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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
Technical Approach

- 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 zone prioritization
   • Held MPO Working Group Work 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 MPO Working Group work session to discuss each zone’s readiness for implementation
5. Developed pilot recommendations
Findings & Recommendations
Pilot Readiness Factor Considerations:

- Unmet transportation need
- Political support
- Resources to market and educate

### Short Term vs Medium Term

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

**Year 1 (Pilot) Operating Cost Estimate Range:** $1.5 M - $3.1 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 (East) (Chesterfield County) | Model: GRTC-operated  
Cost: $475,700 - $634,300 | - Identified among top priorities by Chesterfield County. Serves apartments, shopping centers, supermarkets. |
Next Steps
Next Steps

• Update to CVTA
• Begin Phase 2 Study – Pilot implementation planning, including coordination with jurisdictional partners
• Funding
• Launch Pilot FY24
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