Bus Network Goals and Objectives

Provide high quality mobility options that enable people to spend less time traveling (Metro Vision 2028)

• Target infrastructure and service investments towards those with the greatest mobility needs
• Invest in a world class bus system that is reliable, convenient, and attractive to more users for more trips
• Endorse travel speed, service frequency, and system reliability as the highest priority service design objectives for the NextGen Bus Study (Motion 38.1)
• Optimize system performance to maximize benefit to the public
How Can Metro Help Equitably Grow Transit Ridership?

FIND
How well do people understand how effectively transit can serve their needs? Is the system easy to understand & find?

TRY
How can we encourage people to try transit? Does transit go where & when they need it to? Is transit competitive with other options? Is the service attractive?

RELY
Once people have tried transit, how can we attract them to use it more often? Is service fast, frequent & reliable enough to retain riders & entice occasional/infrequent riders?
How is Metro Addressing Equity?

**Current Approach to Equity:**
> Title VI and Environmental Justice

**Moving Beyond Compliance:**
> Metro Equity Platform: The Four Pillars
  1. Define & Measure
  2. Listen & Learn
  3. Focus & Deliver
  4. Train & Grow
Metro’s Equity Platform in Action
NextGen Goes Beyond Title VI/EJ

Title VI/EJ protects against making opportunities worse for minority and/or low income groups.

Metro enhances Title VI/EJ in its Equity Platform by:
• Going above and beyond to improve service for communities with greatest mobility needs
• Inclusiveness beyond ethnicity and income

Folding the Equity Framework into NextGen
DEFINE & MEASURE
• Use Title VI/EJ and Performance Measures to ensure we are achieving our equity objectives

LISTEN & LEARN
• Use survey results to help define what improvements are wanted/needed
• Verify results through outreach and engagement

FOCUS & DELIVER
• NextGen service design concepts and network redesign based on transit propensity, service performance, service environment and public feedback

TRAIN & GROW
• Refresh Board adopted policies based on NextGen service design concepts

Defining Service Priorities
Community Meetings/EWG Meetings
Service Design Concepts
Transit Propensity Index Maps
Network Redesign
Transit Service Policies
Board Approval
Communities with greatest mobility needs

Title VI/EJ
Community Engagement Highlights

10 million + touchpoints in LA County

- Including nearly 7,000 residents through an online survey. Over 60% were people of color with a balance of genders, age groups, zip codes, & income levels equitably representing the diversity of LA County.
- Bus rider outreach: 300,000
- Digital engagement touchpoints: 9 million +
- Print advertising & collateral: 1.4 million +
- Community events & stakeholder briefings: 200 +
- Input received will help refine services changes
- Meetings & workshops were geographically balanced within Metro's service area, included a broad & diverse focus, & targeting hard to reach communities
Public Workshop Series

18+ public workshops, 950+ attendees & 1,650+ comments

- **Round 1**: 10 meetings organized by Service Council Area
- **Round 2**: 8 additional targeted stakeholder meetings (including 1 ADA-focused meeting)
- **1,650+ quality comments** related to the technical aspects of the system & personal needs/experiences
- **950+ residents** engaged in a dialogue between Metro staff and the system serves
- Utilized interactive & visually appealing workshop stations
- Received requests for additional presentations/workshops
- After meeting series, emailed all attendees who signed in workshop highlights and information on next steps of process
How is the public’s feedback incorporated into service design concepts?

Recurring themes from public outreach (examples):
- More frequency
- Reliability
- Accessibility
- Faster service
- Better connectivity
- Safety

Themes help guide service concepts:
- Hybrid stop spacing
- Shorter route lengths
- Microtransit/on-demand services
- Subarea transit hubs
- Muni coordination
- Standardized frequencies by service tiers
- Routing based on transit propensity and public feedback
- Transit supportive infrastructure
**Design Considerations**

**SFV Example**

**Sylmar/San Fernando Key Facts**
- **Trips:** 380,000 trips
- **Market Share:** 1.4% market share
- **Mileage:** 76% of trips under 2.5 miles
- **Travel time competitiveness:** 3.25-3.50

- 60% of trips occur within the area
- 27% of trips are to the Valley
- 1% of trips are to Downtown LA
- 3% of trips are to Sunland/La Crescenta

Percentages do not equal 100%. Additional trips dispersed throughout the County.
Design Considerations
SFV Example

**Sunland/La Crescenta Key Facts**

- **Trips:** 325,000 trips
- **Market Share:** 0.7% market share
- **Mileage:** 44% of trips under 2.5 miles
- **Travel time competitiveness:** 3.00-3.25

