

## Meeting Summary

# King County Metro Long Range Public Transportation Plan

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting April 21, 2015

### Attendees

Name/Agency	e-mail
Kevin Snyder/Auburn	<a href="mailto:ksnyder@auburnwa.gov">ksnyder@auburnwa.gov</a>
Sherman Goong/Bothell	<a href="mailto:Sherman.goong@ci.bothell.wa.us">Sherman.goong@ci.bothell.wa.us</a>
Rick Perez/Federal Way	<a href="mailto:Rick.perez@cityoffederalway.com">Rick.perez@cityoffederalway.com</a>
Christen Leeson/Issaquah	<a href="mailto:Christenl@issaquah.gov">Christenl@issaquah.gov</a>
Gil Cerise/PSRC	<a href="mailto:gcerise@psrc.org">gcerise@psrc.org</a>
Kris Overleese/Kenmore	<a href="mailto:koverleese@kenmorewa.gov">koverleese@kenmorewa.gov</a>
Jenny Ngo/Woodinville	<a href="mailto:jennyn@ci.woodinville.wa.gov">jennyn@ci.woodinville.wa.gov</a>
Ben Smith/Seattle	<a href="mailto:ben.smith@seattle.gov">ben.smith@seattle.gov</a>
Carol Hunter/WSDOT	<a href="mailto:hunterc@wsdot.wa.gov">hunterc@wsdot.wa.gov</a>
Thang Nguyen/Kirkland	<a href="mailto:Tnguyen@kirklandwa.gov">Tnguyen@kirklandwa.gov</a>
Franz Loewenherz/Bellevue	<a href="mailto:Floewenherz@bellevuewa.gov">Floewenherz@bellevuewa.gov</a>
Jaimie Reavis/Tukwila	<a href="mailto:Jaimie.reavis@tukwilawa.gov">Jaimie.reavis@tukwilawa.gov</a>
Nytasha Sowers/Shoreline	<a href="mailto:Nsowers@shorelinewa.gov">Nsowers@shorelinewa.gov</a>
Roland Behee/Community Transit	<a href="mailto:Roland.behee@commtrans.org">Roland.behee@commtrans.org</a>
Chester Knapp/Redmond	<a href="mailto:cknapp@redmond.gov">cknapp@redmond.gov</a>
Craig Helmann/PSRC	<a href="mailto:chelmann@psrc.org">chelmann@psrc.org</a>
Darin Stavish/Pierce Transit	<a href="mailto:dstavish@piercetransit.org">dstavish@piercetransit.org</a>
Karen Kitsis/Sound Transit	<a href="mailto:karen.kitsis@soundtransit.org">karen.kitsis@soundtransit.org</a>
Brian Roberts/Burien	<a href="mailto:brianr@burienwa.gov">brianr@burienwa.gov</a>
Jim Seitz/Renton	<a href="mailto:Jseitz@Rentonwa.gov">Jseitz@Rentonwa.gov</a>
Bob Lindskov/Covington	<a href="mailto:blindskov@covingtongwa.gov">blindskov@covingtongwa.gov</a>

### King County Staff

Chris O'Claire, Stephen Hunt, Tristan Cook, Lisa Shafer, Graydon Newman, Gary Prince

### Consultant Staff

Jeanne Acutanza/Transpo Group, Alicia McIntire/Parametrix, Sophie Mecham/Transpo Group

### Welcome and Opening (Jeanne Acutanza)

Staff welcomed participants and Jeanne Acutanza provided an overview of the visioning event:

- What do the rest of our outreach efforts look like?
- CAG and TAC meetings
- Website is up and running
- Online survey
- Fairs & festivals in summer season
- Additional visioning event (Sept.)

**Question:** If we have fairs and festivals in Redmond, who can we tell so that Metro can have a presence at these events?

**Answer:** Contact King County Metro Staff. Metro is also partnering with Sound Transit on this outreach effort

**Question:** Where will outreach events be held in other parts of the county?

**Answer:** King County Metro is working to plan visioning events in south and east King County. Bellevue College has agreed to host one event.

