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Regional Service Concept

Set of policy choices that define how the bus network should be designed & a framework for allocating service levels among various markets

- Network goals and objectives
- Process for redesigning the network
- Framework for balancing tradeoffs
- Measures of success
Public Workshop Series

18+ public workshops, over 900 attendees & 1,500+ comments*

• **Round 1**: 10 meetings organized by Service Council area

• **Round 2**: 8 additional targeted stakeholder meetings (including 1 ADA-focused meeting; 3 meetings left to host 3/12, 3/13 and 3/19)

• 1,500+ comments on service, operations, and personal needs/experiences

• Forum for dialogue with over 800 customers and residents

• Utilized interactive stations designed to guide attendees through the complex process of redesigning Metro’s bus system

• Included other service departments and project teams

*Number of attendees and comments are projected due to upcoming remaining meetings
Recurring Themes and Priorities

INITIAL INPUT
- Working Group Meetings (4)
  - Discussions during presentations
  - Breakout sessions (priorities for each service council)
  - Poll Everywhere (live polling)
- Tallied Survey Responses
  - Surveys were conducted both online and printed

ADDITIONAL INPUT
- Detailed Public Workshop Comments
  - "Increase in frequency on buses 183 and 185"
  - "From 910/950 - Would like better connectivity with silver line from Torrance especially near Sepulveda Blvd"
  - "B/c 710 Freeway is not going to be extended, we need express buses along Fremont and or Fairoak, to access gold line."

Public Workshop Input Validates Initial Input

Community Input
- Safety & Security*
- Frequency overall*
- Increase evening & weekend service*
- Reliability*
- Equity/Accessibility*
- Connectivity
- Technology
- Education/Information
- Customer Experience

Community Priorities
- More Reliable Service
- More Peak Hour Frequency
- Safety & Security
- More Geographic Coverage
- More Evening Service
- Better Real-time Bus Arrival Information
- More Weekend Service
- More Midday Frequency

Service Frequency
- Transit Connectivity
- Reduce transfers for long distance trips
- Safety & Security
- Customer Service Quality
- Cleanliness
- Real-time Bus Arrival Information
- More Midday Frequency

*Working Group identified these issues as equal priority

Bus Service Concepts & Policy
Bus Network Goals and Objectives

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

• Target infrastructure & service investments towards those with the greatest mobility needs

• Invest in a world class bus system that is reliable, convenient, & attractive to more users for more trips

• Endorse travel speed, service frequency, & 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
Measures of Success

Balance system efficiency/productivity indicators with measures of customer benefit

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

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?
Network Development Process

Market Demand  Service Performance  Built Environment

Transit Orientation

Fixed route bus service succeeds when:
• There is a high concentration of travel where transit can be competitive, AND
• Current transit service is well aligned with the demand, AND
• The built environment & other external factors favor transit use.

Network Design

Bus service must be designed to the specifications of individual markets based on:
• Time of day/day of week, AND
• Trip distance, AND
• Demographics served, AND
• External factors impacting transit competiveness
Network Design Considerations

There is no “one size fits all” solution. Tradeoffs will be made at the corridor and subarea level for:

- Routing
- Stop spacing
- Frequency
- Span of Service

### Customer Comments by Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>GWC</th>
<th>SFV</th>
<th>SGV</th>
<th>SBC</th>
<th>WSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better real-time bus arrival information</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More reliable service</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More geographic coverage</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More peak hour frequency</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More midday frequency</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More evening service</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More weekend service</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Market Demand

Diagnose the transit competitiveness of each origin to destination trip pair within LA County

A. Succeeding where we should be (can we optimize?)

B. Succeeding where we should not be (can we apply elsewhere?)

C. Not succeeding where we should be (how do we fix it?)

D. Not succeeding where we should not be (these areas are likely more suitable to other modes such as microtransit)

Transit Competitiveness (Ratio of Transit time to Auto)

Sub-Area Pairs & Market Size
(Markets over 20,000 trips)
Service Performance

Where is transit performing well & where is it not?

• Identify top performing line segments for optimization & improvement based on travel pattern, trip length, demand by time of day

• Evaluate areas with underperforming line segments for restructuring, replacement with other modes, or elimination
Built Environment

Pay particular attention to transit friendly environments that promote transit use

- Allocate more resources to serve areas that exhibit several external factors that “push” people to use transit
- Allocate less resources to serve areas that show moderate to few characteristics of transit orientation
- Do not allocate fixed route bus resources in areas with little or no transit friendly characteristics
- Work with City and County partners to improve transit friendliness in areas with strong propensity

Travel Time
- Does transit have priority over cars?

Parking supply
- Is there too much free parking?

Demographics / population
- Are households transit dependent?

Land use
- Is the built environment transit friendly?
Network Design Principles

- Identify market demands with most potential
- System is easier to understand & more convenient
- More people ride transit

Metro has more fare revenue

Apply service & infrastructure treatments

Buses are used more efficiently

Takes fewer resources to provide same service

Metro has lower operating expenses

Metro can reinvest in more service
Next Steps

April 2019
• External Working Group Meeting #5
• Board Staff Workshop

May 2019
• Board approval of Regional Service Concept