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1 INTRODUCTION

Public transit and human service transportation providers in Southeast Michigan are conducting a coordinated human service transportation plan known as “OnHand: Expanding Transportation Access Across Southeast Michigan”. This project will consider how well existing transportation services are matched with the needs of residents, especially older adults, people with disabilities, and people with low incomes and where there may be opportunities to improve access to service. OnHand will also develop a regional strategy to improve coordination among providers, reduce inefficiencies and redundancies, and ultimately strengthen regional mobility. As a coordinated human services public transportation plan, OnHand is also designed to fulfill requirements laid out by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and ensure the region has access to available funds.

This technical memo, the first in a series, examines the underlying market for public transit and human service transportation with a specific focus on the target populations (older adults, people with disabilities and people with low incomes). The market analysis considers the size and spatial distribution of the target population, travel patterns and key destinations, and evaluates the availability of public transportation services within the context of the target populations. The market analysis uses a combination of data available through the U.S. Census, forecast data developed by the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments (SEMCOG), and information provided by local and regional transportation providers.

OnHand is focused on Regional Transportation Authority of Southeast Michigan (RTA) region, which for the purposes of this effort, is defined as the four-county area of Wayne, Oakland, Macomb, and Washtenaw counties (see Figure 1).
Figure 1  OnHand Region
(Wayne, Oakland, Macomb, and Washtenaw Counties)
OVERVIEW

Southeast Michigan is both vast and varied. The four-county RTA region encompasses 2,663 square miles and includes large dense urban environments like Detroit, and smaller cities like Ann Arbor. The region also has multiple suburban communities like Sterling Heights and Novi, and large rural areas. In total, roughly 4.2 million people live in the OnHand region, and there are approximately 1.8 million jobs.

The remainder of the technical memo examines population and employment trends as well as the size and distribution of the target markets of older adults, persons with disabilities and people with low incomes.

Key Findings, Trends and Opportunities

The market analysis provides an overview of trends, opportunities, and broadly identifies key needs. Key characteristics of Southeast Michigan follow:

- Of the 4.2 million residents in the four-county region, roughly half live in Wayne and Oakland counties. These two counties account for 75% of the region’s employment.

- The region’s population overall has remained stable for the past few decades, however, there have been significant shifts and changes within the region. The predominant changes include a loss of population in Wayne County balanced by slow but steady growth in Oakland and Macomb counties and slightly faster growth in Washtenaw County.

- The data also shows that while the region overall has had a stable population and employment base, the region continues to sprawl, with the most significant net gain in population and employment occurring at the region’s fringe.

- Shifts in population and employment away from the urban and suburban communities to the region’s fringe exacerbates both the need for transportation services and the challenges associated with providing them.

- Trends in employment are confirmed by the travel flow data, which shows the importance of Oakland County as a commuter destination. Oakland County has large volumes of commuters traveling from both Wayne and Macomb.
  - Oakland County is also an important employment destination for individuals with low incomes, drawing workers from both Wayne and Macomb counties.

In addition to the general findings, there are socio-economic and demographic trends that are particularly relevant to OnHand and provide insights into service needs and opportunities. These findings include:

- The population of older adults in Southeast Michigan is growing quickly. While the overall population has remained steady since 2010, the population of older adults aged 65 and older increased by 18% and is projected to be 25% by 2040.

- Currently the rate of individuals with disabilities is relatively low. Part of the low estimate of individuals with disabilities in Southeast Michigan reflects changes in
the way disability is defined by the U.S. Census. It is also worth noting that as the region ages, the number of people living with disabilities will increase.

- Southeast Michigan has a high rate of individuals with low incomes overall. This population is spread throughout the region but concentrated in Wayne County.

The OnHand market analysis developed two investigations into needs: a transit needs index and mapped vulnerable populations. The transit needs index considers a range of demographic characteristics related to transit needs and includes individuals who have one or more of the target characteristics (aged 65+, low income or disabled). The vulnerable population analysis was defined more specifically and includes only older adults who also have a disability and live in poverty. In general, individuals included in the transit needs index are younger and more likely to participate in daily activities (school, work, job training) and consequently has more mobility needs as compared with the most vulnerable population. This contrasts with the vulnerable population that is less mobile overall but is more likely to require a higher level of transportation service (i.e. door-to-door or door-through-door).

