

Transit Now Service Partnership Criteria Outreach Process and Comments Received

Contents of this packet

Description of outreach process

Summary of responses to February-March and December outreach efforts

February-March 2007 outreach

- Letter requesting review of draft criteria with draft criteria packet
- Mailing list – private
- Mailing list - public
- Individual responses (8)

December 2006 outreach

- Email requesting preliminary input
 - Questionnaire
 - Mailing list
-

Description of Outreach Process

Step 1: December 11 – 20, 2006

Metro staff created a short questionnaire for the purpose of gathering preliminary input toward developing service partnership criteria. The questionnaire was emailed to transportation managers at 9 cities and 12 private organizations that had expressed interest in partnerships while the Transit Now was being considered by the County Council and voters. Staff received and compiled written responses from five cities and three private organizations.

Step 2: January 2007

Metro staff used the input from outside parties and guidance from Transit Now to draft criteria.

Step 3: February 8 – March 13, 2007

Metro staff mailed via US mail the draft criteria and explanatory introduction for review and comment to 20 private organizations and to all members of King County's three subarea transportation boards and their technical advisory committees (TACs). TAC members also received the packet by email.

In addition, staff presented the criteria in person to each of the subarea transportation boards and their technical advisory committees at their meetings between February and March.

Step 4: March 2007

Metro staff reviewed responses to refine the criteria. Criteria were drafted into ordinance form, reviewed internally by Metro staff and management and by the Prosecuting Attorney's Office, to propose through the Executive for approval by the County Council.

Summary of Comments Related to Transit Now Service Partnership Criteria

February - March 2007

Comments were solicited from all cities and transportation bodies that sit on subarea transportation boards, as well as approximately 20 private organizations or institutions that expressed interest in partnerships.

Eight written comments were received from the following organizations:

Cities of Seattle, Redmond, Issaquah; Children's Hospital, Starbucks; King County Transit Advisory Committee, Puget Sound Regional Council, Transportation Investment Board.

General Comments

- Suggests a number of areas in the requirements and priorities that need clarification for laypersons.
- Supportive of the program.
- Service Partnerships are good solution to service requests from outside parties. Need plan for when partners no longer pay for successful routes.
- Unclear how scoring works – weighing, yes/no, or other.
- Seattle's Urban Village Transit Network is aligned w/KCM service priorities.
- Bridging the Gap pledges substantial funds for 9 years, which "cannot be compared...to incremental investments by other parties."
- Suggests service improvements in SODO including RFA extension, small buses, frequent service.

Direct Financial Partnerships

- Unclear about subarea allocation of hours after 5 years.
- Suggests successful partnership services receive priority for regular service after 5 years.
- Would like city's "town center subareas" considered equally with designated urban centers, including downtown and areas that connect to interstate freeways. Similar request for public circulators.
- Raise priorities for ridership (from # 8 to #3) and additional funding (from # 6 to #4).
- Add to additional actions: service to under-served, low-income pops and land use changes to increase ridership.
- #1 & #3 ("to" vs. "within" urban centers) will prove redundant when applied, and public agency circulators overlap as well with these criteria.
- Priority for more than minimum funds favors wealthier partners.
- Add to additional actions "improving walkways."
- Unclear how criteria are weighted.
- Ridership should be given higher priority, given the objectives of Transit Now.
- Suggest short list of types of service improvements envisioned as improving other goals in 6 year plan.
- Concerned that urban center priority works against willing partners outside such areas that may need greater service precisely because they are not in well-served urban centers.

Speed & Reliability Partnerships

- Unclear whether 10% is measured over entire corridor or just w/in a jurisdiction.
- Requests consideration of current projects being completed w/in 5 years, such as city's ITS system.
- Requests that ITS be considered as a transit priority system if it saves 10% travel time.
- Give higher priority to projects w/shortest implementation time (<5 years).
- Give higher priority to actions that achieve better than 10% speed gain.
- Add priority for actions that increase "volume of buses."
- Add to complementary actions: service to under-served, low-income pops & land use changes to increase ridership.
- Make some gradation to RapidRide partnerships to distinguish them.
- Applicants may not be able to accurately reflect ability to complete within 5 years – suggests higher priority for actions completed sooner than 5 yrs.
- If priority is given for exceeding 10% speed gain, are there requirements for how to achieve that extra amount?

December 2006 Input to Develop Criteria

Eight questionnaires were returned from cities of Auburn, Bellevue, Redmond, Seattle, Shoreline; Virginia Mason Hospital, Starbucks, Vulcan, Children's Hospital, Microsoft.

- Most support for giving highest priority to urban centers. Some support for giving highest priority to ridership.
- Most respondents' partnership objectives were to implement specific routes or trips, or to reduce employee SOV use or increase local travel options.
- Respondents expect that additional measures should be taken by partner and/or KCM to increase success of service, such as promotions, incentives and pass programs, TDM investments and policy changes (including parking), data collection/monitoring, technology, other service changes.
- After 5 years, some respondents felt KCM should take over successful service; others would be willing to continue paying if service meets partner objectives.



King County
METRO

Metro Transit Division
Service Development
Department of Transportation

King Street Center, KSC-TR-0426
201 South Jackson Street
Seattle, WA 98104-3856

February 8, 2007



Name
Title, Organization
address.
city, WA 98xxx

Subject: Review Draft of *Transit Now* Service Partnership Criteria

Dear ___ (This was sent to elected and TAC members on the 3 King Co subarea transportation boards – ie all KC jurisdictions and public agencies on those boards – plus about a dozen private employers/organizations who've expressed interest in partnerships.)

Attached is a short document that summarizes the Service Partnership Program of *Transit Now*, explains minimum requirements identified in *Transit Now's* enabling legislation and proposes criteria to prioritize which partnerships to implement. I am writing to ask for your input on these criteria.

The *Transit Now* ordinance adopted by the King County Council and ratified by the passage of King County Proposition 2 last November specifies a number of minimum requirements for projects to be eligible as partnerships. The ordinance also gives some guidance for prioritizing from among the proposals that meet the minimum requirements. For example, several conditions are to be given priority. Metro was directed to provide further detail on how to define and rank those priorities. We invite you to review the attached draft of those details and let us know your comments before we send a recommendation to King County Executive Ron Sims and transmit a proposed ordinance to the King County Council.

Thank you for your interest. Please send your comments by Tuesday, March 13, 2007, to Matt Hansen, Supervisor, Market Development, 400 Yesler Way #0600, Seattle, WA, 98104-2165 or via email to matt.hansen@metrokc.gov.

Sincerely,

Victor Obeso
Manager, Service Development

Criteria for the Transit Now Service Partnership Program

Introduction

Transit Now (King County Ordinance 2006-0285, <http://www.metrokc.gov/kcdot/transitnow/ordinance.pdf>), approved by King County voters on November 7, 2006 provides funds for new transit services. In addition to those services, Transit Now authorizes King County Metro Transit to enter into service partnerships with public and private entities to add other transit service mutually agreed to by the partners and Metro. The requirements and priorities described below are included in the adopting legislation, which also provided direction to establish criteria for the program. Proposed criteria are attached for your review.

The intent of service partnerships is to increase transit ridership by leveraging Metro's service resources to increase overall transit service and to improve transit operations. Two types of partnerships are authorized: direct financial partnerships to pay for added service, and speed and reliability partnerships that improve transit operations.

To be eligible for consideration as a partnership, a proposal must meet the minimum requirements established by Transit Now. Then each eligible project will be evaluated for implementation in accordance with criteria described in this document. In all cases, proposed Service Partnership agreements are subject to review and approval by the King County Council. Service Partnerships shall be awarded consistent with the provisions of K.C.C. 28.94.020 governing council review of proposed new bus routes or changes to established routes. Council approval shall not be unreasonably withheld from partnership proposals that meet the objectives, guidelines and implementation strategies of the service partnership program as described in King County Ordinance 2006-0285.

