



Potential for Coordination

INTRODUCTION

Technical Memorandum #4 described opportunities to coordinate and enhance transit services in Boone County. The opportunities were presented to the Steering Committee for discussion and input. This chapter explores the potential for implementation of each coordination scenario and service improvement. Local feedback from the Steering Committee was used to help assess the potential for these coordination strategies.

All of the identified opportunities to increase coordination among transit services in the county have the ability to benefit both service providers (e.g., reduced operating costs) and service users (e.g., increased service area). Although coordination can provide benefits, it can be a complex and sensitive task for the agencies and service providers involved. Before agreeing to coordinate, agencies will grapple with, among other things, how entering into a coordination effort will affect their control over the provision of service, the use of their transportation resources, and the quality of the service to their users. Ultimately, agencies are concerned with the ability of a coordinated service to meet their transportation needs and the needs of their clients. Coordination promises to meet these needs in a more efficient and comprehensive manner than any single agency can do on its own, but agencies will naturally be cautious about coordination until it has proven to deliver such benefits within Boone County.

The survey of transportation service providers revealed that many of the social service and transit agencies in Boone County are at least interested in some form of coordinated activity. Coordination is a broad concept, which can refer to myriad activities, from basic information sharing among agencies to consolidation into a single countywide transit system. Therefore, it is possible to pursue coordination even if the relevant agencies have not expressed commitment to the most extensive forms of coordination. In Boone County, where there is little or no prior experience

Potential for Coordination

of coordination among transportation providers, basic coordination efforts—such as inclusive planning discussions, information sharing, and minor service adjustments—are the most realistic starting point. Establishing basic coordination can be inexpensive and does not require major operational changes. Although the rewards are not as great with basic coordination activities, neither are the perceived risks. These efforts will provide agencies with the ability to build relationships and to identify common ground. Once agencies become accustomed to working together, it may be possible to build off success and pursue more extensive coordination.

Examining all of the identified coordination opportunities will reveal which opportunities have the greatest chance to gain immediate support and what it will take to achieve higher degrees of coordination in the future. In many cases, the coordination opportunities are related to one another; some basic coordination activities better set the stage for



more extensive coordination opportunities than others. Understanding the full possibilities for coordination in Boone County will help service providers make decisions about the best ways to initiate working together. Achieving more extensive coordination may take considerable time in Boone County, but even the most basic forms of coordination stand to benefit the county's public transportation network.

This chapter categorizes the identified coordination and enhanced service opportunities into three categories:

Basic coordination – Basic coordination opportunities are the most obvious and easily attainable opportunities. These can usually be implemented without significant cost or administrative effort. Since these efforts are the easiest, they are also the loosest forms of coordination discussed in this chapter. The coordination opportunities presented in this section can serve as the foundation for more extensive forms of coordination in the future. These coordination efforts can help bring the different agencies together without forcing any of them to lose control over their operations or significantly alter the service they provide.

Extensive coordination – The extensive coordination scenarios discussed require a higher degree of commitment from participating agencies than basic coordination opportunities. Several of the extensive coordination scenarios presented have the ability to create a countywide transportation system that would significantly alter how transportation is provided in Boone County. While different scenarios are capable of achieving this end, they all require participating service providers to alter how they administer and deliver service to some degree. These scenarios include opportunities to both closely coordinate service and to consolidate service under a single transit operator.

Enhanced service – Enhanced services do not necessarily require coordination. Rather, these ideas for improving transit service represent potential solutions for better meeting transportation needs identified for Boone County. All of the identified enhanced services require additional resources, coordination may help free up existing transportation resources to meet these needs. Additionally, identifying service improvements that could better meet the county’s transportation needs will provide a broader context for thinking about which types of coordination would be best for the county.

This chapter also presents an overview of federal support for local coordination efforts as emphasized in federal legislation and through the United We Ride program.

Many of the coordination activities and enhanced services presented in this chapter could be pursued individually or simultaneously. Although it is not necessary to start with basic coordination, doing so will help strengthen relationships among agencies and demonstrate how coordination can be successful. Once a basis for coordination has been established, it may be possible to initiate more extensive coordination activities. In large part, the ability for agencies to coordinate will depend on the willingness of each agency to participate, which is why it is advantageous to start small with broad participation and build support. Finding the optimal level of coordination for Boone County will take hard work and time, but has the potential to realize significant improvements for the county’s public transportation system.



FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR COORDINATION

Federal support for coordination of transportation programs is primarily provided under the United We Ride (UWR) program. United We Ride is an interagency federal initiative that supports states and their localities in developing coordinated human service delivery systems. The UWR program and coordination of transportation services is supported at the highest levels of the federal government. Coordination efforts have been directed by Presidential Executive Order in February 2004 which formed the Transportation Coordinating Council on Access and Mobility.

The UWR program provides both technical support and funding through state coordination grants. These grants can be used to assist states in: conducting a comprehensive state assessment using the UWR Framework for Action; developing a comprehensive state action plan for coordinating human service transportation; or for those states with an existing comprehensive state action plan, grants can be used for implementing one or more of the elements identified within the Framework for Action.¹ Missouri has received funding which will be used for transportation coordination workshops.

SAFETEA-LU includes a requirement that any funding for projects under the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5310 program, the Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) program, and the New Freedom program must be based on a local coordinated transportation plan. Some of the human services transportation providers in Boone County may be eligible for funding under the Section 5310 program while some of the enhanced services discussed in this chapter may be eligible for funding under the JARC or New Freedom program. Without support of a local coordinated transportation plan, these activities will not be eligible for funding under these specific federal programs.

EXISTING COORDINATION ACTIVITIES

There are a number of coordination activities which are currently taking place in Boone County. These have been identified in the description of each agency which

¹ Federal Transit Administration at http://www.fta.dot.gov/legal/federal_register/2004/12174_15861_ENG_HTML.htm.

is involved in providing transportation service to the community and are summarized briefly in this chapter. One example of existing coordination is the Medicaid brokerage. LogistiCare serves as the statewide Medicaid broker. Several transportation providers are used in Boone County to provide the service including OATS, Advantage Medical Transportation, and local taxis. Columbia Transit operates the campus shuttles under a contract with the University of Missouri. Columbia Transit and the University are discussing the possibility of open access on Columbia Transit for University students. Several agencies purchase bus passes on Columbia Transit or have contracts with OATS to provide transportation to their clients. OATS is a consolidated rural transportation provider.

These examples of existing coordination activities illustrate many of the coordination efforts that have already been undertaken in Boone County. Recognizing that these coordination efforts are in place, the focus of this chapter is on additional coordination strategies that could be considered for implementation.

