MARKET ANALYSIS: NELSONVILLE REGION

Overview

The Ohio Statewide Transit Needs Study included a market analysis to understand the existing conditions in Ohio related to the demand for and availability of transit service. The study is designed to understand where there are needs for transit service and how well needs are matched with existing service.

The market analysis was conducted at a county level as well as from a statewide perspective, with an analysis prepared for each of Ohio’s 88 counties. Results from the statewide market analysis are published as a separate document. Results for each of the individual counties are grouped into five regional summary documents. This document includes the individual county write-ups for the 25 counties in southeast Ohio surrounding Nelsonville. It includes data on the counties’ historical trends related to population and employment density as well as local socio-economic characteristics. The analysis also briefly describes available transit service.

Methodology

The market analysis describes existing conditions, including changes observed between 2000 and 2012. The analysis considers transit demand from the perspective of 1) development patterns; and 2) demographic characteristics that tend to be associated with higher use or reliance on public transportation services. For purposes of this study, transit demand related to development patterns is based on population and employment density. Demographic characteristics related to transit reliance are measured based on the combined number of low-income individuals, persons with disabilities, older adults (65+), and zero vehicle households. Data is reported for three years: 2000, 2007, and 2012, reflecting the 2000 U.S Census and the 2007 and 2012 American Community Survey datasets. The maps are all based on 2012 data.

Data on the available transit services was drawn from several sources, including the Status of Transit database published by ODOT. It also includes information collected by the Nelson\Nygaard team as part of their site visits and interviews with each of Ohio’s 62 transit agencies. In addition, some data was collected through web-searches and follow up telephone interviews with transit administrators.

Nelsonville Region Counties

Click on any one of the following counties to get to the individual market analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adams County</th>
<th>Harrison County</th>
<th>Meigs County</th>
<th>Ross County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athens County</td>
<td>Highland County</td>
<td>Monroe County</td>
<td>Scioto County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont County</td>
<td>Hocking County</td>
<td>Morgan County</td>
<td>Vinton County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll County</td>
<td>Holmes County</td>
<td>Muskingum County</td>
<td>Washington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coshocton County</td>
<td>Jackson County</td>
<td>Noble County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallia County</td>
<td>Jefferson County</td>
<td>Perry County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guernsey County</td>
<td>Lawrence County</td>
<td>Pike County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ADAMS COUNTY

Overview

- Adams County is located along the southern edge of Ohio, bordering Kentucky.
- West Union is the largest village in the county and is the county seat.
- The nearest metropolitan area is Cincinnati in Hamilton County, which is located about 65 miles west of West Union.

Factors Influencing Transit Reliance and Demand

Employment, Demographics and Socio-Economic Characteristics

- Adams County’s population has increased by 4.2% since 2000.
- The number of youth in Adams County decreased from 19.9% of the population in 2000 to 18.3% in 2007 and 2012.
- The number of older adults aged 65+ increased somewhat over the past 12 years and now represents a greater percentage of the population by 2%. Older adults now make up 15.4% of the county’s population.
- A greater percentage of people have low-incomes today than in 2000, though more people own cars. Nearly 40% of the county’s population is classified as low-income, which is much higher than an average county in Ohio (24.8%).

Figure 1 Selected County Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics: Historical Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>27,330</td>
<td>28,203</td>
<td>28,477</td>
<td>1,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths (5-17)</td>
<td>5,446 (19.9%)</td>
<td>5,165 (18.3%)</td>
<td>5,219 (18.3%)</td>
<td>227 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>3,643 (13.3%)</td>
<td>3,785 (13.4%)</td>
<td>4,374 (15.4%)</td>
<td>731 (2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities^</td>
<td>6,556 (25.8%)</td>
<td>6,121 (23.4%)</td>
<td>5,739 (20.3%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Individuals†</td>
<td>8,347 (30.9%)</td>
<td>10,224 (36.5%)</td>
<td>10,841 (38.5%)</td>
<td>2,494 (7.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Vehicle Households‡</td>
<td>910 (8.7%)</td>
<td>782 (7.9%)</td>
<td>678 (6.2%)</td>
<td>232 (2.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census, SF1 100% data & SF3 sample data; 2007 ACS 3-year estimates; 2012 ACS 3-year estimates

*2007 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2000 Census 100% data whereas 2012 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2010 Census 100% data. The Census asks users to use caution when making comparisons across a decennial census year and warns that the estimates may not be strictly comparable.

^The disability questions asked on the 2000 Census and ACS forms through 2007 were substantially different from the questions asked on the 2008 ACS form and later (including the 2010 Census). Therefore, one cannot say with certainty what changes occurred to the prevalence of disabilities between 2000 and 2012.

†Defined as all family members if the family income is less than 1.5 times the poverty threshold set by the federal government.

‡Note that the data reported here are households and the percentage = (zero-vehicle households)/(total households in the county).
It is impossible to conclude with certainty the historical trend of the prevalence of people with disabilities. However, accounting for sampling error and considering results from 2000 and 2007, in all likelihood at least 20% of the current population in Adams County has some disability.

According to 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data, Adams County had 5,542 jobs within the county. In that same year, 3,950 residents of Adams County were employed outside of the county, which accounts for 55.6% of residents who are employed.

Based on a combined measure of low-income individuals, zero-vehicle households, persons with disabilities, and adults aged 65 and over, the areas most reliant on transit within Adams County are West Union, Peebles, and south of the Appalachian Highway (see Figure 2).

The remainder of the county shows either moderate or moderate-low transit reliance.

Outside of the county, southwestern Pike County and an area along US 62 in Highland County show moderate-high transit reliance.

Transit Supportive Development Patterns

Adams County is almost entirely comprised of low density areas. Small areas in West Union and Peebles show slightly higher density. Of the 28,500 people in the county, 11.0% live in areas of higher density and 89.0% are in areas of lower density (based on 2010 Census block data).

There is no area in Adams County with substantial population and employment densities. West Union, Peebles, and Manchester are the only areas with some population and employment density that, based on national evidence, suggests an ability to support transit service with a frequency of every 60 minutes or less (see Figure 3), but these areas are likely too small to operate effective transit service.

None of the areas outside of Adams County has transit supportive densities.

Existing Transit Services

Transit service is not provided in Adams County.

2012 Transit Riders per Capita: NA

2012 Operating Expenditure per Capita: NA

Opportunities, Challenges, and Needs

Adams County is an extremely low-income county, with nearly 40% of the population in low-income households.

In addition to having one of the highest poverty levels in Ohio, Adams County is almost entirely low-density. West Union, Peebles, and Manchester are the only areas with some concentration of people or jobs, but this concentration is very small geographically.

1 Based on 2012 ACS estimates for Adams County (28,477).
– Socio-economic characteristics suggest a need for public transportation. Currently, no transit services are available in the county. However, similarly-positioned counties in Ohio operate demand response service for people living in rural areas.

– The closest metropolitan area is Cincinnati, which is located about 65 miles from West Union. Cincinnati is the primary urban center for residents of Adams County who travel to the region for jobs, services, and shopping.
Figure 2  Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics Affecting Reliance on Transit Service

Source: 2008 - 2012 5-year ACS Estimates; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT
Figure 3 Development Patterns (Population and Employment Density) Influencing Transit Service Design

Source: 2011 LEHD; 2010 Census SF1 100% data; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT

Note: The “defined transit service area” indicates the official boundaries of the agency service area and does not necessarily indicate the coverage of the current routes in operation.
ATHENS COUNTY

Overview

— Athens County is located along the southeastern edge of Ohio along the Ohio River; a small piece of the county borders West Virginia.
— Athens is the largest city and the county seat; the county is included in the Athens Micropolitan Statistical Area.
— The nearest metropolitan area is Columbus, 77 miles northwest of Athens.

Factors Influencing Transit Reliance and Demand

Employment, Demographics and Socio-Economic Characteristics

— Athens County’s population increased significantly, by more than 2,300 people or nearly 4%, from 2000 to 2012.
— The number of youth in Athens County declined more than 1,000, and the percentage of the population who are youth declines by 2%.
— The number of older adults aged 65+ increased by nearly 900 people, and older adults now make up a larger percentage of the population than in 2000.
— The percentage of low-income individuals rose modestly, by 3.2%; however, the Athens County percent low-income (41%) is much higher than the percent for an average county in Ohio (24.8%). Also, more than 300 additional households no longer have access to a vehicle.

Figure 1 Selected County Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics: Historical Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>62,223</td>
<td>63,265</td>
<td>64,598</td>
<td>♦ 2,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths (5-17)</td>
<td>8,439</td>
<td>7,872</td>
<td>7,426</td>
<td>♦ 1,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>5,793</td>
<td>6,092</td>
<td>6,690</td>
<td>♦ 897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities^</td>
<td>9,739</td>
<td>10,155</td>
<td>8,216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Individuals†</td>
<td>20,336</td>
<td>22,059</td>
<td>22,665</td>
<td>♦ 2,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Vehicle Households‡</td>
<td>1,919</td>
<td>1,685</td>
<td>2,232</td>
<td>♦ 313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census, SF1 100% data & SF3 sample data; 2007 ACS 3-year estimates; 2012 ACS 3-year estimates

*2007 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2000 Census 100% data whereas 2012 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2010 Census 100% data. The Census asks users to use caution when making comparisons across a decennial census year and warns that the estimates may not be strictly comparable.

^The disability questions asked on the 2000 Census and ACS forms through 2007 were substantially different from the questions asked on the 2008 ACS form and later (including the 2010 Census). Therefore, one cannot say with certainty what changes occurred to the prevalence of disabilities between 2000 and 2012.

†Defined as all family members if the family income is less than 1.5 times the poverty threshold set by the federal government.

‡Note that the data reported here are households and the percentage = (zero-vehicle households)/(total households in the county).
It is impossible to conclude with certainty the historical trend of the prevalence of people with disabilities. However, accounting for sampling error and considering results from 2000 and 2007, in all likelihood at least 12% of the current population in Athens County has some disability.

According to 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data, Athens County had 18,599 jobs within the county. In that same year, 8,373 residents of Athens County were employed outside of the county, which accounts for 45.8% of residents who are employed.

Based on a combined measure of low-income individuals, zero-vehicle households, persons with disabilities, and adults aged 65 and over, the areas most reliant on transit within Athens County are Chauncy and the area just to the west of Chauncy, which show high-moderate reliance (see Figure 2).

Areas west in Hocking County and east in Washington County show some transit reliance but not at high levels.

Transit Supportive Development Patterns

Athens County shows significant areas of higher density in the middle of the county around Athens and to a lesser degree in the northwest around Nelsonville. The eastern and southern halves of the county are primarily lower density areas. Of the 64,600 people in the county, 56.8% live in higher density areas and 43.2% are in lower density areas (based on 2010 Census block data).

Athens is the primary area with population and employment densities that, based on national evidence, suggest an ability to support transit service with a frequency of every 60 minutes or less (see Figure 3). Another small pocket of transit-supportive density exists in Nelsonville.

Athens shows support for an even mix of fixed route (red on Figure 3) and deviated fixed-route (orange on Figure 3). Nelsonville falls in the category of deviated fixed-route service.

Similar to the results above, areas with transit supportive densities outside of the county include Logan in Hocking County.

Existing Transit Services

Deviated fixed-route transit service is available through Athens Public Transit (APT) in Athens and the Plaines.

APT is managed by Hocking-Athens-Perry Community Action Program (HAPCAP), a private nonprofit organization offering a number of programs.

APT operating characteristics:

- Four routes Monday – Friday, 7:15 AM – 8:00 PM, and Saturday, 9:00 AM – 5:30 PM
- One early bird special route Monday – Friday, 7:15 AM – 8:52 AM
- APT riders can connect with the free campus CATS shuttle bus service for Ohio University at the Baker Center stop
Three APT routes connect with the Campus and Community Center GoBus stops for service to Columbus, Cincinnati, and Marietta

APT operates a hail system in the Plaines and Far East Athens

ADA paratransit service provided by deviations from routes within 3/4-mile and during the same operating times of their fixed-routes, with ADA reduced fare

- Local funding is provided by the City of Athens and contract income.
- 2012 Transit Riders per Capita\(^1\): \textbf{1.16}
- 2012 Operating Expenditure per Capita\(^1\): \textbf{8.61}

**Opportunities, Challenges, and Needs**

- Athens County is home to Ohio University, which has an enrollment of over 22,000 students and is the county’s largest employer.
- APT has partnered with various apartment complexes that cater to college students to provide transit services to and from the Ohio University campus. This has led to a significant increase in ridership.
- Two of APT’s routes were recently re-aligned in order to move the transfer center from downtown Athens to the Ohio University campus. This transition has led to a sharp reduction in ridership counts (based on unlinked trips) due to the reductions in transfers as students no longer need to transfer in order to reach the campus.
- APT would like to transition to fixed-routes with a separate ADA complementary paratransit program, add bi-directional service on its loop route, improve headways, extend evening service, and transition to heavy-duty low-floor buses.
- APT would also like to expand transit services to Albany and Nelsonville (outside the city of Athens in the County), but there is a lack of funding.
- APT is interested in working with Athens County to provide Medicaid transportation.
- APT has contracted with McDonald Transit to provide operational management and to directly employ drivers, operation managers, dispatchers and mechanics. This partnership is instrumental in reducing the burden of administrative procedures.
- APT’s maintenance and vehicle storage facility is provided by the City of Athens as an in-kind service.
- The need for county-wide transportation services has led HAPCAP to initiate Athens On Demand Transit for senior citizens, low-income area residents, and individuals with disabilities. It operates from 8 AM to 9 PM Monday-Saturday offering rides to medical appointments and social service agencies using two minivans. It is locally-funded and capacity-limited.
- HAPCAP also operates a Mobility Management Program under the Ohio Coordination Program, helping to coordinate all available services and help those needing transportation access what is available.
- GoBus, a rural inter-city bus service also managed by HAPCAP, connects the city of Athens with Columbus, Cincinnati, and Marietta twice a day, with connections to Greyhound services to other points.

\(^1\) Based on 2012 ACS estimates for Athens County (64,598).
Figure 2 Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics Affecting Reliance on Transit Service

Source: 2008 - 2012 5-year ACS Estimates; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT
Figure 3 Development Patterns (Population and Employment Density) Influencing Transit Service Design

Source: 2011 LEHD; 2010 Census SF1 100% data; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT

Note: The "defined transit service area" indicates the official boundaries of the agency service area and does not necessarily indicate the coverage of the current routes in operation.
BELMONT COUNTY

Overview

─ Belmont County is located in east central Ohio, bordering West Virginia.
─ St. Clairsville is the largest city and the county seat; the county is part of the Wheeling, WV Metropolitan Statistical Area.
─ The nearest metropolitan area is Wheeling, WV, located 12 miles each of St. Clairesville.

Factors Influencing Transit Reliance and Demand

Employment, Demographics and Socio-Economic Characteristics

─ Belmont County's population has remained fairly stable, decreasing by fewer than 200 people over 12 years.
─ The number of youth fell by more than 1,600 people or about 14%. Youth now make up just over 14% of the county’s population, 2.4 percentage points lower than in 2000.
─ Older adults aged 65+ decreased very slightly (0.3 percentage points or just over 250 people).
─ Unlike in many Ohio counties, the prevalence of low-income individuals declined in Belmont County by about 6%. This demographic now makes up 24.1% of the population, which is slightly less than in the average county in Ohio (24.8%).

Figure 1 Selected County Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics: Historical Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>70,226</td>
<td>68,315</td>
<td>70,039</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths (5-17)</td>
<td>11,753 (16.7%)</td>
<td>10,189 (14.9%)</td>
<td>10,073 (14.4%)</td>
<td>1,680 (2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>12,758 (18.2%)</td>
<td>11,915 (17.4%)</td>
<td>12,501 (17.8%)</td>
<td>257 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities^</td>
<td>14,861 (23.4%)</td>
<td>12,326 (20.0%)</td>
<td>10,738 (16.2%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Individuals†</td>
<td>16,865 (25.2%)</td>
<td>16,847 (26.0%)</td>
<td>15,896 (24.1%)</td>
<td>969 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Vehicle Households‡</td>
<td>2,820 (10.0%)</td>
<td>2,384 (8.4%)</td>
<td>2,230 (7.9%)</td>
<td>590 (2.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census, SF1 100% data & SF3 sample data; 2007 ACS 3-year estimates; 2012 ACS 3-year estimates

*2007 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2000 Census 100% data whereas 2012 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2010 Census 100% data. The Census asks users to use caution when making comparisons across a decennial census year and warns that the estimates may not be strictly comparable.

^The disability questions asked on the 2000 Census and ACS forms through 2007 were substantially different from the questions asked on the 2008 ACS form and later (including the 2010 Census). Therefore, one cannot say with certainty what changes occurred to the prevalence of disabilities between 2000 and 2012.

†Defined as all family members if the family income is less than 1.5 times the poverty threshold set by the federal government.

‡Note that the data reported here are households and the percentage = (zero-vehicle households)/(total households in the county).
It is impossible to conclude with certainty the historical trend of the prevalence of people with disabilities. However, accounting for sampling error and considering results from 2000 and 2007, in all likelihood at least 16% of the current population in Belmont County has some disability.

According to 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data, Belmont County had 22,194 jobs within the county. In that same year, 19,131 residents of Belmont County were employed outside of the county, which accounts for 64.1% of residents who are employed.

Based on a combined measure of low-income individuals, zero-vehicle households, persons with disabilities, and adults aged 65 and over, the areas most reliant on transit within Belmont County are Martins Ferry and Bridgeport, which show high reliance (see Figure 2).

Others areas showing a moderate transit reliance include Barnesville and the area just north of St. Clairesville.

Batesville in Noble County also has characteristics that suggest a moderate reliance on transit.

Transit Supportive Development Patterns

Belmont County is predominately lower density with pockets of higher density areas around St. Clairsville and along the Ohio River Valley. Of the 70,000 people in the county, 45.3% live in higher density areas and 54.7% are in lower density areas (based on 2010 Census block data).

Martins Ferry, St. Clairesville, Bellaire/Benwood, Shadyside, and Barnesville have population and employment densities that, based on national evidence, suggest an ability to support transit service with a frequency of every 60 minutes or less (see Figure 3).

St. Clairesville, Shadyside, and Barnesville densities suggest that deviated fixed route (orange on Figure 3) service may be more appropriate than standard fixed route (red on Figure 3) services.

Areas with transit supportive densities outside of the county are Yorksville and Titonsville to the north in Jefferson County.

