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Introduction

Study Goals

The goal of the study is to develop an implementable plan for a new community transit system within Moab and the immediate area (study area shown in Figure 1). This new community transit system could be a fixed route bus, on-demand shuttle, commuter bus, or a combination thereof.

The outcomes of the study have included:

- An assessment of the needs and opportunities.
- Development of transit service alternatives to address identified needs.
- A final preferred service alternative with detailed service characteristics (route, schedule, costs, etc.) and operating plan, as well as a financial plan.
- Support for a Request for Proposal (RFP) to select a vendor to operate the service.
- A final plan document with system performance criteria, presented herein.

Figure 1: Study Area


Study Methodology

The methodology for this study has followed a process that built upon each step to ultimately develop an implementable community transit solution for Moab, as shown in Figure 2.

---

**Travel Needs and Market Analysis**
- Completed February and March 2021
- Included stakeholder input

**Develop System Alternatives**
- Three alternatives developed
- Stakeholder and Moab City Council meetings
- Grand County presentation

**Final Moab Transit Plan**
- UDOT Transportation Commission: June 2021
- Final Plan complete: July 2021

**Operating and Financial Plan**
- 6/5/21 – Moab City funding resolution
- 6/15 – Grand County funding resolution
- 6/22 – Moab/Grand County service plan refinement workshop

**Service Contracting and Implementation**
- August 2021 – February 2022
- Goal of service start in March 2022

*Figure 2. Project Process*
Study Area Context

Population and Demographics

Population

The current population of the City of Moab is 5,268, and it has been growing at 0.7% per year since 2010 as shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3. Population Growth in Moab (source: ACS 2010 – ACS 2019)
Most of Moab’s population is centered around the downtown core along US-191 as shown in **Figure 4**.

**Moab Population Density**

![Moab Population Density Map](image)

**Figure 4. Moab Population Density by Census Block Group (source: ACS 2019)**

The population becomes less dense further from the intersection of Center Street and US-191. The northern sections of US-191 experience more dispersed populations than the southern sections of US-191. This southern section of the US-191 corridor remains relatively populated into Spanish Valley in San Juan County.
Demographics

Figure 5 shows Moab residents by race and ethnicity.

Figure 5. Moab Population Demographics (source: ACS 2019)

Roughly three-quarters of the population in Moab is White (78%) and 14% is Hispanic. The remaining 8% of the population consists of Native American, Asian, Black or other mixed races.

One way to understand where demand for transit is located is to analyze those demographic groups that typically use transit at high rates including: those living under the federal poverty level, those with no vehicle available to the household, younger residents, and older adult residents. Figure 6 shows the percentage of these populations most likely to take transit by Census Block Group (as mapped in Figure 4). It should be noted that this approach does mean that some people may fall into multiple categories.
Because the surrounding area is rural and dispersed, it is not surprising that most residents own a vehicle to get around. However, two Census Block Groups in Moab are home to a portion of residents without vehicles available to the household (shown as the dark orange bar in Figure 6) – North Central and Southwest Moab. This is important to note, as those without consistent access to a vehicle could benefit from a local transit system. East Bench/Slickrock and South-Central Moab are home to the highest portions of older residents who may experience physical limitations to mobility and thus may be inclined to consider using a new transit system. North Central and Northwest Moab are home to the greatest percentages of both youth and residents living below the federal poverty level. Experience has continually demonstrated that these populations are likely to take transit due to being too young to drive or because of economic limitations and could directly benefit from a transit system.

Diving further into the income demographic, Figure 7 shows the change in median income from 2016 to 2019, and Figure 8 shows the distribution of income levels in 2019.
As Figure 7 shows, most Moab Census Block Groups experienced an increase in median income from 2016-2019. As shown in Figure 8, North Central Moab also has one of the most even distribution of incomes among block groups. Along with this more equal distribution comes one of the highest number of residents with lower incomes, reflected in the high poverty rate from Figure 6. South Central and Southwest Moab also have relatively high numbers of low-income residents, with Southwest Moab
showing the greatest income disparity. Lower-income residents are more likely to face individual mobility options and should be considered as service options are developed.

Another important demographic determinant of potential transit use is age. People under the age of 18 and over the age of 65 tend, as a percentage, to use transit more frequently than people between 18 and 65. The Moab area is home to populations of all ages, as shown in Figure 9.

![Moab Ages (2019)](image)

**Figure 9: Moab Age Groups (source: ACS 2019)**

Younger working age residents (ages 21-45 years) are the largest age group in each Moab Census Block Group. Young residents (ages 21 years and younger) and older residents (ages 64 years and older) tend to be the age groups with the most limited mobility options. Southwest Moab has a large number of younger and older residents, while North Central Moab is home to many younger residents. South Central Moab has the most equal distribution of age groups among the census blocks.

### National Park Visitation Trends

The regional economy is heavily influenced by tourism, which can impact local transportation needs. **Figure 10** shows steadily increasing visitation to both National Parks in the study area, with Arches National Park experiencing a significant rise in popularity over the past decade.
With the two National Parks (Arches and Canyonlands), plus Deadhorse Point State Park, and numerous recreational sites on BLM lands, the Moab & Spanish Valley area can easily receive hundreds of thousands of visitors every year, as shown by Figure 11 below.
The influx of visitors contributes greatly to the area’s economy, as shown in Figure 12 and Figure 13.
Bicycle and Pedestrian Network

Existing Facilities

As most transit trips begin and end with either a biking or walking trip, it is important to understand the existing biking and walking routes, as shown in Figure 14. It is notable that the options for pedestrian crossings of US-191 are limited, especially in the northern part of Moab city limits, north of East 200 North. This is an important factor for fixed route transit routes, as it is preferrable to have stop pairing on either side of the street with a safe pedestrian crossing connecting the two so that the bus can run a linear route in both directions, with a northbound and a southbound stop connected by a highway crossing.
Figure 14: Moab City and Biking Routes (source: UDOT)

Notable Shared-Use Paths

The Moab Canyon Pathway connects the northern edge of Moab with Arches National Park, Canyonlands National Park and Dead Horse Point State Park. A part of the US-191 widening project, the Pathway will be extended south to Emma Boulevard.

