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About Micro-Transit
What is Micro-Transit?

• Technology-enabled, on-demand public transportation service, using smaller vehicles
  • Technology features like Uber/Lyft (book ride from your phone, track vehicle location, etc.)
  • Call-in option available for riders without smartphones
  • All trips would be eligible for sharing (no guarantee of a private trip)
  • Fare will be affordable (possibly comparable to fixed-route) – no decision on exact fares has been made at this time
  • Service would be available to the general public; no conditions
Key Considerations for Micro-Transit Service

• Micro-transit is typically **most suitable** in locations **where the need for transit among the population is higher** (low-income households, zero-car households, etc.), but **feasibility for fixed-route bus service is lower** (i.e., lower density).

• The on-demand nature of micro-transit requires enough activity that the vehicles can be kept in service nearly continuously for the service to be productive. In highly rural areas, pre-scheduled services may be more likely to be productive.

• Micro-transit is a very flexible and customizable service and can provide insights into where there is previously-unidentified demand.
About the Study
About the Study

• Purpose: Identify locations in the region where on-demand micro-transit would be a feasible and beneficial service and identify where, when, and how it should operate.

• Elements:
  • Engagement: Public survey, interviews and meetings with jurisdictions, providers, and other stakeholders
  • Quantitative analysis: Demographic, market, and travel pattern analyses
  • Qualitative analysis: Literature and best practices reviews, peer agency interviews
Engagement

• Public Survey to Understand Public Priorities
  • High level of interest in micro-transit service; over a third indicated they would use it at least once a week.
  • Reliability and cost were the most important factors to consider for the service.
  • About 80 percent of respondents were willing to pay up to $6 per trip and wait up to 20 minutes for a ride.
  • Most respondents said they are comfortable with app-based booking.

• Interviews with the region’s major providers (Access Chesterfield, Bay Transit, GRTC CARE, Hanover DASH) to understand current operations and conditions

• Meetings with each of the nine jurisdictions to share information about the study and show suitability analysis results to gather input

• Two RRTPO Public Transportation Working Group meetings / work sessions to gather input, discuss readiness and collaboration opportunities.

• GRTC Board briefings throughout the project
Conducted analyses to identify locations in the region with appropriate conditions for micro-transit, including different use cases (e.g., internal circulation versus connections to the bus network).

- Qualitative – Based on input from jurisdictions and understanding of best practices from literature review and 7 peer agency interviews.

- Quantitative – Heavily informed by data on population need (low-income and zero-car households, people with disabilities, etc.), destination locations, and trip patterns indicating where there is demand for service.
Steps:
1. Identified potential zones based on suitability
   • Held meetings with each jurisdiction to gather input
2. Refined zones and conducted data-driven prioritization of zones for further study
   • Held Public Transportation Working Group Session to gather input on top priority zones
3. Identified vehicle requirements and costs for each zone based on provider/service model recommendations (also developed)
4. Made boundary adjustments, developed short list of higher priority zones for further consideration, refined cost estimates
   • Held Public Transportation Working Group work session to discuss each zone’s readiness for implementation
5. Developed pilot recommendations
Findings & Recommendations
Pilot Recommendations

Pilot-readiness factor considerations:
• Unmet transportation need
• Political support
• Resources to market and educate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Term</th>
<th>Medium Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Year (Pilot)</td>
<td>3-5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Washington Park – Azalea Ave</td>
<td>• Short Pump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ashland</td>
<td>• Innsbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sandston-Elko</td>
<td>• Midlothian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Powhatan</td>
<td>• Brandermill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• North Chesterfield – West</td>
<td>• North Chesterfield – East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• North Chesterfield – East</td>
<td>• Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Years</td>
<td>5+ Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providence Forge – Ruthville</td>
<td>• Woodlake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hanover/Mechanicsville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Matoaca-Ettrick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Chester and Chesterfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court House</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Goochland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year 1 (Pilot) Operating Cost Estimate Range: $1.56 M - $3.15 M
# About the Proposed Pilot Zones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Micro-Transit Zone</th>
<th>Service Model and Cost Range</th>
<th>Key Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Washington Park – Azalea Ave (Henrico County)** | Model: GRTC-operated  
Cost: $285,200 - $570,300 | ▪ Potential to replace underperforming fixed route service (Route 93)  
▪ Following initial implementation, potential to expand into Hanover County (Mechanicsville area) to enhance regional connections |
| **Ashland (Hanover County)** | Model: Third party-operated  
Cost: $299,600 - $839,100 | ▪ Need for public transportation in the area has been recognized since at least 2008. Service would provide circulation to destinations in central Ashland and nearby.  
▪ Community confirmed high level of readiness and support for the service |
| **Sandston-Elko (New Kent and Henrico Counties)** | Model: GRTC-operated  
Cost: $229,900 - $364,700 | ▪ Covers areas in New Kent and Henrico Counties, including shopping, healthcare, and government destinations  
▪ Serves area with recognized public transportation need |
| **Powhatan (Powhatan County)** | Model: Third party-operated  
Cost: $214,200 - $531,200 | ▪ Serves major Powhatan County destinations along Route 60, as well as residential areas to the northeast |
| **North Chesterfield – West (Chesterfield County)** | Model: GRTC-operated  
Cost: $554,500 - $839,900 | ▪ Identified among top priorities by Chesterfield County. Serves apartments, shopping centers, supermarkets. |
**Washington Park - Azalea Avenue**

