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 #2
KSC 8th Floor Conference Room
June 29, 2012

Work Group Attendees:

Name	Affiliation
Bill Bryant	Seattle (DOT)
Charlene Anderson	Kent
Dave Godfrey	Kirkland
Gary Costa	Issaquah
Gil Cerise	PSRC
Glenn Akramoff	Covington
Jaimie Reavis	Tukwila
Janet Lewine	Bellevue
Jeff Bender	Seattle (DOT)
Jim Seitz	Renton
Kim Becklund	Bellevue
Lauri Anderson	Kenmore
Lori Peckol	Redmond
Michael Scarey	SeaTac
Michelle Allison	King County Councilmember Joe McDermott's office
Monica Whitman	Suburban Cities Association
Norm Schwab	Seattle- Council Central Staff
Paul Carlson	King County Council Staff
Scott MacColl	Shoreline
Susan Sanderson	SeaTac
Terry Marpert	Redmond

Introduction and review of process

Chris O'Claire, supervisor of Strategic Planning and Analysis, reviewed the purpose of the Working Group and reminded participants of the timeline.

- 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.

Objectives for this meeting are:

- Clarify working group role
- Identify opportunities for potential changes
- Break out sessions: look at barriers to transit supportive actions/policies

Timeline:

- July 11th: Working Group review of possible concepts to link service investment with development
- July 18th: RTC discussion of process so far
- July: Status reports to subarea groups
- August and September: Working Group review of possible concepts
- September: Drafting concepts based on discussions
- October 31, 2012: Report summarizing concepts
- April 2013: Strategic plan update due

Follow-Up items from June 7th meeting:

- Metro staff developed a graphic to show relationship of Puget Sound Regional Council processes, local and long range plans with Metro's Strategic Plan and Guidelines.
- Metro Strategic Plan and Guidelines feed into development of all-day and peak network as well as alternative services plan. Metro will be updating policies and guidance to include in the strategic plan in April 2013.
- PSRC process feeds into all of these plans.

Working Group member comments

- Suggest that subarea groups meet together to get perspectives from across the county.
- Metro Strategic Plan is really about maintenance and this process is really about how we add service. This needs to take into account the Sound Transit corridors.
- *Is adding service similar to growing the system?* Metro grows based on the priorities outlined in the Service Guidelines. This process looks at adding a new priority to those existing ones.
- There is a lot cities can do and there are communities that are underserved. Metro and jurisdictions need to work in partnership – what can we accomplish to get more ridership within constructs of the network? Be helpful to tie in the land use piece. There is a lot we can do to improve our condition dramatically.

Review of Service Guidelines analysis process and outputs

Lisa Shafer, Strategic Planning & Analysis staff, explained how Metro Service Guidelines inform Metro service changes.

- Metro makes service changes three times a year – spring, fall and summer
- Guidelines are used to identify investment priorities based on route performance (overcrowding and on-time performance), service adequacy (underserved corridors) and for areas for improvement? (low productivity routes)
- Examples:
    - On-Time Performance: Making routes more direct and increasing frequency for more reliable trips

    - Under-served Corridors: On RapidRide B Line, Metro increased service levels to meet target levels.
- Corridor Analysis
    - All day and peak network: 113 corridors analyzed
    - Scored based on factors of productivity, social equity and geographic value
    - Identified based on all-day service between centers
    - Multiple corridors on a route, and different corridor segments can be part of one route (example: Route 271)
    - Work with Sound Transit to coordinate and complement rather than duplicate
    - Example: I-90 corridor where Metro provides peak service to supplement all-day service by Sound Transit
- Corridor Analysis Process – Example corridor: Kent to Maple Valley (corridor 49)

  Set target corridor service level
    - Land use: Households and jobs per corridor mile; corridor assigned point value based on these factors.
    - Social Equity: Boardings in low income and minority census tracts, if higher than average boardings in system, corridors are considered as low-income and minority and points are assigned.
    - Geographic Value: if corridor is primary connection between two centers or to a regional growth center, it receives points.
    - Based on these factors, corridor 49 scores 15 points

  Assignment of initial frequency
    - Use score to assign initial frequency, 10-18 points equates to 30 minute service peak and off-peak for corridor 49
    - Review of ridership and cost recovery (how well routes pay for themselves) of routes in the corridor. If it does not meet existing demand, service level is bumped. Corridor 49 receives no bump and is designated in the local service family.
    - Corridor 106 – Route 271 – an example of a service level bump with ridership.
    - Any target service levels that are set meet the demand today.
    - To think about for July 11th: the way we assess corridors – what other factors could be considered – are these the right factors?
- Service Guidelines can respond to changes.
    - If household and jobs per mile are doubled, it would give more points for land use and bump to 19 points for corridor 49 and it would be assigned to the frequent service family.
    - The question is, in setting target service levels, should there be something beyond that takes account of future development? Are we missing something? Does this come under aligning factors? Changing the inputs for setting target service levels?
    - Adding priority: new categories such as transit overlay zones, or emphasis corridors.
    - Internal discussion on how Metro looks at the ST corridors – are there better ways to incorporate them in the service guidelines? Metro will be following up with Sound Transit.