The Mill Creek Parkway is a two-mile east-west facility that connects residential areas throughout Moab with Sand Flats Road and recreational opportunities to the east of the City.
The planned Millsite Riverside Trail will be constructed on the site of a former uranium mine and will provide a connection to the North Moab Canyon Recreation Trail.

**On-Street Facility Types**

The City of Moab has striped bike lanes on a number of roadways including 400 N Street, 500 West Street, and 400 East Street. Facility types include striped bike lanes and marked shoulders such as the example shown below on 500 W Street (Figure 15).

![Striped Shoulder Bike Lane in Moab](image)

**Existing Plans**

*Moab Transportation Plan (2004)*

The Moab Transportation Master Plan (TMP) outlines several short-term and long-term projects, notably a transit system within Moab, a bypass feasibility study, implementation of an emergency vehicle pre-emption system, traffic calming infrastructure, and active transportation (walking and bicycling) safety improvements.

*Spanish Valley Area Plan (2018)*

San Juan County adopted the Spanish Valley Area plan to guide future development in the San Juan County section of Spanish Valley. The plan outlines mixed-use community cores with larger residential lots on the perimeter. Recreational areas should be linked with active transportation infrastructure. Service roads along US-191 should be constructed to serve new development. A well-connected transportation system that safely incorporates multiple modes of transit along US-191 is a guiding principle of the plan.
**Moab Downtown Plan (2019)**

The Moab Downtown Plan summarizes residents' visions for downtown Moab given its growing tourist popularity. Due to the high levels of freight traffic along US-191/Main Street, residents would like traffic calming and congestion mitigation improvements, along with increased opportunities for active transportation. The community also noted that the Main Street corridor needs a balance of tourist and resident retail opportunities along with a unified community character in the downtown area.

**Moab & Spanish Valley Regional Transportation Plan (2021)**

Grand County, San Juan County, the City of Moab, the Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA), and the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) collaborated to form the following regional transportation vision in the Moab & Spanish Valley Regional Transportation Plan: “The Spanish Valley will have a transportation system that welcomes residents and visitors to access community amenities and recreational opportunities using a safe, efficient, and multi-modal system that moves people and goods reliably into, out of, and around the region.” The plan recommends a public shuttle to a few key destinations in the area to alleviate parking problems and recommends connecting the airport in any future transit service as a multi-modal hub.

**Other Plans**

The City of Moab, Grand County, and UDOT have conducted several other plans in the study area:

- US-191 Corridor Preservation Study (2015) – Grand County
- Arches Area Recreation Hotspot (2018) – UDOT
- Main Street Moab Bypass Planning Study (2018) – UDOT
- Moab Parking Study (2019) – City of Moab

**Common Themes from Recent Planning Efforts**

With growing resident and tourist use of US-191 as a main thoroughfare, planners have been working to develop solutions to maintain community quality of life while still providing important north-south highway access for freight. Peak traffic has become a significant concern and is perceived to be exacerbated by the lack of a transit system which limits transportation mode choice options in the area. A bypass or limited access highway has been discussed to provide economic benefits for freight, but route options and community support are limited. Many traffic calming measures, active transportation infrastructure, and parking projects have also been considered in recent planning efforts, along with a possible transit or shuttle service.

**COVID-19 Context**

This community transit implementation study is taking place during unprecedented times that are important to note, specifically the coronavirus COVID-19 pandemic and ongoing impacts in 2021 with rising Delta variant cases and possible return to more restrictive health guidelines that may continue to
create uneven travel patterns and unpredictable future economic conditions for the Moab area. Currently, a new community shuttle is envisioned for a 2022 launch, but it may be necessary to reassess community demand and possible public transit capacity restrictions ahead of launching a new transit solution. The conditions for success should be as optimal as possible, and ongoing pandemic challenges with getting people to use a new transit service may require a delayed service launch.
Study Area Travel Assessment

Travel Market Analysis

A travel market analysis identifies who might use a new public transportation service, how they might use it, and where it needs to connect.

Activity Centers

Understanding where the current activity centers are within Moab and the surrounding region is a starting point for determining potential travel markets. As shown in Figure 16, and not surprisingly, the major activity center is downtown Moab, with concentrations of activity along US-191 from Colorado River bridge on the north side to the south end of Moab. More dispersed activity centers exist within the upper Spanish Valley area.

Activity centers identified include:

- Hotels and RV parks/campgrounds along US-191.
- Downtown shopping, restaurants, and services along US-191/Main Street in downtown Moab.
- Residential areas throughout the City of Moab and within Spanish Valley.
- Outfitters and tour companies along US-191.
- Schools, medical services, and social services within Moab.

Figure 16: Moab Activity Center Density (source: Fehr & Peers)
Potential Trip Patterns

Through review of limited, available data and stakeholder input, the following potential trip patterns were identified.

- From hotels, motels, and campgrounds north of Moab (as far as the hotels just north of the Colorado River) into downtown Moab
- From hotels, motels, and campgrounds south of Moab (as far as the KOA campground) into downtown Moab
- From Spanish Valley residential areas (as far south as Rim Village) into downtown Moab
- From points throughout Moab and Spanish Valley to employment locations primarily along US-191
- From hotels, motels, and campgrounds throughout the Moab area to close-in recreation spots such as Mill Creek/Power Dam and Rotary Park
- Point-to-point within Moab city limits

Identification of Top Trip Patterns

The top three identified trip patterns include:

1. Hotels, motels, campgrounds, and RV parks (along US-191) to/from downtown Moab.
2. Upper Spanish Valley to/from downtown Moab.
3. Point-to-point within Moab city limits between a variety of origin and destination locations.