Transit Needs Index shows that:
- Older adults, people with disabilities and people with low incomes are concentrated in Wayne County, especially around the City of Detroit.
- There are also concentration of transit needs in the southern half of Macomb County and much of the southeastern quadrant of Oakland County.
- In the portion of Wayne County outside of the City of Detroit, high needs extend to the west of the Detroit and in the southeast portion of the county (Allen Park, Lincoln Park).
- Washtenaw County also has pockets of high transit and transportation needs. Areas with high needs are clustered around Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti and the corridor connecting these communities with Wayne County.

- Vulnerable populations of older adults with low incomes and disability:
  - The highest concentration of the vulnerable population is in Wayne County, especially in the urbanized area in Detroit and surrounding communities of Highland Park and Dearborn.
  - Vulnerable populations are also concentrated throughout Macomb and Oakland counties, including in the southern parts of the county but also the northern, rural communities.
  - The rural communities also include vulnerable populations. Also, the density of these individuals is lower as compared with Wayne County and southern Macomb and Oakland counties.
2 REGIONAL DEMOGRAPHICS AND TRENDS

Overview

Regions and communities are always changing; the pace of overall growth and associate development patterns impact transportation systems in ways that are both positive and negative. Changes to regional transportation systems will directly and indirectly impact the target populations. Investments in regional transit services, for example, can improve access and increase choices for older adults, people with disabilities and people with low incomes. Likewise, negative impacts tend to disproportionately impact these same groups. For example, traffic congestion that slows travel times are likely more difficult for people with low incomes who often travel farther and spend more of their income on commuting. Or job growth that occurs in the suburbs may lead to a mismatch in available public transportation services and new travel needs. As part of understanding transportation needs for the target populations, OnHand considers the overall population and employment growth and development in the region.

Southeast Michigan has a rich and complex history in terms of population and employment trends. Many of the challenges the region has faced disproportionately impacted the City of Detroit in the form of diminished access to opportunity, although other communities and groups also suffered. Over the past decade, the region has started to stabilize and regain its economic footing. The following analysis illustrates, however, that benefits associated with employment and growth have not been shared equally in the region, including among members of the target population.1

1 Anatomy of Detroit’s Decline, New York Times August 17, 2013
Population

Southeast Michigan is home to about 4.2 million people, making it the 12th most populated urban area in the United States, just behind Miami and Atlanta, and ahead of Seattle. Of the 4.2 million people in Southeast Michigan, roughly 40% live in Wayne County with another 30% in Oakland County followed by 20% in Macomb County and 10% in Washtenaw County (see Figure 2).

OnHand considered regional population between 2000 and 2019. Overall, population has been stable hovering around 4.2 million (see Figure 3). Within this general trend the experience of individual counties has varied. Wayne County, for example, has lost population steadily since 1990, with the greatest decline occurring between 2000 and 2010, when nearly 12% of the population moved out of the county. Since 2010, however, Wayne County’s population loss has slowed. Population trends also show that the other 3 counties have grown, mostly notably Washtenaw, which grew by 7% between 2000 and 2010. Washtenaw County is expected to grow by another 9% between 2010 and 2020. Growth in Washtenaw County is attributable to a combination of factors, including educational and medical facilities and job growth.\(^2\)

OnHand mapped changes in population between 2010 and 2017, looking specifically at changes by census blocks (see Figure 4). This information helps us understand how sub areas adding or losing people (and jobs) may influence the demand and need for transportation services. In the case of Southeast Michigan, the analysis suggests the following trends:

- The Detroit urbanized area accounts for most of the region’s population with the highest density areas in northeastern Wayne County and southeastern portions of Macomb and Oakland counties.
- Although the most densely populated area, Wayne County has lost the most people in the region. The population decline is slowing, however, suggesting that the county maybe stabilizing.
- Although parts of Southeast Michigan continue to lose population, there are only a handful of pockets with significant gains or losses. This suggests that on a

\(^2\) The Detroit News, “Census: Washtenaw leads the region in population growth” March 23, 2017
community-by-community basis, growth and decline is more evenly borne across the region.

