



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 #3

KSC 8th Floor Conference Room

July 11, 2012

Work Group Attendees:

Name	Affiliation
Janet Lewine	Bellevue
Judy Clark	Bellevue
Kim Becklund	Bellevue
David Johanson	Burien
Glenn Akranoff	Covington
Richard Hart	Covington
Christen Leeson	Issaquah
Cathy Mooney	Kent
Charlene Anderson	Kent
Paul Carlson	King County Council
Dave Godfrey	Kirkland
Gil Cerise	PSRC
Chester Knapp	Redmond
Terry Marpert	Redmond
Jeff Bender	Seattle (DOT)
Norm Schwab	Seattle- Council Central Staff
Rachel Markle	Shoreline
Nicole Sanders	Snoqualmie
Mike Bergman	Sound Transit
Monica Whitman	Suburban Cities
Jaimie Reavis	Tukwila

Introduction and review of process

Chris O’Claire, supervisor of Strategic Planning and Analysis, reviewed the purpose of the workgroup, timeline and provided follow up to items discussed at the June 29th meeting.

- Workgroup Purpose: Link Metro’s service guidelines and associated service investment priorities to transit supportive actions of jurisdictions

Per Ordinance 17143, the Working Group is looking into aligning factors or adding a new priority to the guidelines so that they may better account for future land use changes.

Meeting Objectives:

- Increase understanding of transit network and its interaction with development
- Gather input from jurisdictions on aligning factors
- Gather input from jurisdictions on new service addition priority

Timeline:

- Upcoming meetings: August 8th and September 6th
- Metro staff will be presenting at the Eastside Transportation Partnership (ETP) and South County Area Transportation Board (SCATbd) week of July 16th.
- July 17th: Regional Transit Committee (RTC) to discuss process so far with plans to share more detail information at September meeting.
- Working to schedule a joint subarea meeting
- Preliminary Report: Due October 31st

Follow-up items from June 29th meeting:

- Sound Transit is in attendance today. Metro staff will be working with Sound Transit to discuss further how to integrate this discussion with Sound Transit plans.
- There is a strong interest in understanding different pieces of the Metro network. Today, Metro staff will be walking through different service families and why they are important to Metro's transit network.
- There is currently an unmet need for service; in on-time performance, overcrowding and underserved corridors. Are there additional priorities in your jurisdiction and how do they align in with our current priorities?

Dimensions of Transit Network

Lisa Shafer, Strategic Planning & Analysis staff, provided a brief reminder of how Metro sets target service levels in the Service Guidelines and discussed how each of the service families fit into Metro's network.

Target Service Levels

Step 1:

- Look at six factors to set target service levels.
- Assign points in each of the areas: households, jobs, low income, minority, activity centers, regional growth centers.
- Assign an initial service level based on total score

Step 2:

- Look at ridership and productivity factors and adjust service levels.
- If not sufficient to meet demand, we may bump to a higher service family (hourly, local, frequent, very frequent).

Network: There is range of corridor and service family types:

- Corridors in each service family : 35 Very Frequent, 28 Frequent, 35 Local, 15 Hourly
- Hourly: Tends to be in lower density areas and service provides connections to local centers and the greater transit network.
- Local: Slightly higher densities and serves even more local centers.
- Frequent: Higher density, more frequent service to more centers.
- Very frequent: connects to major centers.

Service families are on a continuum of speed and access. Hourly is focused on lower density areas and getting people to connections while Very Frequent is focused on moving more people, more quickly.

Overview of Service Families:

<i>Service Family</i>	<i>Characteristics</i>
Very Frequent and Sound Transit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over half of Metro's boardings Parts of the county that don't have access to this network
Frequent and Local	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connects to a majority of transit activity centers 1/3 of Metro boardings
Hourly	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fills in the gaps in the network. Connect to rest of activity center. Serve less concentrated markets

Productive routes in all families.

- Evaluate routes based on productivity by those that serve Seattle (University area/Downtown) and those do not.
- There is a range of productivity in all service families for both routes that serve and do not serve Seattle.

Land Use in the Network:

- Land use is only one of six measures.
- Household distribution:
 - Range of households among service families, but many corridors do not reach the first threshold, 25% of the highest household score to receive 4 points.
- Can reach a higher frequency service without a high score for households
- Jobs: much more concentrated with fewer areas with job concentration.
 - 71% of frequent and very frequent do not even get points for jobs.