BASIC COORDINATION

The basic coordination strategies discussed in this section are based upon continuation of existing coordination efforts. Other agencies could participate in some of the existing coordination efforts to enhance the overall coordination of service in Boone County. For example, additional agencies could purchase transportation service from OATS or Columbia Transit. Smaller providers could join together for joint purchasing of fuel, maintenance, and supplies. These existing coordination efforts should be continued and expanded to other agencies as part of the basic coordination strategies.

There are two basic coordination activities identified as the most obvious steps available to Boone County transportation providers:

- joint public relations and marketing materials, and
- coordination with other modes of transportation.

At the most basic level, both of these efforts are designed to bring service providers together to work and share information. Teaming for public relations will facilitate public transportation service providers working together, while efforts to coordi-

Potential for Coordination

nate with other modes of transportation will bring public transportation operators together with local governments and private transportation operators. The following discussion of these two opportunities addresses the requirements for implementation, associated costs, benefits, and the likelihood of implementation.

Even with these basic forms of coordination, there are activities capable of matching different levels of commitment. The opportunity to undertake a coordination effort at the lowest level of commitment creates a very low barrier to participation. Basing a coordination effort around a basic form of coordination will make it easier to gain broad support from transportation providers. Further, the participating agencies can continue to take steps toward improving their coordination without altering the nature of their efforts. This will enable coordination to develop as support grows.

Joint Public Relations and Marketing Materials

The Steering Committee expressed the greatest support for initiating Boone County's coordination activities with transportation providers joining together to conduct public relations and marketing activities. The Steering Committee, Columbia Transit and OATS, as well as 20 other agencies, stated that they were at least interested in participating in a countywide marketing program. Such a program would revolve around the collection and distribution of information on each of the participating services. Under all circumstances, this type of activity would be based on sharing information between agencies, but there are multiple means for distributing this information to the public. The distribution method will largely depend on the level of commitment from the participating agencies and their desire to coordinate. Since some agencies have shown apprehension about coordination in Boone County, the most basic form of this coordination may be the most manageable first step.



Inclusive Brochures

In its most basic form, a joint public relations effort and shared marketing materials would consist of the inclusion of essential information for services on one another's brochures. For example, Columbia Transit could include contact and

service information for OATS on its schedules. This would be relevant to riders since Columbia Transit only operates in the city. This sort of coordination can be accomplished generally cost free, since it is limited to agencies already printing service brochures. There is no need for any management or oversight of this effort, and agencies would have the freedom to choose which agencies to coordinate with. Participation of the larger transit agencies in the county—Columbia Transit or OATS—could potentially help raise public awareness of smaller agencies operating in the county.

Resource Manual

The next step would be to create a resource manual describing all of the services. Such a manual could be distributed to transit riders, transit agencies, and other human service agencies attracting transit-dependent clients. Producing a transportation resource manual for all services in Boone County would be the first time information on the broad services available would be available in one document. This would enable transit users to rely on a single resource to identify which services best meet their needs as well as how different services can be used in tandem. Further, transportation providers, especially smaller program-specific providers, could use such a resource to help their clients supplement their service.

Since nothing of the sort is currently produced, the creation of a resource manual would generate new work and responsibilities. The production of a resource manual will require one agency or a small group of representatives from different agencies to take responsibility for compiling the relevant information and overseeing the layout and printing of the manual. One of the larger transit operators in the county may have staff members who have experience producing informational materials capable of assuming this responsibility. Much of the information that would be included in a resource manual has already been collected and compiled as part of this study, which reduces the initial groundwork required to produce the document.

It is possible that the resource manual could take several different forms. A simplified version with basic information for users could be produced in a smaller brochure format as discussed in the next section. A more detailed desk reference

Potential for Coordination

manual could be prepared with more information for use by the providers and agencies who have clients with transportation needs. The third format could be an interactive version hosted on a local website.

The primary costs associated with the production of a resource manual are related to the collection and maintenance of the data as well as the publication of the manual. As stated above, much of the information regarding each of the county's transportation services was collected as part of this study, which would reduce the time and cost of the initial data collection. The cost of the production of the manual would depend on the quality and quantity of the printing. Sharing this cost among all of the transportation providers in the county would keep down the amount of funding required by each individual agency. Annual costs to compile updated information is estimated to be \$500 to \$1,000.

Common Brochure

Once the county's transportation providers have collaborated on the creation of a resource manual, they may eventually take an additional step and create a shared brochure describing the different services available in the county. This common marketing material would distill the information presented in the resource manual into a brochure designed for broad distribution to potential users. Additionally, a common brochure may pave the way for other marketing opportunities. Although the creation of a common brochure is a sort of combination of the first two public relations coordination steps, creating a common brochure may require more agreement from participating agencies.

The creation of a common brochure will require making numerous decisions about what information will be included and how it will be presented. Many transportation providers, especially larger transit agencies, spend considerable time and resources in cultivating marketing strategies. It may be difficult to get multiple agencies with unique identities, especially agencies providing similar services and competing for the same market, to agree on common marketing materials.

An agency, or a small number of staff from different agencies, would need to take responsibility for the work of producing the brochure. The agency that is respon-

sible for the production of the resource manual would already have the information required to produce the brochure. Staff from one of the larger transit agencies may be most suitable for undertaking such a task since they likely have greater experience with marketing service. Additional meetings of agency representatives may be required to garner an agreement of the general purpose and design of the brochure.

The cost of a common brochure is variable based on decisions about the quality of printing and level of distribution. Since this brochure would be created for the express purpose of marketing county transportation services to potential riders, it would likely require higher quality printing than the resource manual and have a wider distribution. The design of a common brochure would require more time than the resource manual. Therefore, the common brochure may have greater costs associated with it than the production of a resource manual. Since the common brochure and the resource manual are based on the same information though, creating a common brochure once the resource manual has been produced will benefit from the completion of much of the data collection. And, once again, the cost of a common brochure distributed over all participating agencies would reduce the cost the individual cost for each agency.

Once a resource manual and common brochure have been created, it will be possible to create a common website to post this information. A website can serve both as a marketing tool and as a warehouse of information for potential riders. The design of the site could reflect the common brochure, but it could also provide access to all of the information available in the resource manual.