- Overall areas that are adding population tend to be at region’s fringes, including western Washtenaw County and the northern tiers of Oakland and Macomb counties. This information suggests that the region is continuing to sprawl even with slow growth.

- Sprawling population growth, especially at suburban and rural fringe areas with low population and employment density is difficult to serve efficiently with transitional fixed route public transportation services.
Figure 3  OnHand Region: Population Density
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Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2013-2017 ACS 5-Year Estimates
Figure 4  OnHand Region: Population Change 2010-2017
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Employment

While population has remained somewhat stable, Southeast Michigan’s employment base has changed significantly over the past few decades. Historically, the number of people employed in Southeast Michigan has grown steadily for several decades until the turn of the century, when employment started to decline. Between 2000 and 2010, Southeast Michigan lost more than 325,000 jobs, with job loss especially acute in Wayne County. Some of the job loss has been regained. Further, consistent with population, jobs have not been distributed equally across the four-county region. Macomb and Oakland county experienced the most job growth, while Washtenaw experienced the fastest rate of job growth. Wayne County has added fewer jobs compared to the rest of the region, but there has been modest growth in recent years (see Figure 5). Wayne County has the greatest density among workers compared to the rest of the region (Figure 6).

Consistent with the analysis of population changes, we also mapped changes in employment between 2010 and 2017 by looking at changes at the census block group level to understand how changes at the local level influence the demand and need for transportation (see Figure 7). Further, OnHand also considered the commuting patterns between counties both for all workers (Figure 8) and workers with low incomes (Figure 9). Combined this information gives us high-level insights into the employment market overall as well as regional commuting patterns. This data suggests the following:

- The current density of jobs overall follows a pattern similar to population, with the highest number of jobs in the Detroit urbanized area as well as the southeast corners of Oakland and Macomb counties.
- Historic trends show that after significant job loss between 2000 and 2010, the region is rebounding and adding jobs.
- In terms of job growth, Washtenaw has the fastest rate of job growth, but Macomb and Oakland counties are adding the most jobs overall.
- The change in employment suggests growth in the City of Detroit as well as a ring of communities around the urbanized area, such as Sterling Heights in Macomb.

3 Stabilizing and Sustaining: The Economic and Demographic Outlook for Southeast Michigan through 2045

Source: US Census Bureau: LEHD 2010-2017
County, Troy, Birmingham and Farmington in Oakland County, and Dearborn in Wayne County.

- Trends in employment are confirmed by the travel flow data, which shows the importance of Oakland County as a commuter destination. Oakland County has large volumes of commuters traveling from both Wayne and Macomb counties.
  - Oakland County is also an important employment destination for individuals with low incomes, drawing workers from both Wayne and Macomb counties.

- Wayne County also has a high volume of commuters traveling into the county, especially from Oakland County, but also Macomb County. However, there are larger volumes of lower income workers commuting out of Wayne County as compared low income workers traveling into Wayne County.

- There are also relatively large volumes of all types of commuters and lower-income workers traveling into Washtenaw County, especially considering the size of the employment market overall. The commuter flows the largest volume of commuters traveling into Washtenaw from Wayne County.
Figure 6  OnHand Region: Employment Density
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Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2017 LEHD
Figure  OnHand Region: Change in Job Density 2010 to 2017
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Figure 7  OnHand Region: Intercounty Worker Travel Flow (2017)
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Figure 8  OnHand Region: Intercounty Low-Income Worker Travel Flows (2017)
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Source: CTPP Data, 2016

Note: for the purpose of this study, Low Income has been defined as people with a ratio of less than 50% of the federal poverty limit.
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3 TARGET MARKETS AND POPULATIONS

Overview

In addition to considering overall population and employment trends, OnHand considered the size, distribution, and trends the study’s target populations: older adults, people with disabilities, and people with low incomes. This section considers the overall size of the target populations and compares them with national trends. It also documents changes in population over time.

