

Meeting Summary

Subject: SCTA Microtransit Feasibility Study – Steering Committee Meeting #4

Date/Time: October 23, 2025, 8:00 am – 9:30 am

Location: In-Person at RRTA and Teams Meeting

Attendees

Name	Organization	Name	Organization
Joy Ashley	SCTA Board Member, Director of Mainspring of Ephrata	Ray D’Agostino	County Commissioner, MPO Chair
Anna Ramos	County Workforce Development Board	Lauri Ahlskog	SCTA
Sandy Burke	SCTA Board Member	Keith Boatman	SCTA
George Tobler (virtual)	VisionCorps	Jen Boley	SCTA
Kristen Phipps	Southern Lancaster Chamber	Carl Albright	SCTA
Dan Kirkner	Penn Medicine Lancaster General Health & Southern Lancaster Chamber	Greg Downing	SCTA
Will Clark	Lancaster County Planning Department	Tyler Beduhn (virtual)	Kimley-Horn (Project Manager)
Mike Hession	Denver Borough Manager	Poonam Patel (virtual)	Kimley-Horn
Scott Peiffer	Fmr. Quarryville Borough Manager	Vickie Karandrikas	Kimley-Horn
Tom Martin (virtual)	Lancaster County Office of Aging		

Action Tracker

- Steering Committee
 - Provide feedback on recommendations by early week of 10/27
 - Provide suggestions for outreach events or locations by early week of 10/27

- **Project Team**
 - Add a comparison of microtransit, paratransit, and fixed route metrics in the performance monitoring recommendations
 - Add trip time, trip purpose, and transferring passengers as secondary measures
 - Investigate the eligibility of the carbon reduction program funding for microtransit, and add business sponsorship as a potential funding source
 - Add considerations for interconnectivity of modes (technology) and adaptability under a contracted service delivery approach

Notes

The following notes accompany the meeting slides:

Introduction

- T. Beduhn (Kimley Horn) introduced the meeting's purpose: reviewing the feasibility of microtransit for Lancaster County, recapping study progress, sharing draft recommendations, and outlining the next phase of public participation. T. Beduhn also introduced team members V. Karandrikas (Kimley-Horn) and P. Patel (Kimley-Horn), who described their experience with microtransit studies.
- G. Downing (SCTA) welcomed attendees, explained SCTA's role in commissioning the study, and facilitated in-room introductions. Other attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations.
- T. Beduhn thanked participants for their involvement and explained this was the final Steering Committee meeting for the planning phase, with continued engagement expected as the study concludes.
- Tyler mentioned that several other Pennsylvania agencies have operated microtransit, and that best practices and lessons learned from these systems were incorporated into the current study for SCTA.
- The group discussed the importance of learning from other authorities' experiences, including their success rates and pilot approaches, to inform local decision-making.

Study Recap

- T. Beduhn summarized the study's data-driven, community-informed approach, emphasizing that microtransit is not a universal solution and that limited transportation funding requires careful prioritization. The process was described as a funnel, narrowing from many possible zones to the most feasible zone for a pilot.
- The study began with goals to supplement the existing bus system, expand to unserved areas, and connect key destinations. Areas were identified based on factors such as density, demographics, and travel patterns, resulting in over a dozen opportunity zones. Opportunity zones were evaluated in two rounds of review, focusing on metrics such as transit need, key connection points, and cost efficiency. In addition, public outreach and

steering committee feedback helped narrow these to seven, with further analysis of larger zones (countywide and fixed-route connector).

- T. Beduhn recapped that feedback emphasized prioritizing underserved areas and transit need and led to advancing the Willow St./Strasburg/Outlets zone for deeper analysis. The study's recommendations and performance monitoring deliverables were completed and shared.

Recommendations

- T. Beduhn presented the seven highest-scoring zones and explained the grouping into three categories: near-term pilot options (Leola/Eden, Willow St./Strasburg/Outlets, Ephrata/Denver), future expansion (East Pete/E. Hempfield, Lititz, Millersville, Columbia/Wrightsville), and long-term (countywide, fixed-route connector). The rationale for selecting pilot recommendations was based on Round 2 scoring, with particular emphasis on transit need and unserved areas.
- T. Beduhn described each recommended pilot zone, including service hours, geographic boundaries, and transfer opportunities. The pilot is recommended for 18–24 months to allow for ridership growth and service adjustments.
- Other opportunity areas identified in the study (Elizabethtown, Mount Joy, Neffsville, New Holland, Christiana-Gap, Quarryville) remain suitable for future expansion but are of lower priority.
- Steering Committee members asked about the methodology for zone selection and whether all municipalities provided feedback. T. Beduhn and L. Ahlskog (SCTA) explained the data sources, weighting of factors (unserved areas and transit need), and outreach process. SCTA utilizes email lists for municipal contacts and will do so again in the next round of public participation.
- Steering Committee members asked about service boundaries, fare, and public understanding of microtransit. T. Beduhn clarified that trips must start/end within zones, but nodes outside of the zone could be considered to connect people to key destinations close to but not within the zone, and that education and fare clarity would be emphasized in the next outreach phase. During the first round of outreach, the opportunity areas for microtransit and the concept of microtransit were introduced to the public. Now that the recommendations for microtransit have been developed, further education about microtransit will be shared.
- Steering Committee members asked about hours of operation, noting the need for late-night hours and weekends. Hours of operation were determined based on existing fixed-route service hours and the hours of operation of adjacent businesses. These can be refined as a pilot service is further defined. It is common for pilots to start with weekday service before expanding to weekend.
- R. D'Agostino (Lancaster County) expressed appreciation for the study team taking feedback and making changes. He highlighted the importance of focusing on needs,

