



King County
METRO
We'll Get You There

King County
Metro Transit
**2015 Strategic
Plan Progress
Report**

June 2016

King County Metro Transit 2015 Strategic Plan Progress Report

June 2016



Department of Transportation
Metro Transit Division
King Street Center, KSC-TR-0415
201 S. Jackson St
Seattle, WA 98104
206-553-3000 TTY Relay: 711
www.kingcounty.gov/metro

Alternative Formats Available

206-477-3839 TTY Relay: 711

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION.....	5
GOAL 1: SAFETY.....	6
GOAL 2: HUMAN POTENTIAL.....	9
GOAL 3: ECONOMIC GROWTH AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT.....	14
GOAL 4: ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY.....	17
GOAL 5: SERVICE EXCELLENCE	21
GOAL 6: FINANCIAL STEWARDSHIP.....	25
GOAL 7: PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND TRANSPARENCY.....	32
GOAL 8: QUALITY WORKFORCE	36
APPENDIX A: Peer Comparison Report.....	A-1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Strategic Plan Progress Report is Metro's primary tool for showing the public and King County leaders how well we are moving toward the goals in our Strategic Plan for Public Transportation 2011-2021 (<http://metro.kingcounty.gov/planning/strategic-plan/index.html>).

The 2015 progress report presents data on 63 performance measures; the majority show positive or stable trends.

Highlights

- **Metro's ridership continued to grow, reaching a new all-time high of 122 million passenger trips in 2015.** Nearly half of all households in the county (39%) have at least one Metro rider. All of the transit agencies in the region combined delivered 163 million trips in King County. That is an increase of 17.4% since 2010—evidence that public transportation is helping the region accommodate a growing population and keep traffic congestion in check.
- **Overall satisfaction with Metro remains very high, with 88% of riders saying they are very or somewhat satisfied.** This finding from Metro's 2015 Rider/Nonrider survey showed satisfaction to be slightly lower than in the previous two years. However, satisfaction with specific elements of Metro's service generally remained the same or improved.
- **More than three-fourths (76%) of jobs in King County were in locations within a quarter-mile of a bus stop,** contributing to economic growth and healthy communities throughout the county.
- **Measures of safety and security improved** over the past year, with operator and passenger assaults falling by 1% and 14%, respectively.
- **Metro's cost per hour increased 0.3%,** yet stayed below the 1.1% rate of inflation.
- **Metro's farebox recovery rate reached an all-time high 30.8%,** well above the 25% target adopted by King County. The rate has increased every year since 2007.
- **Energy use decreased in several areas.** Vehicle energy use per boarding declined 1.7% in 2015. Energy use at Metro facilities has declined by 17% since 2007 when normalized by temperature and square footage. Our energy efficiency measures are contributing to our efforts to mitigate climate change and to control costs.

- **Metro's on-time performance fell in 2015 to 74.9%, below the target of 80%.** There were signs, however, that our on-time performance was improving as a result of Seattle Proposition 1 and Metro investments targeted at improving reliability.
- **Overall, nearly four-fifths of the spaces at King County's 130 park-and-ride facilities were used.** Utilization varies greatly by location, with many park-and-rides operating at full capacity.

2015 was an extraordinary year for Metro. After Seattle voters approved Proposition 1 in 2014 to pay for more Metro service, we worked with the City of Seattle to add 110,000 service hours to 53 Seattle routes in June 2015 and 113,000 more hours in September. These increases were on top of 60,000 service hours we added in other parts of our service area during the year. The 2015 service investments allowed Metro to reduce crowding on buses, improve on-time performance, and add trips on many bus routes. We hired approximately 500 new drivers to deliver the expanded service.



The Proposition 1-related investments brought some stability to Metro's near-term financial picture, and we benefitted from low fuel prices as well. We also bolstered our revenue projections with a fare increase that took effect in March 2015. Nevertheless, Metro's long-term financial stability would benefit from a more stable source of sufficient funding.



Recognizing the impact that the March fare increase and other recent fare and fare-policy changes had on our low-income customers, we introduced our groundbreaking ORCA LIFT reduced-fare program in March 2015. The program saw steady enrollment growth throughout the year.























Integration with Sound Transit remained one of Metro's major areas of focus in 2015. In addition to integrating our bus service with the Link light rail extension to Capitol Hill and the University of Washington, we coordinated planning with Sound Transit as we began developing Metro's first-ever long-range plan.

Another forward-looking effort in 2015 was an extensive update of the Strategic Plan for Public Transportation and Service Guidelines.

SYMBOLS—intended to give a general indication of how well we’re meeting our goals.