Travel Markets

The universe of all possible travel markets (users and user characteristics of a new transit service) includes a variety of potential users. It should be noted that many people fall into multiple potential travel market categories.

- Visitors staying in a variety of lodging properties, primarily along US-191 from just north of the Colorado River to just south of Moab city limits
- Employees living in Spanish Valley and working in Moab
- Employees living and working in Moab
- People with limited access to a vehicle
- Older adults
- Youth
- People with limited mobility or mobility assistant devices
- USU-Moab staff and students
- People looking to hike or relax along Mill Creek

Identification of Top Travel Markets and Trip Purposes

The various information sources were used to help identify the following top travel markets:

1. Visitors traveling between their lodging properties and downtown Moab
2. Employees living in the upper Spanish Valley area and working in downtown Moab
3. Residents of Moab, primarily youth, older adults, and those with limited access to a vehicle, needing to move around Moab for a variety of trip purposes through a variety of trip patterns

**Moab Travel Trends**

**Commute Characteristics**

Commute mode choice is another important factor when considering transit markets. Driving alone represents the predominant travel mode in Moab as shown in Figure 17.

![Moab Commute Mode (2019)](image)

*Figure 17: Moab Commute Mode Choice (source: ACS 2019)*

While most residents commute by driving alone, as is common in a low-density community, a third of residents experience a different commute. Nearly 10% of residents bike and another near 10% work from home. Carpooling is slightly less popular than walking.

While most employees in the City of Moab come from out of town, many live and work in Moab. Of those living in the City, about one third of residents work outside of Moab while the rest remain in Moab to work locally, as shown in Figure 18.
**Existing Transportation Services – Private Providers**

Currently there is no public transit service operating within the study area. The private providers listed below provide transportation service to tourists seeking trailhead access, access to the Moab Canyonlands Airport, and intercity service.

**Canyonlands Shuttle**

On-demand transportation provider serving airports in Utah, western Colorado, and northern Arizona as well as connections to intercity bus and rail stations. In addition, Canyonlands Shuttle provides service to trailheads.

[https://www.canyonlandsshuttle.com/services](https://www.canyonlandsshuttle.com/services)

**Moab Express**

Provides airport service to Moab Canyonlands Airport and Grand Junction Airport.

[https://moabexpress.com/](https://moabexpress.com/)

**Porcupine Shuttle**

Provides bike shuttle service to trailheads, airport service to Moab Canyonlands Airport and Grand Junction Airport, and offers intercity shuttles for tourists on extended one-way bicycle or river rafting trips.

[https://porcupineshuttle.com/](https://porcupineshuttle.com/)
Raven Shuttle

Provides shuttle service to trailheads for bicyclists and hikers, airport service to Moab Canyonlands Airport, Grand Junction Airport, and Salt Lake City Airport and offers intercity shuttles to destinations like Telluride or Durango.

https://www.ravenshuttlemoab.com/

Roadrunner Shuttle

Provides shuttle service to trailheads for bicyclists and hikers, river shuttles for rafting excursions, and airport transportation to Moab Canyonlands Airport, Grand Junction Airport, Salt Lake City Airport, and Telluride Airport.

http://www.roadrunnershuttle.com/

Redrock Express

The Redrock Express is a private shuttle service that provides recreation tours in Southern Utah.

https://www.redrockexpress.com/

Coyote Shuttle

The Coyote Shuttle serves private excursions for biking, rafting, and hiking trips.

https://www.coyoteshuttle.com/

The Whole Enchilada Shuttle Co.

A private provider serving biking trips with trailhead access.

https://wholeenchiladashuttles.com/

Stakeholder Input

To better understand the unique transportation needs of the Moab area, seven stakeholder interviews were conducted by Fehr & Peers staff in March of 2021. These stakeholder interviews afforded more in-depth conversations with representatives from a broad cross-section of community leaders and organizations in Moab. The stakeholders interviewed (and the constituents they represent) were chosen based on their historical and likely future involvement in the operations of a new transit system.

The stakeholders interviewed included key representatives from:

- City of Moab Administration
- City of Moab Planning Department
- City of Moab Public Works Department
- City of Moab City Council
Each interview was conducted as a one-on-one session and lasted 30 minutes to one hour.

**Common Themes**

Many common themes were identified through the interviews.

*Need for Shuttle or Public Bus*

Almost all stakeholders interviewed indicated that they believe there is a need for a new public transit system or community shuttle and that a new shuttle would be beneficial to visitors and locals within and around Moab.

*Traffic and Parking Issues*

Most stakeholders mentioned the peak traffic and congestion issues that are perceived to happen more often each year – the potential for a shuttle to help alleviate traffic congestion, at least to some degree, was of importance to almost all stakeholders. Many stakeholders also indicated that a shuttle could help reduce parking demands, especially downtown and possibly at nearby trailheads such as Mill Creek Power Dam.

*Primarily Visitor-Focused*

Most stakeholders interviewed believed the target market for the service should be visitors, particularly moving visitors from area hotels to and from downtown. However, many stakeholders mentioned the need for the shuttle system to also serve locals, especially for getting people employed in the service industries to and from work, as well as helping get students to the new USU campus at US-191 and South Mill Creek Drive.

*Community Connectivity*

All stakeholders discussed the need to connect key destinations along the US-191 corridor, from the northern hotels at the Colorado River to the southern Moab city limits. Several stakeholders mentioned the need the connect to other destinations including points further south on US-191 such as the Old Spanish Area and points in the Spanish Valley area, primarily to serve people living here and working in downtown Moab. Two stakeholders mentioned that circulation with the Moab city limits would be helpful with connections to destinations such as the Senior Citizens Center, local parks, local schools, the Moab Regional Hospital, and Utah State University-Moab.
Important Service Characteristics

Stakeholders also weighed in on important service characteristics to consider in developing a new community shuttle system.

Year-Round Versus Seasonal Service

All stakeholders believed that a new transit service must operate at least from March through October. However, some stakeholders indicated that the shuttle should also operate during the winter months (with reduced service) to allow for consistency for local riders. Growth in visitation in November was noted by some, as well as busyness around Christmas week, that could require a longer season with almost year-round service.