- **Use Case:**
  - New Service / Neighborhood Circulation
  - Fixed-Route Replacement (Route 93)

- **Key Activity Centers:**
  - Brookhill Azalea Shopping Center
  - Senior Apartments
  - Future: Amazon Facility
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**Service Area Characteristics**
- Composite Score: 8.3/10
- Area (sq. mi.): 4.6
- Population: 16,756
- Jobs: 7,314
- Low-Income Pop.: 4,241
- Minority Pop.: 1,142

**Service Characteristics**
- Span of Service (Mon. - Sat.): 6:00 AM - 11:59 PM
- Vehicles Needed: 1 - 2
- Estimated Annual Operating Cost: $278,300 - $556,600

**Operator**: GRTC

**Attractions**
- Community: 6
- Housing: 12
- Medical: 1
- Shopping: 12
- Education: 3
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**Zone: Washington Park-Azalea Ave**
Ashland

- **Use Case:**
  - New Service / Neighborhood Circulation

- **Key Activity Centers:**
  - Randolph-Macon College
  - Ashland Junction Shopping Center
  - Ashland Hanover Shopping Center

---

**Service Area Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composite Score</th>
<th>11 / 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area (sq. mi.)</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>15,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>18,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Pop.</td>
<td>1,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Pop.</td>
<td>4,051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Service Characteristics**

- Span of Service (Mon - Sat): 6:30 AM - 11:59 PM
- Vehicles Needed: 1 - 3
- Estimated Annual Operating Cost: $299,600 - $836,100
- Operator: Third Party

**Attractions**

- Community: 22
- Housing: 12
- Medical: 9
- Shopping: 28
- Education: 13

---

**Zone: Ashland**

- Randolph-Macon College
- Ashland Junction Shopping Center
- Ashland Hanover Shopping Center
Sandston-Elko

- **Use Cases:**
  - New Service / Neighborhood Circulation
  - First / Last Mile Connections

- **Key Activity Centers:**
  - Social Security Office
  - VCU Health Emergency Center
  - Food Lions on US 60 and New Kent Highway

### Zone: Sandston-Elko

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area Characteristics</th>
<th>Service Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite Score 23 / 30</td>
<td>Area (sq. mi.) 19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population 15,844</td>
<td>Jobs 3,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Pct. 1,840</td>
<td>Minority Pct. 4,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Span of Service (Mon. - Sat.):** 6:30 AM - 9:00 PM
- **Vehicles Needed:** 1 - 2
- **Estimated Annual Operating Cost:** $224,400 - $305,900
- **Operator:** GRTC

#### Attractions
- Community: 8
- Housing: 4
- Medical: 21
- Shopping: 9
- Education: 1

Potential: GRTC Routes
Powhatan

- Use Case:
  - New Service / Neighborhood Circulation
- Key Activity Centers:
  - Powhatan Plaza
  - Powhatan County Library
North Chesterfield (West)

• Use Case:
  • New Service / Neighborhood Circulation
  • First / Last Mile Connections (Commuter)

• Key Activity Centers:
  • Commonwealth Center Mall
  • Shopping centers along Route 360 (including supermarkets and medical offices)
Next Steps
Next Steps

• Begin Phase 2 Study – Pilot implementation planning, including coordination with jurisdictional partners

• Funding
  • Successful TRIP application
  • COVID relief funds

• Launch Pilot FY24

• For more information, please see GRTC’s microtransit study webpage
Thank You!

For more information, contact:

Adrienne Torres
Chief Development Officer
(804) 474-9798
adrienne.torres@ridegrtc.com