Existing Transit Services

Fixed-route transit service is available through the Eastern Ohio Regional Transit Authority (EORTA) in the Belmont and Jefferson County communities of Bellaire, Bridgeport, Brookside, Martins Ferry, Rayland, Shadyside, Tiltonsville, Yorksville, Wolfhurst, Lansing, and Blaine.

All of EORTA’s service begins and ends at the Capital Theater in the city of Wheeling in West Virginia. This means passengers can transfer to routes serving the city of Wheeling as well as a handful of destinations in West Virginia outside of downtown.

Funding for EORTA comes primarily through property taxes.

EORTA operating characteristics:

- Four fixed routes Monday – Saturday, 6:00 AM – 6:30 PM
- AdVANtage paratransit service is provided Monday – Saturday 6:00 AM – 6:00 PM
Route frequencies vary from 50 to 85 minutes, with most peak hour service at or near 60 minutes.
AdVANtage paratransit service is provided within 1.5 miles of fixed route service at a reduced fare of $0.65.

2012 Transit Riders per Capita: 0.86
2012 Operating Expenditure per Capita: $10.15

Opportunities, Challenges, and Needs

Most of the population and employment in Belmont County are located along the eastern edge of the County, along the Ohio River or near to I-70, which is the primary east-west corridor. Outside of these two corridors, population is very sparse.
Transit service mirrors the population centers along the Ohio River Valley and the I-70 corridor as far west as St. Clairsville (limited service only). This is where the fixed-route service operates as well as the ADA paratransit service. As a result, from a geographic perspective, the vast majority of Belmont County does not have access to any public transportation service.
The socio-economic characteristics of Belmont County suggest few changes. This is notable only because many other rural counties in Ohio, especially in the northeastern portion of the state, are losing population as well as becoming older and poorer.
Wheeling, WV is the main urbanized area in the region and sits just across the Ohio River from Martins Ferry, Ohio. Wheeling – as a small city – has lost a lot of jobs, population, and services (shopping, etc). As mentioned, Wheeling is the transit hub for all of EORTA’s routes as well as the services operated by Ohio Valley Regional Transit Authority (OVRTA).
Much of the retail activity has moved from downtown Wheeling to the Ohio Valley Mall in St. Clairsville, or the Highlands Mall outside of downtown Wheeling. There is a lot of demand to travel to both of these places for work and to go shopping. Currently, there is some service to Ohio Valley Mall; four trips per day extend from Blaine to the Mall. Six trips on EORTA’s Route 3 (Elm Grove to Highland) serve Highlands Mall.
EORTA’s expansion is largely hampered by the difficulty in raising additional local funds. As a result, the transit routes have not been able to expand and adapt to changing demographics and development patterns. Serving the Ohio Valley Mall is one example, but other destinations such as Belmont College are not served.
Regional and inter-county transportation is also limited. Similar to other counties along the Ohio River Valley, Pittsburgh is the urban service center for residents in Belmont County. There is some intercity bus service available through Greyhound departing from Wheeling, but the service is infrequent and does not support commuting or frequent travel.
There is some regional coordination through the MPO, the Belmont-Ohio-Marshall Transportation Study (Bel-O-Mar), between EORTA on the Ohio side and OVRTA on the West Virginia side. Bel-O-Mar provides assistance to applicants for the Section 5310 funds. Federal funding is also split between the two transit systems with OVRTA being under FTA Region III.

1 Based on 2012 ACS estimates for Belmont County (70,039).
Figure 2 Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics Affecting Reliance on Transit Service

Source: 2008 - 2012 5-year ACS Estimates; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT
Figure 3 Development Patterns (Population and Employment Density) Influencing Transit Service Design

Source: 2011 LEHD; 2010 Census SF1 100% data; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT

Note: The “defined transit service area” indicates the official boundaries of the agency service area and does not necessarily indicate the coverage of the current routes in operation.
CARROLL COUNTY

Overview

─ Carroll County is located in eastern Ohio close to the West Virginia border.
─ Carrollton is the largest city in the county and is part of the Canton-Massillon Metropolitan Statistical Area.
─ The nearest metropolitan area is Akron, which is located about 50 miles north of Carrollton.

Factors Influencing Transit Reliance and Demand

Employment, Demographics and Socio-Economic Characteristics

─ Carroll County’s population has remained stable, decreasing by less than 100 people in 12 years.
─ The number of youth in Carroll County has decreased by more than 600, which represents a difference of two full points in percentage of the population since 2000.
─ The number of adults aged 65+ increased by 895 between 2000 and 2012. The percentage of the population in this age category grew from 14.2% to 17.3%.
─ A greater percentage of people have low-incomes today than in 2000, and fewer people own cars. Overall, the county is somewhat worse off today than in the past decade and remains slightly poorer than an average county in Ohio (31.0% versus 24.8%).

Figure 1 Selected County Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics: Historical Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>28,836</td>
<td>28,732</td>
<td>28,741</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths (5-17)</td>
<td>5,521</td>
<td>4,892</td>
<td>4,885</td>
<td>636 (2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>4,084</td>
<td>4,260</td>
<td>4,979</td>
<td>895 (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities(^a)</td>
<td>4,949</td>
<td>4,788</td>
<td>3,983</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Individuals(^b)</td>
<td>5,744</td>
<td>6,463</td>
<td>8,828</td>
<td>3,084 (10.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Vehicle Households(^c)</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>146 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census, SF1 100% data & SF3 sample data; 2007 ACS 3-year estimates; 2012 ACS 3-year estimates
*2007 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2000 Census 100% data whereas 2012 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2010 Census 100% data. The Census asks users to use caution when making comparisons across a decennial census year and warns that the estimates may not be strictly comparable.
\(^a\)The disability questions asked on the 2000 Census and ACS forms through 2007 were substantially different from the questions asked on the 2008 ACS form and later (including the 2010 Census). Therefore, one cannot say with certainty what changes occurred to the prevalence of disabilities between 2000 and 2012.
\(^b\)Defined as all family members if the family income is less than 1.5 times the poverty threshold set by the federal government.
\(^c\)Note that the data reported here are households and the percentage = (zero-vehicle households)/(total households in the county).
It is impossible to conclude with certainty the historical trend of the prevalence of people with disabilities. However, accounting for sampling error and considering results from 2000 and 2007, in all likelihood at least 14% of the current population in Carroll County has some disability.

According to 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data, Carroll County had 5,710 jobs within the county. In that same year, 7,318 residents of Carroll County were employed outside of the county, which accounts for 71.2% of residents who are employed.

Based on a combined measure of low-income individuals, zero-vehicle households, persons with disabilities, and adults aged 65 and over, the area most reliant on transit within Carroll County is Carrollton (see Figure 2).

Most of the remaining county shows moderate transit reliance.

Outside of the county, Canton and southeastern Stark County show high transit reliance.

Transit Supportive Development Patterns

Carroll County is predominately lower density, with small amount of higher density near the village of Carrolton in the middle of the county. Of the 28,700 people in the county, 29.0% live in higher density areas and 71.0% are in lower density areas (based on 2010 Census block data).

Carrollton and Minerva are the only areas with population and employment densities that, based on national evidence, suggest an ability to support transit service with a frequency of every 60 minutes or less (see Figure 3).

Areas with a demand for deviated fixed-route (orange on Figure 3) service cluster around Carrollton and Minerva.

Similar to the results above, southeastern Stark County and Canton show transit demand.

Existing Transit Services

Demand response service is available through Carroll County Transit for all of Carroll County and adjacent counties.

Carroll County Transit operating characteristics:

- Demand response service Monday – Friday, 7:30 AM – 4:30 PM
- Based on availability, same day service requests are charged an additional $1.00 per one way trip

Carroll County Commissioners administer Carroll County Transit and it is funded in part by Carroll County.

2012 Transit Riders per Capita\(^1\): 1.21

2012 Operating Expenditure per Capita\(^1\): $14.87

---

\(^1\) Based on 2012 ACS estimates for Carroll County (28,741).
Opportunities, Challenges, and Needs

- Carroll County is low-density with no significant population or employment center besides Carollton, which is very small.
- Residents of Carroll County are aging and becoming poorer. As a result, Carroll County Transit has seen an increase in passengers from human service agencies.
- There is no dialysis center in Carroll County, requiring long trips three days per week to dialysis centers in Canton or Alliance.
- A recent oil boom in the region has caused an increase in truck traffic and congestion on the county roads, slowing transit vehicles and reducing the amount of service that can be provided.
- Scheduling is currently done by hand, sometimes limiting the efficiency of service provision. Scheduling software is being considered by Carroll County Transit.
Figure 2 Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics Affecting Reliance on Transit Service

Source: 2008 - 2012 5-year ACS Estimates; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT
Figure 3 Development Patterns (Population and Employment Density) Influencing Transit Service Design

Source: 2011 LEHD; 2010 Census SF1 100% data; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT

Note: The “defined transit service area” indicates the official boundaries of the agency service area and does not necessarily indicate the coverage of the current routes in operation.
COSHOCTON COUNTY

Overview

— Coshocton County is located in central Ohio.
— Coshocton is the county seat and largest city and is located within the Coshocton Micropolitan Statistical Area, which encompasses the whole county.
— The nearest large metropolitan area is Canton, 60 miles away; the next nearest metropolitan area is Columbus, about 75 miles away.

Factors Influencing Transit Reliance and Demand

Employment, Demographics and Socio-Economic Characteristics

— Coshocton County's population has remained relatively stable since 2000.
— The percentage of youth in Coshocton County has decreased by over two percentage points, or 750 fewer youths.
— The number of older adults aged 65+ increased over the past 12 years, and represents a larger percentage of the population by around two percentage points.
— A larger percentage of people have low incomes today than in 2000, though more people own cars. The county’s percentage of individuals with low incomes (currently 32%) has steadily grown, and the county remains poorer than an average county in Ohio (24.8%).

Figure 1 Selected County Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics: Historical Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>36,655</td>
<td>36,524</td>
<td>36,856</td>
<td>↑ 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths (5-17)</td>
<td>7,266</td>
<td>(19.8%)</td>
<td>6,496</td>
<td>(17.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>5,375</td>
<td>(14.7%)</td>
<td>5,380</td>
<td>(14.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities^</td>
<td>7,045</td>
<td>(20.7%)</td>
<td>6,557</td>
<td>(19.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Individuals†</td>
<td>7,282</td>
<td>(20.1%)</td>
<td>9,870</td>
<td>(27.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Vehicle Households‡</td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td>(9.3%)</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>(7.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census, SF1 100% data & SF3 sample data; 2007 ACS 3-year estimates; 2012 ACS 3-year estimates

*2007 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2000 Census 100% data whereas 2012 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2010 Census 100% data. The Census asks users to use caution when making comparisons across a decennial census year and warns that the estimates may not be strictly comparable.

^The disability questions asked on the 2000 Census and ACS forms through 2007 were substantially different from the questions asked on the 2008 ACS form and later (including the 2010 Census). Therefore, one cannot say with certainty what changes occurred to the prevalence of disabilities between 2000 and 2012.

†Defined as all family members if the family income is less than 1.5 times the poverty threshold set by the federal government.
‡Note that the data reported here are households and the percentage = (zero-vehicle households)/(total households in the county).
It is impossible to conclude with certainty the historical trend of the prevalence of people with disabilities. However, accounting for sampling error and considering results from 2000 and 2007, in all likelihood roughly 13% of the current population in Coshocton County has some disability.

According to 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data, Coshocton County had 11,098 jobs within the county. In that same year, 7,191 residents of Coshocton County were employed outside of the county, which accounts for 52.9% of residents who are employed.

Based on a combined measure of low-income individuals, zero-vehicle households, persons with disabilities, and adults aged 65 and over, the area most reliant on transit within Coshocton County is the city of Coshocton (see Figure 2).

Others areas showing moderate transit reliance include West Lafayette, as well as the northeast and southwest corners of the county.

The town of Baltic, just northeast of the Coshocton County line, and Newark, located southwest in Licking County each show moderate to high transit reliance.

Transit Supportive Development Patterns

Coshocton County is primarily a low density county with some concentration of population around the city of Coshocton, located at the center of the county. Of the roughly 36,900 people in the county, 38.5% live in higher density areas and 61.5% are in lower density (based on 2010 Census block data).

Coshocton, West Lafayette, and Conesville are the only areas with population and employment densities that, based on national evidence, suggest an ability to support transit service with a frequency of every 60 minutes or less (see Figure 3).

Many of the areas that indicate a demand for transit service suggest that deviated fixed route service (orange on Figure 3) may be more appropriate than standard fixed route services (red on Figure 3). An exception to this finding is Coshocton, which shows a variable mix.

Similar to the results above, Newark also demonstrates transit supportive densities outside of the county. Other nearby towns located outside the Coshocton County line with transit supportive densities include Newcomerstown, Dresden, and Frazeysburg.

Existing Transit Services

Transit service is not provided in Coshocton County.

2012 Transit Riders per Capita: NA

2012 Operating Expenditure per Capita: NA

Opportunities, Challenges, and Needs

Coshocton County is a relatively poor county, with 32% of the population in low-income households, and the county has seen a sharp increase in low-income individuals since 2000.

1 Based on 2012 ACS estimates for Coshocton County (36,856).
In addition to having higher poverty levels, Coshocton County is primarily rural. There are only a few areas with significant concentrations of people or jobs.

A key challenge facing Coshocton County is that while socio-economic characteristics suggest a need for public transportation, the development patterns mean that it would be difficult to operate cost effective transit service. Currently, no transit service exists in Coshocton County. However, similarly positioned counties in Ohio operate demand response service for people living in rural areas.

Canton is about 60 miles from the city of Coshocton, and Columbus is about 75 miles from the city of Coshocton. These larger urban areas are the primary urban centers for residents of Coshocton County who travel to these regions for jobs, services, and shopping.
Figure 2 Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics Affecting Reliance on Transit Service

Source: 2008 - 2012 5-year ACS Estimates; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT
Figure 3  Development Patterns (Population and Employment Density) Influencing Transit Service Design

Source: 2011 LEHD; 2010 Census SF1 100% data; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT

Note: The “defined transit service area” indicates the official boundaries of the agency service area and does not necessarily indicate the coverage of the current routes in operation.
GALLIA COUNTY

Overview

— Gallia County is located along the south edge of the state, along the Ohio River and bordering West Virginia.

— Gallipolis is the largest city and county seat; the county is part of the Point Pleasant-WV-OH Micropolitan Statistical Area.

— The nearest metropolitan area is Columbus, located 95 miles north of Gallipolis.

Factors Influencing Transit Reliance and Demand

Employment, Demographics and Socio-Economic Characteristics

— Gallia County's population has remained fairly stable, declining by just over 250 people (< 1%) in 12 years.

— The percentage of youth declined by less than 1%.

— The number of older adults aged 65+ increased by more than 780 people. Older adults now make up 16% of the population.

— The number of low-income individuals increased only slightly since 2000 and has decreased significantly since 2007; Gallia County remains less well-off than the average Ohio county, however, with nearly 32% of the population with low-incomes. The number of households without a vehicle has also decreased somewhat since 2000.

Figure 1 Selected County Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics: Historical Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2007†</th>
<th>2012‡</th>
<th>Change 2000-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>31,069</td>
<td>30,874</td>
<td>30,844</td>
<td>• 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths (5-17)</td>
<td>5,808 (18.7%)</td>
<td>5,225 (16.9%)</td>
<td>5,511 (17.9%)</td>
<td>• 297 (• 0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>4,211 (13.6%)</td>
<td>4,428 (14.3%)</td>
<td>4,994 (16.2%)</td>
<td>• 783 (• 2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities*</td>
<td>7,296 (25.5%)</td>
<td>7,041 (24.9%)</td>
<td>5,518 (18.1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Individuals†</td>
<td>9,071 (30.2%)</td>
<td>11,670 (38.8%)</td>
<td>9,541 (31.8%)</td>
<td>• 470 (• 1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Vehicle Households‡</td>
<td>1,004 (8.3%)</td>
<td>1,026 (8.7%)</td>
<td>872 (7.6%)</td>
<td>• 132 (• 0.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census, SF1 100% data & SF3 sample data; 2007 ACS 3-year estimates; 2012 ACS 3-year estimates

*2007 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2000 Census 100% data whereas 2012 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2010 Census 100% data. The Census asks users to use caution when making comparisons across a decennial census year and warns that the estimates may not be strictly comparable.

*The disability questions asked on the 2000 Census and ACS forms through 2007 were substantially different from the questions asked on the 2008 ACS form and later (including the 2010 Census). Therefore, one cannot say with certainty what changes occurred to the prevalence of disabilities between 2000 and 2012.

†Defined as all family members if the family income is less than 1.5 times the poverty threshold set by the federal government.

‡Note that the data reported here are households and the percentage = (zero-vehicle households)/(total households in the county).
It is impossible to conclude with certainty the historical trend of the prevalence of people with disabilities. However, accounting for sampling error and considering results from 2000 and 2007, in all likelihood at least 18% of the current population in Gallia County has some disability.

According to 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data, Gallia County had 19,748 jobs within the county. In that same year, 4,566 residents of Gallia County were employed outside of the county, which accounts for 46.1% of residents who are employed.

Based on a combined measure of low-income individuals, zero-vehicle households, persons with disabilities, and adults aged 65 and over, the areas most reliant on transit within Gallia County is the central area west of Gallipolis, which exhibits high reliance (see Figure 2).

Other areas showing a moderate transit reliance include the central area of the county.

Outside of Gallia County, the Jackson area in Jackson County shows moderate transit reliance.

Transit Supportive Development Patterns

Gallia County is primarily a lower density county with small pockets of higher density around the village of Gallipolis along the Ohio River. Of the 30,800 people in the county, 18.6% live in higher density areas and 81.4% are in lower density areas (based on 2010 Census block data).

Gallipolis is the only area with population and employment densities that, based on national evidence, suggest an ability to support transit service with a frequency of every 60 minutes or less (see Figure 3).

The transit-supportive area of Gallipolis indicates that deviated-fixed-route (orange on Figure 3) service may be more appropriate than standard fixed-route (red on Figure 3) service.

There are no significant areas of transit-supportive density outside the county.

Existing Transit Services

Transit service is not provided in Gallia County.

2012 Transit Riders per Capita\(^1\): NA

2012 Operating Expenditure per Capita\(^1\): NA

Opportunities, Challenges, and Needs

Gallia County is a less well-off county, with 32% of the population in low-income households.

In addition to having higher poverty levels, Gallia County is very low-density. Only a small part of the county, surrounding Gallipolis, can support transit.