Scheduled and On-Demand Options

Most stakeholders indicated that a frequent service running a fixed route along US-191 was important, but there was less consensus about whether an on-demand service for the Moab city limits made sense. Some thought that a flexible service, where users could request an on-demand trip in real-time using a smartphone app, could be helpful for some trip types within Moab.

Bus Features

There was not consensus among stakeholders on the types of buses for the service. Some thought that having bigger buses was critical and others thought smaller buses would be more appropriate. Many thought that open air buses, possibly rubber-tired trolleys, could help attract users while others thought that having comfortable buses with air-conditioning was important.

Late Night Service

There were differing opinions on how late a new shuttle service should operate. Most agreed that the shuttle should go until at least 7:00 PM, but some believed service was needed until 9:00 or 10:00 PM.

Marketing and Branding

All stakeholders believed that having a service with distinctively branded vehicles (with a Moab-feel) and extensive local marketing and advertising would be critical to the success and popularity of the service.

Service Seven Days per Week

Universally, stakeholders indicated that a new transit service would need to operate every day of the week during the months it operates.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Connectivity

Many stakeholders identified the need for potential bus stops to incorporate safe bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure such as pathways, bus pull-out areas, defined crosswalks, sidewalks, and possibly pedestrian underpasses in areas where crosswalks are not possible, or no traffic signal exists such as the new USU campus.
Park-and-Ride Lots

Some stakeholders mentioned the need for park-and-ride lots on the north and south ends of a potential route along US-191 that would allow for potential riders to park and catch the bus into downtown Moab.

Challenges

Stakeholders identified many challenges to consider for implementing a new public transportation service.

- Having the bus sitting in the same traffic as all other vehicles will impact the attractiveness of the shuttle and could create operational challenges in keeping the bus on schedule.
- Alternative routes away from US-191 are limited and often congested.
- Without strong branding and/or a unique vehicle (such as a trolley), a new public transportation shuttle may be difficult to distinguish from all other big vehicles on the road.
- Providing enough service to have highly frequent service may be challenging with a limited budget.
- Getting visitors who come to Moab with their vehicle (and often lots of toys and gear) to park and take the shuttle could be a “hard sell.”
- Establishing new bus stops along Main Street (US-191) in downtown Moab will require removing parallel parking spots.
- The limitations a shuttle may have in reducing peak traffic, considering the maximum number of people a shuttle could carry compared to the significant number of cars at peak times – a shuttle would have to operate at a very high level of service (for example, every 10 minutes or less) to make a noticeable difference in traffic.
Service Alternatives Analysis

Types of Services

There are several types of transit services that contribute to a successful network. Every community experiences different opportunities and challenges that tilt toward one type of transit service over another, based on community needs, geography/topography, the roadway network, etc. This section describes the types of transit services included in the Moab Transit service alternatives.

Fixed Route

A fixed route bus service operates on predetermined routes, schedules, and stops. Passengers do not need to schedule the service in advance; simply showing up at a designated stop at the scheduled time is enough to catch the bus.

Paratransit

The Federal Transportation Authority (FTA) requires any fixed route to have complementary paratransit for those qualifying under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). This service must be provided within ¾ of a mile of a bus route during the same operating period as the fixed route. Passengers riding paratransit must schedule their ride in advance to ensure pickup. While trips might need to be flexible in order to maintain service to the area, actual pickup times may not vary more than an hour from the requested pickup time.

Deviated Fixed Route

Similar to a fixed route, a deviated fixed route follows a set route but also has the flexibility to deviate ¾ of a mile off the route between stops to pick up those who can't access existing bus stops. A deviated fixed route can serve ADA paratransit trips as well as the public without requiring a separate dedicated ADA van.

Microtransit

Microtransit is a newer form of transit service that utilizes a smartphone app (or a call-in service) to match trip requests in real-time. Small vans or shuttle buses operate a dynamic route with established time points or point-to-point trips within a defined area. Microtransit can also accommodate virtual stops (bus stops that can be requested via the app and are only served if requested), flag-down stops, and flex routes that combine on-demand zones with deviated fixed routes. Figure 19 demonstrates microtransit operational flow. The service can be contracted turn-key or operated by an agency with purchased ride-matching technology. Success of microtransit depends on the connection of low/medium density areas, the ability to group trips, and marketing.
Passenger Fares

Defining fare structure is a policy decision with significant ridership implications. As a new service that needs to attract new riders, it is important to create a fare structure that incentivizes use and creates ridership growth. Fares and ridership have an inverse elasticity in that as fares increase, ridership decreases, but not necessarily equally. The fare structure may need to be adjusted over time as the service develops and service demand changes.

For a new service in Moab, a free fare is recommended to attract new riders. As part of the service alternatives development, it was assumed that any new service would be fare-free to encourage ridership and shift from private vehicles to transit. Implementation of passenger fares can be evaluated after the five-year pilot program.

Many other public transit services in areas with high levels of tourism operate without a fare:

- High Valley Transit (Summit County, UT)
- Park City Transit (Park City, UT)
- RFTA in-town routes in Aspen, CO
- START Bus in-town routes in Jackson, WY

Service Alternative #1 – Fixed Route with Paratransit and Microtransit Zones

Service Alternative #1 features a combination of fixed route, microtransit, and paratransit services. A fixed route operates along US-191 from the northern side of the Colorado River to Mill Creek Drive in southern Moab, with established stops along the way. A microtransit zone extends along the fixed route from 500 West to Mill Creek Drive. This microtransit zone is available to both the public and ADA-eligible riders. On the northern end of the fixed route where microtransit doesn’t operate, a paratransit zone provides a flexible service for those with accessibility challenges. Figure 20 shows the types of transit services and their respective geographical boundaries.
Figure 20. Service Alternative #1

Service Alternative #1’s combination of fixed route (5.5 miles one-way), paratransit (2.4 mi² zone), and microtransit (6.6 mi² zone) requires one bus and one van with an estimated one-way travel time of 18-24 minutes from the north terminus at the route to the south terminus of the route. The fixed route operates with an hourly frequency with eleven hours of service per day. This service alternative is estimated to attract 150-250 riders per day.

