Contents
Overview of Existing Services ................................................................. 2
   Fixed Route Services ........................................................................ 2
   Dial-A-Ride and Other Services ...................................................... 4
Key Destinations .................................................................................. 4
Employment and Commuting Patterns .............................................. 4
   Employers ...................................................................................... 4
   Commuting Patterns ..................................................................... 6
Demographic Overview ................................................................. 8
   Population Density ......................................................................... 9
Market Segments and Transit Propensity ....................................... 10
Regional Forum Comments .......................................................... 15
   Service Gaps and Challenges ...................................................... 16
   Other Comments .......................................................................... 16
   Potential Solutions ..................................................................... 17
Comments from the Upper Valley E&D Committee ....................... 17
MetroQuest Responses ...................................................................... 18
Summary of Transit Service Gaps and Needs ............................... 18
   Geographic Service Gaps ............................................................ 19
   Temporal Service Gaps ............................................................... 19
   Gaps for Specific Rider Groups/Trip Types .................................. 19
Transit Market Segments ............................................................. 20
   Size of Market Segments ............................................................ 20
   Impacts of Service Gaps on Market Segments .......................... 20

List of Figures
   Figure 1: Transit Services in the Upper Valley Region ..................... 3
   Figure 2: Employers in the Upper Valley Region ............................. 5
   Figure 3: Daily Commuters to Randolph ...................................... 7
   Figure 4: Daily Commuting Trips to Hanover and White River Junction, VT and Lebanon, NH ................................................................. 9
   Figure 5: Population Density in Upper Valley Communities, 2017 ................................................................. 9
   Figure 6: Number and Percentage of Adults Age 80 and Over in Upper Valley Communities, 2012-2016 ................................................................. 11
   Figure 7: Number and Percentage of People with Disabilities in Upper Valley Communities, 2012-2016 ................................................................. 12
   Figure 8: Number and Percentage of Households with Limited Auto Ownership in Upper Valley Communities, 2012-2016 ................................................................. 13
   Figure 9: Transit Propensity Index, Upper Valley Region ................................. 15
Transit service gaps and needs in the Upper Valley region, consisting of Orange County and Northern Windsor County communities included in the Two Rivers Ottauquechee Regional Commission (TRORC) service area, are discussed below.

Overview of Existing Services

Fixed Route Services

As shown in Figure 1, Stagecoach Transportation Services, a division of Tri-Valley Transit, operates local shuttles within and between its more densely populated communities; commuter routes that connect to White River Junction (VT) and Hanover and Lebanon (NH); and routes that operate on limited schedules for local trips in less populated towns.

The Randolph Area Circulator includes an Orange-Green Loop that operates from roughly 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. on weekdays, providing 4-6 round trips a day. A Bethel extension serves each stop in that community once or twice a day. Deviations of up to ¾ of a mile may be requested for door-to-door service.

The Bradford Area Circulator includes a Bradford—Newbury Loop that runs from 8:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. on weekdays, providing four trips per day. The Bradford—Newbury—Woodsville Loop, which also serves Wells River, operates 4 trips per weekday between 9:00 and 4:30 p.m. Both Bradford Area Circulator routes are fare-free and accept requests for deviations up to three miles.

Commuter routes include the 89er South between Randolph and White River Junction/Lebanon/Hanover, the 89er North between Randolph and Montpelier/Berlin, and the River Route along I-91 to White River Junction/Lebanon/Hanover. All three routes operate on weekdays; no deviations are available. Each route provides 2-3 trips in the morning and in the afternoon; the River Route also provides two mid-day trips.

The Current division of Southeast Vermont Transit operates several commuter routes from Bellows Falls to White River Junction/Lebanon/Hanover that travel along I-91 through Upper Valley communities. Routes 71, 72, 73, and 74 make stops at the park and ride lot at Exit 9 in Hartland. Routes 73 and 74 serve the Veterans Administration Hospital in White River Junction as well as other destinations.

Fixed routes that operate on limited schedules are available in a number of Upper Valley communities:

- The Berlin Shopper operates between Randolph and Berlin one Friday a month, offering one round trip with a two-hour stop in Berlin. The 2nd Friday shopper runs between Hancock, Rochester, Randolph, and West Lebanon one Friday a month, offering one round trips with a three-hour stop in West Lebanon. Both monthly shoppers accept requests for deviations up to ¾ of a mile.
- The Royalton Route operates one round trip on Tuesday and Thursday, connecting Randolph, Bethel, and Royalton.
- The Chelsea Route offers three round trips each Monday, and Friday between Randolph, Bethel, Royalton, Tunbridge, and Chelsea.
Figure 1: Transit Services in the Upper Valley Region
The Hancock Route operates one round trip that connects Randolph, Bethel, Stockbridge, Rochester, and Hancock with one round trip every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday.