Socio-economic characteristics suggest a need for public transportation.

\(^1\) Based on 2012 ACS estimates for Gallia County (30,844).
This page intentionally left blank.
Figure 2 Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics Affecting Reliance on Transit Service

Source: 2008 - 2012 5-year ACS Estimates; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT
Figure 3 Development Patterns (Population and Employment Density) Influencing Transit Service Design

Source: 2011 LEHD; 2010 Census SF1 100% data; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT

Note: The “defined transit service area” indicates the official boundaries of the agency service area and does not necessarily indicate the coverage of the current routes in operation.
GUERNSEY COUNTY

Overview

- Guernsey County is located in eastern Ohio, bisected east-west by US 77 and north-south by US 70.
- The largest city is Cambridge, which is also the county seat; the entire county is within the Cambridge Micropolitan Statistical Area.
- Cambridge lies nearly equidistant between Pittsburgh, PA, roughly 100 miles east, and Columbus, OH about 80 miles west.

Factors Influencing Transit Reliance and Demand

Employment, Demographics and Socio-Economic Characteristics

- Guernsey County’s population has decreased by just over 2% since 2000.
- The number of youth in Guernsey County has also decreased by roughly 1,000 people, a decline of more than 2%.
- Older adults aged 65+ have increased in both absolute number and as a share of the county population, now making up about 16.5% of the county population.
- A greater percentage of people have low-incomes today than in 2000, though more people are able to own cars. Overall, the county has a larger percentage of individuals with low-incomes, an increase of 2.5% from 2000.

Figure 1 Selected County Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics: Historical Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>40,792</td>
<td>40,503</td>
<td>39,897</td>
<td>-895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths (5-17)</td>
<td>7,927 (19.4%)</td>
<td>7,575 (18.7%)</td>
<td>6,877 (17.2%)</td>
<td>-895 (2.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>5,896 (14.5%)</td>
<td>6,066 (15.0%)</td>
<td>6,586 (16.5%)</td>
<td>690 (2.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities†</td>
<td>7,913 (21.1%)</td>
<td>7,469 (19.8%)</td>
<td>6,411 (16.2%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Individuals‡</td>
<td>10,850 (27.0%)</td>
<td>10,282 (25.7%)</td>
<td>11,597 (29.5%)</td>
<td>747 (2.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Vehicle Households‡</td>
<td>1,268 (7.9%)</td>
<td>1,575 (9.6%)</td>
<td>937 (6.1%)</td>
<td>-331 (1.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census, SF1 100% data & SF3 sample data; 2007 ACS 3-year estimates; 2012 ACS 3-year estimates

*2007 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2000 Census 100% data whereas 2012 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2010 Census 100% data. The Census asks users to use caution when making comparisons across a decennial census year and warns that the estimates may not be strictly comparable.

†The disability questions asked on the 2000 Census and ACS forms through 2007 were substantially different from the questions asked on the 2008 ACS form and later (including the 2010 Census). Therefore, one cannot say with certainty what changes occurred to the prevalence of disabilities between 2000 and 2012.

‡Defined as all family members if the family income is less than 1.5 times the poverty threshold set by the federal government.

†Note that the data reported here are households and the percentage = (zero-vehicle households)/(total households in the county).
It is impossible to conclude with certainty the historical trend of the prevalence of people with disabilities. However, accounting for sampling error and considering results from 2000 and 2007, in all likelihood at least 16% of the current population in Guernsey County has some disability.

According to 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data, Guernsey County had 13,595 jobs within the county. In that same year, 5,951 residents of Guernsey County were employed outside of the county, which accounts for 45.9% of residents who are employed.

Based on a combined measure of low-income individuals, zero-vehicle households, persons with disabilities, and adults aged 65 and over, the area most reliant on transit within Guernsey County is Cambridge (see Figure 2).

Other areas showing moderate transit reliance include areas in the northeast and southwest corners of the county.

Batesville and Barnesville, each near Quaker City and just south and east of the Guernsey County line, respectively, demonstrate a moderate to high transit reliance.

Transit Supportive Development Patterns

Guernsey County shows high density around Cambridge and Byesville. The remainder of the county has low density. Of the roughly 39,900 people in the county, 38.6% live in areas of higher density and 61.4% are in areas of lower density (based on 2010 Census block data).

Cambridge is the primary area with population and employment densities that, based on national evidence, suggest an ability to support transit service with a frequency of every 60 minutes or less (see Figure 3). There are other pockets south of Cambridge along US 77, such as in Byesville, that may support transit service.

Most of the areas that indicate a demand for transit service suggest that deviated fixed route service (orange on Figure 3) may be more appropriate than standard fixed route services (red on Figure 3). There appears to be exceptions in certain neighborhoods in Cambridge, which show a mix of orange and red.

Areas with transit supportive densities outside of the county are east in Barnesville, west in New Concord, and north in Newcomerstown.

Existing Transit Services

Transit service (fixed-route and paratransit) is available through South East Area Transit (SEAT) in the city of Cambridge and village of Byesville. SEAT is a public transit agency for both Guernsey and Muskingum Counties.

SEAT offers countywide demand response service called “Express Service.” It is a curb-to-curb service open to the general public.

SEAT operating characteristics:

- Two fixed-routes, one in Cambridge and another in Byesville, Monday - Friday, 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM
- Operates at a 60-minute frequency
- Curb-to-curb ADA paratransit service called EZ Ride during the same operating times of their fixed-routes. Seniors are also eligible for the service through a reduced fare program.
Express demand response service Monday - Friday, 8:00 AM – 4:00 PM

- Local funding is provided by Muskingum and Guernsey Counties, the cities of Zanesville and Cambridge, and the village of South Zanesville. Additional funding is provided through contracts with human service agencies.
- 2012 Transit Riders per Capita\(^1\): 0.29
- 2012 Operating Expenditure per Capita\(^1\): $5.30

**Opportunities, Challenges, and Needs**

- Guernsey County is experiencing a small increase in their transit-reliant population.
- There is an express route that goes between Cambridge and Zanesville, but to avoid having a vehicle from one county enter the other one (due to funding from two separate counties), two vehicles meet at the county line to exchange passengers. Riders would benefit from finding a way to run the express route in such a way that passengers have a one-seat ride between Zanesville and Cambridge.
- Due to financial constraints, SEAT is unable to add any additional services and providing current rural services has become challenging.
- SEAT has CodeChoppers PTX3 software for scheduling trips but administrators find the system difficult to use in generating data and reports.
- Given the potential for lengthy demand response trips in the rural areas of the county, a strong scheduling program could increase efficiency.
- To provide transit services to Cambridge and Guernsey County, SEAT maintains an office in the City of Cambridge. Having a satellite location reduces deadhead miles.
- The need for dialysis transportation continues to increase. Anecdotal evidence suggests the need has doubled in the past few years.
- SEAT has coordinated and partnered with Perry County Transit by loaning vehicles back-and-forth and arranging van pools. They have also partnered with the City of Zanesville by sharing equipment and personnel.

\(^1\) Based on 2012 ACS estimates for Guernsey County (39,897) and Muskingum County (86,109).
Figure 2 Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics Affecting Reliance on Transit Service

Source: 2008 - 2012 5-year ACS Estimates; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT
Figure 3 Development Patterns (Population and Employment Density) Influencing Transit Service Design

Source: 2011 LEHD; 2010 Census SF1 100% data; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT

Note: The “defined transit service area” indicates the official boundaries of the agency service area and does not necessarily indicate the coverage of the current routes in operation.
HARRISON COUNTY

Overview

– Harrison County is located along the eastern edge of Ohio close to the West Virginia border.
– Cadiz is the largest city in the county and is also the county seat.
– Harrison County is equal distance from two metropolitan areas – Akron, 70 miles to the north, and Pittsburgh, PA, 70 miles to the east.

Factors Influencing Transit Reliance and Demand

Employment, Demographics and Socio-Economic Characteristics

– Harrison County’s population has remained stable over the past 12 years.
– The number of youth in Harrison County declined by 1.3 percentage points or just over 200 people.
– The number of older adults aged 65+ rose slightly and now makes up 18% of the county’s population.
– The number of low-income individuals rose by nearly 600; this demographic has increased the most of the characteristics shown in Figure 1. Today nearly 29% of Harrison County’s population is low-income; this is higher than the average Ohio counties (24.8%).

Figure 1 Selected County Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics: Historical Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>15,856</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,818</td>
<td>♠ 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths (5-17)</td>
<td>2,733</td>
<td>(17.2%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♠ 206 (∆1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>2,804</td>
<td>(17.7%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♠ 103 (∆0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities*</td>
<td>2,953</td>
<td>(20.2%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Individuals†</td>
<td>3,869</td>
<td>(24.9%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♠ 599 (∆4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Vehicle Households‡</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>(5.6%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♠ 13 (∆0.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census, SF1 100% data & SF3 sample data; 2007 ACS 3-year estimates; 2012 ACS 3-year estimates

*2007 ACS estimates are not available for Harrison County because the ACS does not release 3-year estimates for geographies with a population below 20,000.

*The disability questions asked on the 2000 Census and ACS forms through 2007 were substantially different from the questions asked on the 2008 ACS form and later (including the 2010 Census). Therefore, one cannot say with certainty what changes occurred to the prevalence of disabilities between 2000 and 2012.

†Defined as all family members if the family income is less than 1.5 times the poverty threshold set by the federal government.

‡Note that the data reported here are households and the percentage = (zero-vehicle households)/(total households in the county).
It is difficult to accurately conclude the historical demographics of people with disabilities. However, accounting for sampling errors and considering the 2000 and 2007 census, it is estimated at least 16% of the current population in Harrison County has some disability.

According to 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data, Harrison County had 3,381 jobs within the county. In that same year, 4,461 residents of Harrison County were employed outside of the county, which accounts for 75.7% of employed residents.

Based on a combined measure of the absolute population of low-income individuals, zero-vehicle households, persons with disabilities, and adults aged 65 and over, the areas most reliant on transit within Harrison County are the Cadiz area and the northern edge of the county, which shows moderate-low reliance (see Figure 2).

Otherwise, the county exhibits low transit reliance.

Portions of neighboring Guernsey, Tuscarawas, Jefferson, and Carroll Counties have some transit reliance, but levels are in the moderate-low threshold.

### Transit Supportive Development Patterns

Harrison County has a low population density, with small pockets of higher density areas near the villages of Cadiz and Hopedale. Of the approximately 15,800 people in the county, 15.9% live in higher density areas and 84.1% are in lower density areas (based on 2010 Census block data).

Cadiz is the only area with population and employment densities that, based on national evidence, suggest an ability to support transit service with a frequency of every 60 minutes or less (see Figure 3).

Densities of Cadiz suggest that deviated-fixed-route (orange on Figure 3) service may be more appropriate than standard fixed-route (red on Figure 3) services.

Similar to the results above, areas with transit supportive densities outside of the county are in Uhrichsville in Tuscarawas County.

### Existing Transit Services

Harrison County Rural Transit (HCRT) offers county-wide demand response service that is available to everyone living in Harrison County.

**HCRT operating characteristics:**
- Demand response service Monday – Friday, 5:00 AM – 5:00 PM
- Trips within the county require 24 hours advanced notice, while travel to adjacent counties requires 5 days notice
- Provides Medicaid trips

Local funding is provided primarily through agency contracts. Currently, there are no additional local sources of funding.

- **2012 Transit Riders per Capita**: 1.48
- **2012 Operating Expenditure per Capita**: $36.92

---

1 Based on 2012 ACS estimates for Harrison County (15,818).
Opportunities, Challenges, and Needs

- Harrison County contains several human service agencies that use their own vehicles for transporting clients. Currently coordination of transportation services with Harrison County Rural Transit is minimal. Additional opportunities to coordinate services should be explored, including resource sharing.

- HCRT riders’ trip purpose is primarily for errands, grocery visits, family/friend visits, and doctor appointments. Some trips must go to Steubenville and St. Clairesville for medical dialysis treatments.

- A Saturday shopper shuttle was previously offered once per week but had low ridership. Currently the shopper shuttle operates once per month.

- The agency has had some difficulty finding drivers. The issue has been exacerbated by competition from the oil and gas industry where many people are finding work.

- While Harrison County Rural Transit has been in operation since 1996, many people still are not aware of the service. The agency does not have a website and has a hard time advertising their services.
Figure 2 Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics Affecting Reliance on Transit Service

Source: 2008 - 2012 5-year ACS Estimates; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT
Figure 3 Development Patterns (Population and Employment Density) Influencing Transit Service Design

Source: 2011 LEHD; 2010 Census SF1 100% data; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT

Note: The "defined transit service area" indicates the official boundaries of the agency service area and does not necessarily indicate the coverage of the current routes in operation.
HIGHLAND COUNTY

Overview

- Highland County is located in southwest Ohio.
- Hillsboro is the largest city in the county and is the county seat.
- The nearest metropolitan areas are Cincinnati and Dayton, which are located about 55-60 miles west and northwest of Hillsboro, respectively.

Factors Influencing Transit Reliance and Demand

Employment, Demographics and Socio-Economic Characteristics

- Highland County's population has increased by 6.0% since 2000, nearly 2,500 people.
- The number of youth in Highland County has decreased by about 150, or a drop of 1.3%.
- The number of older adults aged 65+ decreased by more than 1,000 over the past 12 years, and the percentage of the population in this age category rose from 13.8% in 2000 to 15.5% in 2012.
- Low-income population has increased by more than 5,500 since 2000. Nearly a third of the county’s population is classified as low-income, which is much higher than the average Ohio county (24.8%). The percentage of zero-vehicle households has remained nearly constant at just under 7%.

Figure 1 Selected County Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics: Historical Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>40,875</td>
<td>42,453</td>
<td>43,331</td>
<td>✷ 2,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths (5-17)</td>
<td>8,124 (19.9%)</td>
<td>7,857 (18.5%)</td>
<td>7,979 (18.4%)</td>
<td>✷ 145 (verbs 1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>5,649 (13.8%)</td>
<td>5,766 (13.6%)</td>
<td>6,697 (15.5%)</td>
<td>✷ 1,048 (verbs 1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities*</td>
<td>9,263 (24.6%)</td>
<td>8,619 (22.2%)</td>
<td>7,317 (17.0%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Individuals†</td>
<td>8,899 (22.1%)</td>
<td>11,111 (26.7%)</td>
<td>14,464 (33.8%)</td>
<td>✷ 5,565 (verbs 11.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Vehicle Households‡</td>
<td>1,053 (6.8%)</td>
<td>1,019 (6.6%)</td>
<td>1,147 (6.7%)</td>
<td>✷ 94 (verbs 0.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census, SF1 100% data & SF3 sample data; 2007 ACS 3-year estimates; 2012 ACS 3-year estimates

*2007 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2000 Census 100% data whereas 2012 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2010 Census 100% data. The Census asks users to use caution when making comparisons across a decennial census year and warns that the estimates may not be strictly comparable.

*The disability questions asked on the 2000 Census and ACS forms through 2007 were substantially different from the questions asked on the 2008 ACS form and later (including the 2010 Census). Therefore, one cannot say with certainty what changes occurred to the prevalence of disabilities between 2000 and 2012.

†Defined as all family members if the family income is less than 1.5 times the poverty threshold set by the federal government.

‡Note that the data reported here are households and the percentage = (zero-vehicle households)/(total households in the county).
It is impossible to conclude with certainty the historical trend of the prevalence of people with disabilities. However, accounting for sampling error and considering results from 2000 and 2007, in all likelihood at least 17% of the current population in Highland County has some disability.

According to 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data, Highland County had 9,450 jobs within the county. In that same year, 9,779 residents of Highland County were employed outside of the county, which accounts for 67.7% of residents who are employed.

Based on a combined measure of low-income individuals, zero-vehicle households, persons with disabilities, and adults aged 65 and over, the area most reliant on transit within Highland County is Hillsboro (see Figure 2).

Areas immediately north, south, and east of Hillsboro and the northeastern corner of the county show moderate-high transit reliance. The rest of the county has moderate-low or low transit reliance.

Outside of the county, Mount Orab in Brown County and the northwestern corner of Pike County show moderate-high transit reliance.

Transit Supportive Development Patterns

Highland County is predominately lower density, with small pockets of higher density around the city of Hillsboro and the village of Greenfield. Of the 43,300 people in the county, 27.0% live in areas of higher density and 73.0% are in areas of lower density (based on 2010 Census block data).

Hillsboro and Greenfield are the only areas with population and employment densities that, based on national evidence, suggest an ability to support transit service with a frequency of every 60 minutes or less (see Figure 3).

Wilmington in Clinton County, northwest of Hillsboro, has some areas with transit supportive densities.

Existing Transit Services

Transit service is not provided in Highland County.

2012 Transit Riders per Capita\(^1\): NA

2012 Operating Expenditure per Capita\(^1\): NA

Opportunities, Challenges, and Needs

Highland County is a less well-off county, with a third of the county’s population in low-income households.

The prevalence of low-income households rose by nearly 12%, while zero-vehicle households remained steady, potentially indicating increased need for transportation.

In addition to having higher poverty levels, Highland County is primarily low density. Hillsboro and Greenfield are the only areas with significant concentrations of people or jobs.

\(^1\) Based on 2012 ACS estimates for Highland County (43,331).
The socio-economic characteristics in Highland County suggest a need for public transportation in some parts of the county. Similarly positioned counties in Ohio operate demand response service for people living in rural areas.

Given that 70% of the residents leave Highland County for work, combined with a high percentage of low-income population, there may be need for employment transportation.

Cincinnati is located about 59 miles west of Hillsboro and Dayton lies 56 miles to the northwest. It is likely that Highland County residents rely upon these two urbanized areas for jobs, services, and shopping.
Figure 2  Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics Affecting Reliance on Transit Service

Source: 2008 - 2012 5-year ACS Estimates; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT
Figure 3 Development Patterns (Population and Employment Density) Influencing Transit Service Design

Potential Transit Service Design:
(based on Pop/Emp Density by Census Block)

- Demand response (> 60 min)
- Deviated fixed-route (30 - 60 min)
- Fixed-route (≤ 30 min)
- Defined transit service area

Source: 2011 LEHD; 2010 Census SF1 100% data; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT

Note: The “defined transit service area” indicates the official boundaries of the agency service area and does not necessarily indicate the coverage of the current routes in operation.
HOCKING COUNTY

Overview

- Hocking County is located in south central Ohio.
- Logan is the largest city in Hocking County and is also the county seat.
- The nearest metropolitan area is Columbus, 60 miles to the northwest.