Target Populations: Comparison with National Trends

Overall, the size of the target populations in Southeast Michigan is generally in line with national trends, with the exception of individuals with low incomes. Southeast Michigan tracks closely with national trends in terms of the rate of older adults and individuals with disabilities. In terms of individuals with low incomes, however, the portion of Southeast Michigan’s population living in poverty is more than double the national average (see Figure 9). The region also has a higher percentage of minorities, with nearly 33% of the population non-white as compared with 24% nationally.

Figure 9 Southeast Michigan Target Markets as a Percentage of Overall Population as compared with National Averages (2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National Average</th>
<th>OnHand Study Area (4-County Region)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>327,167,434</td>
<td>4,231,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (Aged 65+)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals with Disabilities</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals with Low Incomes</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minorities (Non-white population)</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census via American Community Survey

Target Populations: Regional Trends

The distribution of the target groups among the four counties varies by demographic groups. Older adults, for example, are evenly distributed. Macomb is slightly older, and Washtenaw is slightly younger, but in all cases the portion of the population aged 65 or older is consistent (12-16%). As discussed, the region has a slightly lower share of people with disabilities vs. the national average. Wayne has the highest proportion of people with disabilities (9%), while Oakland (6%) and Washtenaw (4%) have the lowest.
Southeast Michigan has fewer veterans compared with the national average, with just 5% compared to a 13% (see Figure 10).

The largest disparities from a regional perspective relate to people with low incomes and minority populations. Wayne has the highest proportion of people living in poverty (34%), which is considerably higher than either Macomb or Washtenaw (20% each) and more than twice as high as Oakland. Wayne’s minority population is nearly double neighboring counties. These data suggest that Wayne County has an increased need for public transportation services, and specialized services.

Figure 10  Southeast Michigan 2018 Target Markets as a Percentage of Overall Population (2018)
OLDER ADULTS

Older adults, or people age 65 years or more, comprise roughly 15% of the overall population in Southeast Michigan, which equates to about 630,000 individuals (see Figure 11). The population of older adults is fairly evenly distributed throughout the region, with the highest proportion of the population in Wayne County, followed by Macomb and Oakland counties, and Washtenaw is slightly younger (see Figure 12). As compared with other population groups, older adults have concentrations in urban, suburban, and rural communities.

Older adults are somewhat unique in the market analysis because it is one of the few demographic groups that can be relatively accurately forecast, and the data suggests rapid growth patterns. The data suggests that the population is aging quickly regionwide, with an additional 100,000 residents aged 65 or more in 2020 (regionwide) as compared with 2017. While a relatively small number, this is a rapid rate of growth, which is expected to continue.

Within the population of older adults, there are a handful of sub-populations within the group of older adults that inform the need for transportation services and the type of transportation services needed. These subgroups include older adults aged 85 (see Figure 13) and older adults who also have a disability and live in poverty (see Figure 14). Individuals aged 85 or more are scattered throughout Southeast Michigan, but the concentration of these individuals is greatest in Oakland and Macomb and slightly smaller in Washtenaw and Wayne County. The population of older adults who also have a disability and live in poverty are scattered through the region but are more likely to live in the region’s rural communities in northern Macomb and Oakland, as well as western Wayne. There are also pockets of this high-need community in Washtenaw.
Figure 12  OnHand Region: Population Density of Older Adults by Age Group
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Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2016-2018 ACS 5-Year Estimates
Figure 13  OnHand Region: Population Density of Older Adults Aged 85 Years or Older
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Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2013-2017 ACS 5-Year Estimates
Figure 14  OnHand Region: Population of Most Vulnerable Residents (Older Adults (65+) with Disabilities and Low Incomes)
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Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2013-2017 ACS 5-Year Estimates
PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

According to the U.S. Census, roughly 570,000 people, or 13% of the overall population in the four counties, are people with disabilities. The data also suggests that the number of people with disabilities has decreased steadily since 2000. However, the decline primarily reflects a change in the definition by the Census Bureau rather than a change in the underlying population. Despite the decline in the last decade, it is expected that the rate of individuals with disabilities will likely increase as the population ages. The growth of older adults has outpaced population growth overall, such that as of 2017, adults aged 65 represent 15% of the overall population, compared with 12% in 2000 (see Figure 15). People with disabilities often require specialized transportation services to accommodate limited mobility, mobility devices, caregiver support or attendants, and additional time from door to curb, and/or curb to vehicle.

