Planning as a Team: Highlights & Challenges from Partnerships with Sound Transit and Seattle DOT

APTA, Strategic Planning for New Mobility Tuesday, September 25







Customers' needs are changing

- King County is becoming more diverse and an increasing proportion of residents are foreign born
- Cities are growing and suburbanization of poverty is rising. 25% of the population have incomes less than twice the federal poverty level.
- Customers have and are demanding new mobility options that offer ondemand, door-to-door service.





Competition is growing, but customers benefit from regional coordination

Regional Ridership Trends, 2013-2017

- Metro moves the most people, but has seen smaller percentage ridership gains than Sound Transit.
- We can best serve customers by working with Sound Transit to strategically expand or restructure service, in coordination with Link







Two Futures: Marginalized Transit vs. Transit at the Center

Marginalized Transit Scenario:

- <u>Description</u>: New mobility options decrease use of public transit
- Impacts:
 - Shared or unshared car-based autonomous vehicles draw riders from public transit rather than from SOVs, leading to higher traffic, congestion, and energy use
 - Personal convenience of new mobility comes at the cost of societal benefits
 - Transportation gets better for those who can afford and worse for those who can't, furthering negative equity outcomes





Two Futures: Marginalized Transit vs. Transit at the Center (cont).

Transit at the Center Scenario:

- <u>Description</u>:
 - A mobility ecosystem with transit at the center, moving large numbers of people over longer distances and along busiest corridors
 - New mobility complements rather than competing or undercutting mass transit by delivering first and last mile, low-density, and off-peak service
- Impacts:
 - Fewer vehicles and lower VMT leads to less congestion and lower energy use.
 - Lower overall system costs
 - More equitable access













Highlights

Chal	lenges

Opportunities for Innovation: Together, we can lead the way in creating innovative mobility solutions

Maintenance and Growth:

2 Metro can leverage partners to maintain and expand our mobility network

Flexibility:

Partnerships help Metro adapt and offer tailored services to meet changing needs

Agreement with Diverse Stakeholders:

Developing new solutions requires a comprehensive vision

Capacity:

Operational capacity constraints can limit our ability to grow or meet partners' requests

Clarity:

Metro must define partnership roles, responsibilities, and expectations



	Highlights (cont.)	Challenges (<i>cont.</i>)
4	Risk Management: Partnerships can help share or manage risk	Risk Tolerance: Innovation requires risk tolerance
5	Customer Experience: Partnerships can benefit customers	Joint Development: Working together involves compromise and constant negotiation
6	Honoring Willing Partners: Metro appreciates and wants to honor partners who step up with support	Equity and Geographic Value: We must serve everyone in King County, while investing where the need is greatest, regardless of partner capabilities







1. Opportunities for Innovation vs. Agreement with Diverse Stakeholders

Ex: METRO CONNECTS

- Metro's long-range plan envisions 70% service growth by 2040 and serving more people, faster, and in new ways
- Challenge: Achieving this vision depends on collaboration with and investments from diverse stakeholders
- Takeaway: Metro must collaborate with others to fund and deliver the vision, while recognizing the need to serve King County equitably





Ex: Seattle Community Mobility Contract

- In Nov. 2014, Seattle voters approved a ballot measure to fund 10% of Metro's service hours
- Challenge: Metro's ability to grow service is constrained by base and operational capacity
- **Takeaway:** Metro is developing strategies to build capacity and fund innovative solutions





3. Flexibility vs. Clarity

Ex: Community Connections Program

- Targets parts of King County that do not have the infrastructure, density, or land use to support traditional fixed-route bus service.
- Key features:
 - Community based process and partnerships
 - Innovative services & products
 - Customized, creative solutions
- **Challenge:** Lack of clarity around meaning and expectations of a partnership, and how to measure the success of pilot programs ongoing
- Takeaway: Metro must clarify partnership expectations and determine how to transition this pilot to a permanent program (including performance evaluation)





4. Risk Management vs. Risk Tolerance

Ex: Innovative Mobility Pilot Programs

- Metro is getting more people on transit through innovative pilots, such as:
 - Shared employer shuttles
 - Care share parking
 - First/last mile pilot programs
- **Challenge:** Testing new programs and products involves risk.
- **Takeaway:** Metro must develop a higher risk tolerance internally and among elected officials and partners







5. Customer Experience vs. Joint Development

Ex: Capital improvements

- Partnering to improve infrastructure and create mobility hubs will help connect people to transit
- Challenge: Partnerships require constant negotiation with multiple parties
- **Takeaway:** Metro and partners must develop principles of responsibility









6. Honoring Willing Partners vs. Equity and Geographic Value

Ex: ORCA Opportunity Fund

- Seattle funded the majority of a pilot program to provide free transit passes to students
- **Challenge:** Some jurisdictions do not have resources to "pay-to-play"
- **Takeaway:** Metro must develop partnerships policies to value nonfinancial contributions and serve the county equitably

All of Seattle's public high school students to get unlimited ORCA passes under new Durkan plan

Education | Local Politics | Northwest | Traffic Lab