Direct Financial Partnerships

In a direct financial partnership, a partner or group of partners make financial contributions toward the fully allocated cost of transit service. A partner that wishes to contribute to more service on existing routes or create new routes may do so by agreeing to pay toward the fully allocated cost of providing the service. Transit Now requires a minimum contribution from the partner of \$100,000 per year for five years to add service on an existing route or routes, or \$200,000 per year for five years to add a new route or routes. Metro will match a partner's contribution on a 2:1 basis. (For example, a partner's \$100,000 share will be matched by \$200,000 in Metro's Transit Now funds for a total \$300,000 toward the service.)

Metro will collaborate with potential partners to identify proposals that have a high likelihood of increasing ridership. The criteria for financial partnerships, shown on the attached list, reflect priorities for ridership gains, support of urban centers and the core network, resource and service sustainability, and a willingness by the partner to take additional actions to increase success.

Speed and Reliability Partnerships with Local Jurisdictions

The primary goal of the Speed and Reliability partnerships is to encourage local cities – alone or with others - to establish and maintain changes to traffic operations that will improve transit travel time along Metro’s arterial core service connections as adopted in Metro’s Six Year Transit Development Plan or its successor plans. (See Table 4.2 in the 2002-2007 Plan at http://www.metrokc.gov/kcdot/tp/transit/sixyearplan/section_4.pdf). Metro will add 5,000 annual service hours for each route along the corridor that is projected to achieve a speed gain of at least 10 percent as a result of the traffic operations and facilities changes. The matching dollars will be reserved at the time of agreement and service will be added after the changes/improvements are complete.

Metro will collaborate with proposing partners to identify actions that result in forecast 10 percent speed improvement on an eligible core service connection. The highest priority Speed and Reliability Partnerships will be those that benefit RapidRide corridors. Priority also will be given when a partner is willing to take additional actions that further support transit operations and ridership. These priorities are shown on the attached list.

Monitoring, Evaluation and Modification of Service

All partnership services will be monitored for performance. Partnership agreements will provide for a collaborative process between Metro and the partner(s) to change or improve the service following two years of its initial implementation or earlier, subject to the agreement of both parties. Service provided via Service Partnerships will be considered successful if, within the term of the partnership agreement, it performs at or above the subarea average for the time period in which it operates in at least three of the four performance measure indicators used in Metro’s annual Route Performance Report.¹ Should the partner(s) decide to withdraw from a service partnership either by terminating their financial commitment for direct financial partnerships or by cancelling or removing the traffic operations measures they implemented to qualify for a Speed and Reliability partnership, Metro’s commitment to continue the service also will expire.

Proposed Service Partnership Process

The following describes the proposed process under which potential partnership services would be identified by prospective partners and Service Partnership Agreements negotiated and approved.

1. New service partnerships can be proposed by prospective partners at any time during the calendar year.
2. Upon expression of interest by a prospective partner, Metro will provide, within 14 calendar days, an informational packet including Transit Now Ordinance and Attachment A, Program Requirements and Criteria, and Service Partnership Agreement Terms and Conditions including currently applicable service cost rates.

¹ The four performance measures are: rides per revenue hour, operating revenue to operating expense ratio, passenger miles per revenue hour, and passenger miles per platform mile.

3. Metro and prospective partner(s) will meet to discuss service or speed and reliability project alternatives, costs and potential implementation timeline. Such meeting(s) will proceed until Metro and prospective partner reach mutual agreement on the service that would be added under the terms of a Service Partnership Agreement.
4. Prospective partner(s) will submit final proposal and signed Service Partnership Agreement.
5. Within 45 calendar days, Metro will submit a proposed ordinance to the King County Council requesting authorization of the Service Partnership Agreement.
6. Service will be implemented per the terms of the approved agreement and per K.C.C. 28.94.020.

The following dates represent deadlines by which King County Council authorization of agreement must be complete in order to implement service by the next scheduled Metro service shakeup:

- | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| ○ January 31 st | June service shakeup |
| ○ April 30 th | September service shakeup |
| ○ August 31 st | February service shakeup |

Minimum Eligibility Requirements for Service Partnership Program Agreements King County Ordinance 2006-0285, Attachment A

Reviewers: The requirements listed on this page are set by Transit Now's enabling legislation (Ordinance 2006-0285; <http://www.metrokc.gov/kcdot/transitnow/ordinance.pdf>) and vote authorizing King County Proposition 2 in November 2006. They are shown here for your reference as you review the draft prioritization criteria on the next pages.

Requirements for All Service Partnership Agreements

- Proposed new partnership hours fit within the calendar year limit of half of total new service hours funded by Transit Now.
- Proposed service is public transportation available to the general public.
- Proposed service will operate primarily on local streets and arterials, not primarily on state or interstate highways where traffic operations are not managed by the local jurisdiction.

Requirements for Direct Financial Partnerships

- If proposal is to add hours to an existing route(s), partner will contribute at least \$100,000 per year for a minimum of five years (in 2007 dollars).
- If proposal is to establish a new route(s), partner will contribute at least \$200,000 per year for a minimum of five years (in 2007 dollars).

Requirements for Speed and Reliability Partnerships

- Capital improvements or traffic operations changes will be made along a RapidRide or core service connection corridor.
- The changes are projected by Metro to result in transit speed improvements of 10 percent or more on EACH affected core route for 12 core hours of weekday operation. The speed improvements are projected to be met in both directions and during six-hour weekday a.m. and p.m. peak as well as six-hour midday.

Next Step: If "Yes" to all applicable requirements above, project is eligible. Metro staff would then review the project using the proposed priority criteria on the next page. If "No" to any applicable requirement, staff would contact partner to check understanding of proposal and/or discuss possible modifications. Metro will work with partners to define potential partnership services that best address the prioritization criteria.

Prioritization Criteria for Direct Service Partnership Proposals

Reviewers: Please consider both the content and order of the priorities proposed below. These priorities are guided by Transit Now, which directs Metro to propose criteria for adoption.

All references to the "Six Year Plan" mean Metro's 2002-2007 Six Year Transit Development Plan or its successor plans. Please see http://www.metrokc.gov/kcdot/tp/transit/sixyearplan/section_4.pdf

Direct Financial Partnerships Priorities – in Priority Order

1. Improves access to, from or between designated Urban and Manufacturing Centers as defined in Countywide Planning Policies LU-40 and LU-52. (See Section D. 1 of <http://www.metrokc.gov/ddes/compplan/PPP-current.pdf>)
2. Improves service on the network of core service connections as defined in the Six-Year Plan, Service Strategy S-3.
3. Improves access and circulation within designated Urban and Manufacturing Centers as defined in Countywide Planning Policies LU-40 and LU-52. (See Section D. 1 of <http://www.metrokc.gov/ddes/compplan/PPP-current.pdf>) and as outlined in the Six Year Plan, Service Strategy S-13.
4. Improves other services that support the goals and objectives of the Six Year Plan.
5. Partnership agreement commits to continue the partnership for more than five years.
6. Partner agrees to fund more than the minimum one-third share of the fully allocated service cost.
7. Partnership agreement commits to implementation of additional actions that are likely to increase ridership on the new services, such as:
 - ___ Conducting promotional activities
 - ___ Providing incentives to employers and riders
 - ___ Implementing parking management (preferential HOV parking/pricing)
 - ___ Taking other policy actions that support the new service
 - ___ Taking other actions _____
8. Projected ridership gain in annual boardings over the term of the agreement.

Public Agencies Only: Direct financial partnership for a circulator or ride-free area

1. Project enhances transit circulation within a designated urban center or adjacent activity areas, providing frequent connections between a transit center and major destinations within the urban center.

(This page is applicable to cities and was not sent to private organizations.)