One example of a consolidated information brochure is Glenn Ride in Glenn County, California. The brochure describes Glenn Ride, subsidized taxis, volunteer medical transportation, and a Ride to Work program. Contact information is provided for those needing more detailed information. The brochure may be viewed online at www.countyofglenn.net. Regional Transportation Program, Inc. (RTP) in Portland, Maine also has a consolidated Ride Guide which describes the various services available in the community. The Ride Guide and other information is available on the RTP website at www.rtprides.org.

Informational Phone Line

A shared informational phone line would provide potential users with the most convenient access to information on all transportation services in the county. The creation of a shared phone line is the most extensive of the efforts suggested under joint public relations because it would require a dedicated and knowledgeable customer service representative to answer the phone line. The phone number for this line could be distributed with all informational and marketing materials regarding transportation services.



Although an informational phone line is a more accessible version of the resource manual, it will take considerably more effort to implement. Either a new employee will have to be hired or an existing employee of one of the agencies will have to assume the responsibility for answering the informational line. The cost of one additional person for this function would be about \$32,000. This employee will have to be familiar with all of the transportation services in Boone County. Furthermore, the information line will be most useful to callers if the employee has knowledge about how users could best take advantage of the transportation resources in the county, such as by chaining trips of different providers together. In addition to the requirement of a dedicated employee to answer the phones, maintaining an informational phone line will also require consistent maintenance of the information available on each of the services to remain current. The customer service representative responsible for answering the phone line may also be able to take responsibility for collecting and maintaining that data.

The agency responsible for collecting and maintaining the data for the resource manual will likely be the most capable of taking responsibility for the informational phone line, especially if it is one of the larger transportation providers. The larger transportation providers—such as Columbia Transit and OATS—have larger staffs, resources, and institutional infrastructures than the smaller agencies, many of which don't provide transportation as their primary function. One of the larger agencies may also have the ability to train and room to house a shared customer service representative.

The primary cost associated with an informational phone line is for the salary and benefits of a customer service representative. This cost may be reduced if an existing employee of one of the providers was able to assume the additional responsibility of answering the informational phone line. An employee already tasked with responding to phone calls to the public may be able to handle additional calls from the proposed line. In return for providing this service for all of the agencies, the participating agencies could help pay for a portion of the salary and benefits of the employee. If no existing employee was capable of taking on the additional responsibility, a new employee would need to be hired and all agencies would need to share the cost. In this case, it may be warranted for the larger agencies to pay for a greater share of the cost, especially if it is found that they generate more informational requests. Additional costs would include the added staff time required to maintain the information on different services, which would depend on how frequently providers changed their services.

There are many examples of one-call centers. The RTP in Portland, Maine described in the section on brochures is one example of a single telephone number for transportation information and services. The Potomac and Rappahannock Transportation Commission (PRTC) in Woodbridge, Virginia is another example. The PRTC call center was established in 1995 and handles approximately 400 calls a day. PRTC provides fixed-route commuter service, shuttles to Metrorail stations, flex-route and subscription demand-response service, and rideshare matching service.

Summary

All four of the proposed public relations and marketing activities have the ability to benefit both riders and the participating agencies. Within Boone County, transit users and potential users have numerous transportation resources available to them. Some of these services offer broad service and are well known while others cater to specific populations. Despite all of these individual service providers, there is no countywide system. Riders are left on their own to piece together different services to meet their transportation needs. Having information on all of the different services provided in one location will make it easier for riders to find ways to get to their destinations when they need to. The easier it is to access this infor-

Potential for Coordination

mation and the more the services are marketed together, the easier it will be for riders to find the service that best accommodates their needs or to rely on multiple services.

The transportation providers who participate in joint public relations and marketing efforts also stand to benefit. By aiding their riders in understanding how each service relates to one another, it may be possible for riders to make better use of the system, which will potentially increase ridership. Having all of the agencies combining their resources for marketing purposes will enable each small service provider to reach a larger audience at a cost not possible if they acted on their own. Providing potential riders with information on all services may also result in a more efficient use of resources across the public transportation network.

In addition to the operational benefits, this basic coordination will provide agencies with the opportunity to compare services and find common ground for future coordination. Currently, the numerous service providers do not coordinate their services and many are apprehensive about coordination. Bringing transportation providers together to share information and build relationships with one another may serve as a foundation for more extensive coordination. If Boone County service providers accomplish coordination of basic public relations efforts, there may be a foundation for eventually transitioning from a shared phone line into a central reservation line and dispatch center.

Coordinate with Other Modes of Transportation

Basic coordination regarding public relations provides a means to bring public transportation providers together to discuss their services and share information. Increasing communication



among service providers has the potential to build a foundation for more extensive coordination in the future. Furthermore, providing an opportunity for agencies to discuss their services and overlapping interests may motivate individual agencies to make changes to better coordinate their services with others on their own. While these efforts will improve coordination among public transportation providers in the county, the public transportation system will also benefit from discussions

between public transportation providers and providers of other modes of transportation, specifically pedestrian, bicycle, taxi, and private bus.

Coordinating with these other modes of transportation can begin with discussions about current services and facilities, as well as future plans. At the most basic level these discussions may not be able to motivate immediate action, but they can broaden the considerations each individual agency, company, or municipality takes into account as they plan for the future. It is possible for public transportation providers to enter into discussions with providers of other modes of transportation as a group or on their own. Because they have the largest ridership, Columbia Transit and OATS will likely have the best success of coordinating with other agencies, companies, and municipalities if they enter into their own discussions.

Pedestrian and Bicycle

Almost all public transportation trips begin and end as pedestrian or bicycle trips as transit riders travel to or from transit service. Pedestrian and bicycle facilities are generally constructed and maintained by municipalities, although private landowners may also provide such facilities on their property. Local municipalities are continuously maintaining and improving their pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and transit services are continuously evaluating their service and schedules. Transportation providers meeting with representatives of municipalities regarding coordination between public transportation and pedestrian and bicycle facilities will enable both groups to make more informed decisions in the future about how to make changes and improvements. These discussions can address both specific needs, such as a lack of sidewalk access to a bus stop, and general future plans, such as a new bus route or development. This is a particularly timely strategy to consider for Columbia as the community has received a grant specifically to enhance non-motorized transportation. As the City develops plans for non-motorized transportation facilities, coordination with public and human services transportation providers should be an important element of the process.

In addition to holding discussions with municipalities, the transportation providers can take steps to make it easier for riders to use bicycles in conjunction with

Potential for Coordination

public transportation. Transit services, especially those catering to the general public, can install bicycle racks on their vehicles, such as those on all Columbia Transit vehicles. This will make it possible for riders to use a bicycle to access both the transit service as well as their destination. Public transportation providers could further enhance the ability of riders to incorporate bicycles into their trips by installing bike lockers and racks at major transit facilities, such as transfer centers and popular bus stops. Municipalities may be willing to install bike lockers or racks near transit facilities as well as near other popular destinations.

