



## King County

Department of Transportation

Metro Transit

Service Development

201 South Jackson Street

M.S. KSC-TR-0426

Seattle, WA 98104-3856

### Linking Transit and Development

Working Group Meeting #1

KSC 8<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room

June 7, 2012

Work Group Attendees:

Name	Affiliation
Albert Torrico	SeaTac
Alicia McIntire	Shoreline
Charlene Anderson	Kent
Chester Knapp	Redmond
Chris Arkills	King County Executive's Office
Christen Leeson	Issaquah
Conrad Lee	Bellevue- Mayor
Dave Godfrey	Kirkland
David Hiller	Seattle - Mayors Office
Diane Carlson	King County Executive's Office
Emiko Atherton	Councilmember Julia Patterson's Office
Florendo Cabudol	SeaTac
Glenn Akramoff	Covington
Jaimie Reavis	Tukwila
Jeff Bender	Seattle
Jim Seitz	Renton
Kim Becklund	Bellevue
Kris Overleese	Kenmore
Lauri Anderson	Kenmore
Mark Rigos	Newcastle
Mary Joe de Beck	Issaquah
Monica Whitman	Suburban Cities
Nicole Sanders	Snoqualmie
Nina Rivkin	Redmond
Norm Schwab	Seattle
Paul Carlson	King County Council
Rachael Markle	Shoreline
Tom Hauger	Seattle

## Background and Working Group Charge

Chris O'Claire, Supervisor of Strategic Planning and Analysis, explained the purpose of the Working Group reviewed the following goals for this meeting:

- Understand the ordinance and timeline associated with the process
- Review how the adopted Service Guidelines address land use and development and the challenges raised during the process
- Review the Transit Overlay Zone as one possible concept for revising the guidelines to modify the existing evaluation process and/or add a new priority to the evaluation process that would assess how to better link transit and development
- Gather feedback to better understand local jurisdictions' issues and concerns that will help shape this effort

Chris explained the purpose of the Working Group - to help develop concepts and address how Metro can respond to land use growth and development in the region.

To accomplish this, transit, transportation and land use staff from local jurisdictions have been asked to work together to find ways to better integrate transit and land use. Chris also provided background on the steps that have been taken to get to this point and the legislation that will guide this effort. The following was provided as context for this process:

- The Strategic Plan was developed based on King County Strategic Plan, recommendations of Regional Transit Task Force and the need to meet increased demand for transit service.
- The Regional Transit Task Force was 28 members from around the county, tasked with developing a policy framework to guide growth and reduction of Metro's transit system. (March-November 2010)
- The Task Force recommended a transparent process for changing the system with focus on productivity, social equity, and geographic value as well as on cost-savings. (November 2010)
- Through this guidance, Metro developed the King County Metro Strategic Plan for Public Transportation (Metro's Strategic Plan) and the King County Metro 2011 Service Guidelines (Service Guidelines), which was adopted in July 2011.
- The Strategic Plan and Service Guidelines are a result of a major collaborative effort that sets a new course for Metro that is grounded in quantitative measurement and performance management. Metro's Strategic Plan reflects the King County Strategic Plan, which focuses on customer service, partnerships and ways to make government more cost effective. Metro's Strategic Plan also incorporated recommendations from the Regional Transit Task Force to emphasize productivity while ensuring that bus services are available to those that are most dependent on transit and providing value to the diverse cities and communities throughout the county.
- When the Strategic Plan and Service Guidelines were adopted in 2011, there was strong support from jurisdictions and communities in King County. There were also unresolved concerns about how to align future service with land use changes. As a result, the ordinance adopting the plan directs that an update in 2013 should address how Metro responds to growth and development in the region.

- The legislation adopting the Metro Strategic Plan and Service Guidelines (Ordinance 17143) called for updates to the Strategic Plan and Service Guidelines to be transmitted by April 30, 2012, and also in 2013 and 2015. The baseline service guidelines report was submitted in April 2012, and the effort of this Working Group is focused on the collaborative process to incorporate input from local jurisdictions called for by the ordinance.
- The Working Group will meet several times over the summer of 2012 to help develop concepts for ways to better link transit service and development. The Regional Transit Committee (RTC) will be providing policy guidance. Metro plans to update RTC in July and September and review the concepts in October RTC meeting. Metro will also be briefing subarea groups: SeaShore Transportation Forum, Eastside Transportation Partnership (ETP) and South County Area Transportation Board (SCATBd) – to keep them apprised of the effort and obtain their feedback. A preliminary report is required by the legislation to be completed by the end of October of this year.

### **Overview of Service Guidelines**

Lisa Shafer, Strategic Planning & Analysis staff, provided an overview of the Service Guidelines, which:

- Set target service levels for corridors
- Evaluate route performance
- Guide service design
- Provide direction for making changes to service

To set corridor service levels, Metro looks at six factors and comes up with initial score for the corridor. Metro then reviews ridership and how well route is used, which leads to identifying service family and evaluating service adequacy (determine if route is over served, adequately service or underserved).

