Service Guidelines Task Force

Technical Workshops
## Discussion Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Impacts best seen through</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target service level</strong></td>
<td>Productivity, social equity and geographic value factors that influence how much service should be on each corridor in the transit network</td>
<td>Investments (unconstrained)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service types</strong></td>
<td>Performance categories of like services that are used to evaluate all routes</td>
<td>Reductions (100,000 hrs example)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative services</strong></td>
<td>Growth of the program to better meet the needs of King County</td>
<td>Policy guidance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target Service Level Analysis
**Metro’s investment priorities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Reduce overcrowding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improve reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Achieve target service levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Become more productive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target service levels: Current analysis

- Metro sets target service levels based on productivity, social equity, and geographic value.
- Target service levels form the basis of the majority of our investment list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Social Equity</th>
<th>Geographic Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Riders in low-income areas</td>
<td>Connections to regional centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs and Students</td>
<td>Riders in minority areas</td>
<td>Connections to transit activity centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target service levels: Draft Guiding Principles

- Different parts of the county have different travel demands
- Create better connections between centers
- Maintain and improve services that meet social equity objectives
- Maintain and improve services that meet geographic value objectives
- Maintain and improve services that meet productivity
Recommendations to better incorporate social equity

DRAFT Task Force Recommendations

- Revise the point system to allow for a scaling of points for social equity
- Address the needs of youth, elderly, and persons with disabilities

DRAFT Changes to Social Equity

- Added gradation to low-income and minority scores
- Included a larger population using a revised definition of low-income, consistent with ORCA LIFT program
Recommendations to better incorporate geographic value

**DRAFT Task Force Recommendations**

- Revise the point system to allow for a scaling of points for geographic value
- Develop minimum service standards for each service type
- Develop strategy utilizing Park & Rides more efficiently

**DRAFT Changes to Geographic Value**

- Added gradation to corridor scoring
- Ensured minimum service levels on corridors
- Included Park & Rides in corridor scoring
Target service levels: Analysis Results

- An additional 148,100 hours of investment need identified
  - 37 corridors identified for additional investment to reach target service level
  - More corridors identified for investment, especially in Off-Peak time period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Subarea</th>
<th>Current Methodology</th>
<th>Revised Corridor Analysis</th>
<th>Growth Over Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>61,700</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>106,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH</td>
<td>170,400</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>202,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST</td>
<td>252,100</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>323,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>484,200</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>632,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Target service levels: High level findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social equity changes</td>
<td>More corridors receive some points, but fewer receive the maximum. Allows incremental shifts in year-to-year target service level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Value changes</td>
<td>All corridors receive some points, some stayed the same or increased.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?
Service Types Analysis
Service types: Current analysis

- Metro uses service types to assess route performance and inform service reductions
  - Seattle Core – routes serving downtown Seattle, First Hill, Capitol Hill, South Lake Union, the University District, or Uptown; held to higher performance standard
  - Non-Seattle Core – routes serving other areas of Seattle and King County
Service types: Task Force Draft Principles

- Measure performance of routes against similar services
- Maintain and improve services that meet productivity objectives
- Different parts of the county have different travel demands
Recommendation to consider service types

DRAFT Task Force Recommendations

- Create an express category
- Create a new alternative services category
- Consider different service types (e.g. express, rural, suburban)

DRAFT Changes to Service Types

- Evaluated four different service types options
- Three new options compared to current
Service types: Options tested

Option 1: Current
- Seattle Core
- Non-Seattle Core
  - Alternative Services

Option 2: Peak Emphasis
- Urban (All-day)
- Suburban/Rural (All-day)
- Peak/Express
- Demand Response

Option 3: Peak Emphasis by Market
- Urban All-day
- Urban Peak
- Suburban/Rural All-day
- Suburban/Rural Peak
- Demand Response

Option 4: VISION 2040
- Metropolitan City
- Core City
- Other Smaller City
- Demand Response
Option 1: Current
- Highest reduction of peak service
- Has highest proportion of reductions in south county, due to 2014 reductions of low performing east county service

Option 2: Peak Emphasis
- Less peak period service reduced
- Reductions more evenly spread across county than current

Option 3: Peak Emphasis by Market
- Least peak period reduction
- Reductions more concentrated in west and east county compared to current

Option 4: PSRC VISION 2040-based
- More peak period reductions than Options 2 or 3, but less than current
- Reductions most evenly split throughout the county
- Route groupings are the most different from current
Questions?