![Figure 15 Change in Population of People with Disabilities 2000-2020](https://www.census.gov/topics/health/disability/guidance/data-collection-acs.html)

Defining Disability

The OnHand team mapped disability data using information collected by the American Community Survey (ACS). The ACS is a sample of the U.S. Census data; data is collected continuously (250,000 households per month) to provide annual updates on demographic and socioeconomic data.

The ACS collects data on individuals with disabilities, which it defines as difficulty related to hearing, vision, cognitive, ambulatory, self-care and independent living.

In 2009, the U.S. Census Bureau and ACS changed the way it defined disability to focus on the impact of conditions on basic functioning. Previous versions of the Census data defined a disability as the presence of specific conditions. Because of these changes, current ACS data should not be compared with US. Census data collected in 2000 (or earlier).

Source: U.S. Census Bureau: How Disability Data are Collected from the American Community Survey. Available at: https://www.census.gov/topics/health/disability/guidance/data-collection-acs.html
Figure 16  OnHand Region: Population Density of People with Disabilities
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PEOPLE WITH LOW INCOMES

For purposes of this analysis, individuals with low incomes are defined as people with an income of 150% of the federal poverty limit. As a reference, this means a person has a low income if their annual household income (with a population of 4 individuals) is $36,900 or less (in 2017$). The growth in people with low incomes increased dramatically between 2000 and 2010, corresponding with an exodus of regional jobs and employment opportunities. As employment has rebounded regionally, growth in the low-income population slowed (see Figure 17).

In 2017, there were over 1 million people in Southeast Michigan with low incomes, which translates to a poverty rate of 24%, considerably higher than the national average (12%). Within the region, Wayne County has both the largest number of people with low incomes and the highest poverty rate in the region (see Figure 18). Indeed, there are more people with low incomes in Wayne than in the remaining three counties combined. Further, population estimates suggest that nearly one-third of Wayne residents will have low incomes by 2020.

OnHand also mapped changes in poverty by census track (see Figure 19). This data shows that only a handful of communities in Oakland, Macomb and Washtenaw added or lost individuals with low income and most of the changes occurred in Wayne County. Within Wayne, there are a handful of census tracks, mostly within the City of Detroit that continued to increase the number of people with low incomes. In addition, in the census blocks just outside of the most urbanized parts of Detroit, there are a handful of communities that have reduced the number of individuals with low incomes.

---

Figure 18  OnHand Region: Population Density of People with Low Incomes
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Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2013-2017 ACS 5-Year Estimates

Note: for the purpose of this study, Low Income has been defined as people with a ratio of less than 50% of the federal poverty limit, i.e. if a person's annual household income (with a population of 4 individuals) is $35,900 or less (in 2017).
Figure 19  OnHand Region: Change in Population of People with Low Incomes by Census Tracts (2010 – 2017)
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Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Decennial Census 2010 and 2010-2017 ACS 5-Year Estimates
TRANSIT NEEDS INDEX

The OnHand project team has developed a transit needs index to highlight the U.S. census block groups with the highest proportion of population groups that tend to have a higher need for transit (see Figure 20). These groups include OnHand’s target populations (older adults, individuals with disabilities, and individuals with low incomes). Figure 21 illustrates the areas of the region with the highest proportion of these population groups. All data is from the 2017 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimate.

This data shows the highest concentration of individuals with transportation needs in Wayne County, consistent with the profile of the individual demographic populations. The individuals with the highest needs are clustered in the northeast portion of Wayne, in and around the City of Detroit. High need populations are also clustered in southeastern Macomb County and the southeast corner of Oakland County. While not as acute, the transit needs index shows needs are also distributed in the southern half of Macomb and much of the southeastern quadrant of Oakland. Outside of the City of Detroit, high needs extend to the west of the Detroit and in the southeast portion of Wayne (Allen Park, Lincoln Park).