 Improving
 Stable

 Opportunity to improve
 N/A, just one year of data, or trend not easily defined

MEASURES		TREND
GOAL 1: SAFETY		
1	Preventable accidents per million miles	
2	Operator and passenger incidents and assaults	
3	Customer satisfaction regarding safety and security	
4	Effectiveness of emergency responses	
GOAL 2: HUMAN POTENTIAL		
1	Population within a quarter-mile of a transit stop	
2	Percentage of households in low-income census tracts within a quarter-mile walk to a transit stop	
3	Percentage of households in minority census tracts within a quarter-mile walk to a transit stop	
4	Number of jobs within a quarter-mile walk to a transit stop	
5	Percentage of households within a half-mile walk to a transit stop with frequent service	
6	Number of jobs within a half-mile walk to a transit stop with frequent service	
7	Number of students at universities and community colleges that are within a quarter-mile walk to a transit stop	
8	Vanpool boardings	
9	Transit mode share by market	
10	Student and reduced-fare permits and usage	
11	Accessible bus stops	
12	Access registrants	
13	Access boardings/number of trips provided by the Community Access Transportation (CAT) program	
14	Requested Access trips compared with those provided	
15	Access applicants who undertake fixed-route travel training	
GOAL 3: ECONOMIC GROWTH AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT		
1	All public transportation ridership in King County	
2	Transit rides per capita	
3	Ridership in population/business centers	
4	Employees at CTR sites sharing non-drive-alone transportation modes during peak commute hours	
5	Employer-sponsored passes and usage	
6	Park-and-ride capacity and utilization	
7	HOV lane passenger miles	

GOAL 4: ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY		
1	Average miles per gallon of Metro's bus fleet	+
2	Vehicle energy (diesel, gasoline, kWh) normalized by miles	+
3	Vehicle fuel (diesel, gasoline, kWh) normalized by boardings	+
4	Total facility energy use	+
5	Energy use at Metro facilities: kWh and natural gas used in facilities, normalized by area and temperature	+
6	Per-capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT)	-
7	Transit mode share	-
GOAL 5: SERVICE EXCELLENCE		
1	Customer satisfaction	↓
2	Customer complaints per boarding	-
3	On-time performance by time of day	-
4	Crowding	↓
5	Use of Metro's web tools and alerts	↓
GOAL 6: FINANCIAL STEWARDSHIP		
1	Service hours operated	+
2	Service hours and service hour change per route	●
3	Boardings per vehicle hour	↓
4	Boardings per revenue hour	↓
5	Ridership and ridership change per route	↓
6	Passenger miles per vehicle mile	+
7	Passenger miles per revenue mile	+
8	Cost per hour	+
9	Cost per vehicle mile	-
10	Cost per boarding	+
11	Cost per passenger mile	↓
12	Cost per vanpool boarding	+
13	Cost per Access boarding	-
14	Fare revenues	+
15	Farebox recovery	+
16	ORCA use	+
17	Asset condition assessment	+
GOAL 7: PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND TRANSPARENCY		
1	Public participation rates	+
2	Customer satisfaction regarding Metro's communications and reporting	↓
3	Social media indicators	+
4	Conformance with King County policy on communications accessibility and translation to other languages	↓
GOAL 8: QUALITY WORKFORCE		
1	Demographics of Metro employees	↓
2	Employee job satisfaction	●
3	Promotion rates	+
4	Probationary pass rate	↓



INTRODUCTION

The King County Council adopted Metro’s Strategic Plan for Public Transportation 2011-2021 in July 2011 and approved updates in 2012 and 2013. The plan lays out a vision for the region’s public transportation system; sets goals, objectives, strategies and quantitative performance measures; and establishes service guidelines. It builds on King County’s strategic plan and reflects the recommendations of the 2010 Regional Transit Task Force.

The County Council also directed Metro to report on how we are meeting the strategic plan’s goals and objectives. This is our fourth progress report; it covers five years whenever comparable data are available. In 2015, the County Council began a process of updating the Strategic Plan. As part of that process, they proposed that a number of new indicators be tracked. Because of the timing of this process, these new indicators have not yet been adopted. The methodologies for monitoring these new indicators are still being developed, with the exception of two that are included in this year’s report (measures 2.5, percentage of households within a half-mile walk to a transit stop with frequent service; and 2.6, number of jobs within a half-mile walk to a transit stop with frequent service).

The 63 measures in this report focus on many aspects of Metro’s public transportation system, including how well we deliver on the key values of productivity, social equity, and geographic value. We are continuing to refine our performance measurement processes, and are in the process of defining performance targets for each of the eight goals in the strategic plan. We have developed preliminary measures and created a tiered approach that connects how operation, maintenance and planning of a transit system contribute to the goals. This approach ties everyday workplace activities to progress toward our strategic goals.

As part of our performance monitoring, we compare Metro with 30 of the largest motor- and trolley-bus agencies in the United States using National Transit Database data. Given the timing of data availability, the Peer Comparison Report appended to this document is based on data through 2014.



METRO AT A GLANCE (2015)

Service area	2,134 square miles
Population	2.12 million
Employment	1.31 million
Fixed-route ridership	121.8 million
Vanpool ridership:	3.6 million
Access ridership:	1.3 million
Annual service hours	3.6 million
Active fleet	1,472 buses
Bus stops	8,091
Park-and-rides	130
Park-and-ride spaces	25,468

SYMBOL KEY

These symbols are intended to give a general indication of how well we’re meeting our goals.