Factors Influencing Transit Reliance and Demand

Employment, Demographics and Socio-Economic Characteristics

- Hocking County's population has increased by just over 1,100 people, around 4%.
- The number of youth declined, but very slightly, by just 58 people.
- The percentage of older adults 65+ jumped by 2.7%.
- The number of low-income individuals increased the most of any characteristic shown in Figure 1. The percentage of low-income individuals in Hocking County is slightly higher than the average for Ohio (27.8% versus 24.8%). Households without access to a vehicle declined by nearly 2%.

Figure 1 Selected County Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics: Historical Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>28,241</td>
<td>28,810</td>
<td>29,353</td>
<td>↑ 1,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths (5-17)</td>
<td>5,310 (18.8%)</td>
<td>5,211 (18.1%)</td>
<td>5,252 (17.9%)</td>
<td>↓ 58 (0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>3,708 (13.1%)</td>
<td>3,873 (13.4%)</td>
<td>4,644 (15.8%)</td>
<td>↑ 936 (2.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities^</td>
<td>5,772 (22.5%)</td>
<td>5,508 (21.0%)</td>
<td>4,588 (16.0%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Individuals†</td>
<td>6,303 (23.0%)</td>
<td>7,547 (27.2%)</td>
<td>7,953 (27.8%)</td>
<td>↑ 1,650 (4.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Vehicle Households‡</td>
<td>846 (7.8%)</td>
<td>593 (5.5%)</td>
<td>673 (5.9%)</td>
<td>↓ 173 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census, SF1 100% data & SF3 sample data; 2007 ACS 3-year estimates; 2012 ACS 3-year estimates

*2007 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2000 Census 100% data whereas 2012 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2010 Census 100% data. The Census asks users to use caution when making comparisons across a decennial census year and warns that the estimates may not be strictly comparable.

^The disability questions asked on the 2000 Census and ACS forms through 2007 were substantially different from the questions asked on the 2008 ACS form and later (including the 2010 Census). Therefore, one cannot say with certainty what changes occurred to the prevalence of disabilities between 2000 and 2012.

†Defined as all family members if the family income is less than 1.5 times the poverty threshold set by the federal government.

‡Note that the data reported here are households and the percentage = (zero-vehicle households)/(total households in the county).
It is impossible to conclude with certainty the historical trend of the prevalence of people with disabilities. However, accounting for sampling error and considering results from 2000 and 2007, in all likelihood at least 16% of the current population in Hocking County has some disability.

According to 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data, Hocking County had 6,387 jobs within the county. In that same year, 9,837 residents of Hocking County were employed outside of the county, which accounts for 75.8% of residents who are employed.

Based on a combined measure of low-income individuals, zero-vehicle households, persons with disabilities, and adults aged 65 and over, the area most reliant on transit within Hocking County is a swath east of Logan. This area displays moderate reliance (see Figure 2).

All other areas of the county exhibit low-moderate transit reliance.

Transit Supportive Development Patterns

Hocking County has areas of higher density around the city of Logan in the middle of the county. The western and southern halves of the county are primarily lower density areas. Of the 29,400 people in the county, 27.0% live in higher density areas and 70.8% are in lower density areas (based on 2010 Census block data).

Logan is the only area with population and employment densities that, based on national evidence, suggest an ability to support transit service with a frequency of every 60 minutes or less (see Figure 3).

Logan’s transit-supportive patterns show that deviated-fixed route service (orange on Figure 3) may be more appropriate than standard fixed route services (red on Figure 3).

Lancaster in Fairfield County and Nelsonville in Athens County also exhibit transit-supportive densities.

Existing Transit Services

Logan Public Transit (LPT) offers demand response service that is open to the public and it will travel within a two mile radius of the city of Logan.

Logan Public Transit operating characteristics:

- Demand response service Monday – Friday, 8:00 AM – 5:00 PM
- Local funding is provided by the City of Logan, Hocking Athens Perry Community Action, Hocking College, Logan/Holl Foundation, and donations.
- Major agency contracts include Hocking College, The Employment Connection, the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation, and the Southeastern Ohio Center for Independent Living.
- While many human service agencies are supportive, contracts for service have not been executed.
2012 Transit Riders per Capita: \textbf{0.50}

2012 Operating Expenditure per Capita: \textbf{$7.72}$

**Opportunities, Challenges, and Needs**

- Over the past five years, LPT’s vehicle fleet has doubled in size from three to six vehicles (five modified mini-vans and one LTN). LPT typically operates four vehicles during peak periods.
- LPT reached an agreement with Hocking College to establish a college shuttle.
- Expansion in service hours and area are needed.
- An ODOT review of Hocking County found that the area exhibits an aging population, fixed incomes, high poverty, high food insecurity, and high unemployment.
- Rider’s disabilities are becoming more severe and many riders are overweight or obese requiring lifts for wheelchairs that weigh over 600 lbs.
- The greatest challenge to LPT is a lack of local funding. Additional human service agency contracts would also be of assistance.
- LPT has identified goals of providing countywide service with connectors to major metro areas and to provide transportation to all the individuals that fall through the social service agency cracks. A lack of funding has stopped these two goals from becoming a reality.
- LPT acts as a feeder service for the GoBus.
- Establishing a partnership with Veterans Services Organizations has been an ongoing discussion.

\footnote{Based on 2012 ACS estimates for Hocking County (29,353).}
Figure 2 Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics Affecting Reliance on Transit Service

Source: 2008 - 2012 5-year ACS Estimates; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT
Figure 3 Development Patterns (Population and Employment Density) Influencing Transit Service Design

Source: 2011 LEHD; 2010 Census SF1 100% data; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT

Note: The “defined transit service area” indicates the official boundaries of the agency service area and does not necessarily indicate the coverage of the current routes in operation.
HOLMES COUNTY

Overview

- Holmes County is in central Ohio southwest of Cleveland and Akron.
- Millersburg is the largest community in the county.
- The nearest metropolitan area is Akron, which is located about 55 miles northeast of Millersburg.

Factors Influencing Transit Reliance and Demand

Employment, Demographics and Socio-Economic Characteristics

- Holmes County's population has increased by nearly 3,800 people since 2000, a 9.7% increase.
- The number of youth in Holmes County has increased by more than 500 people, but the share of the county's total population that are youth has declined by one percentage point. Overall, nearly 25% of the county's population consists of youth.
- The number of older adults increased by more than 900 people. Today older adults make up 11.7% of the total population, up from 10.5% in 2000.
- The low-income population has increased by over 3,400 individuals. Nearly one-third (33%) of the county's population falls into the low-income category; this is significantly higher than the average Ohio county percentage of 24.8%.

Figure 1 Selected County Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics: Historical Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>38,943</td>
<td>41,350</td>
<td>42,733</td>
<td>3,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths (5-17)</td>
<td>9,854</td>
<td>9,957</td>
<td>10,366</td>
<td>512 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>4,092</td>
<td>4,431</td>
<td>5,017</td>
<td>925 (1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities^</td>
<td>5,760</td>
<td>3,860</td>
<td>3,273</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Individuals†</td>
<td>10,201</td>
<td>8,532</td>
<td>13,661</td>
<td>3,460 (5.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Vehicle Households‡</td>
<td>3,532</td>
<td>3,713</td>
<td>3,720</td>
<td>188 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census, SF1 100% data & SF3 sample data; 2007 ACS 3-year estimates; 2012 ACS 3-year estimates

*2007 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2000 Census 100% data whereas 2012 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2010 Census 100% data. The Census asks users to use caution when making comparisons across a decennial census year and warns that the estimates may not be strictly comparable.

^The disability questions asked on the 2000 Census and ACS forms through 2007 were substantially different from the questions asked on the 2008 ACS form and later (including the 2010 Census). Therefore, one cannot say with certainty what changes occurred to the prevalence of disabilities between 2000 and 2012.

†Defined as all family members if the family income is less than 1.5 times the poverty threshold set by the federal government.
‡Note that the data reported here are households and the percentage = (zero-vehicle households)/(total households in the county).
It is impossible to conclude with certainty the historical trend of the prevalence of people with disabilities. However, accounting for sampling error and considering results from 2000 and 2007, in all likelihood at least 7% of the current population in Holmes County has some disability.

Holmes County has a much higher percentage of zero-vehicle households than the average county in Ohio (30% versus 8.3%), due in part to the county’s large Amish population.

According to 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data, Holmes County had 16,857 jobs within the county. In that same year, 7,027 residents of Holmes County were employed outside of the county, which accounts for 45.9% of residents who are employed.

Based on a combined measure of low-income individuals, zero-vehicle households, persons with disabilities, and adults aged 65 and over, those areas most reliant on transit within Holmes County are block groups to the northeast of Millersburg (see Figure 2).

Other areas showing a moderate to high transit reliance include most of the areas along the northern and eastern borders of the county.

The areas just across the northern border of Holmes County have a moderate to high reliance on transit.

Transit Supportive Development Patterns

Holmes County is predominately lower density, with small areas of higher density near the villages of Millersburg and Killbuck. Of the roughly 42,700 people in the county, 7.0% live in higher density areas and 93.0% are in lower density areas (based on 2010 Census block data).

Millersburg and Killbuck are the only areas with population and employment densities that, based on national evidence, suggest an ability to support transit service with a frequency of every 60 minutes or less (see Figure 3).

The transit-supportive areas are very small, making them difficult to serve with transit.

Similar to the results above, areas with transit supportive densities outside of the county include Brewster, Loudonville, and Shreve.

Existing Transit Services

Transit service is not provided in Holmes County.

2012 Transit Riders per Capita: NA

2012 Operating Expenditure per Capita: NA

Opportunities, Challenges, and Needs

Holmes County is a very poor county, with nearly 33% of the population in low-income households.

1 Based on 2012 ACS estimates for Holmes County (42,733).
In addition to having higher poverty levels, Holmes County is extremely low-density. Virtually no areas show a significant concentration of people or jobs.

The socio-economic characteristics in Holmes County suggest a need for public transportation, especially in the eastern half of the county; however, the development patterns mean that it would be extremely difficult to operate cost effective transit service.

Counties with similar levels of transit reliance and population in Ohio offer demand response services, and some type of transit would provide enhanced accessibility and mobility for this community.
Figure 2 Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics Affecting Reliance on Transit Service

Source: 2008 - 2012 5-year ACS Estimates; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT
Figure 3 Development Patterns (Population and Employment Density) Influencing Transit Service Design

Source: 2011 LEHD; 2010 Census SF1 100% data; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT

Note: The "defined transit service area" indicates the official boundaries of the agency service area and does not necessarily indicate the coverage of the current routes in operation.
JACKSON COUNTY

Overview

- Jackson County is located in south central Ohio.
- Jackson is the county’s largest city and is the county seat.
- The nearest metropolitan area is Huntington, West Virginia, a little over 60 miles south of Jackson, but it takes just as long to travel to Columbus or Parkersburg, West Virginia, both of which are 75 miles from Jackson.

Factors Influencing Transit Needs and Demand

Employment, Demographics and Socio-Economic Characteristics

- Jackson County’s population has increased slightly, by just under 500 people.
- The number of youth decreased slightly, and youth now make up a somewhat smaller percentage of the population by 1.4 percentage points.
- The percentage of older adults aged 65+ increased 1 percentage point but only slightly by absolute population.
- Low-income individuals increased the most of any characteristic in Figure 1, a change of more than 32% and 8 points in the percentage of the population. More than 35% of Jackson County’s population has low incomes, which is much higher than the average Ohio county (24.8%). Zero-vehicle households have also increased since 2000.

Figure 1 Selected County Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics: Historical Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>32,641</td>
<td>33,289</td>
<td>33,130</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths (5-17)</td>
<td>6,342 (19.4%)</td>
<td>5,944 (17.9%)</td>
<td>5,959 (18.0%)</td>
<td>383 (-1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>4,439 (13.6%)</td>
<td>4,675 (14.0%)</td>
<td>4,831 (14.6%)</td>
<td>392 (+1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities^</td>
<td>7,561 (25.1%)</td>
<td>7,608 (24.7%)</td>
<td>6,701 (20.4%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Individuals†</td>
<td>8,757 (27.3%)</td>
<td>9,470 (28.7%)</td>
<td>11,569 (35.3%)</td>
<td>2,812 (+8.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Vehicle Households‡</td>
<td>1,114 (8.8%)</td>
<td>1,148 (8.8%)</td>
<td>1,340 (10.0%)</td>
<td>226 (+1.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census, SF1 100% data & SF3 sample data; 2007 ACS 3-year estimates; 2012 ACS 3-year estimates

*2007 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2000 Census 100% data whereas 2012 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2010 Census 100% data. The Census asks users to use caution when making comparisons across a decennial census year and warns that the estimates may not be strictly comparable.

^The disability questions asked on the 2000 Census and ACS forms through 2007 were substantially different from the questions asked on the 2008 ACS form and later (including the 2010 Census). Therefore, one cannot say with certainty what changes occurred to the prevalence of disabilities between 2000 and 2012.

†Defined as all family members if the family income is less than 1.5 times the poverty threshold set by the federal government.

‡Note that the data reported here are households and the percentage = (zero-vehicle households)/(total households in the county).
It is impossible to conclude with certainty the historical trend of the prevalence of people with disabilities. However, accounting for sampling error and considering results from 2000 and 2007, in all likelihood at least 20% of the current population in Jackson County has some disability.

According to 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data, Jackson County had 10,245 jobs within the county. In that same year, 4,588 residents of Jackson County were employed outside of the county, which accounts for 44.9% of residents who are employed.

Based on a combined measure of low-income individuals, zero-vehicle households, persons with disabilities, and adults aged 65 and over, the areas most reliant on transit are north and south of Jackson, which show moderate-high reliance (see Figure 2).

The remainder of the county shows moderate-low or low transit reliance.

Rio Grande in Gallia County and South Webster in Scioto County also show moderate transit reliance.

**Transit Supportive Development Patterns**

Jackson County is primarily a lower density county with a few higher density areas around the cities of Jackson and Wellston. Of the 33,100 people in the county, 35.4% live in higher density areas and 64.6% are in low density areas (based on 2010 Census block data).

Jackson and Wellston are the only areas with population and employment densities that, based on national evidence, suggest an ability to support transit service with a frequency of every 60 minutes or less (see Figure 3).

The development patterns of Jackson and Wellston indicate that deviated-fixed-route (orange on Figure 3) service may be more appropriate than standard fixed-route (red on Figure 3) services.

There are no areas immediately outside Jackson County with significant pockets of transit-supportive densities.

**Existing Transit Services**

- Transit service is not provided in Jackson County.
- 2012 Transit Riders per Capita\(^1\): **NA**
- 2012 Operating Expenditure per Capita\(^1\): **NA**

**Opportunities, Challenges, and Needs**

- Jackson County is a poor county; more than 35% of the population has low-incomes.
- Jackson County is predominantly low-density, but there are two pockets of transit-supportive densities in Jackson and Wellston. Given the low densities in neighboring counties, it is likely that Jackson County draws some regional visits.
- A key challenge facing Jackson County is that while socio-economic characteristics suggest a need for public transportation, the development patterns mean that it would be difficult to operate cost effective transit service.

\(^1\) Based on 2012 ACS estimates for Jackson County (33,130).
Figure 2  Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics Affecting Reliance on Transit Service

Source: 2008 - 2012 5-year ACS Estimates; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT
Figure 3 Development Patterns (Population and Employment Density) Influencing Transit Service Design

Source: 2011 LEHD; 2010 Census SF1 100% data; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT

Note: The “defined transit service area” indicates the official boundaries of the agency service area and does not necessarily indicate the coverage of the current routes in operation.
JEFFERSON COUNTY

Overview

- Jefferson County is located along the eastern edge of Ohio along the Ohio River.
- Steubenville is the largest city in the county and is part of the Weirton (WV) – Steubenville Metropolitan Statistical Area.
- The nearest metropolitan area is Pittsburgh, PA, which is located about 40 miles east of Steubenville.

Factors Influencing Transit Reliance and Demand

Employment, Demographics and Socio-Economic Characteristics

- Jefferson County's population has decreased by nearly 5,000 people since 2000, a decline of 6.7%.
- The number of youth in Jefferson County has decreased by nearly 1,500, making up 15.2% of the population today.
- While the number of older adults aged 65+ decreased over the past 12 years, the percentage of the population in this age category remained nearly constant at just under 19%.
- A greater percentage of people have low-incomes today than in 2000, though more people own cars. Overall, the county is somewhat better off today than in the past decade but remains slightly less well-off than an average county in Ohio (24.8%).

Figure 1 Selected County Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics: Historical Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>73,894</td>
<td>69,428</td>
<td>68,965</td>
<td>-4,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths (5-17)</td>
<td>11,961</td>
<td>10,452</td>
<td>10,469</td>
<td>1,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>13,752</td>
<td>13,033</td>
<td>12,783</td>
<td>969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities†</td>
<td>14,121</td>
<td>13,700</td>
<td>10,883</td>
<td>3,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Individuals†</td>
<td>18,124</td>
<td>18,750</td>
<td>18,002</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Vehicle Households‡</td>
<td>3,236</td>
<td>2,781</td>
<td>2,432</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census, SF1 100% data & SF3 sample data; 2007 ACS 3-year estimates; 2012 ACS 3-year estimates

*2007 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2000 Census 100% data whereas 2012 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2010 Census 100% data. The Census asks users to use caution when making comparisons across a decennial census year and warns that the estimates may not be strictly comparable.

†The disability questions asked on the 2000 Census and ACS forms through 2007 were substantially different from the questions asked on the 2008 ACS form and later (including the 2010 Census). Therefore, one cannot say with certainty what changes occurred to the prevalence of disabilities between 2000 and 2012.

‡Defined as all family members if the family income is less than 1.5 times the poverty threshold set by the federal government.

†Note that the data reported here are households and the percentage = (zero-vehicle households)/(total households in the county).
It is impossible to conclude with certainty the historical trend of the prevalence of people with disabilities. However, accounting for sampling error and considering results from 2000 and 2007, in all likelihood at least 15% of the current population in Jefferson County has some disability.

According to 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data, Jefferson County had 21,961 jobs within the county. In that same year, 14,021 residents of Jefferson County were employed outside of the county, which accounts for 54.7% of residents who are employed.

Based on a combined measure of low-income individuals, zero-vehicle households, persons with disabilities, and adults aged 65 and over, the areas with the highest transit reliance within Jefferson County are Steubenville and Wintersville (see Figure 2).

