Service Guidelines Task Force

Alternative services and service types
Financial partnerships
Alternative Services have evolved over time

**Existing Alternative Services**
Build on these successful services.
- VanShare
- VanPool
- Rideshare
- CAT
- DART

**Community Shuttle**
A route with flexible service areas provided through a community partnership.
- fixed and flexible service area
- community partner provides resources and marketing

**Community Hub**
Local transportation center, access to community vans, bikes and information resources.
- partner provides location, transportation info and scheduling
- regularly scheduled and one-time trips

**Flexible Rideshare**
Variable ridesharing via promotion of mobile and web-based app.
- responds to unique commuter needs
- may include set pick-up points and driver incentives
Metro has increased focus on alternative services as a way of providing mobility options

Expanding program:

- $12 million / 2-years
  - Mitigate impacts of service cuts
  - Complete 2012 Plan
  - Complementary areas
- Focus on community partnerships
- Demonstration projects
There are over 20 current or planned alternative services throughout King County.

**DART**
- Flexible service area
- 14 routes in King County

**Community Shuttle**
- Flexible service area
- Community partnerships

**Flexible Rideshare & Community Hubs**

**Planned Services**
- Southeast King County
- Vashon Island
Is this the right approach to alternative services?

- Metro implements Alternative Services:
  - Where fixed-route mobility does not work
  - To replace lower-performing, less used fixed-route services
  - To seed new markets
  - To test new concepts
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Service types
Changes to service types would value different kinds of service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Current service types</th>
<th>Possible changes to service types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Two primary service types</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Preserves service within two different markets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• New service types to value Peak-Only routes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Revised service type to value community shuttles with variable routing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Types</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Seattle core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Non-Seattle core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Seattle core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Non-Seattle core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demand Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Express</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How would performance change if Metro added Express and Demand Response service types?

**Impacts**
- Establishes different performance thresholds for like services
- Values different kinds of services, based on mobility needs throughout the county
- Would limit cuts to Express and DART routes

**Trade-offs**
- Less focus on productivity
- Systemwide cost per rider would likely increase
- Some higher productivity services would be identified for reduction
- More potential candidates for reduction and investment
Adding these example service types would shift Metro’s service emphasis

**New Markets:** Building ridership in emerging markets

**Existing Markets:** Providing more service to current riders

**Productivity:** Serving the most dense, transit-supportive areas of the county

**Coverage:** Serving all parts of the county

**Peak-Only:** Connecting lower density areas to job centers during busiest travel times in one direction only

**All-day:** Connecting centers throughout the county all-day in both directions

**Non-Transit Dependent Riders:** Providing service to those who have other options

**Transit Dependent Riders:** Providing service to those with limited mobility options
Metro could consider other ways of modifying the guidelines in combination with changes to service types:

- Implement minimum service levels
- Define different performance measures for different service types
- Expand the alternative services program
- Consider how performance is used to make reductions
- Add an investment priority targeted to peak-only express service
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Financial partnerships
Metro’s financial partnerships

Why does Metro have financial partnerships?

- To leverage funds from other sources to provide transit service
- To collaborate with municipalities and communities to better meet mobility needs
- To address gaps in service, service regional needs and provide specialized service

Example entities that Metro partners with

- Cities
- Private employers
- Other transit providers
- Social service agencies
- Public schools
Depending on the type and percentage of funding for a partnership, Metro may:

- Elevate identified investments in our service guidelines
- Make exceptions to the service guidelines when changing or reducing service
- Match partner’s financial contributions

Is this the right approach to financial partnerships?