Prioritization Criteria for Speed & Reliability Partnership Proposals

Reviewers: Please consider both the content and order of the priorities proposed below. These priorities are guided by Transit Now, which directs Metro to propose further detail for adoption.

Speed and Reliability Partnership Priorities – in Priority Order

1. Partner's capital investment or traffic operations change will create a transit speed and reliability benefit along a continuous RapidRide corridor.

2. Improvements can be completed within five years.

3. Partnership agreement commits to additional traffic operations management actions that achieve transit priority in excess of the required projected 10% travel time savings.

4. Partnership agreement commits to provision of the following complementary actions:
 - ___ Implementing innovative transit signal phases and timing
 - ___ Providing the infrastructure, preferably fiber, required to support communication between transit signal priority equipment in the field and from the field back to the applicable agency and to Metro
 - ___ Adding curb space for transit terminal/layover
 - ___ Taking parking management actions that reduce parking supply and/or increase its cost
 - ___ Implementing pass subsidy and promotional programs that achieve higher ridership
 - ___ Taking other complementary actions _____

Saluta First Name	Last Name	Title	Company	City	
Ms	Kate	Joncas	President	Downtown Seattle Transportation Alliance	Seattle
Ms	Shelley	DaRonche	Transportation Manager	Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center	Seattle
Ms	Belinda	Green	Trans. Consultant/ETC	PEMCO Mutual Ins Co	Seattle
Ms	Patty	Vandenburgh	Administrative Services Mgr	Zymogenetics	Seattle
Ms	Lyn	Tangen	Director of Gov't & Community Relations	Vulcan Inc	Seattle
Mr	Dan	McGrady	Gov't Affairs Manager	Vulcan Inc	Seattle
Mr	Mike	Meany	Parking & Commuter Services Mgr.	Virginia Mason Medical Center	Seattle
Ms	Karen Lee	Kimber	Manager, Parking & Commuting	Swedish Hosp. Medical Ctr	Seattle
Mr	Mike	Sletten	Dir. of Security	Seattle University	Seattle
Ms	Linda	Johnson	Parking & Commuter Services Mgr.	Harborview Medical Center	Seattle
Mr	Peter	Dewey	Asst Dir. of Transportation Services	University of Washington	Seattle
Mr	Brady	Clark	Sr Trans. Analyst, Transportation Services	Safeco Ins. Co.	Seattle
Mr	Allen	Spence	CFO, Business & Finance	Seattle Community Colleges	Seattle
Ms	Dora	Allie	Facilities Service Coordinator	Pacific Medical Center	Seattle
Mr	John	Schoettler	Global Property Manager	Amazon	Seattle
Ms	Norma	Miller	Director, Corp. Facilities	Starbucks	Seattle
Ms	Cathy	Garrison	Transportation/Commute Mgr, Facilities	Starbucks	Seattle
Ms	Stephanie	Frans	Comm. Affairs & Gov't Affairs	Children's Hosp. & Reg'l Medical Center	Seattle
Ms	Desiree	Leigh	Comm. Affairs & Gov't Affairs	Children's Hosp. & Reg'l Medical Center	Seattle
Mr	Robert	Werdell	ETC	Northwest Hospital	Seattle
Mr	Shawn	Rossiter	Facilities Mgr	Northwest Hospital	Seattle
Mr	John	Hendricks	Commuting, Parking, Mail Services Mgr.	The Boeing Company	Seattle
Ms	Debra	Hansen	VP, Business Services	Weyerhaeuser Company	Federal Way
Mr	Jim	Stanton	Comm. Affairs Mgr.	Microsoft Company	Redmond
Mr	Jeff	Aumell	Transportation Manager	Microsoft Company	Redmond

Mailing List, Transit Now Service Partnership Criteria Review, Public Agencies

Honorable	First Name	Last Name	Saturation	Title	Organization Name	City	Rep	Alt
The Honorable	Loe	Scholz	Mayor	Mayor, City of Algona	Algona	Algona	Yes	
The Honorable	Peter B.	Lewis	Mayor	Mayor, City of Auburn	Auburn	Auburn	Yes	
The Honorable	Roger	Thordarson	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Auburn	Auburn	Auburn	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Claudia	Balducci	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Bellevue	Bellevue	Bellevue	Yes	
The Honorable	John	Chelminiak	Deputy Mayor	Deputy Mayor, City of Bellevue	Bellevue	Bellevue	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Conrad	Lee	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Bellevue	Bellevue	Bellevue	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Phil	Noble	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Bellevue	Bellevue	Bellevue	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Howard	Botts	Mayor	Mayor, City of Black Diamond	Black Diamond	Black Diamond	Yes	
	Jason	Paulsen	Mr.	City Administrator, City of Black Diamond	Black Diamond	Black Diamond	Yes	
The Honorable	Patrick	Ewing	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Bothell	Bothell	Bothell	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Joshua	Freed	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Bothell	Bothell	Bothell	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Sandy	Gunn	Deputy Mayor	Deputy Mayor, City of Bothell	Bothell	Bothell	Yes	
The Honorable	Andrea	Perry	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Bothell	Bothell	Bothell	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Tim	Tobin	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Bothell	Bothell	Bothell	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Sue	Blazak	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Burien	Burien	Burien	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Jack	Block, Jr.	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Burien	Burien	Burien	Yes	Yes
	Stephen	Clark	Mr.	Public Works Director, City of Burien	Burien	Burien	Yes	
The Honorable	Margaret	Harto	Mayor	Mayor, City of Covington	Covington	Covington	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Bud	Sizemore	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Covington	Covington	Covington	Yes	Yes
	Grant	Fredricks, P.E.	Mr.	Public Works Director, City of Des Moines	Des Moines	Des Moines	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Dave	Kaplan	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Des Moines	Des Moines	Des Moines	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Gerard	Cattin	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Duvall	Duvall	Duvall	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Peggy	Pritchard-Olson	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Edmonds	Edmonds	Edmonds	Yes	Yes
	Chris	Searcy	Mr.	Public Works Director, City of Enumclaw	Enumclaw	Enumclaw	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	John	Wise	Mayor	Mayor, City of Enumclaw	Enumclaw	Enumclaw	Yes	Yes
	John	Paylor	Mr.	Chairman Elect, Eastside Transportation	ETA	Bellevue	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Kathleen	Huckabay	Councilmember	Chairperson, Eastside Transportation	ETC	Kirkland	Yes	Yes
	Scott	Hamilton	Mr.	Eastside Transportation Choices	ETC	Seattle	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Jeanne	Burbidge	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Federal Way	Federal Way	Federal Way	Yes	Yes
	Cary	Roe	Mr.	Public Works Director, City of Federal Way	Federal Way	Federal Way	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Eileen	Barber	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Issaquah	Issaquah	Issaquah	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Ava	Frisinger	Mayor	Mayor, City of Issaquah	Issaquah	Issaquah	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Maureen	McCarthy	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Issaquah	Issaquah	Issaquah	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	David	Baker	Deputy Mayor	Deputy Mayor, City of Kenmore	Kenmore	Kenmore	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Randy	Eastwood	Mayor	Mayor, City of Kenmore	Kenmore	Kenmore	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Bob	Hensel	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Kenmore	Kenmore	Kenmore	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Laurie	Sperry	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Kenmore	Kenmore	Kenmore	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Allan	Van Ness	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Kent	Kent	Kent	Yes	Yes
	Larry	Blanchard	Mr.	Public Works Director, City of Kent	Kent	Kent	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Suzette	Cooke	Mayor	Mayor, City of Kent	Kent	Kent	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Dave	Asher	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Kirkland	Kirkland	Kirkland	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Mary-Alyce	Burleigh	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Kirkland	Kirkland	Kirkland	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Tom	Hodgson	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Kirkland	Kirkland	Kirkland	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Don	Fiene	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Lake Forest Park	Lake Forest Park	Lake Forest Park	Yes	Yes
	Neil	Jensen, P.E.	Mr.	Public Works Director, City of Lake Forest Park	Lake Forest Park	Lake Forest Park	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Ed	Stern	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Lake Forest Park	Lake Forest Park	Lake Forest Park	Yes	Yes
	Nick	Afzali	Mr.	Director, Dept. of Public Works	Maple Valley	Maple Valley	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Noel	Gerken	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Maple Valley	Maple Valley	Maple Valley	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Bryan	Cairns	Mayor	Mayor, City of Mercer Island	Mercer Island	Mercer Island	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Sven	Goldmanis	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Mercer Island	Mercer Island	Mercer Island	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Steve	Lizow	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Mercer Island	Mercer Island	Mercer Island	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Jim	Pearman	Deputy Mayor	Deputy Mayor, City of Mercer Island	Mercer Island	Mercer Island	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Katrina	Asay	Mayor	Mayor, City of Milton	Milton	Milton	Yes	Yes
The Honorable	Margaret	Drotz	Councilmember	Councilmember, City of Milton	Milton	Milton	Yes	Yes