Washtenaw County also has pockets of high transit needs. Areas with high needs are clustered around Ann Arbor and Ypsilanti and the corridor connecting these communities with Wayne County.
Figure 20  OnHand Region: Transit Needs Index
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4 TRANSIT NEEDS AND AVAILABLE SERVICES

INTRODUCTION

The market analysis highlights local and regional transportation needs. The companion piece to this analysis is the inventory of available service, which shows where services are available, including any restrictions or constraints on the availability of service, such as eligibility, availability and cost. Together, the two pieces of information show service gaps in services and needs and help complete the understanding of needs.

In addition to the market analysis, OnHand is developing a detailed service inventory. This analysis is underway and being summarized in a separate technical memo. This inventory of existing services will summarize service available from the largest public transportation operators, as well as smaller, publicly funded transportation services and nonprofit transportation providers. For purposes of the market analysis, however, we provide an overview of existing public transportation services and a summary of the human service transportation network to create an early analysis of service gaps.

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SERVICE

Southeast Michigan is served by three fixed route public transportation service providers, which are the largest public transportation providers in the region and serve the most densely populated areas (see Figure 21). These transit operators provided a combination of local and regional fixed route bus services. As part of operating fixed route bus services, transit operators are required to operate complementary paratransit for individuals unable to use fixed route service because of a disability. In addition to the fixed route and ADA paratransit, several of the transit operators offer specialized services, including shuttles, employment services and demand response services:

- **Suburban Mobility Authority for Regional Transportation (SMART)** – SMART operates regional fixed route bus service in Wayne, Macomb, and Oakland counties. In conjunction with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), SMART also operates complementary paratransit service for people unable to use fixed route service due a disability. SMART also operates Connector Service, an advance-reservation, curb-to-curb service, available to individuals living more than 1/3 mile of a SMART fixed route.

- **Detroit Department of Transportation (DDOT)** – DDOT operates fixed route bus service and complementary paratransit service (branded as MetroLift) within Detroit, as well as in Highland Park, Hamtramck, Dearborn, Southfield, River Rouge, Redford, and Livonia.
• **Ann Arbor Area Transportation Authority (AAATA)** – Also known as The Ride, AAATA operates a fixed route bus service in the Ann Arbor-Ypsilanti area in Washtenaw County, as well as ADA complementary paratransit service. The Ride’s ADA paratransit service is branded as A-Ride.

The list of fixed route services does not include the region’s two rail services (QLine and People Mover) that provide limited services within the City of Detroit. Both transportation services are ADA accessible. DDOT’s MetroLift service area overlaps with the two rail services; neither agency directly operates ADA paratransit services but coordinates service for riders with a disability through DDOT.

**Service Gaps in Fixed Route Transit Network**

In addition to the major transportation services listed above, there are numerous transportation providers that operate community and other local services. Many of these service providers receive federal and region transportation funds, either through Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grants for transit providers outside of the urbanized areas (FTA Section 5311 funds) and/or FTA grants for older adults (FTA Section 5310 funds). The availability of these services and how they correspond with needs will be further explored as part of the OnHand Transit Service Inventory.

Mapping the public transportation networks (including both fixed route with the ADA service boundaries) together with the transit propensity analysis, demonstrates that transit services are concentrated in the parts of the region with the greatest need (see Figure 22). Transit services are also largely aligned with the distribution of OnHand’s target populations. While illustrative, it is important to note that the coverage of the region by transportation service does not reflect the quality of service, which can be represented by service schedules, travel times and the number/ease of transferring between services. This analysis will be explored as part of the service inventory.
Figure 21  OnHand Region: Fixed Route Transit Service Network Coverage
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SMART Community Transportation Services

As the regional transit service provider in Southeast Michigan, SMART serves Wayne, Oakland and Macomb counties. Funding for the service comes from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) through their Urbanized Transit Formula grants, known as Section 5307. In addition, SMART levies a property tax, equal to $1.00 per thousand taxable value millage rate. This millage is applied against taxable value across Macomb County and in participating communities in Oakland and Wayne counties. Communities in Oakland and Wayne County counties may opt into or out of SMART individually through the decision of their municipal governments, while communities in Macomb County opt into or out of service on a county-wide basis. In total, there are 132 communities in the SMART service area of which 79 “opt-in” to the millage. The property tax was most recently reauthorized in August, 2018 and generates roughly $70 million annually5 (see Figure 23 and Figure 24).