Major capital improvement projects within a municipality such as the construction of a new side walk or a bike lane can be costly. Although these improvements may be necessary to improve the integration of the pedestrian, bicycle, and public transportation networks, it is unlikely that any such projects will be undertaken as an immediate result of coordination discussions. Instead, as municipalities improve their infrastructure, they can include the ability of improvements to provide better coordination to other forms of transportation as a consideration in their decision to allocate resources. Over time as the pedestrian, bicycle, and public transportation systems begin to reflect consideration of one another in their planning, the general transportation system will become better coordinated.

The immediate costs incurred by transportation providers coordinating with these modes of travel would be based on the decision to install bicycle racks on vehicles and facilities at bus stops. There are numerous brands and varieties of bicycle racks for vehicles and parking facilities for securing bikes, which provide opportunities



to fit different sized budgets. Bicycle racks enable transit vehicles to carry limited number of bicycles (usually two or three) and cost approximately \$600 each.² Columbia Transit's vehicles are all already equipped with bicycle racks. If OATS were to install this equipment on its 14 vehicles, it would cost approximately \$8,400. Other transportation providers could also install bike racks on their vehicles.

² Marni Leff, "Sales keep rolling along for maker of Bike-Rack-for-Buses," at seattlepi.nwsource.com/business/63174_bend21.shtml.

An additional improvement would be to provide more official places for riders to securely lock their bicycles, especially near major Columbia Transit bus stops. There are several different types of facilities designed for securing bicycles, including a simple lockpoint or more sophisticated bike lockers. A lockpoint provides a secured metal structure to lock a bike and costs approximately \$150 per lockpoint. Bicycle lockers provide each user with an enclosed space to lock a bike and cost approximately \$1,300 per locker. The total cost for bike facilities would depend on how many places facilities were installed, the type of facilities, and the number of bikes to be accommodated.

There are potential sources of federal funding for bicycle facility improvements within the public transportation system. FTA Section 5309 capital grants provide up to 80 percent of funding for capital transit projects. FTA Section 5319 funding may be used for bicycle facilities. The federal government also initiated a Non-motorized Transportation Pilot Program in four communities, including Columbia, Missouri. This grant program provides funds for projects that contribute to the nonmotorized transportation infrastructure.³ These funding sources have the potential to reduce the funding share required of the individual agencies.



Improving coordination between public transportation and the pedestrian and bicycle systems will foremost benefit transit riders. By improving access between transit stops and destinations, these coordination efforts have the potential to make it easier for transit users to access jobs and essential services. This is especially important in the rural parts of the county, where destinations are spread out and pedestrian infrastructure is less extensive. The ability for a rider to use a bike as part of a transit trip extends the distance they are able to travel or reduces the total time of travel. Although the benefit to the environment may be inconsequential, the ability to use a bicycle in conjunction with transit may also allow an individual the opportunity to avoid using a car.

3

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, at www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bikeped/legtealu.htm.

Potential for Coordination

Other communities have taken steps to better coordinate their nonmotorized and public transportation systems. Ann Arbor, Michigan—a small midwestern city with a large university—recently completed the Ann Arbor Nonmotorized Transportation Plan.⁴ A component of the vision of the plan is to improve pedestrian and bicycle transportation so that residents will have the ability to choose to use public transportation.

Private Transportation

The public transportation providers could also loosely coordinate with private transportation providers, such as Greyhound or the various taxi services, by sharing information. This type of coordination is not unlike the basic coordination proposed for the public transportation providers. All of the transportation providers could share information about their services. This may reveal opportunities to better coordinate services in the future as minor schedule and operational changes are considered. For instance, OATS could decide to meet select intercity (Greyhound) trips or Greyhound could notify OATS if a passenger wanted to make a connection. The different providers could also provide links to one another's websites and provide information at each other's facilities. This type of coordination could make transferring between these modes of transportation easier for customers.

Similar to basic coordination efforts among the public transportation operators, basic coordination efforts between public and private transportation providers would provide the foundation for more extensive coordination in the future. For example, more extensive coordination in the future could result in Columbia Transit sharing its transfer center—Wabash Station—with Greyhound. This would create a multimodal facility where riders could access local, regional, and national bus service. If Greyhound agreed to use Wabash Station, Columbia Transit could consider acting as the agent, which would permit it to collect associated fees. Sharing its space with Greyhound could generate additional revenue for Columbia Transit while offering better coordinated bus service for its customers. Two

4

The Greenway Collaborative, Inc., at www.greenwaycollab.com/images/AANoMo/AANoMo%20Master%20Plan%20Complete%20PRD%2010-6-05.pdf.

examples where the local public transit system serves as the intercity bus ticket agent are in Pocatello, Idaho and Helena, Montana.

Summary

The identified basic coordination efforts provide the most obvious and attainable forms of coordination for transportation providers in Boone County. These activities are relatively inexpensive and do not require any major service or institutional changes. These activities have the ability to both improve the usability of the entire transportation network for transit users and to provide the basis for more extensive coordination in the future. While these efforts will not necessarily lead to more extensive coordination, they will help agencies to make more informed decisions about coordinating with one another. Furthermore, many of the agencies, including Columbia Transit and OATS, have already expressed interest in exploring these types of options for countywide marketing and coordinating schedules.

EXTENSIVE COORDINATION

The extensive coordination scenarios require more effort, change, and funding than those described in the basic coordination section. Although these coordination scenarios require more work, they have greater potential benefits, both for agencies and riders. There are two general categories of extensive coordination scenarios presented in this section—coordination and consolidation. Coordination scenarios provide opportunities for service providers to closely coordinate their services while continuing to directly operate their services, whereas consolidation scenarios result in the operation of transportation services under a single agency.

Coordination

Brokerage/Lead Agency

The creation of a brokerage or lead agency would enable all of the transportation providers to closely coordinate their services while retaining their own services and identities. A brokerage agency could be developed separately or as part of an existing agency. The central function of the brokerage agency would be to operate a central reservation and dispatch center for all of the county's services. Potential riders could call one toll-free phone number and have the ability to make a reser-

Potential for Coordination

vation or receive information on any transit or paratransit service in the county. With the acquisition of reservation software, the lead agency could direct individuals in need of rides to the most appropriate service and provide agencies with the most efficient routes of travel. This scenario could develop out of the shared informational phone line described in the basic coordination section.