Key to trend symbols

- + Improving
- | Stable
- Opportunity to improve
- N/A, just one year of data, or trend not easily defined

GOAL 1: SAFETY

1

Support safe communities.

► **Objective 1.1: Keep people safe and secure.**

Intended outcome: Metro's services and facilities are safe and secure.

Metro protects the safety and security of customers, employees, and facilities in a variety of ways, including planning, policing, facility design, operational practices, safety training, and collaboration with local jurisdictions and other agencies on safety-related matters.

Specific strategies include promoting safety and security in public transportation operations and facilities, and planning for and executing regional emergency-response and homeland-security efforts.

Our safety program for bus drivers emphasizes steps to raise safety awareness. Our Operator Assault Reduction Project includes a number of strategies and programs to increase the safety of both bus drivers and passengers.



HOW WE'RE DOING: GOAL 1 OVERVIEW


Metro saw another significant decline in assaults on our buses in 2015. The rate of preventable accidents rose again in 2015, but current levels are still well below the levels of just a decade ago. Increased driver training and a pedestrian awareness campaign contributed to a reduction in preventable pedestrian accidents. Customer satisfaction with personal safety while riding the bus at night remains high, as does satisfaction with the safe operation of the buses. Metro is currently conducting a major safety system review, with a report due out in 2016.

MEASURES		TREND
1	Preventable accidents per million miles	⊖
2	Operator and passenger incidents and assaults	⊕
3	Customer satisfaction regarding safety and security	⊕
4	Effectiveness of emergency responses	⊕

1) Preventable accidents per million miles ⊖

Metro continues to focus on reducing accidents through driver training and customer education. The number of preventable accidents per million miles increased by 1.5 from 2014 to 2015. However, pedestrian accidents, which declined by 35% in 2014, decreased again in 2015 by an additional 8.5%.

1) Preventable accidents per million miles



GOAL 1: SAFETY


2) Operator and passenger incidents and assaults +

The total number of operator assaults fell again in 2015—a 1.3% reduction compared to 2014. The 77 operator assaults (0.6 per million transit boardings) in 2015 include those on Sound Transit bus service operated by Metro.

It has been nearly two years since the last felony aggravated assault occurred (defined as when the offender uses a weapon or displays it in a threatening manner, or the operator suffers severe or aggravated bodily injury). This decline reflects the success of Metro’s Operator Assault Reduction Project, which focuses on close coordination between Transit Operations and Metro Transit Police to ensure timely assault response and follow-up. The project also includes a training program that helps operators learn how to de-escalate potential conflicts and communicate effectively with challenging passengers.

Passenger vs. passenger physical disturbances fell significantly—13.6% from 2014 to 2015. There were 273 disturbances, or 2.1 per million boardings. Passenger vs. passenger physical disturbances are incidents recorded by drivers that may or may not be criminal in nature and don’t necessarily entail a victim, a suspect, a request for police, or the filing of a report.

2) Operator assaults and passenger physical disturbances




3) Customer satisfaction regarding safety and security +

Every year, Metro’s Rider Survey asks riders about their satisfaction with many attributes of Metro service. In the most recent survey, 82% of riders said they are “very satisfied” with the safe operation of the bus; this is 8% more than were very satisfied in 2014. (Most of the remainder said they are “somewhat satisfied.”) This is an increase over past years, although the wording of the question changed slightly to focus more on operators than on the operation of the bus.

When asked about personal safety while riding the bus at night, 79% said they are very or somewhat satisfied, which is similar to the average for the previous four years.

3) Rider satisfaction with safe operation of the bus



4) **Effectiveness of emergency responses** 

The Department of Homeland Security's Transportation Security Administration administers the Baseline Assessment for Security Enhancement (BASE) program, which establishes a security standard for transit system security programs and assesses progress. This voluntary, comprehensive review focuses on categories identified by the transit community as fundamentals for a sound transit security program, including an agency's security plans, security training, drills and exercise programs, public outreach efforts, and background-check programs.



Metro's score on this test increased from 91% in 2009 to 95% in 2012, with improvements in our infrastructure protection protocols, security and emergency preparedness training and exercise program, and inclusion of security upgrades in our mid- and long-term planning. The 2015 triennial audit was delayed at the request of TSA. The assessment is being redeployed in stages beginning the first week of April 2016. We expect to conclude by June with scoring available by July.

Metro's Operator Assault Reduction Project

Metro instituted the Operator Assault Reduction Project in January 2009 to bring down a high level of assaults directed at Metro operators as they drove their routes. A joint effort of the Metro Transit Police (MTP) and Transit Operations, the project's goal was to use Metro's available resources to reduce the number of operator assaults.

The program helped develop procedures for reporting, responding to, investigating and tracking operator assault incidents. The program has 11 specific objectives covering things such as:

- Field responses by MTP
- Investigations and communications by MTP's Criminal Investigation Unit
- Operator training on how to recognize and defuse hostile situations and to enhance communication to promote improved security on coaches
- Early intervention efforts
- Suspension and exclusion policies and reward programs
- Post-incident victim counseling
- Improvements to the Security Incident Report program.