The Woodstock Route offers two round trips between Randolph and Bethel, Barnard, Woodstock, Bridgewater, and Quechee on the 1st and 3rd Wednesdays of each month.

- The Royalton, Chelsea, Hancock, and Woodstock routes are all fare-free, and accept requests for deviations up to ¾ of a mile.

Many of the Stagecoach local circulators, monthly shoppers, and part-time routes offer fare-free service or fare-free zones.

**Dial-A-Ride and Other Services**

Stagecoach’s Dial-A-Ride service offers rides to Upper Valley region residents who are age 60 and older and/or have a disability and eligible clients of a number of human service agencies and programs, including Medicaid, Ticket to Ride, and senior meals programs.

Service for residents of the region who meet age and/or eligibility criteria is supported by Stagecoach’s partners in the Vermont Elders and Persons with Disabilities (E&D) program, including Central Vermont Council on Aging (CVCOA), Upper Valley Services, Thompson Senior Center, Senior Solutions, Clara Martin Center, Gifford Adult Day, Springfield Adult Day, Oxbow Senior Independence Program and Bugbee Senior Center, and Scotland House Adult Day. E&D trips are generally provided by Stagecoach volunteer drivers or partners using vehicles leased to them by Tri-Valley Transit.

Other human service agencies, such as Volunteers in Action, the VA Medical Center in White River Junction, and the Vermont Association for the Blind and Visually impaired also provide transportation for eligible individuals.

Private providers serving the Upper Valley region include Vermont Translines (service from Rutland), Greyhound (stop in White River Junction), Amtrak (stops in Randolph and White River Junction), numerous taxi companies, and providers based in New Hampshire.

**Key Destinations**

Retail areas (including supermarkets), health care facilities, colleges and universities, and human service agency offices are primarily located in the following communities:

- Hanover/Lebanon, NH
- Hartford
- Norwich
- Randolph
- White River Junction
- Woodstock

Some of those key destinations are shown in Figure 1 (more detail can be found on the route maps posted on the Stagecoach website, [https://stagecoach-rides.org/](https://stagecoach-rides.org/). Stagecoach bus routes serve many local and regional destinations.

**Employment and Commuting Patterns**

**Employers**

Figure 2 shows the location of employers of various sizes in the region.
Figure 2: Employers in the Upper Valley Region

Source: Dun & Bradstreet, 2005
Larger employers—those with 100 or more employees—are located throughout the region along major roadways (I-89, I-91, US 4, VT 12) and the New Hampshire border. Smaller employers, with fewer than 100 employees, are located in the same areas and scattered throughout the region.

Most large employers and many smaller ones appear to be served by Stagecoach bus routes or those operated by neighboring transit systems. There are very small employers not located on bus routes throughout most of the communities in the region.

**Commuting Patterns**

Error! Reference source not found. presents an overview of where residents of the Upper Valley region work and where individuals who are employed in the Upper Valley region live.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total Upper Valley Region Employment</th>
<th>Percent of Total Employed Upper Valley Region Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workers in Upper Valley Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employees in Upper Valley Region</td>
<td>25,476</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Valley Region Residents Employed in Upper Valley Region</td>
<td>11,114</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of Other Areas Working in Upper Valley Region</td>
<td>14,362</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of Other Vermont Counties</td>
<td>10,159</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents of Other States</td>
<td>4,203</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residents of Upper Valley Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employed Upper Valley Region Residents</td>
<td>25,108</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Valley Region Residents Employed in Upper Valley Region</td>
<td>11,114</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Valley Region Residents Employed in Other Areas</td>
<td>13,994</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in Other Vermont Counties</td>
<td>4,940</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in Other States</td>
<td>9,054</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census, Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics, 2015

Slightly fewer than half (44%) of individuals who are employed in the Upper Valley region also live there. Of the employees who live outside of the Upper Valley, 40% live in other Vermont counties, including Chittenden, Washington, Rutland, Caledonia, Addison, and Franklin counties. Sixteen percent of Upper Valley employees live in other states, primarily New Hampshire, but also New York, Massachusetts, and others.