Service Alternative #2 – Fixed Route with Deviated Zone

Service Alternative #2 features a deviated fixed route service operating along US-191 from the northern side of the Colorado River to Overlook Road in southern Moab, with established stops along the way. The deviated service includes a flex zone of ¾ of a mile in which passengers can schedule a pickup at a
location within the flex zone that is not a designated stop. This fulfills the FTA requirement for ADA paratransit while also opening up this flexible service to the general public. Figure 21 shows the fixed route with the corresponding deviated zone.

Service Alternative #2’s deviated fixed route (4.6 miles one-way fixed route, 8 mi\(^2\) ADA deviated zone) is slightly shorter than Service Alternative #1 to allow for potential deviations. The deviated fixed route operates on a half-hour frequency with ten hours of service per day, requiring two buses with an estimated travel time of 20-26 minutes. This service alternative is estimated to attract 250-300 riders per day.
Service Alternative #3 – Microtransit Zone throughout Moab

Service Alternative #3 is a microtransit service throughout Moab from the north side of the Colorado River to Spanish Valley. Passengers can schedule the service for travel between any two points in the zone. At least one vehicle would be wheelchair accessible, fulfilling the FTA ADA paratransit requirements. A trip-matching technology would dynamically route vehicles to combine trips and passengers wherever possible to increase efficiency of the service. Figure 22 shows the extents of the microtransit service.

Figure 22. Service Alternative #3
Service Alternative #3’s 6.5 mi² microtransit zone requires two vans with an estimated response time of 10-15 minutes. The fixed route operates on hourly frequency with fourteen hours of service per day. This service alternative is estimated to attract 100-200 riders per day.

Service Alternative #4 – Flex Microtransit Route with Microtransit Zone

Service Alternative #4 features a combination of a flex microtransit route and a general microtransit service. A flex microtransit route operates along US-191 from the northern side of the Colorado River to Center Street in downtown Moab, with established stops along the way. A general microtransit zone also operates in downtown Moab, beginning at 400 North and extending south to Spanish Valley. Both the flex and general microtransit services are available to the public and ADA-eligible riders with accessible vehicles, fulfilling the FTA paratransit requirements. The overlap of zones in downtown Moab allows for transfers between services. Figure 23 shows the types of microtransit services and their respective geographical boundaries.

Figure 23. Service Alternative #4
Service Alternative #4’s combination of flex route (3 miles one-way with 4.7 mi$^2$ of flex zone) and microtransit (5.9 mi$^2$ zone) requires two vans with an estimated travel time of 6-10 minutes on the flex route. The service operates fourteen hours per day with the fixed route operating on a half-hour frequency and the microtransit operating on a 10-15 minute response time. This service alternative is estimated to attract 250-300 riders per day.

**Turn-Key Operating Budget Constraint**

Implementing a “Turn-Key” operation is a proven way of quickly providing transit service to an area while minimizing capital costs and start-up challenges. Turn-key contractors are responsible for supplying everything necessary to deliver day-to-day operations including vehicles for operations, spare vehicles, supervision of service, drivers, dispatch function, and necessary smart phone app/ridematching technology for microtransit on-demand services. On the other hand, turn-key operations can potentially involve higher ongoing costs and less flexibility and control. Table 1 compares the turn-key operating budget constraint for the four service alternatives, assuming March through October season with seven days/week service.

*Table 1. Turn-Key Operating Budget Constraint*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Alternative</th>
<th>Fleet</th>
<th>Fixed Route Bus Cost</th>
<th>On-demand Van Cost (microtransit or paratransit)</th>
<th>Total Turn-key Operations</th>
<th>Resulting hours of operation per day*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Alternative 1</td>
<td>1 bus, 1 van</td>
<td>$296,450</td>
<td>$202,125</td>
<td>$498,575</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Alternative 2</td>
<td>2 buses</td>
<td>$539,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$539,000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Alternative 3 or 4</td>
<td>2 vans</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$514,500</td>
<td>$514,500</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Fehr & Peers.*

With buses being more expensive than vans, Service Alternative #2 is the most expensive option, even while operating at the least number of hours per day. Service Alternative #1 is the least expensive with nearly the same number of service hours as Service Alternative #2 but operating with only one bus and one van. Service Alternative #3 or #4 have a middle-ground budget, replacing all buses with vans yet operating on the most service hours of any of the alternatives.
Typical Roles and Responsibilities

The success of a transit service depends on the cooperation of the different parties involved. **Table 2** describes the typical roles and responsibilities of each entity: UDOT, City of Moab, a Partner Organization, and the contract operator.

**Table 2. Typical Roles and Responsibilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UDOT</th>
<th>City of Moab</th>
<th>Partner Organizations</th>
<th>Contract Operator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Administer state and federal funding</td>
<td>• Comply with terms of UDOT funding contract</td>
<td>• Support development of new funding sources</td>
<td>• Provide necessary vehicles, drivers, insurance, dispatch, supervisors, vehicle storage, fuel, maintenance, and microtransit ridematching technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manage funding allocation, award, and contracting process of rural transit funding</td>
<td>• Develop local matching funds</td>
<td>• Provide additional funding for transit services</td>
<td>• Operate service day-to-day according to the service plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure grantee compliance with state and federal regulations (e.g., ADA, Title VI, drug and alcohol testing, etc.)</td>
<td>• Oversee day-to-day operations of contractor</td>
<td>• Market and promote the services</td>
<td>• Be accountable to specific performance metrics and provide excellent customer service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Periodic reviews of grantees operations</td>
<td>• Bus stops and transit supportive on-street infrastructure</td>
<td>• Advocate for community support of transit</td>
<td>• Resolve minor customer complaints and service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review and resolve serious customer complaints</td>
<td>• Solicit feedback on service improvements and long-term development</td>
<td>• Make suggestions on service improvements, based on operations knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other possibilities – provide/develop transit facility, provide/purchase transit vehicles, operate portion (or eventually all) of services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fehr Peers
Performance Evaluation Criteria

In order to determine the best alternative for the City of Moab, Fehr & Peers developed a criteria table to evaluate the various service alternatives. Table 3 shows the performance evaluation criteria and each service alternative’s ranking. Green squares indicate a high (favorable) ranking, yellow indicate a medium (acceptable) ranking, and red indicate a low (unfavorable) ranking. Multiple service alternatives can receive the same ranking for one category.