In addition to “opt-in” communities, there are 53 “opt-out” communities in Oakland and Wayne counties that do not pay into the SMART regional system. Opt-out communities do not receive SMART fixed route services, but in some cases still work with SMART to organize transportation services. The opt-out communities account for a portion of the areas identified as having transit needs in Oakland and Wayne counties, especially in the northern and northwest tiers of Oakland County and parts of western Wayne County.

---

5 SMART Financial Report with Supplemental information, June 30, 2019
SMART Community Transportation Service Network

SMART’s regional network includes a variety of fixed route transit services that connect Southeast Michigan’s population and employment markets. In communities at the fringe of the service area, especially communities with lower population and employment densities too low to support frequent fixed route service, SMART’s operates a Community Partnership (or Community Transit) Program. This program allows communities that do not receive fixed route transit to get “credits” that can be invested locally to operate local community transit services that fit the local mobility needs. In most cases, funding provided by SMART is matched by FTA Section 5310 funding, so local communities can provide service with limited (or no) additional local funding.

In total, there are 75 communities that partner with SMART to operate transportation services (see Figure 25). In all cases, individual municipalities identify a service provider, determine the services it will operate, and the eligibility criteria and process. Most municipalities provide a senior transportation service, while others provide a public dial-a-ride service. In total, SMART provides vehicles, maintenance, and operating funding to nearly 50 municipally based transportation services in over 70 municipalities throughout the tri-county area.

SMART also operates a handful of flexible services and shuttles in locations with limited or no access to fixed route. These services include a flexible route in Groesbeck, shuttles to the Oakland Mall and in Somerset and a dial-a-ride service in Farmington and Farmington Hills.

AAA1B Travel Planning Services

Another major regional transportation service is the Area Agency on Aging 1-B (AAA 1-B). To fulfill its mission of connecting seniors in Southeast Michigan with services needed to maintain their independence, AAA1B developed myride2, a one-call, one-click mobility management service dedicated to helping older adults and people with disabilities find transportation resources, continuing to drive safely, or learning how to use public transportation. AAA1B manages the myride2 website to connects older adults and people with disabilities to transportation services from providers throughout a six-county region, which includes Macomb, Oakland, Wayne and Washtenaw.

AAA1-B also provides travel training for first-time and returning transit riders who need assistance using public transportation in Oakland, Macomb and Wayne counties.

TRANSPORTATION RESOURCES BY COUNTY

In addition to the regional transportation service providers, there are many local public transportation providers that service municipality and client markets within each of the individual counties (Oakland, Macomb, Washtenaw and Wayne). Service operated by municipalities are typically, but not always, available to members of the general public, but are designed with the needs of older adults, people with disabilities, and people with low incomes in mind. There are also several non-profit organizations that provide transportation services within individual counties; these organizations are specifically oriented around agency clientele and specific high need groups, such as older adults and people with disabilities. This section highlights a handful of the largest municipal
operated services to demonstrate the availability of local services. Additional information will be available in OnHand’s full inventory of human service transportation resources.

**Oakland County**

There are an estimated 69 transportation service providers based in Oakland County that work with SMART to operate public and specialized transportation services. Of the 69 service, the majority (59) are managed or operated by municipalities. In most cases, services are available to members of the general public but are primarily designed to serve older adults, people with disabilities and people with low incomes.

Two of the largest demand response providers are:

- **North Oakland Transportation (NOTA)** operates door-to-door demand response transportation for older adults, people with disabilities and people with low incomes living in Orion, Oxford and Addison Townships, as well as the Villages of Lake Orion, Oxford and Leonard.

- **Western Oakland Transportation (WOTA)** currently provides demand response transportation services for older adults (aged 55+) and people with disabilities living in Highland Township, White Lake and Walled Lake. WOTA is scheduled to begin operating as general public transportation services and expand its service area to include Commerce, Waterford, and Wolverine Lake Townships.

**Macomb County**

Like Oakland County, there are 10 municipal and up to 3 nonprofit organizations that work with SMART to provide public transportation services in Macomb County. Some services operate within a single jurisdiction while others serve multiple communities. Most services are designed around the needs of older adults and people with disabilities, while a handful also are available to members of the general public.