MAR.13.2007 4:19PM CITY OF SEATTLE

NO. 948 P.2

*Seattle Department of Transportation*

Gregory J. Nickels, Mayor

Grace Crunican, Director

March 13, 2007

Victor Obeso, Manager, Service Development
Metro Transit Division
King County Metro Transit
201 South Jackson Street
Seattle, WA 98104-3856

Re: Proposed Criteria for Direct Service Partnership and Speed and Reliability Proposals

Dear Mr. Obeso: *Victor*

Thank you for soliciting comments on the proposed criteria to prioritize which partnerships to implement. We share your interest in moving more people through transit service and operational improvements. We understand that 1) the direct service partnership and speed and reliability proposals meeting the minimum eligibility requirements set forth by Transit Now are eligible for King County Council consideration 2) the proposed criteria is to be applied as a tool to further prioritize Transit Now Partnership Hours, and 3) when further prioritization is needed, not all proposals meeting the minimum eligibility requirements can be forwarded to the County Council for consideration.

The City's designation of Urban Village Transit Network (UVTN) corridors, high productivity routes, commitment to capital investments along transit corridors, and successful implementation of numerous transportation demand measures has demonstrated full alignment with Metro's service priorities, and positions the City to fully participate in the service partnership program.

The City of Seattle enthusiastically supported King County Metro's Transit Now initiative. The Mayor and the City Council put Bridging the Gap on the ballot and Seattle voters approved it. This levy's sizable investment and commitment to transit service enhancements and increased ridership through Bridging the Gap is without precedent in the region. The measure provides \$1.5 million dollars annually, for nine years, to leverage Metro's service resources and increase overall transit service and ridership in the City of Seattle. Bridging the Gap also dedicated \$2.2 million dollars a year to transit speed and reliability improvements, to be further leveraged through integration with the larger Bridging the Gap program.

City staff understands and appreciates Metro's desire to develop additional criteria beyond the explicit provisions included in Attachment A of Ordinance 15582. However, the City's pledge to spend \$1.5 million dollars per year during 9 years on a direct financial partnership, and \$2.2 million per annum over the same period on speed and reliability improvements cannot be compared directly to incremental investments by other parties.



Traffic Permits, 700 5th Avenue, Suite 3768, PO Box 34996, Seattle, WA 98124-4996

Tel: (206) 684-5086, TTY/TDD (206) 684-4009, FAX: (206) 684-5085

Internet address: <http://www.seattle.gov/transportation>

An equal opportunity employer. Accommodations for people with disabilities provided on request.

1

MAR.13.2007 4:19PM CITY OF SEATTLE

NO. 948 P.3

We will continue to work toward developing a partnership agreement that satisfies the goals and objectives of both agencies and allocate resources efficiently to further expand and improve bus service in the City.

Specific criteria comments are attached. If you have questions regarding the detailed comments, please contact Cristina Van Valkenburgh at 684-0814 or via e-mail at Cristina.VanValkenburgh@seattle.gov , or Barry Hennelly at 615-1440 or via e-mail at Barry.Hennelly@seattle.gov .

Sincerely,



Susan Sánchez, Director
Policy and Planning Division

Attachment

cc Grace Crunician

Attachment

SDOT's Comments on Criteria for the Transit Now Service Partnership Program

Direct Service Partnership

Staff has reviewed the prioritization criteria for direct service partnerships and has the following comments:

- Page 5 states that criteria should be considered both in content and order of priority proposed. Based on this statement, it is our understanding that the criteria are weighted with criterion #1 having the highest weight. A statement to this effect could be added for clarification.
- The Transit Now Ordinance (Ordinance #15582) highlights the need for additional funds to allow Metro to add the necessary services to keep up with "significantly increasing ridership demand caused by growth in population and employment." The ordinance authorizes King County Metro Transit to enter into service partnerships with public entities in order to increase transit ridership. Nonetheless, the proposed criteria lists projected ridership gains last (criterion #8). We believe that ridership gains should be given higher consideration by Metro when prioritizing direct financial partnerships.
- Criterion #4 relates to the provision of "improvements to other services that support the goals and objectives of the Six Year Plan." It would be helpful to have a short list of the types of service improvements Metro considers as being supportive of the Six Year Plan in the context of the Direct Financial Partnerships.

Speed & Reliability Partnership

Staff has reviewed the prioritization criteria for speed and reliability partnerships and has the following comments:

- Pg.6, No.3 sets forth: *"Partnership agreement commits to additional traffic operations management actions that achieve transit priority in excess of the required projected 10% travel time savings."*

Before entering into any agreements with the County, the City of Seattle would need to know that the full depth and breadth of corridor modifications were being weighed as well. The City is planning to make substantial investments to meet the 10% threshold. If there are to be requirements beyond that threshold, such as a modified threshold, that new measure will need to be expressed more clearly, and applied uniformly.

- Pg.6, No.4 sets forth *"Partnership agreement commits to provision of the following complementary actions:*

___ *Implementing innovative transit signal phases and timing.*

___ *Providing the infrastructure, preferably fiber, required to support communication between transit signal priority equipment in the field and from the field back to the applicable agency and to Metro*

___ *Adding curb space for transit terminal/layover"*

The additional criteria mentioned above are a very liberal interpretation of what were referred to as complimentary actions in Attachment "A" of King County Ordinance 2006-0285. Before entering into an agreement, the City of Seattle needs to know that it is being held to the same standards of participation as neighboring jurisdictions. Specifically, it is important to fully consider that the beneficial modifications carried out within the City of Seattle, would have benefits to the regional transit network as well. Further, it is incumbent upon King County Metro to more clearly identify and define its desires related to the above mentioned "complementary actions".

-----Original Message-----

From: Terry Marpert [mailto:TMARPERT@redmond.gov]

Sent: Tuesday, March 13, 2007 5:23 PM

To: Hansen, Matt

Subject: City of Redmond comments: Draft Transit Now service partnership criteria

Matt,

The City of Redmond has the following comments on the service partnership criteria attached to Victor Obeso's letter of February 8, 2007:

1. It is unclear whether the 10% travel time savings is 10% of the travel time along the portion of the route in a jurisdiction vs. 10% of the travel time along the whole route.
2. What are the implications for the 40/40/20 split in the time period immediately following the 5 years (minimum) of service partnerships?
3. If the monitoring and evaluation indicators indicate that the (new) service is performing at or above the subarea average prior to the end of 5 years, ought there not to be a provision to have those routes moved to the top of the list when adding new service?

Please contact me if you have questions or would like to discuss these comments.
Thanks.