The split between Upper Valley residents who are also employed in Upper Valley communities is similar: 44% of residents work in the Upper Valley and 56% work in other Vermont counties or in other states. Residents who are employed in Vermont but outside of the Upper Valley work mostly in Washington, Rutland, Chittenden, and Addison counties. Those who are employed in other states work mainly in New Hampshire, New York, and Massachusetts.

Figure 3 illustrates the daily commuting travel flows into Randolph at the town level.
Figure 3: Daily Commuters to Randolph
Most commuters to Randolph come from within Randolph or from the contiguous towns of Brookfield, Braintree, and Bethel. The access provided by I-89 brings in moderate numbers of commuters from Montpelier, Barre, and Northfield. Commuters also travel to Randolph from many other towns, but in smaller numbers.

Figure 4 shows daily commuting trips to the Hanover/Lebanon NH/White River Junction area at the town level. That area is an important employment destination for Upper Valley residents. More than 50 commuters per day, indicated by orange, red, pink, purple, and blue shading in Figure 4, travel to the Hanover/Lebanon/White River Junction area from most Orange County communities and a number of Windsor County communities.

**Demographic Overview**

This section presents an overview of the demographic characteristics of the Upper Valley region and summarizes the location and density of the general population of the county and specific market segments that are likely to need transit service because they cannot or choose not to drive.

Table 2 provides summary demographic characteristics for the Upper Valley region as of 2016, as compared to Vermont as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Upper Valley Region</th>
<th>Vermont</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>55,999</td>
<td>626,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population density</td>
<td>43 persons per square mile</td>
<td>68 persons per square mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population age 60 and over</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population age 80 and over</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents living below poverty line</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey 5-year Average 2012-2016

Residents of Upper Valley communities totaled 55,299 in 2016, making up 9% of the state’s population. The region overall is much less dense than the state as a whole, at 43 people per square mile. It contains a slightly higher percentage of population age 60 and over than the state (28%) and roughly the same percentage of population age 80 and over (4%). Ten percent of Upper Valley residents live in poverty, lower than the state’s 12% and the third lowest percentage among the state’s 11 regions.
Figure 4: Daily Commuting Trips to Hanover and White River Junction, VT and Lebanon, NH
**Population Density**

Figure 5 shows the concentration of the population in Upper Valley communities. Density is a helpful characteristic to consider in the context of public transportation services because it is one measure of where service, particularly fixed route service, is likely to be needed and cost-effective.

Most of the communities in the region are populated at levels that are considered rural—500 or fewer people per square mile. Areas of low to moderate density are found in Randolph and Hartford. Areas of moderate to high density are found in Rochester and the Wilder, VT/White River Junction area.

**Market Segments and Transit Propensity**

Groups that are likely to need transit services because they do not drive, for reasons of disability, income, or choice, include older adults, people with disabilities, individuals with limited or no access to a car, and younger adults. Figure 6 through Figure 8 show the number and percentage (as compared to the state average) of individuals in the first three groups at the town level in the Upper Valley. All data was obtained from the American Community Survey (ACS) 2012-2016 Five-year Estimates.

**Older Adults**

Figure 6 shows the number and percentage of adults age 80 and over in 2012-2016, as compared to the statewide average, in the Upper Valley region. The focus in Figure 6 is on this older age group because younger seniors typically continue to drive and because a significant rise in this population is expected in Vermont (and nationwide) in the next 10-20 years. Concentrations of older seniors are found in Hartford and Randolph, where percentages of adults over age 80 are 1-2 times the state average. Very small numbers of the oldest adults live in other Upper Valley communities.

**People with Disabilities**

Figure 7 shows the number and percentage of people with disabilities, as compared to the statewide average, in Upper Valley communities. Four types of disabilities are included: those associated with hearing, vision, cognition, and working. As with older adults, the highest numbers of people with disabilities live in Hartford and Randolph, plus Bradford. In those communities, the percentage of people with disabilities is 1-2 times the state average.

**Auto Ownership**

The number and percentage of households in Upper Valley towns with limited access to an auto in 2012-2016 are shown in Figure 8. Households with one resident and no vehicle and those with two or more members but only one vehicle or no vehicle are included. Again, Hartford, Randolph, and Bradford contain the highest number of households with limited auto access, and percentages of limited auto access households that are 1-2 times the state average. All other communities contain percentages of such households that are below the state average.