### **Briefing Book Review (Stephen Hunt)**

**Question:** Is service in-between transit supportive densities justified?

**Answer:** Our analysis of Transit Supportive Densities is intended as a general guide for where development densities are sufficient to warrant all day two way transit service. All else equal, transit will be more productive where there are long corridors or transit supportive densities. Where two areas of with transit supportive densities are separated by a long distances of low density development, it will be more difficult to serve, however travel demand between those areas may indeed warrant transit service.

**Question:** Is this all PSRC-based? Are you using the 2040 model for the population inputs?

**Answer:** Yes

**Question:** How do you define accessibility?

**Answer:** There are two sides to how we measure accessibility in the long range plan. First, is access to transit service. This is defined as the population or jobs within ¼ mile of any bus stop along any roadway. Second, is what you can get to using transit. This is defined as the population or jobs within a 30 minute travel time using transit, including any wait or transfer time.

### **Long Range Plan Contents and Planning Process (Stephen Hunt, Alicia McIntire)**

**Question:** For layovers, will you also be looking at policies where you can use more on-street layovers? Are you considering the cost of layover?

**Answer:** Yes, however, specific locations for layover will not be identified.

**Question:** I was wondering at what point would there be differentiation for the different financial scenarios? (preferred concept or final concept level?)

**Answer:** This will be analyzed for the Preferred Concept

**Question:** Can you explain this caveat (\*existing frequent and express services do not all meet future standards)?

**Answer:** Not all Metro service meets the standards used for development of the service concepts. For example, not all current frequent and express service is provided during the service spans.

**Question:** Have you already made assumptions about the spine of the rail network and ridership? (are you making assumptions about sound transit service for the initial concepts?)

**Answer:** Yes. Completion of the rail network through ST2 is assumed as part of the scenarios. Metro will coordinate with Sound Transit over the coming months and modify the future rail network to reflect what is proposed in ST3.

**Question:** Is rail service included in these pie charts?

**Answer:** No, it's an assumption in the background. Changes to the rail network will be an ongoing refining element coordinated between Sound Transit and Metro.

**Question:** What are the assumptions related to BRT?

**Answer:** The existing RapidRide network is included in the concepts. Express bus service is incorporated in the concepts, including Sound Transit bus service. The service concepts will evaluate where a given level of transit service may be provided, regardless of the service provider. The coordination effort between Metro and Sound Transit will identify who provides service along different corridors.

**Question:** Are you accounting for areas where Land Use has already exceeded density forecasts (Seattle)?

**Answer:** In order to be integrated with all our modeling, we need to use the official PSRC forecasts. This means for comparison between the initial concepts we will not be considering the additional development in areas that have already exceeded development forecasts. Moving forward we can address these issues in two ways; First, as we develop the preferred concept, local knowledge of where development is occurring differently than forecast will be helpful in identifying which roadways the network should be utilizing. Second, the PSRC is currently updating their forecasts with their Land Use Vision forecasts. We anticipate being able to use these forecasts in our analysis of the preferred and/or final plan. It is our understanding that these forecasts have had jurisdiction review and so should include appropriate corrections.

**Question:** Does value of time assume access to transit (walk etc.?)

**Answer:** Because walking speeds vary, an estimate of the time needed to access transit has been provided (sourced from APTA).

**Question:** Are you addressing the value of human capital such as time and convenience?

**Answer:** We include measures of time but have not monetized these measures. The travel demand models consider the individuals value of time in making choices about mode and trip routing. Convenience will be considered in the alternative network concepts.

**Question:** Is it in this planning process that we transition from areas where we don't currently have light rail but will in the future; how does this fit into the 2023 plan for ST, or do we just straight to looking at the ST3 network?

**Answer:** Because the ST3 network is unknown at this stage, Metro will incorporate planned service changes resulting from those investments once they are identified. This is part of the ongoing coordination effort between Sound Transit and Metro.