Other areas showing a moderate to high reliance on transit include the northwest and southwest corners of the county, and select areas along the Ohio River Valley, including Mingo Junction, Tiltonsville/Yorkville, and near Toronto.

East Liverpool and Martins Ferry, located along the Ohio River Valley about 5 to 7 miles north and south of the Jefferson County line, respectively, both show high to very high reliance on transit use.

Transit Supportive Development Patterns

Jefferson County is primarily a rural county with small pockets of urbanization around the Ohio River Valley. Of the roughly 69,000 people in the county, 61.0% live in urban areas and 39.0% are in rural areas (based on 2010 Census block data).

Steubenville, Mingo Junction, Wintersville, Tiltonsville/Yorkville, and Toronto are the only areas with population and employment densities that, based on national evidence, suggest an ability to support transit service with a frequency of every 60 minutes or less (see Figure 3).

Many of the areas that indicate a demand for transit service suggest that deviated-fixed-route (orange on Figure 3) service may be more appropriate than standard fixed-route (red on Figure 3) services. An exception to this finding is Steubenville, which shows a variable mix.

Similar to the results above, areas with transit supportive densities outside of the county are along the Ohio River Valley around East Liverpool and Martins Ferry.

Existing Transit Services

Transit service (fixed-route and paratransit) is available through the Steele Valley Regional Transit Authority (SVRTA) in the city of Steubenville and village of Mingo Junction.

No fixed route or paratransit service is available outside of the SVRTA service area.

SVRTA operating characteristics:
- Three routes Monday - Friday, two in Steubenville and one in Mingo Junction that connects to Steubenville, 6:30 AM – 6:10 PM
- Two daily weekday stops in Weirton, WV on the Mingo Junction route
- One route on Saturdays and some holidays in Steubenville, 9:00 AM – 5:00 PM
Market Analysis DRAFT
Ohio Department of Transportation

✓ Most routes operate at about a 60-minute minute frequency
✓ Complementary ADA paratransit service within ¾-mile and during the same operating times of fixed-routes
✓ Vanpool service to Pittsburgh
  – Local funding is provided through a property tax levy. The property tax raises approximately $100k annually.
  – 2012 Transit Riders per Capita¹: **2.43**
  – 2012 Operating Expenditure per Capita¹: **$19.99**

Opportunities, Challenges, and Needs

– Jefferson County is a relatively poor county, with 27% of the population in low-income households.
– In addition to having higher poverty levels, Jefferson County is primarily rural. There are only a handful of areas with significant concentrations of people or jobs. These areas are primarily located along the Ohio River and include Steubenville, Toronto, and Yorkville.
– A key challenge facing Jefferson County is that while socio-economic characteristics suggest a need for public transportation, its development patterns mean that it would be difficult to operate cost effective transit service. Currently, only people living in Toronto, Steubenville, and Yorkville have access to transit services. However, similarly positioned counties in Ohio operate demand response service for people living in rural areas.
– Pittsburgh is located about 40 miles from Steubenville and is slightly closer to the northern parts of the county, including Toronto. As a result, Pittsburgh is the primary urban center for residents of Jefferson County who travel to the region for jobs, services, and shopping. There are also several vanpools operating between Jefferson County and Pittsburgh every day. Anecdotal evidence suggests there is potential for more regional transit service connecting Steubenville with Pittsburgh. Another option for regional service would be connections to Wheeling, WV in order to access Greyhound service.
– There have been recent initiatives to expand the SVRTA service area to include Wintersville, although technical issues surrounding the referendum process prevented this from happening.

¹ Based on 2012 ACS estimates for Jefferson County (68,965).
Figure 2  Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics Affecting the Reliance on Transit Service

Source: 2008 - 2012 5-year ACS Estimates; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT
Figure 3 Development Patterns (Population and Employment Density) Influencing Transit Service Design

Potential Transit Service Design:
(based on Pop/Emp Density by Census Block)
- Demand response (> 60 min)
- Deviated fixed-route (30 - 60 min)
- Fixed-route (≤ 30 min)
- Defined transit service area

Source: 2011 LEHD; 2010 Census SF1 100% data; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT

Note: The “defined transit service area” indicates the official boundaries of the agency service area and does not necessarily indicate the coverage of the current routes in operation.
LAWRENCE COUNTY

Overview

— Lawrence County is located along the southern edge of Ohio along the Kentucky and West Virginia borders.
— Ironton is the largest city and county seat; Lawrence County is part of the Huntington-Ashland, WV-KY-OH Metropolitan Statistical Area.
— The nearest metropolitan area is Charleston, WV, 70 miles east of Ironton.

Factors Influencing Transit Reliance and Demand

Employment, Demographics and Socio-Economic Characteristics

— Lawrence County’s population has remained steady since 2000.
— The percentage of youth has declined slightly, by 1 percentage point.
— The number of older adults aged 65+ increased by more than 1,000. Older adults now make up more than 16% of the county’s population, which is average for Ohio.
— Unlike many Ohio counties, low-income individuals decreased by more than 800, representing a 1.3 percentage point decrease. At the same time, more households now own a vehicle.

Figure 1 Selected County Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics: Historical Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>62,319</td>
<td>62,589</td>
<td>62,299</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths (5-17)</td>
<td>11,431</td>
<td>10,668</td>
<td>10,777</td>
<td>-654 (−1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>8,966</td>
<td>9,189</td>
<td>10,029</td>
<td>1,063 (+1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities^</td>
<td>15,962</td>
<td>15,428</td>
<td>13,122</td>
<td>-2,338 (−14.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Individuals†</td>
<td>19,066</td>
<td>21,833</td>
<td>18,178</td>
<td>-888 (−4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Vehicle Households‡</td>
<td>2,097</td>
<td>2,078</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>-593 (−28.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census, SF1 100% data & SF3 sample data; 2007 ACS 3-year estimates; 2012 ACS 3-year estimates

*2007 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2000 Census 100% data whereas 2012 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2010 Census 100% data. The Census asks users to use caution when making comparisons across a decennial census year and warns that the estimates may not be strictly comparable.

^The disability questions asked on the 2000 Census and ACS forms through 2007 were substantially different from the questions asked on the 2008 ACS form and later (including the 2010 Census). Therefore, one cannot say with certainty what changes occurred to the prevalence of disabilities between 2000 and 2012.

†Defined as all family members if the family income is less than 1.5 times the poverty threshold set by the federal government.

‡Note that the data reported here are households and the percentage = (zero-vehicle households)/(total households in the county).
It is impossible to conclude with certainty the historical trend of the prevalence of people with disabilities. However, accounting for sampling error and considering results from 2000 and 2007, in all likelihood at least 21% of the current population in Lawrence County has some disability.

According to 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data, Lawrence County had 11,879 jobs within the county. In that same year, 20,462 residents of Lawrence County were employed outside of the county, which accounts for 75.9% of residents who are employed.

Based on a combined measure of low-income individuals, zero-vehicle households, persons with disabilities, and adults aged 65 and over, the areas most reliant on transit within Lawrence County are Ironton, Coal Grove, and South Point, which show moderate reliance (see Figure 2).

Much of the central portion of the county shows moderate-low transit reliance.

One area just west of Lawrence County in Scioto County exhibits moderate transit reliance.

Transit Supportive Development Patterns

Lawrence County is primarily a lower density county with pockets of higher density areas around the Ohio River Valley. Of the 62,300 people in the county, 54.1% live in urban areas and 45.9% are in rural areas (based on 2010 Census block data).

Ironton is the only substantially-sized area with population and employment densities that, based on national evidence, suggest an ability to support transit service with a frequency of every 60 minutes or less (see Figure 3).

Several communities along the Ohio River show land development that could support transit. Many of the areas indicate support for deviated fixed route service (orange on Figure 3) rather than standard fixed route services (red on Figure 3). An exception to this finding is Ironton, which shows a variable mix.

There are no substantial transit-supportive areas just outside Lawrence County.

Existing Transit Services

Transit service (fixed-route, paratransit, and demand response) is available through Lawrence County Public Transit (LCT) to all residents of Lawrence County.

LCT operating characteristics:

- Four routes Monday – Friday, connecting the towns of Proctorville, Huntington, Ironton, and Ashland, 6:00 AM – 7:30 PM
- Demand response service operates Monday – Friday, 5:00 AM – 6:00 PM, and Saturday and Sunday if a driver is available
- Complementary ADA paratransit service within ¾-mile of fixed route service Monday – Friday, 6:25 AM – 7:30 PM

2012 Transit Riders per Capita: 0.50
2012 Operating Expenditure per Capita: $17.49

1 Based on 2012 ACS estimates for Lawrence County (62,299).
Opportunities, Challenges, and Needs

- The transit needs have changed a lot of the past decade in Lawrence County. There is a large and growing senior population, and there has been an increase in the student population at Marshall University.

- The major challenges in meeting transit needs are providing an adequate level of frequency, and providing evening and weekend service. Also, over 70% of Lawrence County residents work outside the county, so regional transit services are a necessity.

- While population in the region has not grown, the 2010 U.S. Census altered the boundaries of the Huntington, West Virginia Urbanized Area to include Lawrence County, and so it is now part of an Urbanized Area greater than 200,000. Under the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) program requirements, this change means that the transit system is no longer eligible for operating funding through the FTA Section 5311 Program of funding for rural transit, and it is unable to use its federal funds for operating assistance. These changes have made it increasingly difficult to provide adequate service, particularly to the rest of Lawrence County, which is 80% rural.

- Other challenges include the need to work with three different states (Ohio, Kentucky, and West Virginia) and with three different Federal Transit Administration (FTA) offices since each state is in a different FTA region. Lawrence County Transit has a strong working relationship with the Tri-State Transit Authority and the KYOVA Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), and new Ohio Valley Commuter Express service began April 7, 2014 to connect bus terminals in Ironton, Huntington, and Ashland.

- In recent years, LCT has focused more on capturing choice riders, especially those traveling to Marshall University and to major employment centers. In several months, LCT will be introducing a new commuter express service between Ironton, Huntington (WV), and Ashland (KY).

- LCT has a great opportunity to expand partnerships with Ohio University Southern in Ironton and with Marshall University in Huntington, WV.
Figure 2 Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics Affecting Reliance on Transit Service

Source: 2008 - 2012 5-year ACS Estimates; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT
Figure 3 Development Patterns (Population and Employment Density) Influencing Transit Service Design

Source: 2011 LEHD; 2010 Census SF1 100% data; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT

Note: The “defined transit service area” indicates the official boundaries of the agency service area and does not necessarily indicate the coverage of the current routes in operation.
MEIGS COUNTY

Overview

- Meigs County is located in southeast Ohio along the Ohio River, bordering West Virginia.
- Middleport is the county’s largest municipality; Pomeroy is the county seat.
- The nearest metropolitan area is Parkersburg, West Virginia, just over 35 miles northeast of Pomeroy.

Factors Influencing Transit Reliance and Demand

Employment, Demographics and Socio-Economic Characteristics

- The county’s population has remained stable since 2000, increasing by 600, or 2.6%.
- The number of youth in Meigs County decreased overall from 2000-2012 by more than 1 percentage point, but 2012 numbers show a slight uptick compared to 2007.
- The percentage of older adults aged 65+ increased by more than 1 percentage point, but this is a relatively small change compared to other counties in Ohio. Older adults now make up around 16% of the population.
- The number and percentage of low-income individuals rose only slightly; however, Meigs County’s population was one-third low-income in 2000, a much higher percentage in this demographic than the average Ohio county 12 years ago, and that remains the case today. The number of zero-vehicle households in Meigs County decreased by almost 30% since 2000, though most of this change occurred by 2007.

Figure 1 Selected County Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics: Historical Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>23,072</td>
<td>22,976</td>
<td>23,672</td>
<td>✰ 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths (5-17)</td>
<td>4,206</td>
<td>(18.2%)</td>
<td>3,735</td>
<td>(16.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>3,406</td>
<td>(14.8%)</td>
<td>3,431</td>
<td>(14.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities^</td>
<td>5,511</td>
<td>(25.6%)</td>
<td>5,456</td>
<td>(25.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Individuals†</td>
<td>7,572</td>
<td>(33.3%)</td>
<td>8,108</td>
<td>(35.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Vehicle Households‡</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>(9.2%)</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>(5.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census, SF1 100% data & SF3 sample data; 2007 ACS 3-year estimates; 2012 ACS 3-year estimates

*2007 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2000 Census 100% data whereas 2012 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2010 Census 100% data. The Census asks users to use caution when making comparisons across a decennial census year and warns that the estimates may not be strictly comparable.

^The disability questions asked on the 2000 Census and ACS forms through 2007 were substantially different from the questions asked on the 2008 ACS form and later (including the 2010 Census). Therefore, one cannot say with certainty what changes occurred to the prevalence of disabilities between 2000 and 2012.

†Defined as all family members if the family income is less than 1.5 times the poverty threshold set by the federal government.

‡Note that the data reported here are households and the percentage = (zero-vehicle households)/(total households in the county).
– It is impossible to conclude with certainty the historical trend of the prevalence of people with disabilities. However, accounting for sampling error and considering results from 2000 and 2007, in all likelihood at least 20% of the current population in Meigs County has some disability.

– According to 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data, Meigs County had 3,450 jobs within the county. In that same year, 5,582 residents of Meigs County were employed outside of the county, which accounts for 74.4% of residents who are employed.

– Based on a combined measure of low-income individuals, zero-vehicle households, persons with disabilities, and adults aged 65 and over, the areas most reliant on transit within Meigs County are around the village of Syracuse, which shows moderate reliance (see Figure 2).

– Others areas showing moderate-low transit reliance include the northeast corner of the county, the area south of Racine, the strip bordering Gallia County, and a portion of central Meigs County.

– Rio Grande to the south in Gallia County exhibits moderate-high transit reliance.

Transit Supportive Development Patterns

– Meigs County is a predominately lower density county, with small pockets of higher density areas along the Ohio River Valley. Of the 23,700 people in the county, 18.7% live in higher density areas and 81.3% are in lower density areas (based on 2010 Census block data).

– Middleport is the only area with population and employment densities that, based on national evidence, suggest an ability to support transit service with a frequency of every 60 minutes or less (see Figure 3).

– Middleport indicates a demand for transit service that supports deviated fixed route (orange on Figure 3) rather than standard fixed route (red on Figure 3) services. Outside Middleport, no areas support fixed route transit in Meigs County.

– There are no substantially sized areas outside Meigs County with transit-supportive densities.

Existing Transit Services

– Transit service is not provided in Meigs County.

– 2012 Transit Riders per Capita¹: NA

– 2012 Operating Expenditure per Capita¹: NA

Opportunities, Challenges, and Needs

– Meigs County is a very poor county, with over a third of its population in low-income households.

– In addition to having higher poverty levels, Meigs County is primarily rural. Only one concentration of people and jobs exists within the county (Middleport).

¹ Based on 2012 ACS estimates for Meigs County (23,672).
Socio-economic characteristics suggest a high need for public transportation, but the development patterns mean that it would be difficult to operate cost effective transit service. The total county population is less than 25,000, making for a small transit market for trips, and many trips could be long distance and may cross state lines.

The counties adjacent to Meigs County are also very low-density, indicating that county residents may travel to West Virginia for services. Nearly \( \frac{3}{4} \) of residents’ jobs are outside the county.
Figure 2 Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics Affecting Reliance on Transit Service

Source: 2008 - 2012 5-year ACS Estimates; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT
Figure 3 Development Patterns (Population and Employment Density) Influencing Transit Service Design

Source: 2011 LEHD; 2010 Census SF1 100% data; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI, ODOT

Note: The "defined transit service area" indicates the official boundaries of the agency service area and does not necessarily indicate the coverage of the current routes in operation.
MONROE COUNTY

Overview

— Monroe County is located along the eastern edge of Ohio along the Ohio River.
— The county is very rural, with Woodsfield as the largest town and county seat.
— The nearest metropolitan area is Pittsburgh, PA, which is located about 100 miles northeast of Woodsfield.

Factors Influencing Transit Reliance and Demand

Employment, Demographics and Socio-Economic Characteristics

— Monroe County's population has decreased minimally since 2000.
— Monroe County is among the least populated counties in Ohio.
— The number of youth in Monroe County has decreased by around 16%, and their share of the population has decreased. The number of older adults aged 65+ shows similar, but opposite, trends. Older adults now account for 19.6% of the county population.
— A greater percentage of people have low-incomes today than in 2000, though more people own cars. Overall, the percentage of low-income individuals has remained relatively stable, but Monroe County remains slightly less well-off than an average county in Ohio (25.9% in Monroe County versus 24.8% on average).

Figure 1 Selected County Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics: Historical Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>15,180</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,679</td>
<td>♦ 501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths (5-17)</td>
<td>2,777</td>
<td>(18.3%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♦ 2,331 (15.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>2,467</td>
<td>(16.3%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♦ 2,882 (19.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities^</td>
<td>3,139</td>
<td>(22.1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♦ 2,356 (16.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Individuals†</td>
<td>3,686</td>
<td>(24.6%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♦ 3,763 (25.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Vehicle Households‡</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>(7.6%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>♦ 301 (5.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census, SF1 100% data & SF3 sample data; 2007 ACS 3-year estimates; 2012 ACS 3-year estimates
*2007 ACS estimates are not available for Monroe County because the ACS does not release 3-year estimates for geographies with a population below 20,000.
^The disability questions asked on the 2000 Census and ACS forms through 2007 were substantially different from the questions asked on the 2008 ACS form and later (including the 2010 Census). Therefore, one cannot say with certainty what changes occurred to the prevalence of disabilities between 2000 and 2012.
†Defined as all family members if the family income is less than 1.5 times the poverty threshold set by the federal government.
‡Note that the data reported here are households and the percentage = (zero-vehicle households)/(total households in the county).
It is impossible to conclude with certainty the historical trend of the prevalence of people with disabilities. However, accounting for sampling error and considering results from 2000 and 2007, in all likelihood at least 16% of the current population in Monroe County has some disability.

According to 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data, Monroe County had 3,643 jobs within the county. In that same year, 3,043 residents of Monroe County were employed outside of the county, which accounts for 62.7% of residents who are employed.

Based on a combined measure of low-income individuals, zero-vehicle households, persons with disabilities, and adults aged 65 and over, the areas most reliant on transit within Monroe County are Woodsville and New Martinsville (see Figure 2), but these areas show moderate-low transit reliance.

Others areas throughout Monroe County show a low reliance on transit. Figure 2 shows bands of low reliance along the Ohio River in the eastern region of the county, and another band in the western region.