Table 3. Evaluation Performance Criteria Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>OPTION 1 Fixed Route</th>
<th>OPTION 2 Deviated Fixed Route</th>
<th>OPTION 3 Microtransit</th>
<th>OPTION 4 Flex Route with Microtransit (hybrid of 2 and 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequent connections along US-191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to understand for new users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger convenience (how is it use the service, once they know how it works)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridership potential (ability to help with traffic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to connect many destinations throughout Moab (coverage)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset to locals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset to visitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of vehicle electrification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of service hours provided per day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service Alternative #4, a combination of Service Alternatives #2 and #3, received the highest overall rating.
Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders from the City of Moab, Grand County, as well as the original stakeholders interviewed, provided input on the highest-ranking alternative, Service Alternative #4. Generally, stakeholders liked the flexibility and geographic coverage of microtransit, and stakeholders saw the potential of a fixed route to move higher numbers of people. However, many people identified the challenge of planning a fixed route without understanding exactly where and when the route should run.

To solve this challenge, a fifth and final alternative was developed, as described in the Recommended Service Alternative section. This recommended alternative concept is based around the idea of using microtransit, and the extensive origin-destination trip pattern data that it provides, as the first step in implementing a new transit solution for the Moab area. After one year of microtransit operations and a thorough review of its trip data, a fixed route would then be developed to link the high demand community origination and destination points. Microtransit would remain in place after year two and would help supplement the fixed route service and provide service to a larger geographic area.
Recommended Service Alternative

Recommended Service Alternative Overview

The recommended service alternative is similar to Alternative #3 in that phase one features a single microtransit zone. However, the consultant recommends a second phase of service to establish a fixed route based on the initial phase's microtransit trip trends. The initial microtransit service area will operate along US-191 and throughout the City of Moab, extending south to Spanish Valley. The second phase's fixed route's stop locations and routing will be determined by evaluating the feedback and trip trends of the microtransit service. Microtransit service would continue through the second phase, serving both the public and ADA-eligible riders, fulfilling the FTA paratransit requirements. **Figure 24** shows the types of microtransit services and their respective geographical boundaries.

*Figure 24. Service Alternative #4*
The Recommended Service Alternative’s phasing of microtransit (6.5 mi² zone) and a later fixed route (roughly 4-5 miles one-way, exact routing is to be determined) requires two to three vans with an estimated response time of 10-15 minutes on the microtransit service. The service would operate ten to sixteen hours per day, depending on season and contractor bids. This service alternative is estimated to ultimately attract 200-300 riders per day.

Financial Plan

The 5-year pilot program for the recommended alternative can be roughly broken down into a year-by-year budget. Funding for the system comes from UDOT HotSpot program funding, City/County/Other local sources, and from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) 5311 Rural Transit Funding. Table 4 outlines the estimated year-by-year revenues and expenses for the transit service.

It should be noted that the FTA 5311 program requires an application and is a competitive process; funding is not guaranteed and is an estimate only. Expenses do not include overhead costs such as City employees to oversee the contract and contractors, marketing and promotional costs, vehicle branding, and any on-street improvements such as bus stop signs or benches. An annual inflation factor was assumed for the turn-key contract.

Table 4. Moab Region Transit Financial Plan - Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
<th>TOTALS for 5 YEARS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UDOT HotSpot</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/County/Other Local</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$230,000</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA 5311</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUE TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$510,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$520,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$530,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$540,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,600,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>YEAR 1</th>
<th>YEAR 2</th>
<th>YEAR 3</th>
<th>YEAR 4</th>
<th>YEAR 5</th>
<th>TOTALS for 5 YEARS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turn-key Operator Contract</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$510,000</td>
<td>$520,000</td>
<td>$530,000</td>
<td>$540,000</td>
<td>$2,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSE TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$500,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$510,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$520,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$530,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$540,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,600,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation Plan

Service Delivery

The Moab Regional Transit Service will be contracted through a third-party transit service provider. This provider will be determined through a competitive bidding process put on by the City of Moab. Fehr & Peers will deliver a Request for Proposal (RFP) document for the bidding process in a separate deliverable.

Turn-key contracts involve delivering a service plan directly to a provider and relying on that provider to implement the service. The vendor is typically experienced in delivering fixed route, flex route, and on-demand transit service and will manage all aspects of the service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quick deployment</td>
<td>Requires oversight by sponsoring agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not require agency to have experience</td>
<td>Flexibility, responsiveness, and adaptability are constrained to the terms of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not require hiring of additional agency</td>
<td>Less control of service quality, customer experience, and operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personnel (e.g. vehicle operators, administrative staff, maintenance teams)</td>
<td>procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendor is responsible for service quality and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle capital costs are included in the contract – minimizes the capital assets the agency must acquire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows agency to take advantage of the vendor’s existing scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Vendors

There are several national vendors providing turn-key microtransit and flex/fixed route service today. These include Downtowner, RideCo, Spare Labs, Transloc, and Via, among others. These vendors provide service in a variety of communities, such as Summit County, UT; Park City, UT; Aspen, CO.