Terence (Terry) C. Marpert, AICP
Principal Planner
City of Redmond, Washington
(425) 556-2428



Ava Frisinger, Mayor
PO Box 1307, Issaquah, WA 98027
(425) 837-3020 FAX (425) 837-3029
mayor@ci.issaquah.wa.us

March 20, 2007

Mr. Matt Hansen, Supervisor
Market Development
King County Metro Transit
400 Yesler Way #0600
Seattle, WA 98104-2165
Email: matt.hansen@metrokc.gov

RE: Response Comments of Draft of Transit Now Service Partnership Criteria

Dear Mr. Hansen:

The City of Issaquah is pleased to provide its comments regarding the draft Transit Now Service Partnership Criteria that was provided to us in a letter from Victor Obeso, Manager, Service Development, dated February 8, 2007. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to add our comments.

Direct Financial Partnership

The prioritization criteria for the District Service Partnership Proposal that were provided require improvement of access to, from or between designated Urban and Manufacturing Centers as defined in Countywide Planning Policies LU-40 and LU-52. Although the City of Issaquah is not an Urban Center, it has two towncenter subareas that are densely populated areas with commercial land uses, which substantively function much like urban centers. In addition, the downtown Issaquah area should be considered under partnership criteria. Furthermore, cities that front along Interstate freeways should be considered due to the volume of through traffic accessing the freeways. We would, therefore, like to see these criteria modified to either remove the reference to the Urban and Manufacturing Centers or also allow towncenter subareas that are a mixture of densely populated residential areas and commercial land uses, areas that connect to Interstate Freeways, and the downtown centers of cities to be included.

Public Agencies Criterion Only: Direct financial partnership for a circulator or ride-free area

The proposed refers to a designated urban center or adjacent activity areas and providing frequent connections between a transit center and major designations within the urban center. For the same reasons above, we request that either Urban Center be removed or the criterion modified to allow towncenter subareas that are a mixture of densely populated residential areas and commercial land uses, areas that connect to Interstate Freeways and the downtown center of cities be included.

Speed and Reliability Partnerships with Local Jurisdiction

The second priority listed refers to improvements that can be completed within five years. The City of Issaquah currently is constructing and completing a new Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) that will qualify by reducing travel time by 10%. We request that the criteria be modified to allow improvements that can be completed anytime from when Transit Now was passed until five years out.

The third priority requires that the improvements achieve transit priority in excess of the required projected 10% travel times savings. The City would like to request that transit priority systems not be the only approved method of receiving the travel times savings. We would ask this to read either through transit priority systems or through other Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) that provide a travel time savings through coordination of traffic signals. In addition, instead of requiring a 10% savings, we would request that this be changed to a goal of providing a 10% savings based on valuations of viable ITS projects that will help reduce travel time on existing roadway facilities.

Again, we appreciate the opportunity to comment on the prioritization criteria, and your consideration of our recommendations. If you would like to speak with us regarding our letter, please feel free to contact Gary Costa, Transportation Manager, at 425-837-3443.

Sincerely,



Ava Frisinger
Mayor

AF:GC:cs

cc: Bob Brock, Director of Public Works Engineering
Sheldon Lynne, Deputy Director of Public Works Engineering
Gary Costa, Transportation Manager



March 12, 2007

Mr. Matt Hansen
King County Metro, Transit Division
201 South Jackson Street
Seattle, WA 98104-3856

Dear Mr. Hansen,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed criteria for Transit Now Service Partnerships. All in all, I felt that the proposed criteria are understandable and reasonable. I would like to comment on some aspects of the criteria that may affect major institutions such as Children's.

Children's Hospital is in a unique situation relative to geography and transit access, and this influences our perspective on the proposed criteria. Children's is a major regional health care and employment center. We are located near the University District urban center, and directly on an important corridor to the Northgate Urban Center. However, we are neither within a designated urban center, nor are we quite large enough (such as Microsoft or UW) to be a self-supporting urban center.

Since location relative to an urban center affects the level of transit service; transit does not operate similar levels of service outside urban centers. In our case, this contributes to the underlying need to enter into a partnership in the first place. It would be concerning- and ironic- if the underlying need for a partnership worked against a proposal's successful approval. While I understand the importance of urban centers, I am concerned that the strong emphasis placed on this criterion may disadvantage major institutions that are geographically outside urban centers.

Again, I appreciate the opportunity to review these criteria and share our perspective. We look forward to working with Metro on this and future endeavors.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Frans
Manager, Transportation Services

From: Norma Miller [mailto:NMiller@starbucks.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 15, 2007 8:08 PM
To: Hansen, Matt
Cc: Cathy Garrison
Subject: Transit Now criteria

Hi Matt:

I appreciate your outreach to Starbucks asking for review of the "Draft of **Transit Now** Service Partnership Criteria". We can support the criteria you outlined for Direct Financial Partnerships, and the monitoring of the performance. Your process appears fair (and quick!). We are most interested in the ability to increase in service hours and frequency, and improvements of transit access to, into, through and between urban and manufacturing centers.

We expressed our interest in the partnership program when we completed the "Transit Now Partnership Criteria Questionnaire" in December 2006. We identified a number of transit improvement and partnership program ideas that meet the current Direct Financial Partnership Criteria. At that time we prioritized "the addition of service to a designated urban, manufacturing or industrial center" as the #1 service partnership criteria. We indicated several types of investments needed in the SODO, Duwamish and the south downtown area, with a few included here:

- Extension of Free Ride zone from 1st Avenue to S. to S. Lander Street would increase ridership to SODO/Duwamish which is experiencing as a growth of employers, retail and other small businesses besides Starbucks AND increase ridership from SODO back into the city center/Pioneer Sq for transit connections, shopping, etc. Without an easy way to connect, SODO community employees do not see downtown as very accessible and head south instead.
- Explore and develop innovative circulator services using smaller buses to serve areas in the urban and manufacturing centers that have an increasing employment base. Smaller buses can encourage more use of transit as the area grows and can provide vital connector services to existing transit routes and reduce drive alone commute trips. Frequency and consistency is what we hear from our partners who are not transit users.
- Increase service frequency on 1st Avenue during peak commute times.

I am attaching the attached Questionnaire completed last December for more details and we look to future discussions about partnership opportunities. Please note that our corporate offices are at 2401 Utah Ave South, Seattle, WA 98134. The address on your letter to us was 2401 South Dakota Street.

Thank You.

Sincerely,

Norma Miller
Director, Corporate Facilities
Starbucks Corporation

Transit Now Partnership Criteria Questionnaire – December 2006
*Please type your answers into this document and return it via email by December 20th to
matt.hansen@metrokc.gov*

Your name and position: Cathy Garrison ; Transportation Options Program Manager
Your organization & department: Starbucks , Facilities, Transportation Options Program
Email address and phone cgarriso@starbucks.com; 206-318-7408

Financial Partnerships for Transit Service

If your organization is considering participating in a financial partnership for transit service, please answer the following questions. (See <http://www.metrokc.gov/kcdot/transitnow/ordinance.pdf>)

- 1. If there is greater demand for service partnerships than there are service hours available in any given year, which criteria are most important to prioritize proposals? Please rank the following, with 1 being most important:**

2 The projected number of riders that would be carried on the new service (the more riders, the higher the priority).

3 The total partner dollars and number of years - minimum 5 - the prospective partner(s) is/are willing to commit (the more money and/or longer the term of commitment, the higher priority).

