15 one-way passenger trips per hour for fixed-route and demand-response services, respectively. This demand-response value is above the peer average for medium agencies, indicating TRPTA would likely need to increase demand-response service hours and fleet size to serve future trips. The fixed-route



value is below the peer average, and would not need to add service. Figure 40 displays ridership and productivity by mode today and in 2028, assuming no change in service levels.

**Figure 40 TRPTA Assessment**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028)	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Ridership	Fixed-Route	32,686	41,249	8,563	26%
	Demand-Response	81,730	103,140	21,410	26%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Productivity (Passengers per Hour)	Fixed-Route	2.02	2.55	0.53	26%
	Demand-Response	2.50	3.15	0.65	26%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-

To bring TRPTA’s demand-response productivity down to the average of its medium peers, it would need to add service hours. The increase in service hours would be approximately 22% for demand-response. The fleet would need to grow to 42 demand-response vehicles (an addition of eight vehicles). See Figure 41 for additional details.

**Figure 41 TRPTA Assessment – Additional Resources Needed**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028) with Increase	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Revenue Hours	Fixed-Route	16,163	16,163	-	-
	Demand-Response	32,748	40,025	7,277	22%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Fleet Size	Fixed-Route	11	11	-	-
	Demand-Response	34	42	8	24%

**Valley Vista Care – Lost River Area Transit**

Valley Vista Care – Lost River Area Transit’s ridership is projected to grow by approximately 10,600 one-way passenger trips for demand-response services if trips per capita rates remain the same as today. With existing vehicle revenue hours, this would result in a productivity of 3.97 one-way passenger trips per hour for demand-response services. This demand-response value is below the peer average for small rural providers, indicating no need for service hour or fleet size expansion in the future. Figure 42 displays ridership and productivity by mode today and in 2028, assuming no change in service levels.

**Figure 42 Valley Vista Care Transit Assessment**

		Existing (2015)	Future (2028)	Difference (Number)	Difference (Percent)
Ridership	Fixed-Route	-	-	-	-
	Demand-Response	9,473	10,584	1,111	12%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-
Productivity (Passengers per Hour)	Fixed-Route	-	-	-	-
	Demand-Response	3.56	3.97	0.42	12%
	Vanpool	-	-	-	-

**Other Public Transportation Providers**

Only one other public transportation provider was identified in District 6—Development Workshop. No ridership data was available for that provider. Therefore, no estimated future public transportation trips are allocated to human service agencies or vanpool services.