After an approximate 50% reduction in assaults during the program's first five years, operator assaults trended up in 2012. Additional efforts resulted in annual reductions in 2013, 2014 and 2015.

GOAL 2: HUMAN POTENTIAL

2

Provide equitable opportunities for people from all areas of King County to access the public transportation system.

► **Objective 2.1 Provide public transportation products and services that add value throughout King County and that facilitate access to jobs, education, and other destinations.**

Intended outcome: More people throughout King County have access to public transportation products and services.

Metro strives to make it easy for people to travel throughout King County and the region. We provide a range of public transportation products and services appropriate to different markets and mobility needs, working to integrate our services with others. Our fully accessible fixed-route system is complemented by services such as ridesharing and Dial-A-Ride Transit (DART). In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, we provide Access paratransit service to eligible people with disabilities. Our Community Access Transportation (CAT) program provides vans and support to community organizations that offer rides as an alternative to Access. CAT trips are less expensive and fill some service gaps. Our travel training program helps people with disabilities use regular bus



service. We also offer Jobs Access and Reverse Commute, a federal transportation program intended to connect low-income populations with employment opportunities.

NOTE: In previous years, measures 1 to 4 included housing units within two miles of a park-and-ride in the totals. However, our 2015 Access to Transit study found that proximity to park-and-rides represents neither their true catchment area nor those households' ability to access the transit system. The revised measures better reflect access. Metro continues to measure park-and-ride capacity and utilization in Goal 3, Measure 6.

HOW WE'RE DOING: GOAL 2 OVERVIEW

About 65% of housing units in King County are within a quarter-mile walk to a bus stop—about the same as last year. The percentage is higher in areas with a high proportion of low-income or minority residents.

Access to jobs via transit also remained steady in 2015, with 76% of jobs in King County within a quarter-mile of a bus stop. Approximately 145,000 students attend colleges within a quarter-mile of a Metro stop. Almost 12% of employees in King County and 45% of those who work in downtown Seattle commute by transit—numbers similar to 2014.

The proportion of bus stops that are wheelchair accessible increased in 2015. Access ridership decreased as we continued to expand the more-efficient CAT program and continued travel training to give riders more transportation choices. Metro delivered 100% of the Access trips requested.

Metro continues to operate the largest publicly owned commuter van program in the nation, with Metro vans traveling more than 56 million miles in 2015, when vanpool ridership grew by 4%.

MEASURES		TREND
1	Population within a quarter-mile walk to a transit stop	⬇️
2	Percentage of households in low-income census tracts within a quarter-mile walk to a transit stop	⬇️
3	Percentage of households in minority census tracts within a quarter-mile walk to a transit stop	⬆️
4	Number of jobs within a quarter-mile walk to a transit stop	⬇️
5	Percentage of households within a half-mile walk to a transit stop with frequent service	●
6	Number of jobs within a half-mile walk to a transit stop with frequent service	●
7	Number of students at universities and community colleges within a quarter-mile walk to a transit stop	⬇️
8	Vanpool boardings	⬆️
9	Transit mode share by market	⬆️

Measures continued on next page

GOAL 2: HUMAN POTENTIAL

Measures, continued

MEASURES		TREND
10	Student and reduced-fare permits and usage	ⓘ
11	Accessible bus stops	+
12	Access registrants	●
13	Access boardings/number of trips provided by the Community Access Transportation (CAT) program	+

MEASURES		TREND
14	Requested Access trips compared with those provided	ⓘ
15	Access applicants who undertake fixed-route travel training	+

1) Population living within a quarter-mile walk to a transit stop ⓘ

This basic access metric measures proximity to any transit stop. In winter 2015, 65% of King County housing units were within a quarter-mile walk to a bus stop—the same as last year.




2) Percentage of households in low-income census tracts within a quarter-mile walk to a transit stop ⓘ

To align with other Metro policies, this report now defines "low-income" as less than 200% of the federal poverty level. The 2014 American Community Survey found that 24% of King County residents have low incomes. To measure their access to transit, we define a census tract as low-income if more than 24% of its population is below 200% of the federal poverty level. Almost three-quarters (73%) of housing units in these census tracts are within a quarter-mile walk to a bus stop. This is slightly less than last year (75%), but higher than the countywide population as a whole. The 2015 decrease is attributable to shifts in tracts designated as low-income as a result of the changed definition.



3) Percentage of households in minority census tracts within a quarter-mile walk to a transit stop +

The 2014 American Community Survey found that 37% of King County residents belong to minority groups. We define a census tract as minority if more than 37% of its population belongs to a minority group. In these census tracts, 68% of housing units are within a quarter-mile walk to a bus stop, a slight increase over last year (67%) and higher than for the county population as a whole.



4) Number of jobs within a quarter-mile walk to a transit stop ⓘ

In winter 2015, 76% of jobs in King County were in locations within a quarter-mile of a bus stop—the same as last year.



5) Percentage of households within a half-mile walk to a transit stop with frequent service ●

This is a new measure that looks at a household's proximity to any bus stop served by transit that operates all day at frequencies of 15 minutes or better. This includes all RapidRide lines, Link light rail, and places where two or more routes follow the same path and have a

GOAL 2: HUMAN POTENTIAL

combined headway of 15 minutes or better. In 2015, 43% of households were within a half-mile walk to a transit stop with frequent service.