There are also many local, regional, and national contract transit service providers who may be interested in participating in an RFP for microtransit and fixed route service provision within Moab. This project may also lend itself to a partnership between experienced transit contract service providers and technology companies providing microtransit platforms.

Service Adjustments and Monitoring Plan

The service plan provided in this memorandum is intended to serve as a roadmap for implementing the Moab transit service. While this service plan may prove to be effective for the life of the pilot, it is possible that the service may need to be adjusted periodically to better serve local needs. The following section describes elements of a monitoring plan that should be implemented early in the life of the pilot and used to determine whether and when service changes are needed.

Tracking Ridership

Use of the new transit service is a basic metric that the contract vendor will be able to provide to Moab on a regular basis. Ridership can be reported both as the total number of passenger trips per day and the average number of passengers per vehicle service hour. As discussed in the performance estimates section of this memorandum, the service is projected to have 200-300 passenger trips per day. Initially, the ridership may be much lower than this while the City and its partners build awareness about the service and community understanding of this new transportation resource grows. It is recommended that the goal for the first year of service should be an average of 100 to 150 passenger trips per day, growing to 200-250 passengers per day by year two and 250-300 passengers per day by year three.

If the service is not meeting the ridership targets, then some additional analysis may be needed to pinpoint whether there are particular times of day when the service is utilized at a higher rate. If so, a determination can be made on whether a service span adjustment is needed. While ridership is a key metric, it should not be the single metric for measuring whether the pilot is performing successfully. When Moab is determining whether to extend the service, metrics like response time, rider satisfaction, and the rate at which the service completes the intended trip types should be among the factors considered.
Tracking Ride Times

The number of passengers that can be served within a daily service span is dictated, in part, by the amount of time vehicles spend completing trips and the amount of time vehicles spend responding to trip requests. It is assumed that single passenger trips will take, on average, 10 minutes from origin to destination. As noted in the performance estimates overview for the microtransit zone portion of the service, it is assumed that a 50% buffer should be added into trip time estimates since vehicles will either spend some time traveling to pick up a passenger or a passenger may share the vehicle with someone making an unrelated trip, which will likely extend the ride time for both individuals. Factoring in the buffer time, it is assumed each passenger will experience a 15-minute average trip time. If, after the first three months, the actual per passenger trip time exceeds 15 minutes, the service plan should be adjusted to better reflect local travel conditions.

It is also projected that the average response time (or the time between when a passenger reserves a ride and when the vehicle arrives) should be 15 minutes. The selected vendor will be able to provide a response time by passenger trip. If it is found that the average response time is longer than 15 minutes, then changes may be needed in order to provide riders with a more accurate sense of potential response time.

Tracking User Experience

While metrics like ridership can convey system productivity, more qualitative indicators are also important. The experiences of early riders should be captured in order to learn any unanticipated issues with service provision. Rider feedback can be captured through post-trip surveys distributed electronically via the smartphone app. In order to ensure the highest response rate possible, it is recommended the survey be brief with two to three key questions.

Since the contract vendor will track the quantitative aspects of each trip, like response time and time in vehicle, the survey can be used to assess ease of use of the reservation system, whether riders find the vehicles comfortable, whether riders have positive interactions with vehicle operators, and whether the rider overall travel experience has improved as a result of the new service.

Evaluating Service Area Scope

The initial service zone has been drawn based on the travel market assessment and stakeholder input. It is possible that some portions of the service area may be disproportionately heavy trip generators or popular destinations. Monitoring the origin and destinations patterns by trip will allow Moab to understand whether the service area needs to be modified or if there are particular origin-destination pairs and routes that are utilized at a high rate. The selected vendor will likely be able to provide visualizations of trip patterns like the

Figure 25. Example of visualization of trip patterns (courtesy of Downtowner)
example shown in Figure 25 to help Moab evaluate service utilization and potentially make adjustments such as narrowing the service area or establishing fixed pick-up/drop-off locations that serve popular destination. This data will also inform the envisioned second phase transition to incorporating a fixed route.

**Determining Service Changes**

While this service plan seeks to meet the needs of the Moab area travel market, it is possible that in practice the performance outcomes may differ from service goals as outlined here. Moab should be prepared to collaborate with the selected vendor on making service adjustments on as-needed basis to ensure the microtransit service and subsequent fixed route service are providing efficient service and filling a mobility need. It is recommended that Moab complete a thorough review of the performance metrics described in this service monitoring plan along with initial responses to the rider surveys after the first year of service. If any goals are being unmet or if initial rider satisfaction is low, then targeted service adjustments may be required.

**Implementation Timeline**

Moab and its partners wish to move quickly from project planning to implementation. Typically, a pilot project such as this could take 12 to 18 months to launch once a final service plan is complete, but it is possible to accelerate implementation and condense into six to nine months, assuming that contracting with a microtransit vendor could be done efficiently and that Moab and its community partners can move effectively through the various service preparation steps, shown in Figure 26.

According to this timeline, it may be possible to have this new service operating by March of 2022.
### Figure 26. Implementation Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **6 months before launch** | Finalize program management and oversight  
Select turn-key service operator and associated vehicle fleet  
Finalize budget and associated operating hours  
Select program name, logo, and brand |
| **3 months before launch** | Develop marketing materials and advertising plan  
Formalize promotional partnerships with community groups  
Work with microtransit vendor on service plan adjustments  
Install any permanent infrastructure such as signage |
| **1 month before launch** | Install vehicle brand graphics (vinyl wraps)  
Begin intensive advertising and promotion of program launch  
Coordinate with program partners and electeds about launch  
Test microtransit technology and dry-run service |
| **Launch of operations** | Final planning, promotion, and coordination for launch event  
Determine performance monitoring program  
Launch event  
Intensive advertising and promotion of service |
| **Month 1** | Daily service quality monitoring  
Responsiveness to passenger complaints or input  
Weekly evaluation of performance metrics  
Intensive advertising and promotion of service |
| **Month 2** | Review lessons learned in first month with vendor  
Intensive advertising and promotion of service  
Ongoing evaluation/monitoring/customer responsiveness |
| **Months 3-6** | Implementation of possible service adjustments  
Ongoing advertising and promotion of service  
Ongoing evaluation/monitoring/customer responsiveness  
Report to electeds and community partners on early results |
| **Months 7+** | Plan for Year 2 of service and added fixed route phase  
Ongoing advertising and promotion of service  
Ongoing evaluation/monitoring/customer responsiveness  
Review and report on first year results |
Phasing