**Question:** Will you make assumptions about how much capital will be provided by Metro vs. the jurisdictions?

**Answer:** No. There will only be assumptions about certain levels of capital investments.

**Comment:** It would help to articulate where problems exist (hotspots) on a jurisdiction's roadway

**Question:** Are you using mode-split modeling? What type of modeling/who is doing it?

**Answer:** We will be using the Sound Transit model which is integrated with the PSRC model. The travel demand models consider the mode which will be chosen based on user benefits; if a mode has less total cost to a user that mode will be chosen.

**Question:** I'm concerned about the growth of congestion, how we're moving toward tolling and congestion pricing. Is that considered in this model?

**Answer:** We are using the same tolling assumptions as PSRC's Transportation 2040 plan. Congestion for individual vehicles is also considered in how individuals travel in the region if alternative modes are faster, such as walking, biking or taking transit those will be chosen.

**Question:** I'd be interested in knowing what the transportation infrastructure assumptions are in the model? (Roadway projects, connections that don't exist today, etc.) That would be a concern to my community if those weren't reflected. How should I share this information with you?

- Key infrastructure projects are pivotal to how we envision transit in our community
- How can we tell if there is "improved Access" (ie within Redmond) can we provide shapefiles that reflect improved access?

**Answer:** The TAC will discuss that at the next meeting when the service concepts are presented. The PSRC model includes all projects identified in the Transportation 2040 constrained projects list. It is difficult to predict which projects are funded at the local level, especially those outside of the 6 year CIP.

### **Network Concepts and Evaluation (Stephen Hunt)**

**Comment:** There might be concern that you are giving preference to the frequent network (because you're using ¼ mile access).

**Response:** There is pretty solid nation-wide research that people will walk these distances for these types of service

**Question:** Will all of these metrics be on a countywide level of detail? (For each of the 3 concepts)

**Answer:** Yes. The project team is exploring ways to examine the results on a sub-regional level.

**Comment:** It seems like the span of service could be equal for all of your concepts.

**Response:** "Span of service" in the evaluation criteria refers to how transit service changes over the course of a day, rather than length of time service is provided.

**Question:** Any ideas of how to measure the appropriateness of one concept over another as it relates to regional goals (ie I-5 Long Range Plans and Land Use)?

**Answer:** The project team will examine options for including that as an evaluation criterion.

**Question:** Another metric to consider is looking at the contributions that transit makes along our most congested corridors (Ex. What % of total number of people are carried by transit).

- Maximize the person throughput
- Consider access into and out of regional centers
- Crossing Screenlines
- Are we putting the resources where they'll make the biggest difference?
- Are we considering diversion onto local streets where congestion occurs?

**Answer:** The project team will examine options for including that as an evaluation criterion.

**Question:** In Kenmore we're worrying about the cumulative impacts of tolling – how do you figure out in the long term, who is going to continue to stay in their car and come through our streets vs. who may take transit?

**Answer:** Travel demand models consider the costs of the user of taking the trip in each mode – the private car, transit, cycling, etc. Not only are the cost of driving the vehicle included but so are tolls,

parking costs, and other costs. As congestion increases in the region, and if tolls are imposed, transit may become more favorable.

**Question:** Why are we focusing primarily on access to jobs? What about access to community centers and colleges?

**Answer:** The project team will examine options for including access to activity centers and colleges as part of the evaluation criterion.

**Question:** Do you ever envision a hybrid of the concepts that are being presented? How do you balance conflicting and competing interests?

**Answer:** Yes, the preferred concept will be a combination of the three concepts and will represent the most appropriate transit options for various parts of King County. The evaluation criteria are designed to assist with examining competing interests.

**Question:** How will you define quality of service that address the “transfer” experience?

**Answer:** In two ways. All of our travel time analyses, including summarizing jobs and households that can be accessed within a certain travel time threshold add the wait time of any required transfer. Secondly, the ridership model considers the negative impacts transferring when estimating ridership.

**Question:** What about connections to Pierce Transit and Community Transit?

**Answer:** Representatives from both agencies are participating in the TAC to help address and identify those needs.

**Question:** Are you looking at Cost per boarding as a measure of efficiency?

**Answer:** Yes. Cost per boarding is one measure of efficiency.

**Please provide comments on the evaluation criteria by May 1.**

**Next Meeting Is June 23rd**