**Transit Propensity**

As noted above, older adults, people with disabilities, individuals with lower incomes, and younger adults are likely to need transit services because they cannot or do not drive. The transit propensity index mapped in Figure 9 combines information about the location and weighted size of the county’s total population and of various populations that are typically dependent on transit services—youth, older adults, people with disabilities, people living in poverty, and households with one car or less.

As shown in Figure 9, the only areas of even moderate transit propensity are found in Randolph and Hartford. Other communities show a level of transit propensity that is low or low-moderate.
Figure 5: Population Density in Upper Valley Communities, 2017
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Figure 6: Number and Percentage of Adults Age 80 and Over in Upper Valley Communities, 2012-2016
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Figure 7: Number and Percentage of People with Disabilities in Upper Valley Communities, 2012-2016

Upper Valley Region

% of Population with a Disability
- Green: Below Average
- Yellow: 1x - 2x Average
- Red: 2x - 3x Average
- VT Average = 14.0%

Total Population with a Disability
- 1
- 750
- 1,500
- 2,250
- 3,000

Legend:
- Regional Planning Commission Boundary
- Municipal Boundary
- Urban Area
Figure 8: Number and Percentage of Households with Limited Auto Ownership in Upper Valley Communities, 2012-2016
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Figure 9: Transit Propensity Index, Upper Valley Region
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Regional Forum Comments

Stakeholders and members of the public who participated in the regional forum held in Randolph on October 30, 2018 made comments regarding service gaps, travel challenges, unmet transportation needs, and potential solutions, as summarized below.

Service Gaps and Challenges

Geographic Gaps
- Some seniors say it is hard to get public transportation from Braintree and Brookfield – there is currently only one bus stop on the edge of Braintree. Some seniors are not able to reach the senior center until 11AM or later.
  - Stagecoach pointed out that there is not enough density to serve those areas efficiently with transit. Its new service model has allowed more members of the public to be served by transit, and for demand-response to provide other alternatives.
- There is currently no bus service in the town of Royalton. A law school is there, and some of the students come with families who may not have a driver's license.
- There is a desire for a commuter route on Route 4 to the Upper Valley, but there may not be enough density to support a route. While there is an existing intercity route, it is not a top performer. Route 4 is at the boundaries of several transit agencies, so it is unclear who would cover that area.

Temporal Gaps
- Most commuter routes end service by 6:30 p.m., so it is hard to accommodate third shift transportation needs. Transit dependent jobs concentrate in the restaurant industry, which operates into late hours.
- The frequency and span of service to Montpellier is not enough to accommodate some workers, especially at the end of the day.

Trip Type Gaps
- Recreational trips are the least served, as medical and shopping trips must come first.

Accessibility Needs
- For Advance Transit (which serves Hartford, Hanover, Norwich, White River Junction and Wilder in addition to New Hampshire communities), winter maintenance is an accessibility issue. The driver is forced to remove snow from stops because the town resources are tied up clearing other spaces.

Technology Challenges
- Especially for seniors, technology requirements can be a barrier to using public transportation services. Some people rely on the library for computer and internet access.
- Participants were not familiar with Vermont 211 as a resource to get information on transit and human services transportation.

Affordability Gaps
- Obtaining local funding to match federal and state funds is a challenge for transportation providers.

Other Gaps
- Volunteer drivers are important to the delivery of public transportation services in the region. More drivers are needed.

Other Comments
- High schoolers are a specific market for transit services. Those without car access can’t reach some destinations.
- Older adults over a certain age still drive because they don't have other options.
Potential Solutions

When asked to rank potential service improvements, forum participants most often chose the options listed below.

**Information**
- Centralized transportation information
- Trip planning assistance

**Service Enhancements**
- Expand service hours
- Expand service areas
- Volunteer driver recruiting and training
- Travel training

**Accessibility Improvements**
- Bus shelters
- Sidewalks or curb cuts

**Technology**
- Automatic vehicle location systems
- Mobile information, reservations, and real-time information

**Comments from the Upper Valley E&D Committee**

Development of the PTPP included discussions with the stakeholder committees that provide oversight for administration of the Vermont Elders and Persons with Disabilities (E&D) Transportation Program in each of nine regions, including the Upper Valley. Members of the E&D advisory committees typically include the local public transportation provider; partner organizations—municipalities, human service agencies, and other organizations—that receive services for their clients from the provider, and sometimes also operate services for those clients directly; and the regional planning agency that serves the area.

The discussions with those committees yielded additional comments about transportation needs and potential solutions in those regions.