The ability of a brokerage agency to effectively manage reservations and dispatch vehicles for multiple services will require the purchase and implementation of reservation and dispatch software. This software will be necessary for the brokerage agency to administer trips for multiple agencies with minimal staff. The performance of the reservation software will be further enhanced by the installation of mobile data terminals (MDT) and automatic vehicle location systems (AVL). These pieces of hardware would enable drivers and dispatchers to communicate essential information.



It is possible for any of the smaller transportation providers to form a brokerage for transportation services. The ability of a group of transportation providers to create a brokerage or to coordinate under a lead agency is improved if an agency with the necessary experience and existing infrastructure is able to assume the role of lead agency. Boone County has three agencies that could potentially fill this role—Columbia Transit, OATS, or the Boone County Community Partnership (BCCP). Although BCCP is the only one of the three that does not currently provide transit service, the agency could still lead the coordination effort. As the two largest transit operators in the county, both Columbia Transit and OATS already have experience and infrastructure that would place them in a position to take reservations and dispatch vehicles for paratransit service. Columbia Transit is in the process of acquiring the RouteMatch software program which has the capability to provide scheduling and dispatching service for all of the providers. In addition to these potential lead agencies, all other service providers could join this coordination effort. Even agencies that do not participate in the reservation and dispatch system could have their information made available to callers.

The lead agency will not only gain the responsibility of managing reservations and dispatching, it will also be responsible for reporting the activities of the brokerage

service to member agencies as well as various federal, state, and local agencies. The creation of a brokerage agency will also require the lead agency to contract with all member agencies to explicitly state what services will be provided at what costs.

The primary costs associated with creating a coordinated public transportation system under a lead agency or brokerage system are related to the software, hardware, and staff requirements of implementing the reservation and dispatch center. A geographic information system (GIS)-based reservation and dispatch software system can be a considerable investment. An accurate cost estimate is difficult to determine for such a system because each software package is custom built to the needs and resources of individual clients. Columbia Transit is in the process of implementing RouteMatch for scheduling and dispatch. There would be additional costs to integrate additional providers. The associated vehicle hardware costs approximately \$3,700 for an MDT unit, GPS antennae, and associated hardware, plus approximately \$750 for installation. If all of the vehicles for just the two major transit operators—Columbia Transit (30 vehicles) and OATS (14 vehicles)—received this equipment, it would have a one-time capital cost of approximately \$200,000. This cost would increase if additional vehicles from other services were outfitted with the equipment. These systems would also require annual maintenance and could incur ongoing operating costs.

Additionally, existing staff from one of the transit agencies would need to be supplemented and reorganized to handle reservation and dispatch responsibilities for all of the transportation providers. Three full-time (40 hours per week) and two part-time (25 hours per week) dispatchers could provide service 12 hours per day, seven days per week. The cost of employing five dispatchers would depend on the pay scale and benefits of the agency, but assuming a base full-time salary of \$23,500 plus a 40 percent benefit markup and a base part-time salary of \$14,700 plus a 10 percent benefit markup would result in total annual staffing costs of approximately \$131,000 for this scenario. These costs for equipment and staff would be shared by all participating agencies. The local share of the total costs may be reduced through federal capital and operating grants, such as Sections

Potential for Coordination

5307, 5309, 5310, and 5311 grants, and other funding sources, such as the Community Transportation Association of America and Easter Seals.

Although there are significant costs associated with initiating coordination under a brokerage agency, there are numerous benefits to such a technologically-advanced coordination effort. A central reservation system relying on reservation and dispatch software will increase the efficiency of the total system by spreading trips throughout the system and helping each agency to optimize their routes. Additionally, it will make the system easier to use for riders and more responsive to their needs. Since demand for transportation services exceeds the capacity of current services, these gains in efficiency will enable the system to meet more of the demand. Although, this may limit the ability of efficiency gains to reduce the number of vehicles operating in the region, increasing ridership may result in a lower cost per trip and a reduction in the distance traveled per trip. Sharing reservation and dispatch service also has the potential to reduce the per agency cost of managing their service by eliminating duplication of administrative services.

Many other communities have been moving to a brokerage style of coordination. For example, the State of Georgia implemented a brokerage system which resulted in better coordination between human services agencies and transit providers. This coordination created a more efficient use of transportation resources and increased access throughout the state.⁵ Missouri has established a brokerage system for all Medicaid transportation. Sedgwick County, Kansas has a brokerage system operated by the Department on Aging. Transportation services are provided for the general public, elderly residents, and persons with disabilities. The brokerage provides some service directly and contracts for service with local taxis and other agencies. The ACCESS program in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania serves seniors and persons with disabilities. Working with the Port Authority of Allegheny County, ACCESS has saved costs by sharing administrative costs and coordinating transportation services.

Although there is the potential to benefit both riders and agencies, this form of coordination is not likely in the near future in Boone County. Both the costs

⁵ United We Ride at www.unitedweride.gov?Brokerage_Brochure.doc.

associated with a central reservation and dispatch center and the reliance of all providers on a single agency for their daily administration will make it difficult to attract agencies to this scenario before broader support for coordination has been created.

Columbia Transit Contracts with OATS for Paratransit Service

The majority of paratransit service in Boone County is provided by the two largest transit services—Columbia Transit and OATS. Columbia Transit provides ADA-paratransit service within three-quarters of a mile of its fixed routes, as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act. Service is provided in other areas of Columbia on a space-available basis. OATS provides paratransit service for the disabled and elderly in the remainder of the county and service for the general public in rural portions of Boone County. By having Columbia Transit contract with OATS to provide all paratransit service, these agencies may be able to provide a more integrated paratransit service at a reduced operating cost.



A coordinated system where Columbia Transit operated fixed-route service and OATS operated paratransit service in Boone County could form the basis for a coordinated regional transit system. This arrangement would require a negotiated agreement between Columbia Transit and OATS regarding the exact service OATS would provide for Columbia Transit to ensure the fulfillment of Columbia Transit's obligation to provide ADA-paratransit service in the vicinity of its fixed routes.

