How does Metro’s planning process work?

Metro system Budget adopted
Metro system analysis begins
Service Guidelines Report with system analysis issued annually
If changes, preliminary concepts developed
Draft alternative plan developed
Executive transmits proposed ordinance to County Council
Council action
Service changes

Budget direction
- Growth
- Reduction
- Stable

Guidelines analysis
- Target service levels
- System performance
  - Possible priorities for
    - Investments
    - Reductions

Service planning
- Identify corridor, jurisdiction and community needs
- Use service design guidelines
- Develop conceptual changes
- Consider alternative services
- Analyze system impacts, Title VI

Community engagement
- Involve community and jurisdictions
- Revise and adjust concepts

Council review and action
- Committee and Council consider proposal, Title VI analysis, public engagement report, public testimony
- Council may make adjustments, adopts ordinance

Service change implementation
- Prepare schedules, information materials and website
- Inform customers and community
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## Possible priorities for 36 Service Guidelines

### Investments

1. Reduce overcrowding
2. Improve reliability
3. Achieve target service levels
4. Become more productive

### Reductions

1. Routes in bottom 25 percent
2. Restructures
3. Routes between 25 and 50 percent
4. Routes in bottom 25% that warrant higher service level
Set target corridor service levels

- Analyze 112 corridors connecting 85 centers throughout King County
- Target service levels determined by frequency a corridor should have based on:
  - Productivity
  - Social Equity
  - Geographic Value
### Data that contribute to a target service level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Social Equity</th>
<th>Geographic Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households within ¼ mile of stops per corridor mile</td>
<td>Percent of boardings in low-income tracts</td>
<td>Primary connection between regional growth, manufacturing/ industrial centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs and student enrollment within ¼ mile of stops per corridor mile</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary connection between transit activity centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated cost recovery by time of day</td>
<td>Percent of boardings in minority census tracts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated load factor by time of day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection at night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
System performance

- Determine performance based on measures
- Identify routes with passenger crowding
- Identify routes with reliability issues

**Rides per platform hour:**
Total ridership divided by the total hours from the time the bus leaves its base until it returns

**Passenger miles per platform mile:**
Total miles traveled by all passengers divided by the total miles the bus operates from its base until it returns
Additional Peak-Only evaluation

- Same route performance metrics:
  - Rides per platform hour
  - Passenger miles per platform mile
- Additional evaluation:
  - **Travel time:** 20% faster than local route
  - **Ridership:** Carry at least 90% of the local route riders per trip
Example peak only route evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Peak Route</th>
<th>Rt 218</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rt 7EX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Metrics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>Rides/ platform hour</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>Passenger miles/ platform mile</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Peak Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Travel Time</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service Guidelines Task Force
Corridors and centers provide connections throughout the transit network

- 85 centers geographically distributed throughout King County
- Analyze 112 corridors that connect all 85 centers
- Target service levels determined: frequency a corridor *should* have based on:
  - Productivity
  - Social Equity
  - Geographic Value
**Alternative Services have evolved over time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Alternative Services</th>
<th>Community Shuttle</th>
<th>Community Hub</th>
<th>Flexible Rideshare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build on these successful services.</td>
<td>A route with flexible service areas provided through a community partnership.</td>
<td>Local transportation center, access to community vans, bikes and information resources.</td>
<td>Variable ridesharing via promotion of mobile and web-based app.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• VanShare</td>
<td>• fixed and flexible service area</td>
<td>• partner provides location, transportation info and scheduling</td>
<td>• responds to unique commuter needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• VanPool</td>
<td>• community partner provides resources and marketing</td>
<td>• regularly scheduled and one-time trips</td>
<td>• may include set pick-up points and driver incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rideshare</td>
<td>• CAT</td>
<td>• DART</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CAT</td>
<td>• DART</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DART</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

Service Guidelines Task Force
# Recommendations to enhance investments – Social equity and geographic value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRAFT Task Force Recommendations</th>
<th>DRAFT Changes Target Service Level Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Equity Changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Revise the point system to allow for a scaling of points for social equity</td>
<td>▪ Added gradation to low-income and minority scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Address the needs of youth, elderly, and persons with disabilities</td>
<td>▪ Included a larger population using a revised definition of low-income, consistent with ORCA LIFT program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic Value Changes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Revise the point system to allow for a scaling of points for geographic value</td>
<td>▪ Added gradation to corridor scoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Develop minimum service standards for each service type</td>
<td>▪ Ensured minimum service levels on corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Develop strategy utilizing Park &amp; Rides more efficiently</td>
<td>▪ Included all Park &amp; Rides in corridor scoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations to enhance investments – Alternative services

**DRAFT Task Force Recommendations**

- Further expand alternative services program
- Enhance planning for alternative services
- Create new metric for measuring performance

**DRAFT Alternative services program changes**

- Focus on right-sizing mobility and complementing fixed-route bus service
- Seeding new markets
- Define which communities should get alternative services and how to initiate a program
- Describe how to convert alternative services to fixed-route service
- Define ways for communities to get involved and partner with Metro on alternative services
- Establish new metrics to determine how well the program is working
**Service Type Option 5: Peak Policy Emphasis**

including changes to the target service level analysis

**Description**

Classifies routes based on connections to the county’s densest urban centers, and includes policy protection for peak-only routes.

**Urban Routes:** Routes that serve downtown Seattle, First Hill, Capitol Hill, South Lake Union, University District, or Uptown, including routes serving suburban or rural areas

**Suburban Routes:** Routes that serve other areas of Seattle and King County

**Demand Response:**
- Dial-A-Ride Transit (DART) routes
- Alternative Services Community Shuttles

**Peak-only protection:** Bottom 25% peak-only routes (in either measure) that have a travel time or ridership advantage over a local alternative would be protected from the first reduction priority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Number of Routes</th>
<th>Percent of Hours</th>
<th>Percent of Riders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand Response</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak-Only Protection</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary**

- Establishes a new category for demand response routes
- Policy protection for peak-only routes result in fewer of those routes identified for reduction in a potential reduction
- Defines service types based on the markets served

**Reduction Scenario: 100,000 hours**

**Impacts**

- Fewer peak-only routes would be identified for reduction than in service type options 1, 2, and 3
- More all-day routes would be identified for reduction in the Off-Peak
- Reductions would be spread more evenly throughout the county than in other service type options

**Percent of 100K Hour Reduction by Time Period**

- Night: 11%
- Off-peak: 22%
- Peak: 67%

**Percent of 100K Hour Reduction by Service Type**

- Urban: 61%
- Suburban/Rural: 39%

**Total System Service Hours After Reduction Scenario**

- Total: 103,000 hours
- +0.7% reduction
- Night: 15.8% +0.2%
- Off-peak: 38.1% +0.5%
- Peak: 46.1% -0.7%