

## Meeting Summary

# King County Metro Long Range Public Transportation Plan Technical Advisory Committee Meeting June 23, 2015

### Attendees

Name/Agency	Email
Franz Loewenherz/Bellevue	
Roland Behee/Community Transit	<a href="mailto:Roland.behee@commtrans.org">Roland.behee@commtrans.org</a>
Brian Roberts/Burien	
Nora Getoff/Tukwila	
Benjamin Smith/SDOT	
Gil Cerise/PSRC	<a href="mailto:gcerise@psrc.org">gcerise@psrc.org</a>
Craig Helmann/PSRC	
Darin Stavish/Pierce Transit	<a href="mailto:dstavish@piercettransit.org">dstavish@piercettransit.org</a>
Len Madsen/Des Moines	
Carol Hunter/WSDOT	<a href="mailto:hunterc@wsdot.wa.gov">hunterc@wsdot.wa.gov</a>
Jenny Ngo/Woodinville	<a href="mailto:jennyn@ci.woodinville.wa.gov">jennyn@ci.woodinville.wa.gov</a>
Amy Biggs/Snoqualmie Valley Transportation	<a href="mailto:amyebiggs@comcast.net">amyebiggs@comcast.net</a>
Andrew Zagars/Sammamish	<a href="mailto:azagars@sammamish.us">azagars@sammamish.us</a>
Katie Kuciemba/Sound Cities Association	
Jim Seitz/Renton	
Chester Knapp/Redmond	<a href="mailto:cknapp@redmond.gov">cknapp@redmond.gov</a>
Nytasha Sowers/Shoreline	<a href="mailto:nsowers@shoreline.gov">nsowers@shoreline.gov</a>
Anita Woodmass/SeaTac	
Monica Whitman/Kent	

### King County Staff

Stephen Hunt, Lisa Shafer, Kim Becklund, Graydon Newman, Paul Roybal

### Consultant Staff

Jeanne Acutanza/Transpo Group, Alicia McIntire/Parametrix, Sophie Mecham/Transpo Group, Aaron/Fehr & Peers

### Welcome and Opening – Jeanne Acutanza:

- Quick introductions
- Invitation to today's Open House workshop in Redmond
- Review of coordinated timeline and discussion of where we're at now
- Review of how we get to the preliminary concept
- Review of current and upcoming outreach efforts

### What else should we be doing for outreach?

**Comment:** Do you have notices on all of the buses (rack cards)?

**Q:** Where do we send information about fairs and festivals to?

**A:** Please email any information to Stephen and Tristan.

**Q:** How many survey responses have you received so far?

**A:** We've received 500 responses so far to our current survey; we would be interested in getting more participation from cities outside of Seattle.

**Comment:** You didn't ask about which routes people use on the survey. If we knew this information it might help guide our outreach efforts and inform our perspective.

**Q:** Have there been efforts directed at reaching non-riders in areas where there is no service?

**A:** Every other year we do a non-rider survey. We are trying to reach these people through other avenues, such as fairs and festivals, community organizations, etc.

### **Jeanne – What we have heard so far (Discussion of survey results)**

#### **Alicia – Service Network Concepts**

- All of these concepts represent county-wide networks
- We wanted to model what happens if you put all of your eggs in one basket to illustrate each concept
- We're using the PSRC 2040 projections
- 2.5 million additional service hours
- We're looking at what kind of service should be where and why
- Service integration – What should the priorities be for integration?
- Discussion of service emphasis for three concepts

**Q:** What is the difference between frequent and express? It seems like they share some of the same features.

**A:** This is just representative, some aspects of frequent and express service overlap. Two key differences are bus stop spacing and the type of road buses travel on.

**Q:** Is the 2.5 million hours on top of all the service that exists now?

**A:** Yes, it's what Metro is assumed to have to provide in 2040. It includes Metro and Sound Transit through ST2. We have 3.5 million hours now; we'll have a total of 6 million hours in 2040.

**Q:** Are there fundamental differences in the routing in these scenarios (and differences in how we integrate with Sound Transit)?

**A:** Yes there are. For example, in express, you see a lot more long haul routes that are not associated with the Sound Transit spine.

**Q:** What is the bus/car mode split for to whole day?

**A:** We have not calculated that yet, we've only calculated mode split for peak hour travel. We will add PM mode split and the mode split for all trips.