By contracting out their service to OATS, Columbia Transit may be able to reduce their paratransit operating costs or increase the amount of service for the same cost. Columbia Transit provides approximately 24,000 annual paratransit trips at a cost of \$27.37 per trip. OATS provides paratransit service to the remainder of the county at a considerably reduced cost; OATS serves approximately 35,000 annual trips at a cost of \$14.66 per trip. The cost to operate OATS is approximately \$25 per service-hour while the cost of Columbia Transit's paratransit service is approximately \$48 per service-hour. Columbia Transit's paratransit costs total approximately \$650,000 per year. While it may not be possible for OATS to provide

Potential for Coordination

the paratransit service for Columbia at their current costs, there is a potential for lower costs if Columbia Transit contracted with OATS for all or a portion of their paratransit operations. Additional cost savings could be experienced because of less duplication of service and greater operating efficiencies. This savings could make it possible for Columbia Transit to expand their ADA-paratransit service while still realizing savings.

Coordinated service between Columbia Transit and OATS has the potential to not only reduce operating costs, but also to benefit riders. A single operator providing the majority of general paratransit service in the county and increased coordination with the fixed-route system will make it easier for riders to travel throughout the county and transfer between systems. Operating paratransit service under one operator also has the ability to increase the efficiency of the system. Similar to the brokerage system, efficiency increases may enable OATS to provide the same number of trips with less travel and potentially fewer vehicles. Since there is unmet transit demand, this added capacity will likely result in a ridership increase rather than a reduction in vehicles, which has the potential to decrease cost and amount of travel required per trip.

There are many examples of communities where paratransit service is provided by a private nonprofit agency under contract to the local transit agency. In Boulder, Colorado, Special Transit provides the complementary paratransit service under a contract with the Regional Transportation District (RTD).

Although this coordination opportunity has the potential to reduce operating costs for Columbia Transit, the city has not expressed interest in purchasing transportation from other providers. OATS has expressed a willingness to explore opportunities to provide transportation services for other agencies under contract. Since this effort depends on the willing participation of both agencies, it is not likely in the near future. However, since it has the opportunity to reduce costs significantly, it may be one of the most alluring coordination opportunities.

Consolidation

Consolidation of Rural Transit Services

Consolidation of transit services in Boone County is the most intense form of coordination presented in this chapter. Under this scenario, one agency would assume responsibility and management of all or most of the other transportation providers in the county. Participating agencies would turn over their vehicles, equipment, and other transportation-related assets to the agency assuming control and cease to engage in transportation activities. Within Boone County, only Columbia Transit or OATS have the experience and infrastructure to manage a countywide consolidated service.

The consolidation of several different transportation providers under one agency would require that the designated agency expand its infrastructure and staff to accommodate the new responsibilities. The titles to all state-owned vehicles would need to be transferred to the consolidated service and all other vehicles would need to be donated, leased, or sold to the consolidated service. The consolidated agency would contract with agencies around the county to ensure that service is provided to meet the needs of their constituents. The ability to operate all or many of the county's transportation services may require the consolidated agency to expand their facility to accommodate a larger vehicle fleet and additional staff. The single agency would also need to hire more operations employees (drivers, mechanics, managers, and dispatchers) to operate and oversee the increased service. The increased service provision may also require increasing administrative staff. However, total employment has the potential to be less than the aggregate number of employees currently providing service because of the efficiencies from consolidate service.

A consolidated service will generate new costs, but it also has the ability to reduce the overall amount of resources spent on transportation service operations in the county. A consolidated service would benefit from the same reservation and dispatch software recommended for the brokerage system. The associated vehicle hardware alone is estimated to cost approximately \$200,000 to equip Columbia Transit's and OATS' vehicles, plus the cost of the custom software.

Potential for Coordination

The consolidated agency would also have increased operating costs as a result of expanding service to cover the transportation responsibilities of all of the other services, which would be offset by contracting to provide services to those agencies involved in the consolidation. The cost of providing this additional service largely depends on which agency services would be consolidated under—Columbia Transit or OATS. Current operating costs of OATS are significantly lower than Columbia Transit. Other agencies within the county span a wide spectrum of operating costs, ranging from \$0.55 to over \$75.00 per trip. Therefore, some agencies may see increases in the cost required to provide service to their constituents while others may see decreases. Again, cost per trip calculations are questionable for some agencies, as actual number of one-way trips annually may not be accurate.

Taking on responsibility for providing the specialized services of some of the agencies may make it difficult for either Columbia Transit or OATS to provide those services at their current operating costs. The total costs of consolidating all services are dependent on multiple factors, many of which are unknown at this time. While the efficiency gains of operating all services through one agency may reduce total transportation costs in the future, there will be considerable initial costs associated with the restructuring of the transportation services.

A single consolidated transportation agency has the potential to increase efficiency by reducing duplication of service and administration. These improvements may enable the consolidated agency to improve the capacity of the public transportation system and reduce the cost of operation per trip by providing more trips with the same amount of resources. This added capacity will improve accessibility for transit users and make it easier for them to travel to jobs and services. Centralizing all transportation services under an agency specifically designed for the delivery of such service will also enable human service agencies to focus on their primary missions.

Merced, California combined four publicly-funded transit services into a single consolidated countywide system. The consolidation eliminated duplicate service, allowed for a more efficient distribution of transportation resources throughout the county, and reduced costs through the elimination of duplicate administrative

costs. This reorganization of service also enabled the system to increase service provided within the county while reducing costs.⁶ The State of Florida has established consolidated transportation services throughout the state, and the Montana Department of Transportation is in the process of establishing consolidated transportation systems.

The ability of the county to create a consolidated countywide transportation service depends on the participation of existing agencies. Since consolidation requires agencies to completely relinquish their role in transportation, it is understandable that agencies would be cautious about taking such a step. Based on the survey of transportation providers in Boone County, OATS and 16 smaller transportation providers were at least interested in the consolidation. Columbia Transit did not express interest in consolidation. As support for coordination grows in the county, it may be possible at a future date for OATS to consolidate with the smaller, rural transportation operations.

Develop a Regional Transit Authority for Columbia and Jefferson City

Another form of consolidating transportation services within the county would be to create a regional transit authority (RTA) covering Boone and Cole Counties. Each of these cities currently operates independent transit systems that do not provide intercounty service. The creation of an RTA could also potentially involve OATS to provide contract paratransit service throughout Boone and Cole Counties.

The ability of the two transit systems to come together as an RTA would require an act by the Missouri legislature. If such legislation were passed, the two organizations would then face the difficulty of merging two distinct, large transit operations. The RTA would have the jurisdiction to provide public transportation throughout Boone and Cole Counties. The RTA would continue to operate existing urban service in both cities and could begin to operate intercity, intercounty, and rural service. Under this scenario, the City of Columbia would lose some control over its transportation system as it would no longer be operated as a division of city government.

⁶ TCRP Report 54, *Management Toolkit for Small Urban and Rural Transit Operators*, at onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/tcrp/tcrp_rpt_54-b.pdf.