For this measure, the Strategic Plan Progress Report defines frequent service as any route or combination of routes that provide service every 15 minutes or better. In Metro's draft long-range plan, METRO CONNECTS, frequent service is defined not only by frequency, but also by the span of service (the amount of time between the first trip and the last trip of the day) and a higher level of capital investment in speed, on-time performance, and passenger amenities. METRO CONNECTS envisions its frequent transit corridors to be of a higher overall quality than today's frequent corridors. By the METRO CONNECTS definition, about 20% of the population currently has access to this higher standard of frequent service.



6) Number of jobs within a half-mile walk to a transit stop with frequent service ●

Like the previous item, this measure is new this year. In 2015, 63% of jobs in King County were within a half-mile walk to a transit stop with frequent service.



7) Number of students at universities and community colleges that are within a quarter-mile walk to a transit stop ①

All 27 of the degree-conferring college and university campuses in King County are within a quarter mile to a bus stop. Approximately 151,000 students attend classes in person at these campuses.

8) Vanpool boardings +


Metro continues to operate the largest publicly owned commuter van program in the nation. Steady growth in vanpool and vanship boardings continued in 2015, extending the trend since 2010. Total boardings reached 3.6 million, about 4% higher than in 2014 and 33% above 2010. Our commuter van fleet also grew 6% in 2015, to nearly 1,500. The program helped the region use existing road space more efficiently by eliminating more than 54 million vehicle miles traveled; it also saved more than 2.4 million gallons of fuel.

Vanpool customer satisfaction remains high at 92%. Commuter vanpools are highly valued by both current and past participants, with 93% agreeing that the service helps reduce congestion.

Targeted employer vanpool formations and promotional efforts drive ridership growth. Metro's Commute Coach program helps generate awareness of the vanpool program and helps commuters transition to vanpool service. In 2015, our Commute Coach Program started 149 vans, our highest number in one year so far and making up 57% of new van starts. Major employers that have Commute Coach employees include Amazon (72 vans), Microsoft (28) and Starbucks (3).

Rideshare has a strong social media presence, with a combined 3,149 Facebook fans and Twitter followers, up 55% from 2014.

8) Vanpool boardings (in millions)



The methodology for counting passengers was modified in 2014. Previous years' data on this chart reflect the estimated ridership using the new methodology.

GOAL 2: HUMAN POTENTIAL

9) Transit mode share by market +

According to the 2014 American Community Survey, 11.8% of King County workers take public transportation to work, up from 11% in 2013. Transit's share of commuters is even stronger for workers in downtown Seattle, with 45% taking transit (2014 Commute Seattle survey). This is up from the 2012 figure of 43%. No other mode-split data are readily available.




10) Student and reduced-fare permits and usage i

The Regional Reduced Fare Permit (RRFP) entitles senior riders (age 65 or older), riders with disabilities, and Medicare-card holders to pay a reduced fare of \$1.00. In 2015, RRFP trips made up 12% of all Metro ORCA trips. Many other RRFP riders pay their fares with cash, and we are unable to measure these trips.

In addition to the RRFP, the ORCA Business Passport program has partnered with five school districts (Seattle, Bellevue, Highline, Lake Washington, and Mercer Island) to offer student transit passes. We sold more than 19,000 passes in the 2015-2016 school year. We expect more than 3 million boardings to be made with those passes, or about a 4% increase over the 2014-2015 school year. In addition, many other schools and school districts buy Puget Passes for their students.

New in 2015 was the ORCA LIFT reduced-fare card for people with low incomes (see box below).

10) Reduced fare ORCA trips (in millions)




ORCA LIFT low-income fare program

Metro launched the groundbreaking ORCA LIFT reduced-fare program in March 2015, making transit more affordable for qualified riders whose incomes are below 200% of the federal poverty level.

ORCA LIFT cardholders can save as much as \$1.75 per trip on Metro, and qualify for reduced fares on Kitsap Transit, Sound Transit Link light rail, the King County Water Taxi and the Seattle Streetcar.

As we planned this program, one of our challenges was how to reach potential participants and sign them up. Our solution was to partner with Public Health-Seattle and King County, and eight human services agencies. Together we've been actively promoting ORCA LIFT using advertising, outreach at community events, and our ORCA-To-Go vans. The agencies are verifying applicants' eligibility. This approach has proven to be powerful and effective—people are getting ORCA LIFT cards and they're using them. We also developed a partnership with the City of Seattle to promote ORCA LIFT. City employees are being trained in eligibility and enrollment activities to expand outreach.



Since the program started, the number of enrollees has grown steadily to nearly 23,000 at the end of 2015. ORCA LIFT cardholders took 2,658,810 trips in 2015, making up about 2.2% of Metro boardings.

The Metro program team was honored as a Washington State Department of Transportation Wall of Fame winner.