Metro uses productivity, passenger overloads and reliability to evaluate route performance. Service Guidelines identify priorities for adding, reducing and restructuring transit service. Service design principles, which provide direction for areas such as appropriate bus stop spacing, route directness and duplication, also provide guidance.

Lisa reminded the Working Group members that the focus of this process is to explore concepts of how to better link transit service and development. Areas to consider include reviewing factors used to set target corridor service levels or adding a new priority for making changes to service.

### **Working Group Comments**

Kim Becklund, City of Bellevue: Whatever methodology we come up with, need to know that network will adjust to new growth. Paradigm shift from Regional Transit Task Force was welcome. Will be helpful for jurisdictions to know what they can do.

Tom Hauger, City of Seattle: Transit should serve existing development before leading development.

Conrad Lee, Mayor, City of Bellevue: Process is about how Metro plans for the future. Guidelines already identify areas that are currently not being met. Need to balance existing service needs and leading growth.

### **Transit Service Overlay Zone Approach**

Gil Cerise, Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) staff, explained the Transit Service Overlay Zone (TSOZ) approach as one concept for better linking transit service and land use. This approach came out of legislative proviso in 2011 that asked PSRC to develop a concept to further multimodal concurrency. An Advisory committee met four times in fall 2011 with a broad range of participants. PSRC also worked with local governments and transit agencies.

The advisory committee and other staff looked at all-day, two direction bus service, both existing and planned conditions. Land use principles were recognized as important to transit overlay zones.

The concept developed included a four-step process:

1. Eligibility: all day, frequent transit service (existing or planned), connect high density employment/pop center, meets target for minimum density of jobs/housing for transit. Corridors must be identified in regional plan, and could be changed through plan amendment process. Shows importance of connecting corridors in the region.
2. Transit and local jurisdictions agreement: commit signatories to planning process
3. Local planning process: identifying the transit overlay zone, how it will grow to support transit and coordinating with transit agencies in planning process lead by local jurisdictions.
4. Results of process: regulatory changes, infrastructure and operations (TSP/Transit Priority, pedestrian amenities), prioritizing funding and development incentives. Implementation through agreement by agencies – implemented incrementally.

The study effort determined that the Transit Service Overlay Zone approach can occur under current law. However, changes to state law would provide more formal legal framework. Deb Eddy proposed bill (HB 2601) to kick start this in the last session, but it did not pass.

Next Steps for Transit Service Overlay Zone:

- Incorporate Transit Service Overlay Zone into Transportation 2040 update.
- PSRC-Transit Operators Committee (TOC) to appoint adhoc committee to work on eligibility issues.
- Other possible steps: demonstration projects, agreement templates, focus on state law amendments.

## **Workgroup Comments on Transit Service Overlay Zone**

Conrad Lee, Mayor, Bellevue: Does TSOZ concept create another set of criteria/objectives? Any conflicts with Metro process/plans?

Gil Cerise, PSRC: PSRC worked with land use and transit agency staff to develop this and the intent is to continue to work with local jurisdictions and Metro. PSRC-TOC to recruit transit and land use to participate in adhoc committee. This is a complementary process to Metro's Service Guidelines rather than a conflicting process.

Victor Obeso, Manager, Metro Service Development: The Ordinance adopting the Strategic Plan talks about creating an additional priority for service, so it is logical to link efforts of 2040 and Metro process. We are bringing this concept to this group to get feedback on whether it has merit for KC Metro to incorporate. We feel that it fits well with the effort here, and are interested in the Working Group's input

Steve Clark, Maple Valley: The centers-focused nature of 2040 plan does not allow for addressing the growth at unincorporated fringe area that is occurring. We need east-west connections and flexibility to meet needs outside of centers.

Charlie Howard, PSRC: This concept assumes that at least one end of corridor would be anchored at a center, so the concept could apply anywhere in the region.

Gil Cerise, PSRC: Example of Snohomish County with Community Transit, planning for service with connections through centers such as Lynnwood and Edmonds and onto Mill Creek.

Chris O'Claire, Metro: We are working with Community Transit to understand how they are applying information in their Transit Emphasis Corridors.

Charlie Howard, PRSC: This concept would help us to be more intentional about land use support for transit.

Nina Rivkin, Redmond: Need more information on this concept and address differences between TSOZs, the Growing Transit Communities effort, and Metro's process. Examples of how you would get more service with these concepts and where. How would TSOZ get you additional service? How do you get service that you would otherwise not get through guidelines? Go deeper in the concept, with examples in the north, south and east.

Victor Obeso, Metro: We would like your help in expanding on this framework. For example, what else do we need to know?

Jim Seitz, Renton: TSOZ concept works well on capital side, operational side unclear. Would this be used to help allocate regional funds?

Rachael Markle, Shoreline: Shoreline doesn't have a regional growth center, but it will be growing. We are doing the planning now – are we too far behind to be able to use this concept?