Service for residents of the region who meet age and/or eligibility criteria are provided by Stagecoach and Stagecoach’s partners in the E&D program, including Central Vermont Council on Aging (CVCOA), Upper Valley Services, Thompson Senior Center, Senior Solutions, Clara Martin Center, Gifford Adult Day, Springfield Adult Day, Oxbow Senior Independence Program and Bugbee Senior Center, and Scotland House Adult Day. E&D trips are generally provided by Stagecoach volunteer drivers or partners using vehicles leased to them by Tri-Valley Transit.

Comments regarding transportation needs and service gaps include the following:

- Volunteer drivers help to deliver many E&D rides in the Upper Valley region and keep the cost per trip low. Stagecoach currently has 20-25 volunteer drivers and needs 35-40. A fulltime volunteer ride coordinator position is being established to focus on recruitment and retention.
- Unmet needs are not fully known; the committee would like to focus more on this topic in the future.
- Critical care medical trips to dialysis and cancer treatments, have been trending downward.
Social/personal/wellness trips, although lowest priority among eligible trip types, are generally provided, helped in part by the Ticket to Ride program, which provides fare-free transportation for a variety of trip purposes to eligible adults over age 60 and people with disabilities.

A waiting list for the Ticket to Ride program was established in 2018 as a way to balance demand and available funding.

The committee currently has a request for service from a new potential partner and is in need of guidance regarding policy issues and resources for dealing with such a request.

**MetroQuest Responses**

Respondents to the online MetroQuest survey conducted in September through December 2018 had the opportunity to identify a trip they would like to make using transit service but cannot due to lack of service or infrequent/inconvenient schedules. Respondents were also able to provide comments about the origin and/or destination of the trip they would like to make.

A summary of desired trip origin/destination pairs is provided elsewhere in the PTPP. Ninety-five residents of the Upper Valley region commented on their desired trips. Hartland; Hanover/Lebanon, NH; White River Junction; and Burlington were mentioned multiple times by residents of Hartland, Newbury, Norwich, Sharon, South Royalton, and Woodstock. Other desired locations included Barre, Brattleboro, Montpelier, I-91 P&R lots, and connections to service provided by Advance Transit, Dartmouth Coach, and Amtrak. Several respondents from most communities indicated interest in transit access to locations within their communities.

Survey respondents were also asked to choose up to three transit improvements that would make them or people they know more willing to use public transportation. Choices were:

- More service near my home
- Service to my desired destinations
- More frequent service
- Service that runs evenings and/or weekends
- Faster service
- More reliable
- Cheaper
- If I felt safer riding on it
- If I understood how it works
- Nothing I prefer driving
- Other

Of the 160 responses to this question from the Upper Valley region, 91% were in the top four categories: more service near my home (45%), more service to my destinations (39%), service in the evenings and/or weekends (31%) and more frequent service (30%).

**Summary of Transit Service Gaps and Needs**

The information presented above about the Upper Valley region’s demographic characteristics, location of employers and key destinations, existing transit services, and comments from residents and stakeholders point to the following transit service gaps and needs for the region.
Geographic Service Gaps
Stagecoach fixed bus routes, and the deviations that are available for people with disabilities and others on the local routes, provide service in the communities that contain most of the Upper Valley population as well as a number of less densely populated towns. Most of the areas in which concentrations of likely transit users are located, and many key destinations, are served.

Communities in which fixed route services operate include the following:

- Randolph
- Bethel
- Bradford
- Newbury
- Wells River
- Woodsville
- Hancock
- Rochester
- West Lebanon
- Royalton
- Chelsea
- Stockbridge

Commuter services provide access to White River Junction, Lebanon and Hanover, NH, and Montpelier.

Residents of those communities who live beyond the reach of fixed route services, including their deviation zones, and residents of the other towns in the Upper Valley region, have limited public transit service options, if any, available to them.

Relatively large employers located in Sharon and Thetford are not located near fixed bus routes.

Temporal Service Gaps
Stagecoach local fixed routes operate roughly seven hours each weekday, beginning around 8:30 or 9:00 a.m. and ending around 3:30 or 4:00 p.m. That span of service is likely more convenient for those making trips for shopping, appointments, and errands than for commuting.

Fixed route service to less populated communities, such as Hancock, Rochester, Berlin, Bethel, Royalton, Tunbridge, Stockbridge, Bridgewater, and Quechee, operate on limited schedules, providing service from on designated days from once a month to three days a week to accommodate primarily trips for shopping, local appointments, and errands.