**Q:** What is our current service emphasis?

**Q:** Degradation and travel time – do we have assumptions built in for that? It'll be helpful to have targets identified that we need to hit.

**A:** Yes, we utilized the ST model and viewed it in GIS travel times, and compared the differences in these concept networks.

**Comment:** As we think about an evaluative treatment, it'd be good to know how well we're maximizing the multi-billion dollar rail investment in each network concept.

**Comment:** It would be helpful to see more of the data and what leads to your conclusions (ex. more detailed data than the up and down arrows on the service tradeoffs page).

**Q:** If we're trying to maximize service to light rail, are we considering a very frequent network?

**A:** There are elements of a very frequent network in the frequent concept.

**Comment:** It might be useful to have the guiding principals for each of these service packages, the basic assumptions, and all of the caveats for each.

**A:** This will be provided.

**Q:** Can we see other peak periods (such as PM peak)?

**Q:** Instead of pie charts, could we see these concepts as bar graphs?

**Comment:** To understand these different service emphases, it would be helpful to see the service hours of each throughout the day.

**A:** We can provide these graphs. The evaluation criteria will also show the comparison of trips during the PM Peak and evening off peak.

**Comment:** Your sample trips show a lot of centers to centers and don't necessarily look at how people get to these centers. The access is not being captured in these samples.

**Alicia – Is there other data that you need in order to be prepared in July to work on the preliminary concept?**

**Q:** I would like to have information on the distribution of seniors and those who have disabilities. These will be major populations in 2040.

**A:** Yes, that is part of our performance measures, we will be looking at proximity to these populations, but we need to use existing distributions for these populations.

**Q:** Should we bring our comp plans to the next meeting?

**A:** We would like you to think about how your city is going to be growing and where the growth will occur.

**Q:** I hear a lot of interest in the alternative transportation piece. This will be part of the last mile in hard-to-reach areas. At what point will we discuss this further? Let's have that policy discussion.

**A:** We will be talking about what we want technology to do/accomplish in regards to last mile solutions.

**Q:** I would like to have a metric about person throughput. My city doesn't want to assess mobility just based on vehicle throughput.

**A:** Yes, that is still in the big picture and that will be accounted for in the model when we analyze the preliminary concept.

**Comment:** I would like to see data on mode of access to transit.

**A:** That will be part of the evaluation criteria

**Comment:** It would be helpful to know what these broad metrics mean for my area (mode shift for different time periods, ridership numbers, how much service, and mode of access).

**A:** That will be part of the “quadrant” analysis we will look at in July.

**Comment:** We should think about how the Long Range Plan can inform upward mobility and access to jobs.

**Comment:** The ST model has some quirks, are you tweaking it or aware of its challenges?

**A:** Yes, at this stage we understand that and are studying things from a high level. We are trying to stay consistent with ST’s model, but sometimes we may have to provide additional context to account for these quirks.

**Q:** What have we really learned from this so far?

**A:** Lots of our results have been consistent with previous research, which is good. As we dive into geographic research, we will see how things vary from area to area, which will be interesting. We have also been interested to find that riders are generally willing to do transfers as long as the transfer saves them time in getting to their destination.

**Send requests for data to Stephen by July 7<sup>th</sup>.**

**Comment:** Please put yourself in the shoes of a small local jurisdiction, and keep in mind the briefings we have to do with local officials when you provide materials (Not too simple, not too detailed; easy to communicate).

**Comment:** The map of 30-minute access sheds to light rail is very useful. Something similar for Metro access would be a good tool for communication.

**A:** Yes, we are talking about that and will work on it more once we have identified our preliminary concept.

**Comment:** In selling the plan to people, it would be helpful to be able to compare service in areas of King County to the service networks in other cities (ex. San Francisco, DC, etc.) – This would help people relate, and deter opposition. People will be more accepting if they have a better understanding.

**Q:** Are we looking at going north to go south in some cases?

**Q:** Financing strategies – how would these be pulled together?

**A:** That is unquestionably an issue. There’s no funding strategy at the moment. In a later stage we will look at low/medium/high funding scenarios. The PSRC assumption for 2040 is a lofty goal.

**Comment:** On this meeting chart can you incorporate the opportunities for involvement? (Add them to the TAC & CAG meeting schedule)

**Comment:** It would be helpful to establish a common language for explaining the LRP to others, and also to make sure elected officials are briefed before they have meetings or speak to the public.

DRAFT