Workgroup Member Comments:

- What is the buffer and thresholds for households?* This is the number of households with access to the corridor. The highest concentration is set as the maximum value and is used to set other thresholds. This means that the thresholds can change every year when corridors are reassessed. Guidelines are dynamic. Lowest threshold is 25% of the maximum value.
- Are there similar graphs to the households/jobs for social equity?* It is possible to get this data and results available in the latest Service Guidelines report.
- For jobs, is there a way to tie back to new market that Metro serves? Every travel shed is unique – day time population is larger in Bellevue than residential – are we getting representative enough in exchange of trips? Need to be mindful about this issue.* Any corridor that connects to a job center gets credit for all the jobs that it has access to. The longer the corridor, the more the jobs may be spread out. Do the Service Guidelines capture the job market in the best way?

- *How do you account for hotels?* Guidelines account for centers; there is no direct hotel/tourist indicator. Points are distributed for jobs as follows: 10 points – 50% of highest jobs. 33% to get 7, 16% for 4 points – wide range of job distribution.
- *Does this help give value to jobs not in downtown core? A short corridor that is serving very concentrated job centers will have a higher score compared to others. To have this corridor set the curve is not sensitive to other job center. What refinements can we make to land use component? Should there be more gradation, absolute thresholds – is this an appropriate place to incorporate future growth factors? Or better through new priority approach.*
- *Has there been any analysis to correlate densities and productivity?* We have not done that specific analysis, but did look at it in establishing guidelines. We try to look at land use separate from productivity. Industry research suggests certain densities for types of service – households per corridor mile is different than density. Studies show correlation between density and transit service.
- *Conclusion that very frequent services will get the higher points – less productive services could go away.* There are productive services across the different service families – all services perform distinct functions. Just because routes are hourly or local, doesn't mean you are not productive. Less productive routes will get looked at.
- *Reserve platform hours for certain service families?* Language that talks about routes that would not be eliminated during service reductions. Service families representing services that exist today? Those are target levels.
- *How many local corridors are underserved? Overserved? How many corridor that identified as hourly have a higher level of service today? Is there a pattern of local routes being first in line for reductions?* Some local routes may be in the lower 25%. Productivity Threshold is 10 riders per platform hour – routes have to be in bottom 25% on both measures to be looked at. There are a good number of local corridors that score higher on productivity. If corridor is identified as local but current level of service is frequent with low productivity, we may look at changing the service family. Productivity and service family is not the same thing. All routes matter, and are evaluated in context of network.
- *Concern that the 71% of corridors are not receiving points in jobs factor. May mean that thresholds for jobs are not sensitive enough.* Points for centers may also duplicate jobs points. Social equity points are also important to receive since they can account for 25% of the corridor score. A corridor could score 10 points in social equity and qualify for a higher level of service. If every route receives points for connecting centers, points are spread thinly. Most of Metro routes connect to centers, but differentiate between all-day, more direct connection versus two centers on the end via neighborhood streets. Is there something that we are missing here? Is there is a route that is not on here that should be?

Purpose of points is to classify families and families are expressions of Metro commitment to a certain level of service. Identifying a route as one versus two corridors – between the two, which corridor is fulfilling what function. The neighborhood connection is important, relative to everything else. Our goal is to make it appropriate for the market.

- *Workgroup would like further discussion on changes to the job factor and to learn more about how activity centers are scored for geographic value.*

Ideas for aligning guidelines factors and new service addition priority

Katie Chalmers, Strategic Planning & Analysis staff, discussed ideas for aligning factors and adding a new service priority to the guidelines.

Guidelines set an order of investments.

- 400,000 hours of needs have been identified between first three priorities (Overcrowding, On-Time Performance and Underserved Corridors)
- Meant to identify more immediate, long term needs.
- Use this order of investment if new resources were available and use these in managing resources currently.

On-Time Performance and Overcrowding Priorities

- Address service quality issues
- Similar to maintenance and preservation required for roads before new capacity is added.
- Goal is to add service that is high quality rather than just have more service operating.

Underserved Corridors

- Investments in underserved corridors are prioritized based on geographic values score, followed by the land use score, then the social equity score
- Recent investments:
 - June 2012: Metro invested in routes identified as underserved and those not meeting on-time performance and overcrowding thresholds.
 - RapidRide C and D Line service restructures in fall 2012 are also a place where Metro is making improvements to underserved corridors. Metro invested in routes 131 and 132 between Burien and Seattle, increasing service from hourly to 30 minutes in the midday.