1 The addition of service to a designated urban, manufacturing or industrial center.

- 2. What additional measures would be reasonable to expect of partners and of Metro to help make service investments most successful? Additional measures might include incentives, parking management, trip-reduction strategies, and/or policy changes.**

- Examples of possible investments: 1. community circulators to provide frequent service and connections from industrial or less dense areas that have less transit to train/light rail, ferry or buses; 2. extension of service of multi-county buses south of downtown; 3. east-west transit in areas with minimal transit (i.e. south of 1st S. & Spokane, east-west from Holgate, Airport Way to 1st S. 4. custom bus employer-specific partnership program.
- Technology and Tools: Making it easier to move around by transit once at work with technology aids like bus time, smart trips, et. al. at bus stops, kiosks, cellular devices and computers; improve ease of using transit for short business trips and errands so workers leave cars at home; new incentives to use transit in urban areas, such as subsidies, reduced fares.
- Policy changes: 1. vanshares & vanpools used as circulator services; 2. change vanshare policy to extend 20-mile round-trip limit to access more transit and parking; 3. business use of vans to hire drivers (meet Metro requirements) to provide circulator services; 4. City of Seattle can create more carpool parking and park & rides in industrial areas to increase worker access to transit; 5. improve pedestrian safety at bus stops, e.g. lights, shelters, benches. 6. business use of vans for personal errands and allow children to ride in vans.
- Multiple Use of Funds to Expand CTR: CMAQ \$ with other public, private and Metro funds can leverage additional partnerships to improve employer CTR performance in areas with limited transit and to reduce SOV's. (Example: more service and frequency on Route 132 and service on 1st & 4th S. to light rail; augment transit for construction mitigation.
- Orca SMART Card: Implement soon!. Use \$ savings from fare regionalization to fund more public-private partnerships, such as more service.
- Transit Service: extend service hours in key employment centers as needed; Free Ride Zone from downtown to 1st and Lander; and extend multi-county service beyond downtown.

3. **The minimum requirement of financial partners is a five-year commitment of resources at \$100,000 per year to add service to an existing bus route or \$200,000 per year to create a new bus route. If your organization were to participate in a transit service partnership, what would be your organization's expectation after five years?**

- Reduce complexity to use three-County transit system and use new technologies to charge users and/or businesses that ride transit to be billed to worksite or home.
- Service sustainment.
- Make permanent new, enhanced and/or innovative services that are/is successful under the program.
- Restructure services to balance service between City and County. Continue smaller buses that add more service coverage to underserved areas.
- Expect more CTR program incentives.
- Policy and funding changes enacted to reduce long-term private sector contribution and spread costs throughout regional transit system.
- Regionalization of three county transit systems to improve efficiency of Smart Card and deploy resource savings for more transit and capitol investment to improve regional transportation and plans.
- Innovative services funded by setting up new tools to customize fund sources to improve transit service and efficiency and reduce funding complexity.
- Continue FREE RIDE zone at 1st and Lander

4. **If your organization is considering a financial partnership for transit service that crosses jurisdiction boundaries, how would you propose to work with neighboring jurisdictions to potentially share the cost of the service additions?**

We expect Metro to service these particular partnerships; we don't have capacity or expertise in this area. Expect improved technology to eliminate jurisdictional fare barriers .

5. **In a few sentences, please let us know what would be your organization's primary objective in participating in a transit service partnership.**

- To get our employees to/from work and reduce SOVs to work
- Better and more frequent access to/from rail/train/ferry to Duwamish; more frequent and reliable service.
- More pooling of financial resources from a network of businesses and public agencies and . partnership costs can reduce Starbucks shuttle and parking costs.
- Starbucks and TMA get a seat at the table to give input into partnership program from employer perspective.
- Provide innovative service solutions such as community shuttle, circulator services and extension of Free Ride Zone to 1st and Lander and more tools for employers.
- Benchmark what other cities are doing with transit service and innovations and develop similar programs.

6. **What additional information or criteria would be important to you to make a decision about participating in a transit service partnership?**

- Find out others who are interested to form partnerships, both public and private.
- Work with TMA to apply directly for grants to develop innovative services
- Partnership should provide resources for custom buses from suburban areas that have limited transit and substitute custom buses with high concentrations of vanpools; implement more technology tools for employers to easily access area-wide ridematching at worksites or within network group areas.
- Improvements to pedestrian infrastructure to access transit and improve safety
- Availability of matching funds outside of Transit Now partnerships
- Types of innovations Transit Now funds can/will fund before entering into partnerships
- What will be program design and credible use of Transit Now funds.

Thank you for helping us develop criteria for Transit Now service partnerships. Please email your responses by December 20th to matt.hansen@metrokc.gov.

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

March 13, 2007

Victor Obeso, Manager, Metro Service Development
201 South Jackson
KSC-TR-0426
Seattle, WA, 98104

Dear Mr. Obeso,

Thank you for attending the Transit Advisory Committee meeting of February 13 and discussing the Transit Now Partnership Criteria with us. In response to your presentation, we provide the following comments on the document.

Overall comments

Reading as laypersons, Transit Advisory Committee members felt that the document did not "flow" logically from point to point. To improve this aspect of the document, the TAC suggests providing examples or scenarios that illustrate the process in everyday terms and including these in each section (i.e., "Direct Financial Partnerships," "Speed and Reliability Partnerships with Local Jurisdictions," and so forth).

Direct Financial Partnerships (Page 1)

- During your presentation to the TAC, you explained that Metro will ramp up capacity (i.e., buses, drivers and infrastructure) over the next few years. The Transit Now Review Criteria does not speak to this capacity ramp-up period. How much capacity will be available each year, when will it be available, and how would this effect applications for partnership opportunities (i.e., would a smaller jurisdiction be advised to apply for a partnership later rather than sooner)?
- Are fare revenues factored into direct financial partnerships? The document does not address the role of fare revenues. The TAC recommends that fare revenues be credited 2:1 (the same as the contribution).
- The document does not clearly explain the role of capital improvements. Does the partner pay only for service, only for capital improvements, or both? The TAC recommends that the language be clarified.
- The document does not clearly explain the status of the partnership agreement after five years. If a new route is successful, will Metro eventually take over funding and operation? Or will the operation of such a route always be dependent upon re-negotiation of the partnership agreement? Again, the TAC recommends that the language be clarified, or a supporting example/scenario be included in the document.

Speed and Reliability Partnerships with Local Jurisdictions (Page 2)

- TAC members note that the document defines "speed" improvement criteria, but does not mention "reliability" improvement criteria. The TAC recommends that Metro develop criteria specifically for reliability improvements and include these in the document.
- Proposals in this category will require research. The TAC recommends that any costs to develop the proposal should be borne by the partner, and not by Metro.

- The TAC recommends that the timeline for submitting proposals be clarified. “First come, first served” is not an adequate screening criterion for investments in infrastructure.

Direct Financial Partnership Priorities (Page 5)

- The TAC recommends that “improvements in ridership” (Priority 8) be moved higher on the list, between #2 and #3.
- As a sub-heading under Priority #7, the TAC recommends “service to under-served, low-income communities” be added.
- As a sub-heading under Priority #7, the TAC recommends that “land use changes to increase ridership” be added.
- Priority #6, identifying partners that would like to contribute additional funding, should be moved higher on the list, perhaps between #3 and #4.

Speed and Reliability Priorities (Page 6)

- Priority #2 says that the project must be completed within five years. The TAC recommends the addition of language that gives higher priority to projects that can be completed BEFORE five years, with priority given to those with the shortest implementation time.
- Priority #3 should be moved higher on the list, between #1 and #2.
- Include a new item between #2 and #3, “Increases the volume of buses.”
- As a subheading under #4, TAC recommends the addition of “increases service to under-served low-income communities”
- As a sub-heading under #4, TAC recommends the addition of “land use code changes to increase ridership.”

Once again, the TAC thanks you for your presentation and for the opportunity to provide input to Metro staff on this important document.

Sincerely,

Hans Brandal, Chair
King County Transit Advisory Committee



March 13, 2007

Mr. Matt Hansen
Supervisor, Market Development
King County Metro
400 Yesler Way YES-TR-0600
Seattle, Washington 98104-2165

RE: Comments on Review Draft of *Transit Now* Service Partnership Criteria

Dear Mr. Hansen:

The Puget Sound Regional Council appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Review Draft of the Criteria for *Transit Now* Service Partnership Program, February 5, 2007, version. The criteria reflect the appropriate areas and PSRC is supportive of the program.

