

Attachment 4, DS-2022-47
Tecumseh Transit Service
Analysis of Service Delivery Options

| Analysis of Transit Service Delivery Options | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Expenses | Option 1 On-Demand Status Quo | Option 2 Former Fixed Route | Option 3 On-Demand Two Vehicles | Option 4 Hybrid Fixed Route Tecumseh Road and On-Demand with Two Vehicles | Option 5 Fixed Route Tecumseh Road | Option 6 Original Fixed Route Mon-Fri On-Demand Sat |
| First Student | \$250,000 | \$250,000 | \$400,000 | \$400,000 | \$250,000 | \$250,000 |
| Blaise Transit App | \$10,000 | n/a | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | n/a | \$10,000 |
| Answer 365 Call Centre | \$20,000 | n/a | \$30,000 | \$15,000 | n/a | \$10,000 |
| Total Operational Cost | \$280,000 | \$250,000 | \$440,000 | \$425,000 | \$250,000 | \$270,000 |
| Annualized Capital (Vehicles) | \$80,000 | \$80,000 | \$120,000 | \$120,000 | \$80,000 | \$80,000 |
| Total Estimated Annual Cost | \$360,000 | \$330,000 | \$560,000 | \$545,000 | \$330,000 | \$350,000 |
| Estimated Provincial Gas Tax Contribution (75% of municipal- own spending) | \$270,000 | \$247,500 | 420,000 | \$408,750 | 247,500 | 262,500 |
| Net Annual Cost | \$90,000 | \$82,500 | \$140,000 | \$136,250 | 82,500 | \$87,500 |

| Analysis of Transit Service Delivery Options | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| Expenses | Option 1 On-Demand Status Quo | Option 2 Former Fixed Route | Option 3 On-Demand Two Vehicles | Option 4 Hybrid Fixed Route Tecumseh Road and On-Demand with Two Vehicles | Option 5 Fixed Route Tecumseh Road | Option 6 Original Fixed Route Mon-Fri On-Demand Sat |
| Observed/Anticipated Performance | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ridership down 50% Passenger/driver frustration Significant Administration time/resources Less fuel, GHG and vehicle wear | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ridership will increase but not realize full potential Less passenger/driver frustration Less Administration time/resources More fuel, GHG and vehicle wear | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ridership should increase Frustration should diminish Administration time/resources to address questions and technical issues but should be less | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 70% of riders served by proposed fixed route Ridership should increase particularly as density increases Still offers service accessibility to larger parts of community | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only 70% of existing ridership would be served Headway would be reduced from 1 hr to 0.5 hrs Would align well with areas of intensification and mixed-use Could provide good connectivity to future Lakeshore service | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Serves existing ridership and may help restore ridership to pre-pandemic levels On-demand functions better on Saturdays under lower and more evenly spread ridership (i.e. no peak periods) Ridership/driver frustration reduced Less Admin time/resources Marginally less fuel/GHG Enables easier transition to wider use of on-demand in the future (i.e. in conjunction with Lakeshore or off-peak hours such as Sundays or evenings) |
| Option Assessment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor service delivery resulting in reduced ridership Not recommended | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On-demand opportunities developed to date lost Not recommended | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires two vehicles on route at same time resulting in significant cost increase Not recommended at this time | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides enhanced service but requires two vehicles on the route resulting in significant cost increase Not recommended at this time | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced service area Not recommended at this time | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ridership returns to previous levels while optimizing on-demand benefits on Saturdays Retains knowledge gained from the on-demand pilot project and represents good value for money Recommended |