Commuter routes serve important employment destinations, but limit service to 2-3 trips during morning peak hours and 2-3 trips during afternoon peak hours. Such schedules are not useful for those who commute to jobs that have non-traditional hours. For examples, jobs at Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center 2nd and 3 shifts.

No services are available on weekends, limiting use of transit services for access to jobs as well as social/recreational, shopping, and medical trips.

Gaps for Specific Rider Groups/Trip Types
Stagecoach’s Dial-A-Ride program provides a source of transportation for Upper Valley residents who are age 60 or older, have a disability, or are clients of one of a number of human service programs.

The E&D program transports individuals for a variety of eligible trip purposes, with critical care medical trips being the highest priority. Currently, trips for those needing kidney dialysis—a treatment that is
typically administered three times a week—are capped at 10 round trips per person month. Trips for those needing cancer treatment are capped at 13 round trips per person per month.

The Ticket to Ride program subsidizes trips for eligible individuals for any trip purpose, but funding constraints have caused spending caps for riders. A monthly funding cap, decreasing over time, is set for individuals, households with multiple riders, and individuals who use wheelchairs. In addition, the Ticket to Ride program uses a waiting list to manage demand (although at present, no individuals needing critical care transportation are on the waiting list).

While E&D partners report that trips at the lower end of the priority scale are generally served, regional forum comments indicated that it is difficult to make social/recreational trips.

Transit Market Segments

Size of Market Segments

For the purposes of developing public transit policies that focus transit investments on the markets that will most benefit from those policies, the number of individuals in the Upper Valley region in each of seven sub-markets has been estimated. Market segments are mainly related to age but are also subdivided by income. Automobile availability is treated as a secondary characteristic, related to the age and income of each particular group. The results are shown in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Segment</th>
<th>Likely Low-Auto Access</th>
<th>Estimated Number in Region, 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth (under 18)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>9,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young adult (18-24), employed/student</td>
<td>X (by choice)</td>
<td>3,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult (25-64)</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult (25-64), below poverty line</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities (under age 80)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger seniors (65-79)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older seniors (80+)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>55,021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census, American Community Survey (ACS) 5-Year Estimates

Youth and young adults, adults living in poverty, people with disabilities, and older seniors—their age 80 and older—are likely to have less access to a car for personal travel than adults with higher incomes and “newer” seniors, who typically continue to drive. Young adults, for reasons having to do with a number of generational trends, may prefer not to drive or own a car. For members of the other market segments, however, lack of access to a car is likely due more to an inability to drive or afford a car than to a choice. In the Upper Valley region, market segments that are likely to have limited or no access to a car make up 45% of the population.

Impacts of Service Gaps on Market Segments

Table 4 summarizes the effect of the service gaps identified for Upper Valley communities on the various transit sub-markets in the region.

Many gaps are broad enough to affect all market segments. These include travel challenges or needs related to:
- Geographic coverage
- Accessibility, which can include access to bus stops for all potential riders, not just those with disabilities
- Information about transit options
- Technology to make use of transit service more convenient

Other gaps are applicable to all but the youngest and oldest market segments because they deal with access to jobs or other types of trips those segments are not likely to make.

Finally, some gaps are specific to certain market segments. For example, only older adults and people with disabilities are affected by funding constraints in the E&D transportation program that can limit numbers or trip types.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Segment</th>
<th>Youth (under 18)</th>
<th>Young Adult (18-24), Employed or Student</th>
<th>Adult (25-64)</th>
<th>Adult (25-64), Below Poverty Line</th>
<th>People with Disabilities</th>
<th>Younger Seniors (65-79)</th>
<th>Older Seniors (80+)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likely Low Auto Access</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X (by choice)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic Gaps</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for first/last mile options limits fixed route use</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns without fixed route bus service have limited options</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temporal Gaps</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited hours of fixed route service (business hours or shorter) are not conducive to work trips</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very limited schedules of monthly shoppers/part-time routes limit access to shopping, local medical appointments, errands</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-only schedules of commuter routes do not help those with non-traditional work hours</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No weekend service limits all trip types</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trip Type Gaps</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/recreational/wellness trips are at lower end of E&amp;D eligible trip priorities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;D funding constraints limit trips for older adults and people with disabilities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessibility Needs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient snow removal at bus stops limits fixed route access</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology Challenges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of computers and internet access at home is a barrier for some</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Gaps</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum comments and survey responses indicate some lack of knowledge of available transportation options</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordability Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not an issue for riders</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>