

# Meeting Summary

**Subject:** SCTA Microtransit Feasibility Study – Steering Committee Meeting #3

**Date/Time:** July 21, 2025, 8:30 am – 10:00 am

**Location:** Teams Meeting

## Attendees

Name	Organization	Name	Organization
Joy Ashley	SCTA Board Member, Director of Mainspring of Ephrata	Ray D’Agostino	County Commissioner, MPO member
Sandy Burke	SCTA Board Member	Keith Boatman	SCTA
George Tobler	VisionCorps	Jen Boley	SCTA
Ashley Bulley	ECHOS	Natasha Halulakos	SCTA
Kat Desantis	Lancaster Chamber	David Avery	SCTA
Mike Hession	Denver Borough Chamber	Gregory Downing	SCTA
Scott Peiffer	Quarryville Borough Manager	Tyler Beduhn	Kimley-Horn (Project Manager)
Brian Harris	Warwick Township Manager	Lauren Ledesma	Kimley-Horn

## Action Tracker

Action Item	Responsible	Target Completion	Status
T. Beduhn to share today’s meeting slides.	Kimley-Horn	7/21	Completed
T. Beduhn to share meeting notes summary.	Kimley-Horn	7/28	Completed
Include home zip code data with responses of zone preferences in the Round 1 outreach summary document.	Kimley-Horn	7/31	In Progress
Project team to follow up with industry standard wait times for point of decreased desirability.	Kimley-Horn	7/31	In Progress

Action Item	Responsible	Target Completion	Status
<b>Confirm if Millersville University's student population is included in the population numbers of the zone.</b>	Kimley-Horn	7/31	In Progress
<b>Include PennDOT performance metrics.</b>	Kimley-Horn	8/8	In Progress
<b>Provide questions or comments on zone analysis and prioritization material presented in recent deliverable and meeting slides.</b>	Steering Committee	8/1	In Progress

## Notes

The following notes accompany the meeting slides:

### Introduction

- T. Beduhn introduced the meeting agenda: Round 1 outreach summary, microtransit zone analysis findings, zone prioritization
- The Kimley-Horn team (Tyler and Lauren) and the Steering Committee (SC) members introduced themselves
- T. Beduhn provided an update on schedule timeline and progress since previous SC Meeting #2

### Round 1 Outreach Summary

- T. Beduhn reviewed completed components in Round 1 outreach campaign
- The public survey was open for eight weeks and received 788 responses. Half of respondents were not familiar with microtransit service. The survey included questions prioritizing which features and service elements are most important, as well as desirable zones and key destinations.
- More details can be found in the *Round 1 Outreach Summary* deliverable
- Based on survey feedback, the areas that received the most interest for microtransit were Lititz, Willow St-Strasburg-Outlets, Ephrata-Denver, with desired locations including connections to Lancaster City, grocery stores, medical providers, and shopping centers
- More details can be found in the *What We Heard* sheet posted on the study webpage
- Ray D'Agostino: Asked for clarity on what the survey question's intent was for, "If a microtransit service was available in these areas, which area(s) would help you travel?" If the service is available, would they use it in that area, or could it be somebody from another area saying they want to travel to the Lititz area?

- Response: T. Beduhn explained it could be both. The question's phrasing and intent was focused on service in that specific area, regardless of where they reside. Data to crosscheck where the responder's home zip code location is available. For Lititz particularly, the data showed more responses coming from people outside of the Lititz area, many from Lancaster City. There was no intended restriction on answering only to the zone around the area you live in. Team will include zip code travel patterns to the identified destination zones in the final Round 1 Outreach Summary document. The survey also asked about and reflected a favorable willingness to transfer between RRTA buses and microtransit if, for example, the zone does not cover their destination. T. Beduhn noted an important caveat is that this is a public opinion survey, summarizing the preferences and feedback of respondents (not necessarily statistically representative of entire population).
- Key points the team heard are how residents currently face transportation barriers and challenges. There is a strong interest in microtransit, and it's expressed in all 13 opportunity zones.

### Microtransit Zone Analysis Findings

- T. Beduhn reviewed the opportunity zones identification process, rooted in analyzing transit potential and need, existing service performance, travel patterns, and public feedback
- Evaluation utilized a two-stage scoring process. The initial screening evaluated the 13 opportunity zones using metrics like daily trips within and to/from the zone, transit need, bus connections, area not served by the bus, and public feedback.
- The top six zones were advanced from Round 1 along with two broader-area zones based on feedback from the SC at the last meeting
  - The 'Fixed-Route Connector' zone is intended to connect all the spokes of the Red Rose Transit network and covering areas that meet the typical density threshold for effective microtransit
  - The Countywide zone allows microtransit trips to occur between any two points within the county
- The top six zones (East Petersburg-East Hempfield, Lititz, Ephrata-Denver, Leola-Eden, Millersville, Columbia-Wrightsville) and the two wider-area zones from Steering Committee feedback advanced the second round of scoring and evaluation
- Ray D'Agostino: Requested a broader discussion on the initial screening results. Emphasized the importance of focusing on community needs, particularly given the public funding of the service. Stressed the goal of serving as many people as possible, especially those not currently served by the private sector. Expressed concern that some of the areas screened out through the prioritization process still have needs.