GOAL 2: HUMAN POTENTIAL

11) Accessible bus stops +

We increased our proportion of bus stops that are wheelchair accessible to 80% in 2015. Service realignments, bus stop spacing, and accessibility improvement projects allowed us to increase operational efficiencies and enhance our customers' overall transit experience. Service additions in late 2015 increased the number of active stops.

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Accessible stops	6,714	6,499	6,508	6,346	6,444
All stops	8,744	8,413	8,357	8,079	8,091
Percent accessible	77%	77%	78%	79%	80%

12) Access registrants ●

At the end of 2015, there were 14,315 ADA-eligible registrants in the Access database—a 2.6% drop from 2014. Since January 2014, only riders with current certification have been counted as Access registrants. In previous years, individuals approaching the end of their eligibility who had not taken a trip on Access for a year were considered inactive, but were still listed as eligible even though their eligibility had expired. As a result of that change, the 2014 and 2015 numbers are not comparable to previous years.

13) Access boardings/number of trips provided by the Community Access Transportation (CAT) program +

Access ridership decreased 10.2% in 2015, while the program still provided all of the trips requested by qualified applicants. This decline was partially due to the 1.4% ridership increase in the more cost-efficient CAT program and to continued instruction to help Access registrants use regular bus service, which also reduces costs. Growth in CAT was primarily due to an increase in service from three Adult Day Health (ADH) sites, EADS, Legacy House and Full Life Kent. In 2015, these ADH sites provided approximately 36,000 boardings that were previously provided by Access Transportation, saving the County about \$1.7 million.


14) Requested Access trips compared with those provided ⓘ

Per federal requirements, Metro's Access program provides a trip for every request by a qualified applicant, meeting the target of 100% delivery ratio.


15) Access applicants who undertake fixed-route travel training +

Travel training to help people with disabilities ride regular bus service gives those customers more transportation choices. It also contributes to Metro's cost-control efforts by diverting riders to a less-expensive mode of transportation. The number of riders trained increased 2.3% from 2014.

13) Accessible service trips, in 000s



15) Access applicants who undertake fixed-route travel training



Encourage vibrant, economically thriving and sustainable communities.

► **Objective 3.1 Support a strong, diverse, sustainable economy.**

Intended outcome: Public transportation products and services are available throughout King County and are well-utilized in centers and areas of concentrated economic activity.

► **Objective 3.2: Address the growing need for transportation services and facilities throughout the county.**

Intended outcome: More people have access to and regularly use public transportation products and services in King County.

► **Objective 3.3: Support compact, healthy communities.**

Intended outcome: More people regularly use public transportation products and services along corridors with compact development.

► **Objective 3.4: Support economic development by using existing transportation infrastructure efficiently and effectively.**

Intended outcome: Regional investments in major highway capacity projects and parking requirements are complemented by high transit service levels in congested corridors and centers.



Issaquah Transit Center

The Puget Sound Regional Council’s regional growth strategy assumes a doubling of transit ridership by 2040 and emphasizes the need for an integrated, multimodal transportation system that links major cities and centers. Toward this end, Metro offers travel options that connect people to areas of concentrated activity and provide affordable access to jobs, education, and social and retail services. This in turn supports economic growth.

We work with other transit agencies to create an integrated and efficient regional transportation system, and we encourage the development of transit-supportive communities.

HOW WE'RE DOING: GOAL 3 OVERVIEW

2015 was another year of record ridership for Metro, following four consecutive years of increasing ridership corresponding with the region’s economic recovery that began in 2010. Many factors affected ridership. Service reductions that began in late 2014, a fare increase in early 2015, and sharply lower gasoline prices throughout 2015 had a negative impact on ridership. These factors were more than offset by strong employment growth and transit service purchased by the City of Seattle. Total ridership in the county, including Link and Sound Transit buses, set a record for the fifth consecutive year. Metro continues to work with partners to encourage alternatives to driving alone for work and personal travel. Nearly all of Metro’s bus trips touch regional growth centers or manufacturing centers. The use of ORCA business account passes is increasing, while overall use of park-and-ride lots remains stable.


MEASURES		TREND
1	All public transportation ridership in King County	+
2	Metro Transit rides per capita	-
3	Ridership in population/business centers	!
4	Employees at CTR sites sharing non-drive-alone transportation modes during peak commute hours	-
5	Employer-sponsored passes and usage	+
6	Park-and-ride capacity and utilization	!
7	HOV lane passenger miles	-

GOAL 3: ECONOMIC GROWTH AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT

1) All public transportation ridership in King County (rail, bus, paratransit, rideshare) +

The total number of boardings in King County on all services—including buses, rail, paratransit service, vanpools and passenger-only ferries—grew to 163.5 million in 2015, a 1.6% increase over 2014. Metro fixed-route ridership alone was 121.8 million, an increase of 0.7%, and accounted for three-quarters of the total. Ridership on the other services grew 4%. While Sound Transit’s Link light rail growth rate tailed off, it was still a significant 7% growth from 2014 to 2015. Since 2010, total transit ridership in King County grew 17%, continuing to outpace increases in population (6.3%) and employment (14%).