connectivity, and efficiency, and noted that the pilot should inform future system changes. He also noted that technology and the approach to transit may be changing.

- Steering Committee members raised questions about trip prioritization and reservation systems. T. Beduhn explained that service would be first-come, first-served, with advance reservations possible. He also emphasized the importance of monitoring data and demand, and of being prepared to handle these demands with drivers and vehicles. G. Downing noted that the shared-ride service prioritizes trips to communities with greater needs, serving people with disabilities and seniors.
- Funding for microtransit would utilize existing federal, state, and local sources, with additional opportunities identified from federal discretionary grants, PennDOT demonstration projects, and potential CMAQ and carbon reduction program funds; business sponsorships and partnerships were also suggested for long-term support.
- The recommended service delivery model is a turnkey approach, where a contractor provides drivers, vehicle facilities, maintenance, and technology, while SCTA retains vehicle ownership; concerns were raised about ensuring connectivity between microtransit, Red Rose Access, and fixed-route services, as well as contract flexibility during the pilot phase. Technology contractors in other jurisdictions have been able to integrate with existing technologies, and that can be included in contract requirements. L. Ahlskog also mentioned the opportunity to leverage statewide contracts for technology.
- The group discussed the need for marketing and outreach to employers, highlighting that businesses should be aware of microtransit as it benefits their workforce and could encourage business sponsorships.
- Participants stressed that public transit should prioritize needs over wants, focusing on helping people get to jobs, healthcare, and essential destinations, and that connectivity and efficiency are critical for enabling employment opportunities across the county.
- There was a call to ensure that microtransit provides a real opportunity for people to reach employment locations, especially when traveling between different service zones, and that the pilot should be evaluated for its effectiveness in supporting workforce mobility.
- Concerns were raised about the ability of the service to handle peak demand and prioritize employment-related trips, with suggestions to monitor trip purposes and demand to ensure the system meets commuter needs. An option to schedule recurring trips can also be added to the recommendations.
- Steering Committee members asked about the timeline of a pilot service. T. Beduhn noted that the timeline is dependent on funding and direction from the SCTA Board.

Performance Monitoring

- T. Beduhn outlined that performance metrics and targets would be tracked during the pilot, based on best practices and other agencies' experiences. These metrics would

help determine pilot success and inform decisions about expansion. Steering Committee members inquired about what success looks like for a pilot program and suggested that the Steering Committee be involved in setting these targets. They underscored the importance of setting up a pilot program for success by having it run for a long enough period and refining the service as needed.

- G. Tobler (VisionCorps) suggested monitoring the impact on paratransit usage in pilot zones, and L. Ahlskog noted that other programs for Red Rose Access subsidize most paratransit riders and may not shift to microtransit due to fare difference, but data would be collected. T. Beduhn also noted that the performance of the fixed route in the area can also be monitored to see if there are shifts to microtransit or increases due to microtransit providing opportunities for transfers.
- Steering Committee members also suggested tracking trip time to understand how people are using the service.

Public Participation: Next Phase

- T. Beduhn and V. Karandrikas outlined the next phase of public participation, which will concentrate on the selected pilot zones and feature targeted outreach to municipalities, employers, community partners, and the broader public.
- V. Karandrikas described the creation of educational materials comparing microtransit to other options such as bus, paratransit, and rideshare services (Uber/Lyft), with clear fare and service details to enhance public understanding and engagement.
- Steering Committee members were encouraged to share ideas about potential outreach locations and events. Suggestions were made for Ephrata and Denver tree lightings, leveraging chambers of commerce and business alliances (e.g., Leola Business Alliance), targeted outreach to businesses, Lancaster General Health, and senior facilities (Office of Aging)
- The purpose of this engagement is to gather feedback on the recommendations. A series of outreach meetings is planned from mid-November through mid-December, focusing on the three recommended pilot zones while also allowing for broad education and input on operational details of microtransit and zone selection. The committee emphasized public feedback should be centered on the three recommended pilot zones, while remaining receptive to broader community input. To foster grassroots engagement and ensure no community feels excluded, the team will adapt outreach messages as necessary.