- 60% of trips occur within the area
- 2% of trips are to Sylmar/San Fernando
- 11% of trips are to the Valley
- 1% of trips are to Downtown LA
- 8% of trips are to Glendale
- 6% of trips are to Pasadena

*Percentages do not equal 100%. Additional trips dispersed throughout the County.*
Design Considerations
SFV Example

Existing Transit
- Line 90/91
- Line 92
- Line 94/794
- Line 222
- Line 224
- Line 901 (Orange Line)
- Red Line

Only 2-3% of trips travel between Sylmar and Sunland

Only one route connects to North Hollywood, every 12-21 min

No connection to North Hollywood Station

Only 1% of trips go all the way to Downtown
Design Considerations

SFV Example

Transit Concept
- Line 90/91
- Line 92
- Line 222
- Line 224
- Sylmar Shuttle 1
- Sylmar Shuttle 2
- Sylmar Shuttle 3
- Line 901 (Orange Line)
- Red Line

North Hollywood Station

- New circulators to address short-distance travel
- Increase frequency to every 10 minutes all day
- Fewer routes go Downtown, feed Red Line, frees up resources
- Direct connection to North Hollywood
Design Considerations
Gateway Cities/South Bay Example

Passengers Per Hour (PPH)
- < 15
- 15 – 30
- 30 – 45
- 45 – 60
- 60 – 75
- > 75

Marina Del Rey
Design Considerations
Gateway Cities/South Bay Example

Key Facts
Trips: 200,000 trips
Market Share: 1.0% market share
Mileage: 48% of trips under 2.5 miles
Travel time competitiveness: 2.00-2.25

40% of trips occur within the area
20% of trips are to Santa Monica/Mar Vista
15% of trips are to Westside
10% of trips are to Culver City
2% of trips are along Slauson corridor

Percentages do not equal 100%. Additional trips dispersed throughout the County.
Design Considerations
Gateway Cities/South Bay Example

For Discussion Purposes Only These scenarios are for illustrative purposes. Discussions still need to take place with local Municipal Bus Operators

- Extend Big Blue Bus Route 1 via Pacific into Marina del Rey
- Explore Mobility on Demand opportunities
- Enhance North/South corridors: Centinela, Sepulveda (consolidate frequency)
- End Slauson Ave service at Culver City Transit Center
- Extend and reorient Culver City Bus routes

Marina Del Rey
Design Considerations

Venice Blvd. Example

73% of trips are under 7.5 miles.
Corridor Optimization Example: Venice Blvd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Time (in minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metro Local (Existing)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ride</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metro Rapid (Existing)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ride</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEXTGEN Optimized (Hybrid)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ride</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEXTGEN w/ Transit Priority (Hybrid)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ride</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Represents a 7.5 mile trip
Schedule

- Market Research
- Existing Service Evaluation
- Service Concepts (Policy Choices)
- Service Design Guidelines
- Capital Infrastructure Needs
- Next Gen Service Plan Development
- Draft Service Plan

Working Group Meetings:
- 5/22
- 7/24
- 9/25
- 12/4
- Today
- TBD
- TBD
Implementation Schedule

- **2019**
  - Apr: Next Gen Service Plan Development
  - May: Draft Service Plan
  - Jun: Coordinate with Muni Operators
  - Jul: Board workshops
  - Aug: Public Outreach/Hearing Process 1
  - Sep: (Service changes)
  - Oct: Public Outreach/Hearing Process 2
  - Nov: (Service changes)
  - Dec: Public Outreach/Hearing Process 3

- **2020**
  - Jan: Working Group Meetings
  - Feb: TBD
  - Mar: TBD
  - Apr: TBD
  - May: TBD
  - Jun: TBD

- **2021**
  - Jan: TBD
  - Feb: TBD
  - Mar: TBD
  - Apr: TBD
  - May: TBD
  - Jun: TBD
BRT Vision & Principles Overview

- Develop the overall vision, goals and objectives for the future BRT network
- Define BRT standards
- Recommend evaluation criteria
- Develop design criteria
- Identify and prioritize BRT corridors
Standards and the Need For Flexibility

Mix of Prescriptive and Performance Based Standards

• Mandate key BRT features

• Promote flexibility

• Reflect diversity of Los Angeles County needs

• Focus resources to achieve outcomes

• Combined effects
Proposed Standards

- Dwell Time
- Speed
- On-Time Performance / Reliability
- Headway
- All-Door Boarding
- Intersection Priority (TSP)
- Dedicated Lanes
- Branding
- Station Amenities
Thank you!