- Response: T. Beduhn reiterated the data-driven nature of the screening process, which balances demographic and socioeconomic indicators with input from the public and the Steering Committee. The Round 1 metrics, shaped by feedback to date, prioritized expanding service to areas without existing bus coverage that also demonstrated a clear transit need, while ensuring connectivity to the broader network. The criteria used align with the study's goals and stakeholder input. Importantly, if a zone does not advance, it does not negate the area's demonstrated need—it indicates that microtransit may not be the most effective solution relative to other areas. Future recommendations, to be addressed in the next task, will include considerations for zones that did not score as highly in this round.
- T. Beduhn presented details of each priority zone that advanced to Round 2 evaluation, highlighting the refined zone boundaries and area-specific statistics. Refer to the slide deck for more detailed breakdown.
- Joy Ashley: Asked for clarification on how the team refined zone boundaries.
  - Response: T. Beduhn answered the team initially started with generalized areas based on population and job density, transit need, and census demographics indicators associated with transit use. In the second round of analysis, the team analyzed travel patterns, points of interest, common trip generators, and public feedback of specific destinations they wanted to reach. The goal is to capture areas that have the ideal conditions to support microtransit while ensuring key destinations and connections to other forms of transit are served. Clarified it is common practice to adhere to municipal, census, or other justifiable boundaries.
- Ray D'Agostino: Asked if Millersville included Millersville University student population because it seems high.
  - Response: T. Beduhn will confirm if student population is included. Portions of high-density neighborhoods in Lancaster City in the northern end of the zone may account for the higher population too.
- Round 2 evaluation and prioritization measures are tied to the study's and previous TDP's goals and objectives of being effective, efficient, fiscally sustainable
- T. Beduhn provided context for the use of metric ranges, explaining that they reflect estimates based on simulations of both high and low ridership scenarios. The analysis focused on weekday service, which is considered the best practice for evaluating the suitability of microtransit before expanding investment to weekend service.
- A scorecard comparing daily ridership, wait time, vehicle needs, and annual cost across zones was reviewed. The estimated range of passengers per vehicle revenue hour and operating cost per passenger trip were reviewed and compared to SCTA's existing services.
- Greg Downing: Asked for clarity on vehicles needed metric. How did the team arrive at those numbers?

- Response: T. Beduhn explained that the vehicle count was derived using a simulation modeling tool developed by Kimley-Horn. The tool incorporates projected ridership and travel patterns, including both intra-zone trips and transfers to fixed-route bus service. A 20-minute target wait time—based on community feedback—was also factored into the model. The resulting vehicle estimates do not include spare vehicles. The analysis assumed the use of transit vans with a 9–10 seat capacity.
- Follow up question: Would extending the wait time reduce the number of vehicles needed?
  - Response: T. Beduhn confirmed that longer wait times (e.g., 30–45 minutes) would indeed reduce the number of vehicles required. Vehicle needs—and therefore costs—are driven by the number of vehicles estimated to be necessary during service hours. These service hours are determined by the destinations within each zone and observed travel patterns, which vary between zones.
- Mike Hession: Asked if there is an industry standard for wait time before we start to see ridership decrease for this type of service?
  - Response: T. Beduhn said we have data on reported wait times of other PA agencies, can also investigate typical wait times and when there is a drop in desirability or attractiveness of the service. The survey received most responses for a willingness to wait under 30 minutes; few responses received for beyond 40 minutes.
- Ray D’Agostino: Asked how daily ridership was estimated and whether a formula was used that incorporated the factors listed in the Round 1 screening evaluation table.
  - Response: T. Beduhn explained that the starting point was the total number of trips (across all travel modes) used in the Round 1 screening. From there, the team identified trips that could potentially be served by microtransit, based on origin-destination patterns and the ability to connect to RRTA bus routes for travel beyond the local zone. A capture rate—reflecting the transit mode share in Lancaster County and informed by peer agency experience—was applied, resulting in an estimated 0.3–0.4% of all trips. This range was used to estimate daily microtransit ridership.
- Greg Downing: Asked if some of these metrics are part of the PennDOT required metrics from all transit agencies in the state? Do we have other measures that the state and federal government require?
  - Response: T. Beduhn responded the team has the measures and data. Team will summarize the data to clearly address primary measures PennDOT uses and will ensure it is included in the updated technical deliverable for this task.

## Zone Prioritization

- The team used the Round 2 evaluation measures to rank the eight priority microtransit zones

- Ray D'Agostino: Noted that he will need additional time to digest today's data presentation. He said it's a good start to diving deeper into the information and being able to make the best decision possible moving forward.
  - Response: T. Beduhn said additions to the meeting deck compared to the task deliverable include relative comparisons to existing service as well as new visuals of data designed for easier understanding in a meeting setting. This deck will be shared and accompany the previously sent technical deck.

### **Next Steps**

- The project team is preparing for the next technical tasks 7 and 8 and recommendations and performance monitoring. Feedback from the Steering Committee is welcomed by the end of the month (Friday, August 1) for this slide deck and the previously shared technical deliverable.
- In the next tasks, the project team will provide guidance on high and low priority zones, develop more definitive investment needs, recommend customer education, and outreach activities, and recommend metrics for performance monitoring.
- The project team will share a draft study report for the Steering Committee's review in September.
- The Steering Committee will reconvene in October for Meeting #4, and updates and draft deliverables will be provided in the meantime.

### **Open Discussion and Q&A**

- Ray D'Agostino: Mentioned it's important to get feedback from the people who did not participate in this meeting.
  - Response: T. Beduhn agreed
- Greg Downing: How long/timeframe are we giving people to provide feedback after this meeting?
  - Response: T. Beduhn confirmed the SC should send feedback by Friday, August 1 to allow the study team to keep moving forward and stay on track.