The Recommended Service Alternative will be implemented in phases, as shown in Figure 27: Phase 1 with a microtransit zone service throughout Moab and into Spanish Valley, followed by a Phase 2 fixed route service in addition to the initial microtransit zone and a Phase 3 of span of service improvements. Since the microtransit zone can serve any two points within the zone and will combine trips where possible, the exact routing and stop locations of the Phase 2 fixed route will be determined through feedback and trip trend data from the initial microtransit zone.

**Figure 27. Phasing Plan**

### Fixed Route Vision

The vision is for ridership to grow sufficiently between key destinations along US-191 such that a fixed route will be able to serve larger numbers of riders most effectively, while microtransit will still be in place as the best option to cover larger geographic areas and serve trip patterns that are not suitable for fixed route.

### Service Contractor Considerations

The turn-key contractor selected for microtransit and subsequent fixed route service should be selected based on experience, project/area understanding, project approach, capabilities and ability to deliver, qualifications of the team, references, and cost and overall value. A full list of vendor evaluation considerations will be developed as part of the RFP development deliverable.

### Marketing, Branding, and Outreach

A critical aspect of program success is a robust marketing and outreach effort. An awareness building campaign should be paired with the service rollout to ensure community members and visitors learn of
the new service, understand how to request trips, and are aware of the service area. While traditional avenues, like visually compelling advertisements, will be important, additional community-specific outreach strategies should also be pursued. These can include engaging local stakeholders who have existing community ties to serve as ambassadors for the new service and establishing educational messaging that the new Moab area transit service is a public service that is open to all and highlighting the benefits of using the service (e.g., free, easy, fun).

**Overall Marketing Strategy**

In order for the Moab transit service to be successful, the City and its partners should place an emphasis on a broad and an ongoing outreach approach. With visitors making up the largest potential user group, the marketing of the service must be constant and ongoing, always seeking to reach visitors before, or as soon as possible after, they arrive in the Moab area. Partnerships with local lodging, tourist attractions, and broader community marketing efforts through the Moab Chamber of Commerce and Moab Area Travel Council should be a key strategy. The City should also partner with local businesses, schools, houses of worship, and other key destinations to post information about the new service.

Beyond physical advertisements, the social media networks of these community partners can also be leveraged to broaden awareness. All marketing efforts should focus on educating visitors and community members about the service itself and also on conveying three key messages:

1. The Moab transit system is a new service that has been designed to help address the visitor and local transportation challenges, in particular traffic and congestion.
2. The service will be free, easy, and fun to use.
3. Moab will continuously seek rider feedback to learn how the new service can be optimized to best meet local travel needs.

In order to effectively disseminate these messages, the City should work with community partners to develop a robust brand identity for the service and pursue a broad advertising and outreach campaign, as described below. To ensure the marketing campaign has an effective reach, the City can monitor who is utilizing the service through the rider surveys and then target marketing efforts to groups within the community who have not yet tried the new service. Having a dynamic marketing campaign that tailors messaging to the various audiences within Moab will help ensure ridership grows.

**Branding**

Applying a logo and uniform color scheme on vehicles and on all collateral related to the service will help establish a uniform brand. Brand awareness is critical to developing an understanding that the new Moab transit service is distinctive from existing trailhead and airport shuttles and that it is a new public transit service that is free to use. **Figure 28** shows examples of branding from various microtransit or flex route transit systems. Developing a distinctive visual style for the system will help community members readily identify the transit vehicles.
Figure 28: Microtransit Vehicle Branding Examples
**Signage**

Signage describing the new service and featuring the branding should be posted in all locations where it is likely community members will start or end rides. These signs can serve to designate pick-up and drop-off locations, which would make the system easier to use. High quality, visually compelling signs can be targeted to key market groups such as visitors, youth, and commuters.

**Advertising**

Signage can also be adapted into flyers that are posted in popular locations – having system information at all local hotels, motels, and campgrounds will be important and could take the form of a tabletop rack card with information on how to use the system and where it serves. In addition, the City can partner with local print media along with radio and TV stations to promote the service. While traditional media platforms have a wide reach, social media promotion is also a useful avenue to explore. Social media is particularly effective at reaching visitor audiences, which should be a key consideration in Moab.

**Outreach**

The City should leverage the existing network of community groups to raise awareness and promote the new service. Key stakeholders should be invited to serve as ambassadors for the new service. This role can be as simple as committing to including the Moab transit as a discussion topic in community events or promoting the service on an organization’s website and social media pages. The City can also collaborate with ambassadors to periodically visit popular destinations throughout the community and informally discuss the new service.

*Employer Partnerships*

Partnerships with local employers are another tool the City can utilize. Local businesses with employees who may not have reliable transportation should see the benefit of the new public transit service. Employees living south of Moab and within the microtransit zone will find it easy to use the new service to get to employment destinations downtown.

*School Partnerships*

Local schools can also advertise the new service. While some parents may not be comfortable allowing their child to walk or bike to school, local transit could be perceived as a safe and efficient travel option.

*Business Partnerships*

The City should work with Moab businesses to promote the new transit service. Having printed schedules or flyers in local retail establishments and restaurants that announce the new service and how to use it could be an effective way to gain awareness of the service. Businesses could also distribute information to employees and allow local ambassadors to present at staff meetings.
**Special Events**

The City should consider having a presence at all local events such as markets, visitor events, expos, kids’ events, and neighborhood parties. Setting a table with brochures and a friendly community ambassador is a relatively low-cost way to build awareness of the new service.