The largest provider is **Richmond Lenox E.M.S. Community Transit** provides door-to-door and door-through-door demand response transportation for individuals living in Armada, Chesterfield, Lenox, Memphis, New Baltimore, New Haven, Ray, Macomb Township and Richmond. This service is available to the general public but primarily serves older adults and people with disabilities. Richmond Lenox EMS also provides one daily trip to the Detroit Metro Airport. The nonprofit providers include Macomb County Interfaith Volunteer Caregivers and Catholic Charities of Southeast Michigan.

In addition to the operators receiving financial support from SMART, there are other nonprofit organizations that also operate services.

**Washtenaw County**

Washtenaw County is slightly different as compared with the more urbanized counties of Macomb, Oakland, and Wayne in part because the county has fewer people and lower population and employment densities overall. Despite this, there are a handful of transit agencies that operate within Washtenaw County, including People’s Express and Western-Washtenaw Area Value Express (WAVE). In addition to these operators, **The Ride** also provides specialized transportation services.
• **People’s Express (PEX)** provides transportation for residents of South Lyon, Saline, Lyon Township, Wixom and Milford. Transportation services include commuter routes and demand response services. Fares vary by trip type, but lower fares are available for older adults and people with disabilities.

• **Western-Washtenaw Area Value Express (WAVE)** operates transportation in western Washtenaw County. The service is available to older adults, people with disabilities, and transit-dependent individuals living in western Washtenaw County. Services include a community shuttle, two regional routes that connect communities in Western Washtenaw as well as demand response services. The WAVE Jackson Road service allows riders to transfer to TheRide for travel to Ann Arbor.

• **TheRide** operates fixed route and complementary paratransit services (ARide) in Ann Arbor, Ypsilanti, Pittsfield, Superior Township and Ypsilanti Township. In addition to these services, TheRide operates a handful of services specifically designed to service older adults, people with disabilities and people with low incomes. These services include:
  - **The Gold Ride** is a demand response service available for adults aged 65 or more traveling within the City of Ann Arbor and portions of Pittsfield Township. There are no eligibility requirements associated with the Gold Ride, other than availability of vehicles.
  - **The Flex Ride** is an on-demand microtransit service available to members of the general public with no restrictions on service. The Flex Ride is available to individuals in Pittsfield Township and Southeast Ypsilanti Townships.
  - **MyRide** is a mobility management service that is designed to help coordinate rides and transportation services for transit dependent individuals. Mobility management services include information and referrals, trip planning, and fare assistance. It is primarily available to individuals in Washtenaw County but includes portions of the surrounding counties.

**Wayne County**

Nearly 40 several municipalities and groups of municipalities in Wayne County work with SMART and operate transportation services for their residents who meet age criteria (typically 60+) and/or have a disability. Some also operate services that are available to members of the general public. Some of the largest transportation providers include:

• **Downriver Community Conference (DCC)** operates demand response services in Allen Park, Brownstown Township, Dearborn, Dearborn Township, Ecorse, Flat Rock, Gibraltar, Grosse Ile Township, Huron Township, Lincoln Township, Lincoln Park, Melvindale, River route, Riverview, Rockwood, Romulus, Southgate, Taylor, Trenton, Woodhaven and Wyandotte.

• **Farmington and Farmington Hills Dial-a-Ride** is operated by SMART but designed specifically to serve residents of Farmington and Farmington Hill. All service must end and begin within Farmington and Farmington Hills, but trips can be scheduled on the day of travel.
• **Nankin Transit** operates a combination of demand responsive curb-to-curb transportation services for older adults and people with disabilities living in Wayne, Westland, Inkster, Garden City and Canton.

• **Pointe Area Assisted Transportation Services (PAATS)** operate demand response services for older adults and people with disabilities living in the Pointe Communities (Grosse Pointe City, Grosse Pointe Farms, Grosse Pointe Park, Gross Pointe Shores, Grosse Pointe Woods) and Harper Woods.
Figure 25  OnHand Region: Transit Need and Service Coverage with SMART Communities Providers
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Note: Washtenaw County is not located within SMART’s service area and therefore is not an opt-in nor opt-out community.