Is this the time for TSOZ concept to go into city comprehensive plan? Can this be used to connect a station to town center?

Matt Hansen, Metro, Supervisor, Market Development: There are several historical examples where Metro has coordinated with local jurisdictions that could inform this discussion: Bellevue Incentive Agreement, U-Pass agreement, which allowed a significant expansion of service in exchange for development without parking, and Transit Now Partnership and Rapidly Developing Areas programs. We can share these with the Working Group as examples that might have other applications.

Kim Becklund, Bellevue: TSOZ legislation likely to come back in 2013. How to create legislation at state level that works in King County? Need to include a broad group, criteria could differ in different areas.

Jim Seitz, Renton: Need a crosswalk between efforts.

Conrad Lee, Bellevue Mayor: Appreciate this workshop; this is important work.

Nina Rivkin, Redmond: TSOZ must deal with new or added corridors as well as existing. What are other ideas aside from TSOZ?

Lauri Anderson, Kenmore: How does Sound Transit fit into this process? Why isn't Sound Transit here? What are Sound Transit's plan/frameworks?

Nina Rivkin, Redmond: Factors did not take into consideration other transit service providers - adds to idea that ST needs to be considered. ST and other transit needs to be included in factors.

**Next steps:**

- Provide more detail information on how the Working Group can provide input onto the process
- Further clarify potential application of Transit Service Overlay Zone as a concept – give examples of how it could be applied
- Share information about previous Metro efforts related to land use and transit integration.
- Clarify potential for Alternative Service Delivery approach to address concerns of fringe cities
- Identify additional concepts for better linking transit service with development for further discussion (Working Group members to suggest ideas)
- Invite Sound Transit to participate
- Upcoming Working Group meetings: June 29<sup>th</sup>, July 11<sup>th</sup>, August 8<sup>th</sup> and September 6<sup>th</sup>:
- Update subarea groups in July and discuss concepts with them in September.

Contact Chris O'Claire with any questions: [christina.oclaire@kingcounty.gov](mailto:christina.oclaire@kingcounty.gov)

Website: <http://metro.kingcounty.gov/planning/> - See Transit and Development tab.

**Workgroup Feedback Results:**

<b>13 Respondents</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neutral</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
I have enough information/understanding to participate in this process	0	5 38%	2 15%	6 46%	0
I am able to clearly articulate key messages to staff and elected officials	0	2 15%	3 23%	8 62%	0
I have ample opportunity to make my voice heard	0	0	2 15%	11 85%	0
I have a high level of commitment to this process and the outcomes of this process	0	0	5 38%	5 38%	3 23%
I am able to consistently participate in this process and represent my interests	0	0	3 23%	9 69%	1 8%
I feel that my input has been considered and will make a difference in the outcome	0	0	7 58%	5 42%	0
I feel that the meeting format was effective	0	0	4 33%	8 67%	0

**Other Comments:**

- 1) We are excited to partner in planning for density in Shoreline. We have experienced situations where we would like to reduce parking whereby increase density, but could not provide this incentive due to lack of service. We believe well planned density belongs in Shoreline. We want to work toward being able to provide the transit to support the density we are welcoming. I must admit knowing BRT and light rail on the way gets us a lot further.
- 2) I agree with requests of other example frameworks, & more information of other planning/prioritization efforts with transit, & how this is different.  
  
I was confused at the request for criteria. I wasn't sure if we were being asked for criteria of where the zoning will be applied or what will be asked of in that zone.  
  
As a small city that is not a regionally designated center, it is hard to know how useful commentary would be. If you are trying to get buy-in from all/most/many of the 39 King County cities, being clear on how non-regionally designated centers cities will be connected positively/negatively by the process, or how they are integrated in the considerations.  
  
Looking forward to learning more/ being more useful on the next round.
- 3) It would be helpful to have a review of existing guidelines, since not everyone is familiar with them, along with some specific examples of how the guidelines can be changed. As much as this can be done in every-day non-technical language will be helpful.

**Comments (continued)**

- 3) Maybe each city could share more next time about their existing development plans, and transit planning can be supportive of their development and transportation goals.
- 4) Kenmore is a smaller organization and cannot dedicate a significant level of resources. We would really like to see Metro and Sound Transit future planning linked. How do we best participate regionally to plan for 522 service?
- 5) Understanding needs of jurisdictions would be valuable input to collect – What is the problem to be solved or that could be solved?  
Service partnerships would be examples to show & RapidRide.  
What opportunities are presented by incorporating the land use / plan / transit link? For example:
  - Incorporate into concurrency
  - Allows jurisdictions to zone for transit
  - Provides assurance of transit service giving jurisdictions a clearer reason to potentially invest in roadway
- 6) More roll-up sleeves working sessions. Need metrics & thresholds defined. Devil in the details.
- 7) Covington is very interested in the process, staff and potential effects.