Areas near Batesville, northwest of the Monroe County line, and the northeast corner of Washington County show greater levels of transit reliance than elsewhere in Monroe County.

Transit Supportive Development Patterns

Monroe County is a predominantly low density county, with slightly higher density areas around Woodsfield. Of the roughly 14,700 people in the county, 2.3% live in areas of higher density and 97.7% are in areas of lower density (based on 2010 Census block data).

Woodsfield is the only area with population and employment density that, based on national evidence, suggest an ability to support transit service with a frequency of every 60 minutes or less (see Figure 3).

Woodsfield indicates a demand for transit service suggesting that deviated fixed-route service (orange on Figure 3) would be most appropriate in Monroe County.

There is one small pocket of land with transit supportive density north of the Monroe County line in Belmont County.

Existing Transit Services

Monroe County Public Transportation (MCT) offers county-wide demand response service. The service is open to the general public.

Monroe County Public Transportation operating characteristics:

- Demand response service Monday - Sunday, 6:00 AM – 1:20 AM
- Demand response service for transportation between senior centers, Monday – Thursday, 9:00 AM – 2:00 PM
- Demand response service for out-of-county trips, Monday – Friday, 8:00 AM – 4:00 PM

Local funding is provided through contracts with human services agencies and the Monroe County Board of Commissioners.
Opportunities, Challenges, and Needs

- MCT’s most important transit needs are medical transportation because residents have few in-county medical options. MCT is also the only provider in Monroe County with accessible vehicles, making its services critical for seniors and persons with disabilities. There is unmet community need for accessible transportation, and at times MCT reaches capacity due to vehicle availability.
- MCT provides service to the local aluminum plant, seven days a week, for three shifts.
- MCT struggles with the 20% local match requirement for federal capital funds, which limits the number of vehicles it can purchase and maintain.
- Funding also constrains the number of drivers MCT hires and the salaries of those drivers. The driver wage is not competitive, resulting in retention problems. MCT would like to hire more full time drivers.
- MCT is interested in improving its scheduling process by using software (it currently schedules trips manually) but is hesitant to pursue the technology improvement due to unreliable internet access. A better internet connection would also facilitate online reporting to ODOT.
- MCT would greatly benefit from a new transit facility with indoor vehicle storage. Its vehicles are parked outdoors, in an area that is surrounded by sports fields; flying balls regularly cause windshield damage. A new facility is also needed for administrative space, as the system has outgrown its current location in the Monroe County government building.

1 Based on 2012 ACS estimates for Monroe County (14,679).
Figure 2 Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics Affecting Reliance on Transit Service

Source: 2008 - 2012 5-year ACS Estimates; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT
Figure 3 Development Patterns (Population and Employment Density) Influencing Transit Service Design

Source: 2011 LEHD; 2010 Census SF1 100% data; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT

Note: The "defined transit service area" indicates the official boundaries of the agency service area and does not necessarily indicate the coverage of the current routes in operation.
MORGAN COUNTY

Overview

— Morgan County is located in the southeastern part of Ohio, and is bisected by the Muskingum River.
— McConnelsville is the largest village in the county, as well as the county seat.
— The nearest metropolitan area is Parkersburg, WV, which is located about 40 miles south of McConnelsville.

Factors Influencing Transit Reliance and Demand

Employment, Demographics and Socio-Economic Characteristics

— Morgan County’s population has remained stable, experiencing an increase of roughly 150 people since 2000.
— The number of youth in Morgan County has decreased by about 250, and youth now represent a somewhat smaller percentage of the population than in 2000.
— The percentage of older adults aged 65+ increased over the past 12 years by about 2.5%, now consisting of 18% of the Morgan County population.
— A slightly greater percentage of people have low incomes today than in 2000, though more people own cars. Overall, the county has had growth in low-income individuals, but remains less well-off than an average Ohio county (31.0% versus 24.8%).

Figure 1 Selected County Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics: Historical Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>14,897</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,042</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths (5-17)</td>
<td>2,865 (19.2%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,610 (17.4%)</td>
<td>255 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>2,327 (15.6%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,704 (18.0%)</td>
<td>377 (2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities^</td>
<td>3,094 (22.4%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,342 (15.7%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Individuals†</td>
<td>4,382 (30.0%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,596 (31.0%)</td>
<td>214 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Vehicle Households‡</td>
<td>402 (6.8%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>322 (5.1%)</td>
<td>80 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census, SF1 100% data & SF3 sample data; 2007 ACS 3-year estimates; 2012 ACS 3-year estimates

*2007 ACS estimates are not available for Morgan County because the ACS does not release 3-year estimates for geographies with a population below 20,000.

^The disability questions asked on the 2000 Census and ACS forms through 2007 were substantially different from the questions asked on the 2008 ACS form and later (including the 2010 Census). Therefore, one cannot say with certainty what changes occurred to the prevalence of disabilities between 2000 and 2012.

†Defined as all family members if the family income is less than 1.5 times the poverty threshold set by the federal government.

‡Note that the data reported here are households and the percentage = (zero-vehicle households)/(total households in the county).
It is impossible to conclude with certainty the historical trend of the prevalence of people with disabilities. However, accounting for sampling error and considering results from 2000 and 2007, in all likelihood at least 15% of the current population in Morgan County has some disability.

According to 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data, Morgan County had 2,517 jobs within the county. In that same year, 3,433 residents of Morgan County were employed outside of the county, which accounts for 69.7% of residents who are employed.

Based on a combined measure of low-income individuals, zero-vehicle households, persons with disabilities, and adults aged 65 and over, the areas most reliant on transit within Morgan County are the villages of McConnelsville and Chesterhill, as well as the northwest area of the county (see Figure 2). These areas exhibit low to moderate reliance.

Other than the areas mentioned above, all other areas in the county demonstrate low transit reliance.

There are nearby areas outside of Morgan County that demonstrate moderate levels of transit reliance. They include the town of Beverly to the southeast, Caldwell to the northeast, and New Lexington to the northwest.

Transit Supportive Development Patterns

Morgan County is predominantly a low density county with a small higher density area around McConnelsville, located at the center of the county immediately east of the Muskingum River. Of the roughly 15,000 people in the county, 18.5% live in areas of higher density and 81.5% are in areas of lower density (based on 2010 Census block data).

McConnelsville and neighboring Malta are the only areas with population and employment densities that, based on national evidence, suggest an ability to support transit service with a frequency of every 60 minutes or less (see Figure 3).

These areas indicate a demand for transit service suggesting that deviated fixed route service (orange on Figure 3) may be more appropriate than standard fixed route services (red on Figure 3).

There are villages with transit supportive densities surrounding Morgan County, including Roseville, Crooksville, and New Lexington to the northwest, Glouster and Jacksonville to the southwest, and Beverly to the southeast.

Existing Transit Services

Deviated fixed-route transit service is available through Morgan County Public Transit (MCPT) in McConnelsville. The bus can deviate from the route anywhere within Malta-McConnelsville Village limits.

MCPT provides demand response service throughout Morgan County. MCPT also offers out-of-county service, including trips to Marietta, Zanesville, New Lexington, Athens, and Columbus. The service is open to the general public.

MCPT operating characteristics:

✓ One route Monday – Friday, 8:30 AM – 4:30 PM
✓ Operates at a 80-minute frequency
Demand response service Monday - Friday, 8:00 AM – 5:00 PM
- Local funding is provided through contracts with human services agencies.
- 2012 Transit Riders per Capita: 3.11
- 2012 Operating Expenditure per Capita: $47.04

Opportunities, Challenges, and Needs
- MCPT has grown exponentially over the past decade, in terms of service provided, staff, and budget. MCPT now has scheduling software and advanced vehicle location (AVL) technology.
- Medical, employment, and education transportation are the most important needs in the county. Columbus is the most common out of county trip need, and MCPT currently serves Columbus almost daily.
- A key challenge facing MCPT in the short term is addressing its capital needs. The system must maintain and eventually replace its vehicles and facilities now that it has expanded.
- Most of MCPT’s ridership growth results from contracts with agencies, the largest of which is with Ohio Department of Job and Family Services. MCPT does not currently receive funding from Morgan County.
- MCPT launched a deviated fixed-route as a demonstration project in late 2013 to meet transit need within Malta and McConnelsville. It is also pursuing a project with the Regional Transportation Planning Organization, which has the potential to improve service for all Morgan County residents.

---

1 Based on 2012 ACS estimates for Morgan County (15,042).
Figure 2  Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics Affecting Reliance on Transit Service

Source: 2008 - 2012 5-year ACS Estimates; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT
Figure 3 Development Patterns (Population and Employment Density) Influencing Transit Service Design

Source: 2011 LEHD; 2010 Census SF1 100% data; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT

Note: The “defined transit service area” indicates the official boundaries of the agency service area and does not necessarily indicate the coverage of the current routes in operation.
MUSKINGUM COUNTY

Overview

— Muskingum County is located in central-eastern Ohio, and is bisected by the Muskingum River.
— Zanesville is the largest city in the county, and the Zanesville Micropolitan Statistical Area includes all of Muskingum County.
— The nearest metropolitan area is Columbus, OH, which is located about 55 miles west of Zanesville.

Factors Influencing Transit Reliance and Demand

Employment, Demographics and Socio-Economic Characteristics

— Muskingum County's population has increased by approximately 1,500 people since 2000, an increase of less than 2%.
— The number of youth in Muskingum County has decreased by nearly 1,200, and youth now represent a smaller percentage of the population by 2%.
— The percentage of older adults aged 65+ has increased by more than 1% since 2000, by nearly 1,200 persons.
— A greater percentage of people have low-incomes today than in 2000 and fewer people own cars. Muskingum County's percentage of low-income individuals continues to grow, with a larger share than an average county in Ohio (24.8%).

Figure 1 Selected County Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics: Historical Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>84,585</td>
<td>85,347</td>
<td>86,109</td>
<td>† 1,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths (5-17)</td>
<td>16,293</td>
<td>(19.3%)</td>
<td>15,381</td>
<td>(18.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>12,092</td>
<td>(14.3%)</td>
<td>12,732</td>
<td>(14.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities^</td>
<td>15,518</td>
<td>(20.0%)</td>
<td>15,536</td>
<td>(19.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Individuals†</td>
<td>18,424</td>
<td>(22.5%)</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>(25.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Vehicle Households‡</td>
<td>2,416</td>
<td>(7.4%)</td>
<td>2,039</td>
<td>(6.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census, SF1 100% data & SF3 sample data; 2007 ACS 3-year estimates; 2012 ACS 3-year estimates
*2007 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2000 Census 100% data whereas 2012 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2010 Census 100% data. The Census asks users to use caution when making comparisons across a decennial census year and warns that the estimates may not be strictly comparable.
^The disability questions asked on the 2000 Census and ACS forms through 2007 were substantially different from the questions asked on the 2008 ACS form and later (including the 2010 Census). Therefore, one cannot say with certainty what changes occurred to the prevalence of disabilities between 2000 and 2012.
†Defined as all family members if the family income is less than 1.5 times the poverty threshold set by the federal government.
‡Note that the data reported here are households and the percentage = (zero-vehicle households)/(total households in the county).
It is impossible to conclude with certainty the historical trend of the prevalence of people with disabilities. However, accounting for sampling error and considering results from 2000 and 2007, in all likelihood at least 15% of the current population in Muskingum County has some disability.

According to 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data, Muskingum County had 31,787 jobs within the county. In that same year, 16,877 residents of Muskingum County were employed outside of the county, which accounts for 49.3% of residents who are employed.

Based on a combined measure of low-income individuals, zero-vehicle households, persons with disabilities, and adults aged 65 and over, the area most reliant on transit within Muskingum County is Zanesville (see Figure 2).

South Zanesville also shows moderate transit reliance, as do areas in the northeast corner of the county near the Guernsey County line and the southwest corner of the county near Fultonham.

Cambridge and New Lexington, east and south of the Muskingum County line, respectively, both show moderate transit reliance.

Transit Supportive Development Patterns

Muskingum County is primarily a low-density county with higher density areas around Zanesville, located at the center of the county. Of the roughly 86,100 people in the county, 53.0% live in areas of higher density and 47.0% are in areas of lower density (based on 2010 Census block data).

Zanesville, South Zanesville, Dresden, and New Concord are the only areas with population and employment densities that, based on national evidence, suggest an ability to support transit service with a frequency of every 60 minutes or less (see Figure 3).

Zanesville and South Zanesville densities support a mix of deviated fixed route service (orange on Figure 3) and standard fixed route service (red on Figure 3). Other areas of the county are geographically small, making fixed route transit service a challenge to operate efficiently.

Areas located near, but outside of, Muskingum County with transit supportive densities include Conesville, Coshocton, Cambridge, Crooksville, and New Lexington.

Existing Transit Services

Transit service (fixed-route and paratransit) is available through South East Area Transit (SEAT) in the city of Zanesville and village of South Zanesville. SEAT is a public transit agency for both Muskingum and Guernsey Counties.

SEAT offers countywide demand response service called “Express Service.” It is a curb-to-curb service open to the general public.

SEAT operating characteristics:

- Four routes Monday - Friday, 6:00 AM - 6:00 PM
- Operates at a 60-minute frequency
- Curb-to-curb ADA paratransit service called EZ Ride during the same operating times of their fixed-routes. Seniors are also eligible for the service through a reduced fare program.
Express demand response service Monday - Friday, 8:00 AM – 4:00 PM

- Local funding is provided by Muskingum and Guernsey Counties, the cities of Zanesville and Cambridge, and the village of South Zanesville. Local funding is also provided through contracts with human services agencies.
- 2012 Transit Riders per Capita: **0.29**
- 2012 Operating Expenditure per Capita: **$5.30**

**Opportunities, Challenges, and Needs**

- Due to financial constraints, SEAT is unable to add any additional services and providing current rural services has become challenging.
- SEAT has CodeChoppers PTX3 software for scheduling trips but administrators find the system difficult to use in generating data and reports.
- Given the potential for lengthy demand response trips in the rural areas of the county a strong scheduling program could increase efficiency. To provide transit services to Cambridge and Guernsey County, SEAT maintains an office in the City of Cambridge. Having a satellite location reduces deadhead miles.
- The most important transit need in Muskingum County is providing out of town medical trips that are not Medicaid qualified.
- Muskingum County is experiencing a growth in the elderly population and Medicaid recipients are growing through family generations.
- The need for dialysis transportation continues to increase. Anecdotal evidence suggests the need has doubled in the past few years.
- SEAT has coordinated and partnered with Perry County Transit by loaning vehicles back-and-forth and arranging van pools. They have also partnered with the City of Zanesville by sharing equipment and personnel.

---

1 Based on 2012 ACS estimates for Muskingum County (86,109) and Guernsey County (39,897)
Figure 2: Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics Affecting Reliance on Transit Service

Source: 2008 - 2012 5-year ACS Estimates; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT
Figure 3 Development Patterns (Population and Employment Density) Influencing Transit Service Design

Source: 2011 LEHD; 2010 Census SF1 100% data; TIGER/Line Files; ESRi; ODOT

Note: The “defined transit service area” indicates the official boundaries of the agency service area and does not necessarily indicate the coverage of the current routes in operation.
Noble County

Overview

- Noble County is located in eastern Ohio.
- The county seat is Caldwell, which is also the largest village in the area.
- The nearest metropolitan area is Marietta, OH and Williamstown, WV, a combined metropolitan area approximately 30 miles south of Caldwell.

Factors Influencing Transit Reliance and Demand

Employment, Demographics and Socio-Economic Characteristics

- Noble County's population has increased by over 4.4% since 2000.
- The number of youth in Noble County has decreased by more than 430, and youth now represent a smaller percentage of the population by nearly 4%.
- Noble County is aging, with the percentage of older adults aged 65+ increasing by over 9% in the past 12 years. This translates to an absolute increase of more than 1,400 persons.
- A greater percentage of people have low-incomes today than in 2000, though slightly more people own cars. The growth in low-income individuals in Noble County increased 5.8%, translating to a slightly larger share than an average county in Ohio (24.8%).

Figure 1 Selected County Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics: Historical Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>14,058</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14,673</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths (5-17)</td>
<td>2,477 (17.6%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,046 (13.9%)</td>
<td>-431 (3.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>1,836 (13.1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,249 (22.1%)</td>
<td>1,413 (9.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities^</td>
<td>2,342 (21.1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,190 (18.1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Individuals†</td>
<td>2,546 (21.5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,303 (27.3%)</td>
<td>757 (5.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Vehicle Households‡</td>
<td>361 (7.9%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>332 (6.9%)</td>
<td>29 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census, SF1 100% data & SF3 sample data; 2007 ACS 3-year estimates; 2012 ACS 3-year estimates
*2007 ACS estimates are not available for Noble County because the ACS does not release 3-year estimates for geographies with a population below 20,000.
^The disability questions asked on the 2000 Census and ACS forms through 2007 were substantially different from the questions asked on the 2008 ACS form and later (including the 2010 Census). Therefore, one cannot say with certainty what changes occurred to the prevalence of disabilities between 2000 and 2012.
†Defined as all family members if the family income is less than 1.5 times the poverty threshold set by the federal government.
‡Note that the data reported here are households and the percentage = (zero-vehicle households)/(total households in the county).
It is impossible to conclude with certainty the historical trend of the prevalence of people with disabilities. However, accounting for sampling error and considering results from 2000 and 2007, in all likelihood at least 18% of the current population in Noble County has some disability.

According to 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data, Noble County had 2,700 jobs within the county. In that same year, 5,784 residents of Noble County were employed outside of the county, which accounts for 79.6% of residents who are employed.

Based on a combined measure of low-income individuals, zero-vehicle households, persons with disabilities, and adults aged 65 and over, the areas most reliant on transit within Noble County are Caldwell and Batesville (see Figure 2).

Other areas showing moderate transit reliance include the area north of Caldwell in the villages of Belle Valley and Sarahsville.

The towns of Beverly and Waterford, located along the Muskingum River southwest of the Noble County line, and an area located off the southeast tip of Noble County demonstrate a moderate level of transit reliance.

Transit Supportive Development Patterns

Noble County is an extremely low density county with a very small pocket of higher density in the middle of the county at the village of Caldwell. Of the roughly 14,700 people in the county, 37.5% live in higher density areas and 62.5% are in lower density areas (based on 2010 Census block data).

Caldwell is the only area that may support a deviated fixed-route transit service in Noble County (see Figure 3).

Similar to the results above, the only area outside the county with transit supportive densities is Cambridge to the north.

Existing Transit Services

Transit service is not provided in Noble County.