If you have questions about our comments, please contact me at (206) 587-5670 or via email at jryan@psrc.org.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Ryan
Principal Planner

cc: Bob Drewel, Executive Director, Puget Sound Regional Council
Norman Abbott, Director, Growth Management Planning
Charlie Howard, Director, Transportation Planning



Washington State Transportation Improvement Board

TIB Members

Commissioner Leo Bowman
Chair, Benton County

Councilmember Jeanne Burbridge
Vice Chair, City of Federal Way

Mr. Todd Coleman, P.E.
Port of Vancouver

Ms. Kathleen Davis
WSDOT

Mr. Mark Freiberger, P.E.
City of Colville

Councilmember William Ganley
Chair, City of Battle Ground

Councilmember Calvin Goings
Pierce County

Ms. Paula Hammond, P.E.
WSDOT

Ms. Doreen Marchione
Hopelink

Councilmember Neil McClure
City of Yakima

Mr. Dick McKinley
City of Bellingham

Mr. Dave Nelson
Grant County

Commissioner Greg Patch
Whitman County

Ms. Robin Rettew
Office of Financial Management

Ms. Heidi Stamm
HS Public Affairs

Mr. Harold Taniguchi
King County Metro Transit

Mr. Steve Thomsen, P.E.
Snohomish County

Mr. Jay Weber
County Road Administration Board

Mr. Ralph Wessels, P.E.
Bicycle Alliance of Washington

Mr. Stevan Gorcester
Executive Director

P.O. Box 40901
Olympia, WA 98504-0901
Phone: 360-586-1140
Fax: 360-586-1165
www.tib.wa.gov

March 13, 2007

Mr. Matt Hansen, Supervisor
Market Development
Metro Transit Division
King County Department of Transportation
Matt.hansen@metrokc.gov

RE: Transit Now Service Partnership Criteria

Dear Mr. Hansen:

I am responding to your letter of February 8, 2007 under Mr. Obeso's signature requesting my review of the Draft Transit Now Service Partnership Criteria. I believe the Service Partnership concept provides a good solution to the long-standing problem of the many service requests from outside parties.

You have probably already considered a general concern I have that Metro may be faced with successful service, but lose the partnership support and be faced with a dilemma over continuing operation. You should have a plan for dealing with such a problem so that partners do not pull funding from successful routes, putting cost pressure and/or political pressure on Metro to continue service. At the end of the day, it's still Metro's name on the door and that is where the calls will go.

Criteria Comments, Direct Financial Partnerships

1. The concept of improved access to Centers is a good one, and we also use that criterion. I think there is some redundancy between your criteria 1 and 3 in practical application. Typically, if criterion 1 is met 3 will also be met and the criteria will always be awarded together. In this event, the two criteria will offer no differentiation when rating proposals. Similarly, you will need to be careful when applying the Public Agencies Only item, because it, too, overlaps with 1 and 3, so it needs to be recognizably different from service to the Center in general.

Investing in your local community

Mr. Matt Hansen
March 13, 2007
Page 2

2. Item 6 recognizes what we call overmatch and presents an issue that may drive unintended consequences. If many proposals are strong in the other criteria, overmatch will become a significant tiebreaker. The problem arises because this criterion favors wealthier partners. We try to compensate for this effect by applying a gradation to our base match levels depending upon assessed valuation of the agency.
3. Improving walkways to provide access to transit should be called out in the list under Item 7.

Criteria Comments, Speed & Reliability Partnership

1. You should consider applying some gradation to Item 1; otherwise all of the projects in the RapidRide corridors would bunch together.
2. Item 2 may not be useful because all applicants will say the improvements can be done within five years whether they can or not. This criterion might prove more useful if you apply it based on windows of expected completion, with earlier completion receiving a higher priority.

In general, I'm not clear on whether you intend to weight the criteria or how the scoring is done, using a numerical range or binary (yes or no) approach. Although you did not ask for my review of the scoring method, I am enclosing one of our criteria sets so you can see how scoring direction is given to our engineers. Scoring considerations are nested within each criterion with an indication of the appropriate range of points allowed. I recognize that you may not need such a detailed system, but we rank more than 500 projects per year.

I hope you find my comments useful in finalizing your selection process. Please contact me with any questions. Thank you.

Sincerely,



Stevan Gorcester
Executive Director

Enclosure

Sidewalk Program (SP)

Urban and Small City Subprograms

THRESHOLD REQUIREMENTS

Urban Subprogram

Eligible Agencies

- Incorporated cities with a population of 5,000
- Incorporated cities under 5,000 population located within a Federal Urban Area
- Counties with a federal urban area located in their boundaries

Minimum Width	5 feet with no obstructions
Must meet ADA-minimum guidelines	Yes
Surfacing	Hard, smooth surface
Accepted separation from traffic	Curb in most cases
Federally functional classified route	Yes
Minimum Local Match	20%

Small City Subprogram

Eligible Agencies	Incorporated cities and towns with population less than 5,000
Minimum Width	5 feet with no obstructions
Must meet ADA-minimum guidelines	Yes
Surfacing	Hard, smooth surface
Accepted Separation from traffic	Curb, swale or ditch
Eligible Routes	Serves TIB-Defined Arterial
Minimum Local Match	Cities under 500 - 0 percent Cities with 500 to 4,999 pop - 5 percent

Project Costs

Eligible

- Minor drainage necessitated by the sidewalk
- Retaining walls
- Pedestrian (mid-block) signal
- Pedestrian crossings (pavement flashers)
- Pedestrian overcrossing/undercrossing
- Landscaping & aesthetics (3% of total eligible cost)
- Minor pavement patching due to sawcutting

Ineligible

- Right-of-way acquisition
- Roadway widening
- Bicycle lane construction
- Intersection traffic signal

Sidewalk Program (SP)

Urban and Small City Subprograms

PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA

Maximum Points

PEDESTRIAN SAFETY

50

Existing Conditions (30 max)

Posted Speed

25	1
30	3
35	5
40	7
45	9
50 or greater	10

Visibility

Good to Poor 0 to 5

Existing Facility

Walk in Travel Lane 15 to 20

Walk on Shoulder

Condition (good to poor) 0 to 10

Width 0 to 5

Walk on Existing Sidewalk

Condition (good to poor) 0 to 10

Width 0 to 2

ADA Barriers 0 to 3

ADA Retrofit of System

Small City PSMP Program Only 0 to 15

Proposed Improvements (10 max)

Separation from edge of travel lane to edge of sidewalk 0 to 10

Sidewalk width greater than 5 foot minimum 0 to 3

Accident History (25 max)

Correctable Ped/Vehicle
10 per incident 10 to 20

Correctable Pedestrian only
5 per incident 5 to 15

Existing Hazards (15 max)

0 to 15

Sidewalk Program (SP)

Urban and Small City Subprograms

Maximum Points

PEDESTRIAN ACCESS

30

Direct Access (30 max)

Schools (5 pts per school)	0 to 15
Public Buildings (2 pts per bldg)	0 to 6
Central Business District	0 to 3
Medical Facilities	0 to 3
Senior Housing	0 to 3
High Density Housing	2
Activity Center	2
Transit Facilities	2

Improves Access (10 max)

Schools (2 pt per school)	0 to 6
Public Buildings (1 pt per bldg)	0 to 2
Central Business District	1
Medical Facilities	1
Senior Housing	1
High Density Housing	1
Activity Center	1
Transit Facilities	1
Childcare Facilities	1

Network Development (10 max)

Completes gap(s)	5 to 10
Extends existing sidewalk	0 to 5

LOCAL SUPPORT

20

Community Impact (5 max)

Effect of project on community	0 to 5
--------------------------------	--------

Local Match (15 max)

1 point for each 1% above minimum local match	0 to 15
---	---------

TOTALS

100

From: Hansen, Matt

Sent: Monday, December 11, 2006 2:09 PM

To: (sent to a specific individual at the following organizations:

Cities: Directors of PW, transportation or community development/planning at cities of Auburn, Tukwila, Renton, Federal Way, Bellevue, Redmond, Sammamish, Seattle, Shoreline.