1) Transit boardings in King County* (in millions)




*Includes Sound Transit bus service operated by Community Transit and Pierce Transit, which was not included in previous reports.

2) Metro Transit rides per capita -

Metro’s ridership growth of 0.8% in 2015 was lower than King County’s 1.8% population growth, so boardings per capita declined slightly. However, since 2010 the ridership increase has outpaced King County population growth, and the boardings per capita grew by 4.6%. Much of this gain was driven by employment growth as well as service improvements such as new RapidRide lines.

2) Metro transit rides per capita




3) Ridership in population/business centers I

In fall 2015, Metro provided 11,064 bus trips each weekday to, from, through or between regional growth centers or manufacturing/industrial centers (as designated in the region’s growth plan). This made up 98% of Metro’s directly operated, non-custom, scheduled trips—so virtually all of the transit trips we provide serve one of these centers. This percentage is the same as in 2014, and is a couple of percentage points higher than the previous years.

4) Employees at CTR sites sharing non-drive-alone transportation modes during commute hours -

The share of employee commute trips that serve Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) sites in King County has remained remarkably stable since the 2011/2012 survey cycle. CTR sites are those with at least 100 employees who arrive at work between 6 and 9 a.m. About one-third of these commuters use buses, trains, carpools or vanpools to get to work. Over the years, improvements in this rate tend to be tied to rising gas prices, major roadway construction projects, tolling on freeways, and major promotional campaigns as well as improvements to transit service. Data are not yet available from the 2015/2016 surveys.

4) Peak mode share at King County CTR sites




GOAL 3: ECONOMIC GROWTH AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT

5) Employer-sponsored passes and usage +

The payment of fares with business account ORCA cards has increased dramatically as ORCA has matured. (ORCA is an electronic fare card adopted in 2009 by seven transit agencies in the region.) Metro's ORCA Passport revenue was more than \$65 million, a 13% increase over 2014. Total regional revenue from business ORCA accounts in 2015 was more than \$139 million. This was nearly two-thirds of all regional ORCA revenue. The largest of the products is Passport, a program in which employers purchase transit passes for their employees. There were 51.1 million regional boardings with Passport in 2015—4% more than in 2014—and revenue of \$104 million. The University of Washington's U-Pass program brings in 27% of regional ORCA Passport revenue (\$27.8 out of \$104 million).

5) Regional boardings with ORCA Passport passes (in millions)



6) Park-and-ride capacity and utilization !

The average number of spaces used at King County's 130 park-and-ride facilities fell slightly in 2015 after a four-year growth spell in the preceding years. Utilization rates of the 25,000 spaces at these facilities fell by about 2% from 2014. On typical weekdays in 2015, the lots were 78% full. Utilization varies greatly among the 130 lots, with many park-and-ride facilities operating near or at full capacity. For usage information on each lot, see the park-and-ride quarterly reports on Metro's online Accountability Center (<http://metro.kingcounty.gov/am/accountability/park-ride-usage.html>).


Total park-and-ride spaces			
Year*	Capacity	Used	Utilization
2011	25,110	18,549	74%
2012	25,143	19,212	76%
2013	25,397	19,485	77%
2014	25,489	20,054	79%
2015	25,468	19,600	78%

*Fall service, September to February

7) HOV lane passenger miles -

HOV (high-occupancy vehicle) lanes are considered fixed guideways, as defined by the Federal Transit Administration. Transit-only lanes and trolley wire are also in this category. Passenger miles on these lanes fell by 4.9%, reflecting a small drop in overall revenue miles of service, and particularly revenue service on fixed-guideway lanes. Notably, the number of fixed-guideway lane miles has fallen due to changes made by the FTA in the classification of what constitutes a fixed-guideway lane.

7) Passenger miles on transit-only and HOV lanes (in millions)



Safeguard and enhance King County’s natural resources and environment.

► **Objective 4.1: Help reduce greenhouse-gas emissions in the region.**

Intended outcome: People drive single-occupant vehicles less.

► **Objective 4.2: Minimize Metro’s environmental footprint.**

Intended outcome: Metro’s environmental footprint is reduced (normalized against service growth).

In November 2015, the King County Council unanimously adopted the King County Strategic Climate Action Plan, which established a long-term goal of reducing countywide greenhouse-gas emissions by at least 80% by 2050. Metro plays a key role in progressing toward this goal by providing travel options that increase the proportion of travel in King County by public transportation, and by increasing the efficiency of our services and facilities.

Every action Metro takes to make transit a more accessible, competitive, and attractive transportation option helps to counter climate change and improve air quality. We have also developed an agencywide sustainability program to



coordinate sustainability initiatives as part of planning, capital projects, operations, and maintenance. We are committed to green operating and maintenance practices, and we incorporate cost-effective green building and sustainable development practices in all capital projects. We continue to seek opportunities to improve energy efficiency and decrease energy use in our facilities and fleet.