2012 Transit Riders per Capita: NA

2012 Operating Expenditure per Capita: NA

Opportunities, Challenges, and Needs

Noble County is a sparsely populated area, with a population of less than 15,000.

There is only one pocket of population density in the county, which is the village of Caldwell.

Noble County’s reliance upon transit falls in the moderate range. While a certain subset of the population might rely upon transit, providing service in a cost-effective manner would be challenging.

---

1 Based on 2012 ACS estimates for Noble County (14,673).
Figure 2 Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics Affecting Reliance on Transit Service

Source: 2008 - 2012 5-year ACS Estimates; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT
Figure 3 Development Patterns (Population and Employment Density) Influencing Transit Service Design

Source: 2011 LEHD; 2010 Census SF1 100% data; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT

Note: The “defined transit service area” indicates the official boundaries of the agency service area and does not necessarily indicate the coverage of the current routes in operation.
PERRY COUNTY

Overview

- Perry County is located in east-central Ohio.
- New Lexington is the largest city and the county seat.
- The nearest metropolitan area is Columbus, OH which is located about 55 miles northwest of New Lexington.

Factors Influencing Transit Reliance and Demand

Employment, Demographics and Socio-Economic Characteristics

- Perry County's population has increased by more than 2,000 people since 2000, an increase of about 6%.
- The number of youth in Perry County has decreased somewhat since 2000, and the percentage of the population who are youth declined by about 2%.
- The percentage of older adults aged 65+ increased over the past 12 years by 1%.
- A greater percentage of people have low-incomes today than in 2000, and fewer people own cars. The county experienced a growth in low-income individuals of nearly 9% since 2000. Nearly 31% of the county population fit into this characteristic, compared to an average county in Ohio (24.8%).

Figure 1 Selected County Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics: Historical Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>34,078</td>
<td>34,832</td>
<td>36,095</td>
<td>2,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths (5-17)</td>
<td>7,079 (20.8%)</td>
<td>6,784 (19.5%)</td>
<td>6,851 (19.0%)</td>
<td>228 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>4,093 (12.0%)</td>
<td>4,297 (12.3%)</td>
<td>4,757 (13.2%)</td>
<td>664 (1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities†</td>
<td>6,810 (21.7%)</td>
<td>7,422 (22.8%)</td>
<td>5,538 (15.5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Individuals†</td>
<td>7,352 (21.8%)</td>
<td>9,199 (26.6%)</td>
<td>10,963 (30.7%)</td>
<td>3,611 (8.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Vehicle Households‡</td>
<td>926 (7.4%)</td>
<td>681 (5.5%)</td>
<td>1,071 (7.8%)</td>
<td>1415 (0.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census, SF1 100% data & SF3 sample data; 2007 ACS 3-year estimates; 2012 ACS 3-year estimates

*2007 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2000 Census 100% data whereas 2012 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2010 Census 100% data. The Census asks users to use caution when making comparisons across a decennial census year and warns that the estimates may not be strictly comparable.

†The disability questions asked on the 2000 Census and ACS forms through 2007 were substantially different from the questions asked on the 2008 ACS form and later (including the 2010 Census). Therefore, one cannot say with certainty what changes occurred to the prevalence of disabilities between 2000 and 2012.

‡Defined as all family members if the family income is less than 1.5 times the poverty threshold set by the federal government.

†Note that the data reported here are households and the percentage = (zero-vehicle households)/(total households in the county).
It is impossible to conclude with certainty the historical trend of the prevalence of people with disabilities. However, accounting for sampling error and considering results from 2000 and 2007, in all likelihood at least 15% of the current population in Perry County has some disability.

According to 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data, Perry County had 5,298 jobs within the county. In that same year, 8,280 residents of Perry County were employed outside of the county, which accounts for 73.6% of residents who are employed.

Based on a combined measure of low-income individuals, zero-vehicle households, persons with disabilities, and adults aged 65 and over, the areas most reliant on transit within Perry County are north and southwest of New Lexington, which show moderate reliance (see Figure 2).

Much of the rest of the county demonstrates low to moderate transit reliance, with the exception of the southeast and northwest corners of Perry County, which exhibit very low transit reliance.

Areas outside of Perry County showing high transit reliance include the villages of Zanesville, Nelsonville, and Heath.

Transit Supportive Development Patterns

Perry County shows high density in New Lexington, and small medium density areas in Thornville, Somerset, and Crooksville. The remainder of the county is of lower density. Of the roughly 36,100 people in the county, 24.8% live in areas of higher density and 75.2% are in areas of lower density (based on 2010 Census block data).

New Lexington, Roseville, Crooksville, Shawnee, Thornville, and Somerset are the areas with population and employment densities that, based on national evidence, suggest an ability to support transit service with a frequency of every 60 minutes or less (see Figure 3).

Most of the areas that indicate a demand for transit service suggest that deviated-fixed-route service (orange on Figure 3) may be more appropriate than standard fixed-route services (red on Figure 3). An exception to this finding is New Lexington, which shows a variable mix.

Areas with transit supportive densities outside of the county include Zanesville and South Zanesville to the northeast, Logan to the south, and Bremen to the southwest.

Existing Transit Services

Perry County Transit (PCT), provided by the county government, offers a countywide demand response service, and out-of-county service within a 100-mile radius. The service is open to the general public.

PCT operating characteristics:

- 24-hour advance reservation required
- Service offered Monday – Friday, 6:00 AM – 8:00 PM and Saturday, 8:00 AM – 4:00 PM
- Local funding is provided through contracts with Jobs and Family Services, but there is no additional county funding for match.
2012 Transit Riders per Capita: 1.48
2012 Operating Expenditure per Capita: $30.99

Opportunities, Challenges, and Needs

- Over the past five years, there has been significant growth in ridership for the system that has led to expansions in the vehicle fleet and driver pool.
- All PCT trips are demand response and the majority of trips are out of county.
- The biggest need is access to the resources outside of the county—most medical trips are out-of-county.
- Perry County is rural in nature; very few medical facilities and specialized services are available within the county.
- The need for out of county transportation is growing as job opportunities are increasingly hard to find in Perry County.
- Limited funding presents a challenge to keeping up with growing demand.
- Limited local match has made it very difficult for PCT to find a capital match for replacement or expansion vehicles.
- One of the biggest challenges to PCT is the number of passengers using wheelchairs. One wheelchair trip can tie up a vehicle for hours when it could be used for multiple trips in another area of the county. Only nine of PCT’s 18 vehicles are equipped with wheelchair lifts.

---

1 Based on 2012 ACS estimates for Perry County (68,965).
Figure 2: Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics Affecting Reliance on Transit Service

Source: 2008 - 2012 5-year ACS Estimates; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT
Figure 3 Development Patterns (Population and Employment Density) Influencing Transit Service Design

Potential Transit Service Design:
(based on Pop/Emp Density by Census Block)
- Demand response (> 60 min)
- Deviated fixed-route (30 - 60 min)
- Fixed-route (≤ 30 min)
- Defined transit service area

Source: 2011 LEHD; 2010 Census SF1 100% data; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT

Note: The “defined transit service area” indicates the official boundaries of the agency service area and does not necessarily indicate the coverage of the current routes in operation.
PIKE COUNTY

Overview

Pike County is located in south central Ohio, near the Ohio River.

Pike County does not have any designated cities – it has three villages, 14 townships, and several unincorporated areas.

The nearest metropolitan area is Columbus, OH, 67 miles north of Piketon.

Factors Influencing Transit Reliance and Demand

Employment, Demographics and Socio-Economic Characteristics

Pike County’s population has increased slightly, by less than 1,000 or around 3%.

The percentage of youth in Pike County dropped slightly, by 1.6%.

The percentage of older adults aged 65+ increased by just over 1%.

The number of low-income individuals increased sharply, by more than 3,200 people, and now represents a larger percentage of the population by 10%. This demographic now makes up more than 41% of Pike County’s population, which is far higher than the prevalence in a typical Ohio county (24.8%). Households without a vehicle have also increased slightly.

Figure 1 Selected County Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics: Historical Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>27,695</td>
<td>27,902</td>
<td>28,606</td>
<td>911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths (5-17)</td>
<td>5,617 (20.3%)</td>
<td>5,293 (19.0%)</td>
<td>5,330 (18.6%)</td>
<td>-287 (-1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>3,756 (13.6%)</td>
<td>3,911 (14.0%)</td>
<td>4,193 (14.7%)</td>
<td>437 (1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities^</td>
<td>6,575 (25.8%)</td>
<td>6,790 (26.5%)</td>
<td>6,168 (21.9%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Individuals†</td>
<td>8,349 (30.7%)</td>
<td>10,896 (39.8%)</td>
<td>11,591 (41.2%)</td>
<td>3,242 (10.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Vehicle Households‡</td>
<td>869 (8.3%)</td>
<td>842 (7.7%)</td>
<td>1,071 (9.9%)</td>
<td>202 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census, SF1 100% data & SF3 sample data; 2007 ACS 3-year estimates; 2012 ACS 3-year estimates

*2007 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2000 Census 100% data whereas 2012 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2010 Census 100% data. The Census asks users to use caution when making comparisons across a decennial census year and warns that the estimates may not be strictly comparable.

^The disability questions asked on the 2000 Census and ACS forms through 2007 were substantially different from the questions asked on the 2008 ACS form and later (including the 2010 Census). Therefore, one cannot say with certainty what changes occurred to the prevalence of disabilities between 2000 and 2012.

†Defined as all family members if the family income is less than 1.5 times the poverty threshold set by the federal government.

‡Note that the data reported here are households and the percentage = (zero-vehicle households)/(total households in the county).
It is impossible to conclude with certainty the historical trend of the prevalence of people with disabilities. However, accounting for sampling error and considering results from 2000 and 2007, in all likelihood at least 21% of the current population in Pike County has some disability.

According to 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data, Pike County had 8,972 jobs within the county. In that same year, 7,923 residents of Pike County were employed outside of the county, which accounts for 69.8% of residents who are employed.

Based on a combined measure of low-income individuals, zero-vehicle households, persons with disabilities, and adults aged 65 and over, the area most reliant on transit within Pike County is the north central area of the county, which shows high reliance (see Figure 2).

Others areas showing a moderate transit reliance include the western half of the county and the east-central area.

Areas of moderate transit reliance exist south in Scioto County and west in Highland County.

Transit Supportive Development Patterns

Pike County is predominately a lower density county, with small pockets of higher density areas near the villages of Piketon and Waverly. Of the 28,600 people in the county, 25.8% live in higher density areas and 74.2% are in lower density areas (based on 2010 Census block data).

Waverly and Piketon are the only areas with population and employment densities that, based on national evidence, suggest an ability to support transit service with a frequency of every 60 minutes or less (see Figure 3).

The areas that indicate a demand for transit service suggest that deviated fixed route service (orange on Figure 3) may be more appropriate than standard fixed route services (red on Figure 3).

There are no significant pockets of transit-supportive areas just outside the county boundaries.

Existing Transit Services

Community Action Transit System (CATS) offers county-wide demand response service that is available to everyone.

CATS demand response service operates on a zone system, with two zones and service to the cities of Columbus, Chillicothe, and Portsmouth outside of Pike County.

CATS operating characteristics:
- Demand response service Monday – Friday, 7:00 AM – 5:00 PM, and Saturday, 9:00 AM – 3:00 PM
- CATS demand response service is provided for East Jackson, Piketon-Waverly, Wakefield, Camp Creek, Latham Buchanan Idaho, Stockdale/Beaver, and Waverly.
- Demand response pick-up and return service hours and days vary depending times of day and scheduled trips
Local funding is provided through the Pike County Department of Job and Family Services, Community Services Block Grant, Community Action Committee for Pike County, Ohio Elderly & Disabled Transit Fare Assistance Program, the Ohio Department of Aging, and the Area Agency on Aging District #7 Rio Grande, Ohio.

- 2012 Transit Riders per Capita: **1.05**
- 2012 Operating Expenditure per Capita: **$15.74**

**Opportunities, Challenges, and Needs**

- The most important needs in Pike County are transportation of people to senior centers and places of employment. Related to this, more evening and weekend service, and more service to out-of-county destinations appear to be the greatest transit needs.
- The demand for transit has increased significantly due to the closure of a major employer (a cabinet factory) five years ago. The former factory workers are more likely to be unemployed and need transit to transport them to new jobs or job training services.
- A potential service need is the US-23 corridor, between Portsmouth and Columbus.
- CATS’ contract revenue has decreased significantly as non-emergency medical transport (NEMT) is constantly changing hands between Medicaid providers due to new regulations.
- CATS struggles with coordination with neighboring transit agencies and county agencies. There appears to be a lot of duplicative services, and this may be an area for improved coordination.
- CATS also had difficulties with its scheduling software, and sees a role for ODOT in assistance with the procurement of a new software system.
- Coordinating with local and regional hospitals to provide service to their patients would also be an opportunity to improve service.

---

1 Based on 2012 ACS estimates for Pike County (28,606).
Figure 2  Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics Affecting Reliance on Transit Service

Source: 2008 - 2012 5-year ACS Estimates; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT
Figure 3 Development Patterns (Population and Employment Density) Influencing Transit Service Design

Source: 2011 LEHD; 2010 Census SF1 100% data; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT

Note: The “defined transit service area” indicates the official boundaries of the agency service area and does not necessarily indicate the coverage of the current routes in operation.
ROSS COUNTY

Overview

- Ross County is located in south central Ohio.
- Chillicothe is the largest city and the county seat; Ross County is included in the Chillicothe Micropolitan Statistical Area.
- The nearest metropolitan area is Columbus, which is 50 miles north of Chillicothe.

Factors Influencing Transit Reliance and Demand

Employment, Demographics and Socio-Economic Characteristics

- Ross County’s population has increased significantly, by more than 4,300 people or about 6%.
- The number of youth declined slightly, by more than 100, and the youth as a share of the population declined by 1.2%.
- The number of older adults increased by more than 1,700; older adults now make up just under 14% of the population, and increase from just over 12% in 2000.
- The low-income population increased the most of those characteristics shown in Figure 1, by nearly 6,000 people. Ross County’s percent of low-income individuals (28.9%) is higher than the percent in an average Ohio county (24.8%). Households without a vehicle fell slightly, by 100 households.

Figure 1 Selected County Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics: Historical Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>73,345</td>
<td>75,137</td>
<td>77,723</td>
<td>4,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths (5-17)</td>
<td>13,054 (17.8%)</td>
<td>12,301 (16.4%)</td>
<td>12,922 (16.6%)</td>
<td>-132 (−1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>8,928 (12.2%)</td>
<td>9,734 (13.0%)</td>
<td>10,713 (13.8%)</td>
<td>1,785 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities^</td>
<td>13,903 (21.8%)</td>
<td>13,975 (21.5%)</td>
<td>12,765 (17.8%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Individuals†</td>
<td>14,739 (21.7%)</td>
<td>15,362 (22.3%)</td>
<td>20,642 (28.9%)</td>
<td>5,903 (7.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Vehicle Households‡</td>
<td>1,914 (7.1%)</td>
<td>1,437 (5.3%)</td>
<td>1,812 (6.5%)</td>
<td>102 (0.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census, SF1 100% data & SF3 sample data; 2007 ACS 3-year estimates; 2012 ACS 3-year estimates
*2007 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2000 Census 100% data whereas 2012 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2010 Census 100% data. The Census asks users to use caution when making comparisons across a decennial census year and warns that the estimates may not be strictly comparable.
^The disability questions asked on the 2000 Census and ACS forms through 2007 were substantially different from the questions asked on the 2008 ACS form and later (including the 2010 Census). Therefore, one cannot say with certainty what changes occurred to the prevalence of disabilities between 2000 and 2012.
†Defined as all family members if the family income is less than 1.5 times the poverty threshold set by the federal government.
‡Note that the data reported here are households and the percentage = (zero-vehicle households)/(total households in the county).
It is impossible to conclude with certainty the historical trend of the prevalence of people with disabilities. However, accounting for sampling error and considering results from 2000 and 2007, in all likelihood at least 17% of the current population in Ross County has some disability.

According to 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data, Ross County had 25,243 jobs within the county. In that same year, 11,011 residents of Ross County were employed outside of the county, which accounts for 44.9% of residents who are employed.

Based on a combined measure of low-income individuals, zero-vehicle households, persons with disabilities, and adults aged 65 and over, the area just west of Chillicothe is highly reliant on transit (see Figure 2).

Much of the rest of the county exhibits moderate transit reliance.

Washington Courthouse west in Fayette County, Circleville north in Pickaway County, and a portion of Pike County bordering Ross County show high transit reliance.

Transit Supportive Development Patterns

Ross County shows higher density areas in the middle of the county around Chillicothe. The remainder of the county has low density. Of the roughly 77,700 people in the county, 41.3% live in areas of higher density and 58.7% are in areas of lower density (based on 2010 Census block data).

Chillicothe is the only area with population and employment densities that, based on national evidence, suggest an ability to support transit service with a frequency of every 60 minutes or less (see Figure 3).

Chillicothe is a mix of areas that support deviated fixed route service (orange on Figure 3) as well as more standard fixed route services (red on Figure 3).

Similar to the results above, areas with transit supportive densities outside of the county are in Washington Courthouse to the west, Circleville to the north, and Greenfield on the border of Highland and Ross Counties.

Existing Transit Services

Transit service (fixed-route and paratransit) is available through the Chillicothe Transit System (CTS) in the city of Chillicothe. The service includes trips to Adena Medical Center, just north of the city limit.

CTS offers demand response service throughout Ross County. The service is open to the general public.

CTS operating characteristics:

- Three fixed-routes Monday - Friday, 6:00 AM – 10:00 PM, and Saturday, 10:00 AM - 6:00 PM
- Most routes operate at a 60-minute frequency; one route to Adena Hospital operates at a 30-minute frequency on Saturdays only
- Complementary ADA paratransit service is provided within ¾-mile and during the same operating times of their fixed-routes
Shuttle service to VA Medical Facility from the CTS Transit Hub, Monday – Friday, 7:30 AM – 4:45 PM; Saturday, 10:00 AM – 5:00 PM, generally operating at a two-hour frequency

Demand response service Monday – Friday, 6:00 AM – 9:30 PM

Local funding is provided through an income tax levy. The City of Chillicothe contributes 1/10 of its 1% income tax towards funding for the transit system. Additional funding is provided through contracts with Job and Family Services and the Ross County Board of Developmental Assistance.