Potential for Coordination

The creation of an RTA has the potential to reduce the administrative costs for each transit agency, for example, by consolidating human resources, planning, or accounting departments. The expanded jurisdiction of an RTA over that of either individual agency would enable the agency the ability to provide more comprehensive regional service. The introduction of this additional service would increase the operating costs of the combined system. How much the added service would cost depends on how much service is added and the operating cost of the RTA. Columbia Transit currently operates at a cost of \$65.15 per revenue-hour for fixed-route service and \$48.13 per revenue-hour for paratransit service, but operating costs of the RTA may differ from this.

An RTA covering Boone and Cole Counties would provide transit-dependent populations with the ability to access jobs and services over a much larger area. The increased service area would also allow the RTA to garner more federal, state, and local transit funds to help cover the cost of the broader service. The development of an RTA would also provide increases in administrative efficiency by reducing duplicate administrative functions.

Cape Girardeau County recently consolidated their urban and rural transit service under the Cape Girardeau County Transit Authority. While it is too soon to evaluate the full benefits of this example, the county was motivated to combine services to increase ease of use and accessibility for users.

Since this study has largely dealt with the coordination of services within Boone County, it is unknown if JEFFTRAN (the transit agency in Jefferson City) would be interested in consolidating their service with Columbia Transit as an RTA. Columbia Transit has not expressed interest in consolidating their service. As stated previously, OATS is interested in providing contract paratransit service to other agencies. Improving coordination within the county may be the first step before coordination at a larger regional scale is possible.

Summary

Extensive coordination efforts are not likely to be implemented in the immediate future. This level of coordination requires the support of all the major service pro-

viders in the county. Although that support does not currently exist, there is support for more modest coordination efforts. By focusing coordination efforts in the county on initiating these more basic activities, it will be possible to build the foundation for these more extensive forms of coordination. Once the service providers have developed some experience with coordination and have seen its benefits, they may be more willing and interested in increasing to a higher level of coordination.

ENHANCED SERVICES

In exploring the opportunities and needs for the coordination of public transportation in Boone County, this study also revealed several opportunities and needs of enhanced services not necessarily associated with coordination. Although several of the identified enhanced services do not require coordination, coordination may provide strategies for attaining enhanced public transportation service in the county. It is also important to note that coordination of existing services alone does not have the ability to meet existing transit demand in the county. An assessment of transit demand conducted as part of this study revealed that 50 percent of maximum transit demand in Boone County is unmet with current service. Although it is not possible to meet 100 percent of maximum potential transit demand, it is possible to serve more of the demand. Coordination can help improve efficiency and provide more trips, but even with coordination efforts, unmet demand will exceed the capacity of the system. Expansion of service will also be required to serve more of the unmet demand.

Expand Columbia Transit Service Area in Columbia

Columbia Transit currently provides ADA-paratransit service within three-quarters of a mile of its fixed-route service as required by the Americans with Disability Act (ADA) with limited, space-available service in other areas of the city. While Columbia Transit's fixed-route and paratransit system provides access to many important destinations around the city, service is not available to other important destinations in the city, such as the dialysis treatment center. Providing extended fixed-route service within Columbia would result in broader paratransit service, which would benefit all transit riders. Unfortunately, some parts of the city may not be able to generate the level of ridership necessary to sustain fixed routes. For this

Potential for Coordination

reason, Columbia Transit could expand just its paratransit service area to include the entire city.

Expanding paratransit service to cover the entire city would require additional funding to pay for the staff and vehicles necessary to provide the expanded paratransit service. Columbia Transit operates their paratransit service at an operating cost of \$27.37 per trip and serves approximately 24,000 annual trips. Demand estimates for ADA paratransit service show that 15,000 to 32,000 additional trips could be made if service were available throughout the city. An additional 15,000 trips would cost about \$400,000 annually. If Columbia Transit served the additional 32,000 trips by expanding service, their paratransit costs would increase by approximately \$875,000 to \$1.5 million. This increase can be seen as the maximum increase in ridership and costs possible because it is unlikely that expanding the service area will meet all of the predicted ADA demand. Additionally, Columbia Transit would potentially need to double their paratransit fleet to serve the additional area, resulting in capital costs for the purchase of new vehicles.

As is the case with all transit agencies, Columbia Transit is tasked with providing transit service with levels of funding incapable of supporting services to meet all transit demand. Therefore, it will be difficult for Columbia Transit to take on service expansions without first identifying new sources of revenue to cover the costs of adding service. However, if Columbia Transit contracted with OATS to provide paratransit service as discussed previously, it is possible that the service could be expanded with no additional cost.

Expand Columbia Transit Service to Include Boone County

Columbia Transit, as a city transit system, currently limits its operations to destinations within the City of Columbia. By expanding the service area of Columbia Transit to include all of Boone County, it would be possible to create a countywide transit system. Increasing its service area to include Boone County would represent a major service expansion. The ability to serve the remainder of the county would require the development of a general demand-response or flex-route service for the outlying county.

The cost of Columbia Transit introducing countywide demand-response service is considerable. Columbia Transit operates its paratransit service at a cost of \$27.17 per trip. A rural transit demand estimate predicted the county would generate up to 131,000 rural transit trips. Approximately 59,000 of these trips are estimated to be non-program trips, which includes trips taken by seniors, persons with disabilities, and the general public. The remaining 72,000 trips are estimated to be program trips, or trips associated with specific programs or services. If Columbia Transit covered all of these trips at their current paratransit operating costs, it would cost the agency approximately \$3.5 million. This estimate is the upper bounds of possible ridership and cost increases. The actual costs would likely be lower since Columbia Transit would likely not capture 100 percent of the estimated demand and other transportation services already serve some of these trips. Columbia Transit could further reduce this cost by contracting out its paratransit service to OATS, which operates rural paratransit service at nearly half the cost (\$14.66 per trip). To meet the estimated rural transit demand, Columbia Transit would incur capital costs associated with the purchase of additional paratransit vehicles.

The high estimated costs associated with expanding Columbia Transit's service to cover all of Boone County makes this improvement unlikely in the near future, especially since transportation providers are already serving rural Boone County. The need for more extensive and integrated paratransit service in the outlying county could also be met through better coordination, which has the ability to increase the capacity of existing service and make transferring between services easier. Sharing the responsibility for providing and funding the service across multiple agencies will also make service improvements more palatable.