Working Group comments

- *Is there a map that shows corridor numbers and lines together?* In back of packet, corridors are alphabetized. There are maps of corridors by service family as well. There is not a map currently available showing all corridors.
- *How are the calculations done and what are the sources of the data?*
  - Land use – assessor data
  - Jobs – PSRC parcel data
  - Social Equity– all census tract data
- *Please review the social equity scoring:* It is based on higher than average boardings in minority and low income census tracts. If boardings are higher than system average (54%), then route gets points for low income or minority. Maximum corridor points are 40.
- *What is max load?* Maximum load – highest average load on the trip. Load factor based on seats compared to rides.
- *Relationship between Metro and Sound Transit:* ST provides a different transit market in some cases. How does Metro's system mesh with ST grid? There has to be a way to show that. ST is meeting what would otherwise be provided by Metro. Where is Metro serving those lines? Transit markets are fulfilling different needs. ST service is not frequent or local, consider whether Metro should be in the game. We need to get people focused on the system.ST is updating long range plan – there is an opportunity there.

Examples of successful transit and development integration

Katie Chalmers, Strategic Planning & Analysis staff, reviewed an example of how Metro and a local jurisdiction worked together to meet each other's needs.

- RapidRide F line begins in Sept. 2013. Initial planning assumed from Burien to Renton Transit Center. City of Renton identified need for more service to the Landing area, a mixed use development. As part of Renton city planning, they expected a lot of commercial and residential growth along with employment growth from Boeing.
- City has been taking actions to support F Line as it moves forward:
  - Supporting both Metro and ST service
  - Road projects – better sidewalks, pedestrian improvements
  - BAT lanes on Rainier
  - Infrastructure for signal priority, real time information
  - Worked with city to identify layover at the Landing. Frequency of RapidRide requires all day space for laying a bus.
  - Extension to Landing is not budgeted; Metro only has resources to go to transit center. Renton has helped in thinking creatively about how to close the gap: supporting grants, suggestions of restructures to help close the gap.
  - Priority treatments that speed up bus service can result in real operational savings for Metro and may also translate to productivity increases.

Working Group Comments

Jim Seitz, Renton: F line was a collaborative process and Metro was open to our suggestions. Metro was open to ideas of restructuring/new routing for the F Line.

Summary of Report-Out from Small Groups

Group #1

Things cities can do to support transit

- Zone to allow more density
- Manage parking (reduce supply/charge/provide alternatives)
- Provide capital improvements

Barriers

- Lack of certainty (Example: want to connect downtown Redmond and Totem Lake with all day service in the Willows corridor); could use MOA to accomplish
- Service quality (crowding)
- Lack of last mile connection, or long wait for connection (Example: 5,000 employees within ½ mile of Bear Creek park and ride with no way to connect)

Group #2

Things cities can do to support transit

- Include improvements in CIPs
- Establish TOD districts (Kenmore)
- Use portion of impact fees to support transit

Barriers

- Insufficient coordination/ relationship with Metro on city plans
- Funding – right of way acquisition, political understanding

Mismatch of service and development

- Auto based planning limits ability to plan for transit
- Transit service needs to match land use type (employment centers and service) and time of day needs, such as work trips vs. all day trips for services and shopping (Example: East-West service in Kent to connect with RapidRide)

Group #3

Things cities can do to support transit

- Lead through concurrency – when to turn on transit? What role does transit play in meeting the city's vision?

Mismatch of service and development

- How to connect to destination stations? How is the rest of the community connected?
- Understand different types of transit service
- Connect Metro to light rail trunk service
- Proper use of through-routing (service reliability issue)

Group #4

Things cities can do to support transit

- Cities already are taking actions (need to strengthen relationship with Metro, i.e., earlier coordination for stop locations on RapidRide)

Mismatch of service and development

- Connection between neighborhood and major corridors
- Change discussion from "what do you want" to "what is appropriate"

Next Steps:

- Upcoming Work Group Meetings; July 11th, August 8th and September 6th:
- Please let Metro staff know about any updates to the Working Group list
- Follow-Up materials: Send an email to Metro staff with examples of how your jurisdiction has integrated transit and land use or examples from around the country.

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.