Private organizations: Transportation representative from Downtown Seattle Transportation Alliance, Harborview, Seattle Univ, Virginia Mason, Swedish Hospital, Starbucks, South Lake Union Employers c/o Fred Hutchinson CRC, Vulcan, Children's Hospital, Northwest Hospital, Microsoft, Safeco)

Subject: Transit Now partnership input

Dear _____,

I am writing to ask for your input. Your organization expressed interest in the transit service partnership opportunities of Transit Now, which was approved by voters on November 7th. King County Metro staff will be developing an implementation plan for Transit Now, including a set of criteria to evaluate partnership proposals.

We'd like your initial thoughts on such criteria before we draft a plan for review by a wider audience, then transmit it to the County Council in the spring of 2007.

Attached is a short questionnaire about transit service partnerships to get some quick, informal feedback. We'd appreciate your responses by December 20th so that we can include them in our draft plan.

To answer the questions, you may want to refer to the Transit Now ordinance (<http://www.metrokc.gov/kcdot/transitnow/ordinance.pdf>), and to the attached .pdf listing the Core Service Connections in Metro's Six Year Plan.

The ordinance authorizes two types of partnerships and gives Metro some direction on how to implement those partnerships (see pages 3 to 6 in Attachment A of the ordinance).

The two types of partnerships are:

- Financial partnerships, in which partners make financial contributions for at least five years to add or increase transit service, and
- Speed and reliability partnerships, in which partners (generally cities) make improvements to traffic operations that will increase bus speeds by at least 10% on a "core service connection" corridor. In return, Metro would add 5,000 more annual bus service hours in that corridor.

If you have questions or would like to discuss your response, please contact me at 206-263-3598.



TNowCriteriaQ's-cit CoreService-6yrPla
y.doc (46 K... n.pdf (99 KB...

Thank you!

Matt Hansen, Supervisor

King County Metro Market Development Group

Transit Now Partnership Criteria Questionnaire – December 2006

Please type your answers into this document and return it via email by December 20th to
matt.hansen@metrokc.gov

Your name and position _____
Your organization & department _____
Email address and phone _____

Financial Partnerships for Transit Service

If your organization is considering participating in a financial partnership for transit service, please answer the following questions. (Reference: <http://www.metrokc.gov/kcdot/transitnow/ordinance.pdf>)

1. If there is greater demand for service partnerships than there are service hours available in any given year, which criteria are most important to prioritize proposals? Please rank the following, with 1 being most important:

 ___ The projected number of riders that would be carried on the new service (the more riders, the higher the priority).

 ___ The total partner dollars and number of years - minimum 5 - the prospective partner(s) is/are willing to commit (the more money and/or longer the term of commitment, the higher priority).

 ___ The addition of service to a designated urban, manufacturing or industrial center.

2. What additional measures would be reasonable to expect of partners and of Metro to help make service investments most successful? Additional measures might include incentives, parking management, trip-reduction strategies, and/or policy changes.

3. The minimum requirement of financial partners is a five-year commitment of resources at \$100,000 per year to add service to an existing bus route or \$200,000 per year to create a new bus route. If your organization were to participate in a transit service partnership, what would be your organization's expectation after five years?

4. If your organization is considering a financial partnership for transit service that crosses jurisdiction boundaries, how would you propose to work with neighboring jurisdictions to potentially share the cost of the service additions?

...continue...

(This page is applicable to cities and was not included for private organizations.)

Speed and Reliability Partnerships

If your city is considering participating in a speed and reliability partnership, please answer the following questions.

1. If your city were to pursue a speed and reliability partnership, what types of traffic operations changes or capital projects are potentially feasible for your transportation department to achieve a 10 percent improvement in bus speeds along a core bus route corridor?

2. If your city is considering improvements along a route that crosses jurisdiction boundaries, how would your city propose to work with neighboring jurisdictions to improve speeds along the entire core route, and in potentially sharing the service additions?

General Questions

- In a few sentences, please let us know what would be your organization's primary objective in participating in a transit service partnership.

- What additional information or criteria would be important to you to make a decision about participating in a transit service partnership?

Thank you for helping us develop criteria for Transit Now service partnerships. Please email your responses by December 20th to matt.hansen@metrokc.gov.

Organization	Email	Questionnaire Sent to	Contact Info	Other Contacts at This Org
City of Auburn	Dennis Dowdy, PW Director		253-931-3023 ddowdy@auburnwa.gov	Tiffin Goodman, Transportation Planner/Grants Manager, 253-804-4050. tgoodman@auburnwa.gov
City of Federal Way	Cary Roe, PW Director		253-835-2701 cary.roe@cityoffederalway.com	Rick Perez
City of Renton	Peter Hahn, Transportation Manager		phahn@ci.renton.wa.us	Nate Jones, njones@ci.renton.wa.us 425-430-2701, Jim Seitz
City of Tukwila	Jack Pace, Deputy Director, Comm. Dev.		206-431-3686, jpace@ci.tukwila.wa.us	
City of Bellevue	Bernard Van de Kamp		425-452-6459 bvandekamp@ci.bellevue.wa.us	
City of Redmond	Erika Vandenbrande		EVandenbrande@redmond.gov	
City of Sammamish	John Cunningham, PW Director		jcunningham@ci.sammamish.wa.us 425-836-7913	Ben Yazici, City Mgr, 801 228th Av SE, 98075
City of Seattle	Jeff Bender and Michael Mann, cc to Jemae Hoffman		206-684-8837 jeff.bender@seattle.gov	
City of Shoreline	Kirk McKinley, PW Dept.		206-546-3901 krmckinley@ci.shoreline.wa.us	Alicia Sherman, Aurora Corridor Planner, 206-546-2051, asherman@ci.shoreline.wa.us
Private Orgs				
Downtown Seattle Transportation Alliance	Kate Joncas		206-623-0340 katej@downtownseattle.org	
Equity Office	Pat Callahan (contacted via DSA)		206-262-5445	
Unico	Dale Sperling (contacted via DSA)		206-628-5050	
Harborview Hospital	Linda Johnson, Parking & Commuter Services Mgr.		206-731-4736 lmjohnson@u.washington.edu	Elise Chayet, Dir. of Planning & Regulatory Affairs 206-521-1656
Seattle University	Mike Sletten		206-296-5993 sletten@seattleu.edu	
Virginia Mason	Mike Meany, Parking & Commuter Services Manager		206-625-7385 michael.meany@vmmc.org	Tony Roberto, Director, Security & Logistics Services 206-625-7373 Ext. 63199
Swedish Hospital	Karen Lee Kimber, Parking & Commuter Mgr.		206-320-2465 karen.kimber@swedish.org	
Starbucks	Norma Miller		206-423-8470 nmiller@starbucks.com	Cathy Garrison, 206-318-7408
South Lake Union Employers	Fred Hutch: Shelley DaRonche		sdaronch@fhcrc.org	
Vulcan	Lyn Tangen		lynt@vulcan.com	Dan McGrady, dmcg@vulcan.com
Children's Hospital and Regional Medical Center	Desiree Leigh		desiree.leigh@seattlechildrens.org	Stephanie Frans, 206-987-1297 stephanie.frans@seattlechildrens.org
Northwest Hospital	Robert Werdell, ETC		206-368-6566, rwerdell@nwseas.org	
Microsoft	Shawn Rossiter, Facilities Manager		srossite@nwseas.org	
Safeco	Jim Stanton		425-707-5076	
	Brady Clark, Sr. Transportation Analyst		206-925-2560 bradcl@safeco.com	
	Transportation Services Ty Munger, Transportation Manager		tylmun@safeco.com	