Extend Columbia Transit's Hours and Days of Operation

Existing transportation services have been unable to accommodate the demand for transit in Boone County. Besides expanding the service area, more of the demand could be met by expanding the hours and days of operation. Expanding Columbia Transit's evening service and introducing Sunday service would provide greater transportation choices, especially for residents with nontraditional work schedules.

Potential for Coordination

Similar to expanding the service area, expanding Columbia Transit's hours of operation would increase its cost of operation. Columbia Transit operates its fixed-route service at an average cost of \$65.15 per revenue-hour and a marginal cost of \$39.85 per revenue-hour. The bus system already operates during evenings on Thursday through Saturday. Extending operations by four hours per evening (until approximately 10:30 p.m.) on Monday through Wednesday on Routes 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 would add approximately 6,240 revenue-hours of service. This service improvement would cost approximately \$250,000 per year. Adding Sunday service from 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Routes 1, 2, 3, 4, and 6 would add approximately 3,640 revenue-hours of service, which would cost approximately \$145,000 per year. Operating paratransit service during these times would further increase the cost of operating evening and weekday service.

Intercity/Commuter Bus Service

Creating links via public transportation to other cities widens the job market available to Boone County residents and provides more transportation choices for commuting. Although Greyhound provides trips to Kansas City and St. Louis, Jefferson City—the closest city to Columbia (31 miles)—is not accessible by any public or private bus. Even without coordinating with JEFFTRAN (Jefferson City's transit agency), Columbia Transit could provide intercity service. Intercity service would be even more effective if it was coordinated with JEFFTRAN and Jefferson City.

If Columbia Transit provided eight trips between Columbia and Jefferson City over 12 revenue-hours per day and operated on weekdays, the service would add approximately 3,000 annual revenue-hours. Since Columbia Transit operates at a marginal cost of \$39.85 per revenue-hour, the additional service would cost an estimated \$120,000 per year. Although this service could expand commuting options for Boone County residents, it is unlikely that Columbia Transit will attempt long-distance service before expanding its service within the county.

Columbia Transit Coordinates with Private Transportation Companies

There is also an opportunity for expanding transportation service through coordination between Columbia Transit and private taxi companies. Access to public transportation in Columbia is limited to Columbia Transit's hours of operation. If Columbia Transit started a taxi voucher program, it could offer customers reduced-fare cab rides during the hours it was not operating. This strategy would provide limited night and weekend service without directly operating additional transit service. Through a taxi voucher program, Columbia Transit could potentially negotiate a set fare for voucher holders with a taxi company. The agency would then sell vouchers at a reduced cost to customers, covering the difference between the cost of the trip and the cost of the voucher.

The cost of a taxi voucher program depends on cost of the taxi service. Allowing multiple taxi companies to bid for the contract will help the transit agency to negotiate the best price possible for the service. The transit agency can also closely manage the costs by limiting how many vouchers it will make available to the public. The creation of a taxi voucher program is not likely in the near future since Columbia Transit has not expressed interest in purchasing transportation from other service providers and there are opportunities to use additional funding to enhance their directly-operated service.

Summary

Improving public transportation service in Boone County will enable more residents to access jobs, services, and stores on their own schedules. Regardless of what types of coordination Boone County service providers decide to pursue, continually developing services to better meet the needs of residents should remain a goal. Columbia Transit has not conducted a thorough operational analysis for a number of years. One strategy to improve service would be to complete an operational analysis and transit development plan to determine if there are changes which could be made to better serve the community. It may be possible to restructure the system to serve new areas or better serve existing areas by eliminating some services that are duplicated or inefficient. This will enable Columbia Transit to serve more of the unmet transit demand in the city and potentially meet

some of the demand in the county. In some cases, coordination may provide a means to achieve the identified enhanced services.

CONCLUSION

Coordination can be a difficult process, especially when agencies are coming together for the first time. There are valid reasons why each agency should come to the table cautiously. Coordinating with other agencies has the potential to jeopardize the service each agency individually provides, potentially leaving their customers and constituents stranded. Maintaining the status quo may not be the most efficient use of transportation resources across the county, but at least each agency knows what to expect. Despite the perceived risks associated with coordination, there are also substantial benefits associated with coordination, both for riders and agencies. Riders can benefit from a unified system that can provide seamless and often increased service. Agencies can improve their efficiency and costs by reducing the duplication of service and administration. In some places coordination has enabled agencies to serve the same number of trips with fewer vehicles. In Boone County, since unmet transit demand appears high, it will be possible to increase capacity and serve more trips with the same amount of resources.



Few if any Boone County service providers are ready for extensive coordination activities, but most, including Columbia Transit and OATS, are at least interested in exploring more basic coordination efforts. These basic coordination efforts cannot deliver the same benefits as the more extensive coordination scenarios, but they will provide more modest benefits and opportunities to work together. As agencies develop relationships and become more familiar with one another's services, they may become willing to try more advanced levels of coordination. Building off of the foundation laid by the basic coordination of joint public relations, it may be possible for the agencies to develop into a fully coordinated countywide system under a brokerage agency some day. With each step toward a more coordinated system, the service available in the county stands to improve, providing better service to riders.

Table XIV-1 provides a summary of the various coordination strategies. For each strategy, the relative cost, level of effort, and potential benefits are identified. For most, the cost of implementation will depend on the specific approach to implementation of that strategy. For example, establishment of a consolidated telephone reservations and dispatch center could have a very low cost if it is set up with one of the existing transit providers. If the center is set up in a new location with new staff, the costs for office space, equipment, and staff could be significant.

Table XIV-1 Summary of Coordination Strategies			
Strategy	Relative Cost	Level of Effort to Implement	Potential Benefits
Inclusive Brochure	Low	Moderate	Better information for users
Resource Manual	Low	Moderate	Easier sharing of information Better service for users
Common Brochure	Moderate	Moderate	Better information for users
Information Phone Line	Low	Low	Single point of contact Better service for users Potential cost savings
Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities	Low to Moderate	Low	Better access for passengers
Brokerage/Lead Agency	Moderate	High	Efficiency Better service Potential cost savings
Contract for Paratransit Service	Low	High	Efficiency Potential cost savings
Consolidate Services	Low	High	Efficiency Increased service opportunities for users Potential cost savings
Regional Transit Authority	Moderate	High	Regional service Increased service
Expand Columbia Transit Service Area	High	Moderate	Additional service
Extend Columbia Transit Hours and Days of Operation	High	Moderate	Additional service
Commuter Bus Service	Moderate	Moderate	Additional regional service
Coordinate with Private Companies	Low	Low	Increased opportunities for service Potential cost savings