Partnerships:

- Guidelines already move a corridor up the list for investment if a partner funds one-third of the service.
- Metro also had Transit Now partnerships for both service and speed and reliability. Are there other types of partnerships we should look into?

Considering changes to the Guidelines:

- Are there ways to better address city needs? Perhaps through new investment priorities to better tie city and Metro actions together.
- Are there ways to have transit emphasis and overlay corridors?
- Service partnership models? Ways to incorporate future growth/need?
- With changes to prioritization – what actions would be required of jurisdictions? Of Metro? What is the action that a jurisdiction could take to justify changing priority order?
- What degree of action would it take for new order/ go out of order of priority list?

Workgroup Member Comments:

- *Are school routes parts of the guidelines analysis?* School routes are outside of the scope of the guidelines analysis. Service that is between one-third and fully funded by Metro partners is given top priority among the set of investments identified in the underserved corridors, but is not automatically prioritized above investments to address service quality issues. If partner pays all of the cost, they are not included. Microsoft and other employers have paid 100% of additions to some transit services that serve their sites. This has evolved over time though, with employers paying into flex pass programs and more investment in these areas as they have grown.
- *Also need to consider what actions would be required from Metro to get jurisdictions to invest.*
- *Is there overlap in overcrowding and on-time performance investments with high productivity routes?* There is some duplication. There may be highly productive services without overcrowding or on-time performance issues. Metro has not been able to reach the high productivity prior for investment due to needs identified for overcrowding, on-time performance and underserved corridors. We may address high performing routes in a restructure by taking two routes and combining them into one to produce more ridership.

Small Group Discussion Report Out

Small Group Questions

- Is there a corridor that is not identified as needing investment that you feel should be a higher priority than those on the underserved corridor list?
- What are the types of changes to the guidelines process that could offer greater predictability for your jurisdiction?
- Are there ways outside the Service Guidelines that Metro could improve coordination to address linking transit and development?

Group 1: staffed by Katie Chalmers and Candida Lorenzana

- There may be underserved neighborhoods rather than corridors.
- Having some outliers removed for scoring thresholds could have huge impacts and changes for corridors.
- Community shuttles and neighborhood connections are not accounted for in service guidelines.
- How do we prioritize connecting neighborhoods over other needs? Getting people to transit, with easy access.
- Extending to neighborhoods may affect corridor ranking. How does it impact your corridor score?
- Make jobs score more sensitive
- Capital investments – requires buy-in from city.
- Other factors to consider: how to meet needs of immigrants, ensure Metro and jurisdictions are using the same data, frequent transit network – several corridors interacting together.

- Consider a cap on schedule maintenance – OTP and overcrowding priorities – so you can get to underserved corridor investments.

Group 2: Staffed by Lisa Shafer and Stephen Hunt

- Connecting services to meet the needs of jobs. Looking at types of jobs in corridors.
- Looking at other trip generators including land use, densities.
- Commitment to refinement of guidelines – enriching data set – parking, densities, etc.
- Prioritization: Considering design of development, how easy it is to access, walkability and parking management
- Concerns about quantifying prioritization (prioritization is appropriate).
- New priority would need to clear, determine how it would relate to other priorities

Next Steps:

- Upcoming Work Group Meetings; August 8th and September 6th:
- Follow-Up items:
 - Review the corridors and contact if there are corridors that may not be valued correctly.
 - Please inform of other forums that need to reach out to.
 - let Metro staff know about any updates to the Working Group list
- Next meeting Metro staff will bring ideas about how land use, jobs and centers can be valued differently and see how it changes the corridors.

Contact Chris O’Claire with any questions: christina.oclaire@kingcounty.gov

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

Survey Results

8 Respondents	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
I have enough information/understanding to participate in this process				8 100%	
I am able to clearly articulate key messages to staff and elected officials			2 25%	6 75%	
I have ample opportunity to make my voice heard			1 13%	3 37%	4 50%
I have a high level of commitment to this process and the outcomes of this process				4 50%	4 50%
I am able to consistently participate in this process and represent my interests				7 87%	1 13%
I feel that my input has been considered and will make a difference in the outcome				6 75%	2 25%
I feel that the meeting format was effective				5 63%	3 37%

Other Comments:

1. The break-out groups were productive given the large group of people participating in this process.
2. The breakout sessions were very successful in stimulating discussion.
3. Metro contact assigned to a jurisdiction is a great idea. Many plans should have Metro at the table. Especially land use planning.