2012 Transit Riders per Capita: 2.34
2012 Operating Expenditure per Capita: $36.41

Opportunities, Challenges, and Needs

CTS has extended service into the county through a partnership with Ross County Developmental Disabilities. Service was previously only provided within the city of Chillicothe.

In Ross County, an important need is to market public transit and work to change the perception that it is only for poorer and transit dependent people.

CTS has faced difficulty implementing its scheduling software due to a lack of tech support from the city. CTS said that they might need technical assistance from ODOT.

The challenges for CTS have historically focused on properly managing funds, as well as obtaining adequate local funding. For example, last year the city did not have enough local match for the number of vehicles that were ordered and had to turn three vehicles back. Adequate staff time to write and manage grants is needed.

ODOT and CTS are interested in partnering with Greyhound to become a ticket agency. The CTS facility could handle this task, but local political support does not exist for this partnership. This would be a good opportunity to link Ross County to Columbus.

---

1 Based on 2012 ACS estimates for Ross County (77,723).
Figure 2  Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics Affecting Reliance on Transit Service

Source: 2008 - 2012 5-year ACS Estimates; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT
Figure 3 Development Patterns (Population and Employment Density) Influencing Transit Service Design

Source: 2011 LEHD; 2010 Census SF1 100% data; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT

Note: The “defined transit service area” indicates the official boundaries of the agency service area and does not necessarily indicate the coverage of the current routes in operation.
SCIOTOO COUNTY

Overview

- Scioto County is located along the south edge of Ohio, bordering Kentucky,
- Portsmouth is the largest city, as well as the county seat,
- The nearest metropolitan area is Columbus, OH, 90 miles north of Portsmouth,

Factors Influencing Transit Reliance and Demand

Employment, Demographics and Socio-Economic Characteristics

- Scioto County’s population has remained fairly steady, decreasing by just over 100 people in 12 years.
- The percentage of youth in Scioto County fell by 1.3%.
- The number of older adults aged 65+ increased slightly, by more than 500 people, but this increase is less than 1%.
- Scioto County is a poor county. The prevalence of low-income individuals increased moderately, by 4.2%, but the county’s overall percent low income (35.5%) is far above the average for an Ohio County (24.8%). Households without a vehicle declined slightly since 2000.

Figure 1 Selected County Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics: Historical Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>79,195</td>
<td>76,090</td>
<td>79,079</td>
<td>-116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths (5-17)</td>
<td>14,323</td>
<td>12,740</td>
<td>13,240</td>
<td>1,083 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>11,826</td>
<td>11,423</td>
<td>12,327</td>
<td>501 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities^</td>
<td>18,476</td>
<td>18,962</td>
<td>16,686</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Individuals†</td>
<td>23,685</td>
<td>26,605</td>
<td>26,745</td>
<td>3,060 (4.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Vehicle Households‡</td>
<td>3,066</td>
<td>2,764</td>
<td>2,326</td>
<td>740 (2.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census, SF1 100% data & SF3 sample data; 2007 ACS 3-year estimates; 2012 ACS 3-year estimates

*2007 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2000 Census 100% data whereas 2012 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2010 Census 100% data. The Census asks users to use caution when making comparisons across a decennial census year and warns that the estimates may not be strictly comparable.

^The disability questions asked on the 2000 Census and ACS forms through 2007 were substantially different from the questions asked on the 2008 ACS form and later (including the 2010 Census). Therefore, one cannot say with certainty what changes occurred to the prevalence of disabilities between 2000 and 2012.

†Defined as all family members if the family income is less than 1.5 times the poverty threshold set by the federal government.

‡Note that the data reported here are households and the percentage = (zero-vehicle households)/(total households in the county).
It is impossible to conclude with certainty the historical trend of the prevalence of people with disabilities. However, accounting for sampling error and considering results from 2000 and 2007, in all likelihood at least 21% of the current population in Scioto County has some disability.

According to 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data, Scioto County had 22,386 jobs within the county. In that same year, 13,476 residents of Scioto County were employed outside of the county, which accounts for 49.0% of residents who are employed.

Based on a combined measure of low-income individuals, zero-vehicle households, persons with disabilities, and adults aged 65 and over, the areas most reliant on transit within Scioto County are Portsmouth and an area to the east, which show high reliance (see Figure 2).

Other areas showing moderate transit reliance include the north half of the county and the area surrounding Portsmouth.

An area of Pike County just north of Scioto County exhibits moderate transit reliance.

**Transit Supportive Development Patterns**

Scioto County shows areas of higher density around Portsmouth in the south of the county. The west, north, and east of the county are primarily lower density areas. Of the 79,100 people in the county, 45.7% live in higher density areas and 54.3% are in lower density areas (based on 2010 Census block data).

Two communities in the Portsmouth area, New Boston and South Shore, are the only areas with population and employment densities that, based on national evidence, suggest an ability to support transit service with a frequency of every 60 minutes or less (see Figure 3).

The transit-supportive areas of New Boston and South Shore show a clear mix of demand for fixed route service (red on Figure 3) and deviated fixed route service (orange on Figure 3).

Similar to the results above, areas with transit supportive densities outside of the county appear in Jackson to the northeast in Jackson County.

**Existing Transit Services**

Demand response transit service is available through Access Scioto County (ASC) for all of Scioto county and South Shore, Kentucky.

ASC’s demand response service is open to the public and uses a fare zone structure called ‘Grid Areas’.

ASC operating characteristics:

- Nine grid areas Monday – Friday, 6:00 AM – 6:00 PM
- The grid areas are Buena Vista Area, Franklin Furnace Area, Lucasville Area, Minford Area, Morgan Township Area, Rarden & Northwest Area, South Webster Area, West Portsmouth Area, and Wheelersburg Area
- Grid areas have varying approximate schedules and spans of service that are not operated unless someone schedules a trip in that area of the county

Local funding is provided by the Board of Scioto County Commissioners.
2012 Transit Riders per Capita: 0.45
2012 Operating Expenditure per Capita: 8.45

Opportunities, Challenges, and Needs

- Scioto County is the fourth least well-off county in the state.
- A key challenge facing Scioto County is the lack of sufficient funding to meet the transportation needs and demands of its residents.
- Access Scioto County lost contracts to provide transportation funded through Title XX and Prevention, Retention, and Contingency (PRC). This contract revenue reduction led to major cuts in service, including all of its Dial-A-Ride and out-of-county service, and a reduction of staff. Overall, ridership has dropped off from over 94,000 passengers in 2007 to roughly 36,000 last year.
- Shawnee State University, located in Portsmouth, has a growing on-campus student population, and there is an opportunity for ASC to provide service to students and connect them with shopping destinations outside of Portsmouth.
- As part of the Locally Developed Transportation Coordination Plan, ASC has discussed adding point deviation routes as an additional service. However, ASC is concerned that obtaining matching funds will be a challenge.

1 Based on 2012 ACS estimates for Scioto County (79,079).
Figure 2  Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics Affecting Reliance on Transit Service

Source: 2008 - 2012 5-year ACS Estimates; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT
Figure 3 Development Patterns (Population and Employment Density) Influencing Transit Service Design

Source: 2011 LEHD; 2010 Census SF1 100% data; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT

Note: The “defined transit service area” indicates the official boundaries of the agency service area and does not necessarily indicate the coverage of the current routes in operation.
VINTON COUNTY

Overview

— Vinton County is located in south central Ohio.
— McArthur is the largest city and is also the county seat.
— The nearest metropolitan area is Columbus, located 75 miles northwest of McArthur.

Factors Influencing Transit Reliance and Demand

Employment, Demographics and Socio-Economic Characteristics

— Vinton County is sparsely populated, but population has increased by nearly 600 since 2000, about 5%.
— The number of youth declined very slightly.
— The number of older adults increased by nearly 400 people. This demographic now makes up 14.5% of total population.
— Vinton County’s low-income population is very high compared to the average Ohio County (24.8%). More than one-third of the county’s population falls into the low-income category, and this cohort has increased by 5.7% since 2000. Zero-vehicle households have declined during the same time period.

Figure 1 Selected County Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics: Historical Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>12,806</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,397</td>
<td>↑ 591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths (5-17)</td>
<td>2,525</td>
<td>(19.7%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,485 (18.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>1,551</td>
<td>(12.1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,938 (14.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities^</td>
<td>2,864</td>
<td>(24.3%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,381 (17.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Individuals†</td>
<td>3,978</td>
<td>(31.5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,939 (37.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Vehicle Households‡</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>(8.5%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>265 (5.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census, SF1 100% data & SF3 sample data; 2007 ACS 3-year estimates; 2012 ACS 3-year estimates
*2007 ACS estimates are not available for Vinton County because the ACS does not release 3-year estimates for geographies with a population below 20,000.
^The disability questions asked on the 2000 Census and ACS forms through 2007 were substantially different from the questions asked on the 2008 ACS form and later (including the 2010 Census). Therefore, one cannot say with certainty what changes occurred to the prevalence of disabilities between 2000 and 2012.
†Defined as all family members if the family income is less than 1.5 times the poverty threshold set by the federal government.
‡Note that the data reported here are households and the percentage = (zero-vehicle households)/(total households in the county).
It is impossible to conclude with certainty the historical trend of the prevalence of people with disabilities. However, accounting for sampling error and considering results from 2000 and 2007, in all likelihood at least 17% of the current population in Vinton County has some disability.

According to 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data, Vinton County had 2,368 jobs within the county. In that same year, 3,142 county residents were employed outside of the county, which accounts for 73.2% of employed residents.

Based on a combined measure of low-income individuals, zero-vehicle households, persons with disabilities, and adults aged 65 and over, there are no areas in the county with high or moderate-high transit reliance.

The western portion of the county and a portion of the eastern half of the county fall into the moderate-low transit reliance category (see Figure 2).

Wellston in Jackson County and the southwest corner of Athens County bordering Vinton County show moderate transit reliance.

Transit Supportive Development Patterns

Vinton County is a predominately low density county, with only a small area of higher density in the middle of the county around the village of McArthur. Of the roughly 13,400 people in the county, 0.0% live in higher density areas and 100.0% are in lower density areas (based on 2010 Census block data).

McArthur is the only area with population and employment densities that, based on national evidence, suggest an ability to support transit service with a frequency of every 60 minutes or less (see Figure 3). However, the extremely small geographic area of McArthur would make it difficult to serve with any fixed-route service.

Similar to the results above, areas with transit supportive densities outside of the county are Wellston and Jackson in Jackson County.

Existing Transit Services

Transit service is not provided in Vinton County.

2012 Transit Riders per Capita: \(\text{NA}\)

2012 Operating Expenditure per Capita: \(\text{NA}\)

Opportunities, Challenges, and Needs

Vinton County is a low-income county; 37% of the population has low incomes.

In addition to having higher poverty levels, Vinton County is extremely low density; the county’s total population is less than 14,000. The only area with any concentrations of people or jobs is McArthur.

Based on demographics typically reliant upon transit, Vinton County has moderate-low need. While certain people would likely take transit, providing it in a cost-effective manner would be challenging.

More than 73% of resident jobs are located outside the county, indicating that overall, people must travel to neighboring communities for goods and services.

\(^1\) Based on 2012 ACS estimates for Vinton County (13,397).
Figure 2  Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics Affecting Reliance on Transit Service

Source: 2008 - 2012 5-year ACS Estimates; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT
Figure 3  Development Patterns (Population and Employment Density) Influencing Transit Service Design

Source: 2011 LEHD; 2010 Census SF1 100% data; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT

Note: The "defined transit service area" indicates the official boundaries of the agency service area and does not necessarily indicate the coverage of the current routes in operation.
WASHINGTON COUNTY

Overview

Washington County is located along the eastern edge of Ohio along the Ohio River.

Marietta is the largest city in the county and is part of the Parkersburg-Marietta-Vienna, West Virginian-Ohio Metropolitan Statistical Area.

The largest city within the metropolitan area is Parkersburg, WV, located about 14 miles south of Marietta.

Factors Influencing Transit Reliance and Demand

Employment, Demographics and Socio-Economic Characteristics

- Washington County's population has decreased by more than 1,600 people since 2000, a decline of 2.6%.
- The number of youth in Washington County has decreased by roughly 1,800, a decline of about 16%.
- The percentage of older adults aged 65+ increased over the past 12 years by nearly 3%, comprising about 18% of the population of Washington County.
- A greater percentage of people have low-incomes today than in 2000, though more people own cars. The county experienced a 5% increase in low-income individuals and remains less well-off than an average county in Ohio (24.8%).

Figure 1 Selected County Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics: Historical Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>63,251</td>
<td>61,773</td>
<td>61,583</td>
<td>1,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths (5-17)</td>
<td>11,200 (17.7%)</td>
<td>9,996 (16.2%)</td>
<td>9,398 (15.3%)</td>
<td>1,802 (2.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>9,463 (15.0%)</td>
<td>9,965 (16.1%)</td>
<td>11,020 (17.9%)</td>
<td>1,557 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with Disabilities^</td>
<td>11,076 (18.9%)</td>
<td>13,060 (22.5%)</td>
<td>11,435 (18.8%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Income Individuals†</td>
<td>13,363 (21.8%)</td>
<td>13,693 (22.6%)</td>
<td>16,087 (26.9%)</td>
<td>2,724 (5.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero-Vehicle Households‡</td>
<td>1,674 (6.7%)</td>
<td>1,615 (6.4%)</td>
<td>1,563 (6.3%)</td>
<td>111 (0.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: 2000 Census, SF1 100% data & SF3 sample data; 2007 ACS 3-year estimates; 2012 ACS 3-year estimates

*2007 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2000 Census 100% data whereas 2012 ACS estimates are weighted based on 2010 Census 100% data. The Census asks users to use caution when making comparisons across a decennial census year and warns that the estimates may not be strictly comparable.

^The disability questions asked on the 2000 Census and ACS forms through 2007 were substantially different from the questions asked on the 2008 ACS form and later (including the 2010 Census). Therefore, one cannot say with certainty what changes occurred to the prevalence of disabilities between 2000 and 2012.

†Defined as all family members if the family income is less than 1.5 times the poverty threshold set by the federal government.

‡Note that the data reported here are households and the percentage = (zero-vehicle households)/(total households in the county).
It is impossible to conclude with certainty the historical trend of the prevalence of people with disabilities. However, accounting for sampling error and considering results from 2000 and 2007, in all likelihood at least 18% of the current population in Washington County has some disability.

According to 2011 Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data, Washington County had 23,588 jobs within the county. In that same year, 12,407 residents of Washington County were employed outside of the county, which accounts for 49.0% of residents who are employed.

Based on a combined measure of low-income individuals, zero-vehicle households, persons with disabilities, and adults aged 65 and over, the areas most reliant on transit within Washington County are Marietta and Belpre (see Figure 2).

Other areas showing a moderate to high transit reliance include the towns of Beverly and Waterford in the northern portion of the county. Rural areas in the northeast portion of the county near the Monroe County border also demonstrate moderate transit reliance, as do areas in the eastern corner of the county.

Chesterhill and McConnelsville, west of Washington County, and areas outside the southwest corner of the county also show moderate reliance on transit.

**Transit Supportive Development Patterns**

Washington County shows higher density areas around Marietta and Belpre and small to medium density areas along the Muskingum River, including Beverly, Lowell, and Devola. The remainder of the county has low density. Of the roughly 61,600 people in the county, 43.4% live in areas of higher density and 56.6% are areas of lower county (based on 2010 Census block data).

Marietta, Belpre, and Beverly are the only areas with population and employment densities that, based on national evidence, suggest an ability to support transit service with a frequency of every 60 minutes or less (see Figure 3).

Many of the areas that indicate a demand for transit service suggest that deviated fixed route service (orange on Figure 3) may be most appropriate, though the small geographic area presents challenges for any fixed route transit service. An exception to this finding is Marietta, which shows a variable mix of demand for deviated fixed-route and standard fixed route services, and covers a somewhat larger land area.

Similar to the results above, areas with transit supportive densities outside of the county are northwest of Washington County, in McConnelsville and Malta.

**Existing Transit Services**

Transit service (fixed-route and paratransit) is available through the Community Action Bus Lines (CABL) in the cities of Marietta and Belpre. CABL is operated by Washington-Morgan Community Action under contract with Washington County and the City of Marietta.

CABL operating characteristics:

- Three routes in Marietta, Monday - Friday, 7:00 AM - 5:00 PM
- One route in Belpre, Monday - Friday, 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM
- Most routes operate at a two-hour frequency; only one route in Marietta operates at a 60-minute frequency
All fixed routes operate on a flag stop basis

One regional route making two trips to New Matamoras and two trips to Macksburg from Marietta on Thursdays only

Curb-to-curb ADA paratransit service during the same operating times of their fixed-routes

Local funding is provided by Washington County and the city of Marietta. The county contributes about $55,000 from the general fund and Marietta contributes about $40,000 from Community Development Block Grant funds.

2012 Transit Riders per Capita\(^1\): 0.35

2012 Operating Expenditure per Capita\(^1\): $6.35

**Opportunities, Challenges, and Needs**

A need exists for evening service (after 5 PM) and service on Saturdays, but funding is a barrier in CABL’s efforts to reinstate or expand service.

Generating local match is CABL’s primary challenge, one that prevents the system from pursing new projects and initiatives. The system never draws down its full state/federal allocation because of insufficient local match.

Similar to other systems in the region, CABL has difficulty hiring drivers with CDLs because its wages are not competitive. The oil and gas boom in southeastern Ohio means that drivers with CDLs are finding better paying work elsewhere.

CABL recently used the state’s Clean and Green Program to replace its entire vehicle fleet. This funding was critical for CABL’s vehicle replacement needs. Replacing vehicles in the future may be an issue if the Clean and Green Program no longer provide funding assistance.

CABL is shifting from an urban system under the S. 5307 program to a rural system under S. 5311 due to a decrease in the 2010 Census population. Staff foresees new reporting requirements and is looking to ODOT for assistance during this process.

CABL has an opportunity to strengthen its partnership with Marietta College, beyond the college’s current purchase of bus tickets, but CABL’s limited service hours have prevented a more formal partnership thus far.

\(^1\) Based on 2012 ACS estimates for Washington County (61,583).
Figure 2 Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics Affecting Reliance on Transit Service

Source: 2008 - 2012 5-year ACS Estimates; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT
Figure 3 Development Patterns (Population and Employment Density) Influencing Transit Service Design

Source: 2011 LEHD; 2010 Census SF1 100% data; TIGER/Line Files; ESRI; ODOT

Note: The “defined transit service area” indicates the official boundaries of the agency service area and does not necessarily indicate the coverage of the current routes in operation.