HOW WE'RE DOING: GOAL 4 OVERVIEW
<p>In 2015, Metro realized an additional 1.7% improvement in the energy efficiency of our fleet. Coupled with increases in boardings and a reduction in miles, energy use fell by 2.6% on a per-boarding basis.</p> <p>Similarly, overall facility energy use has decreased 21% since 2007 when assessed by square footage and temperature, largely as a result of conservation efforts.</p> <p>Thirty-nine percent of King County households have a member who rides Metro at least one time per month—a slightly lower percentage than in 2014, although the average number of trips taken per month by riders increased in 2015.</p>

MEASURES		TREND
1	Average miles per gallon of Metro’s bus fleet	+
2	Vehicle energy (diesel, gasoline, kWh) normalized by miles	+
3	Vehicle fuel (diesel, gasoline, kWh) normalized by boardings	+
4	Total facility energy use	+
5	Energy use at Metro facilities: kWh and natural gas used in facilities, normalized by area and temperature	+
6	Per-capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT)	-
7	Transit mode share	-

GOAL 4: ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

1) Average miles per gallon for Metro's bus fleet +

Fuel economy for Metro's diesel bus fleet continued to improve in 2015. Average miles per gallon increased by just over 0.5% to almost four miles per gallon, saving nearly 60,000 gallons of diesel compared to the prior year's use.

Buses vary significantly in their passenger capacity and occupancy. In recent years, the main factors affecting the average miles per gallon of our fleet were:

- The replacement of older diesel buses with new diesel-electric hybrids that consume less fuel.
- The replacement of 40-foot, high-floor buses with new 60-foot, low-floor articulated buses that use more fuel because they are larger and carry more passengers.

Our 60-foot buses carry one-third more passengers than our older 40-foot buses. This increased ridership capacity is needed to achieve Metro's ridership growth targets. Metro is committed to purchasing fuel-efficient vehicles.

2) Vehicle energy (diesel, gasoline, kWh) normalized by miles +

Metro operates diesel and hybrid motor buses and electricity-powered trolley buses. When diesel fuel and kilowatt hours are converted to the energy measure BTUs, Metro's energy consumption declined by 1.7% between 2014 and 2015.

While diesel and hybrid buses operate more than 90% of Metro's service miles, some diesel miles were reallocated to more efficient trolley buses on weekends. We expect our new electric trolley fleet to be fully deployed in 2017.

3) Vehicle fuel (diesel, gasoline, kWh) normalized by boarding +

Vehicle energy use per boarding declined 2.6% in 2015 as a result of an increase in passenger boardings, a decrease in miles operated, and the improvement in total fleet efficiency noted above.

4) Total facility energy use +

Metro continues to use 2007 as a baseline year against which to measure future progress in reducing energy demand per the King County Strategic Climate Action Plan. Total energy use at all Metro facilities—which does not include the energy used to power buses—has decreased by approximately 17% since then. Energy use was reduced thanks to conservation practices and the completion of numerous energy efficiency projects. Between 2014 and 2015, total building energy usage declined by 8%.



GOAL 4: ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

5) Energy use at Metro facilities (kWh and natural gas used in facilities normalized by area and temperature) +

Metro defined a set of baseline facilities in 2007 against which to compare future energy use and account for changes in the number and size of facilities over time. After also adjusting for weather variability and changes in square footage at the facilities, normalized energy use at these facilities decreased by approximately 21% between 2007 and 2015, thanks in part to investments in conservation measures such as LED lighting and HVAC system upgrades at various facilities.



Battery-powered buses—the fleet of the future?

In 2015, Metro acquired three all-electric fast-charge battery buses manufactured by Proterra. These buses produce zero tail-pipe emissions and use a “fast-charge” battery technology that allows them to receive a full charge in approximately 10 minutes.

Currently operating on routes 226 and 241 in Bellevue, the battery-powered buses are being evaluated to


determine how well they perform, their operations and maintenance costs, and service performance. The analysis will help Metro determine the feasibility and potential for acquiring battery buses as part of our bus fleet in the future.

GOAL 4: ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

6) Per-capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT) ⊖

The number of vehicle miles traveled on state roads in King County grew again in 2015 to 8.9 billion. This works out to 4,329 per resident, an increase of 1.4% over 2014, but a decline of 2.3% since 2010. During these five years, per capita passenger miles on Metro buses increased more than 10%.


6) Per capita vehicle miles traveled



7) Transit mode share ⊖

Metro's 2015 Rider Survey found that 32% of King County households had at least one member who rode Metro five or more times in the previous month. Another 7% had a member who rode one to four times. The total of 39% is a slight decrease from the past few years. The downturn in the number of households is somewhat offset by an increase in the average number of trips taken per month by riders.

7) Transit mode share



GOAL 5: SERVICE EXCELLENCE

5

Establish a culture of customer service and deliver services that are responsive to community needs.

► **Objective 5.1: Improve satisfaction with Metro’s products and services and the way they are delivered.**

Intended outcome: People are more satisfied with Metro products and services.

► **Objective 5.2: Improve public awareness of Metro products and services.**

Intended outcome: People understand how to use Metro’s products and services and use them more often.

Metro is committed to giving our customers a positive experience at every stage of transit use, from trip planning to arrival at a destination. We strive to provide service that is reliable, convenient, easy to understand and easy to use. We emphasize customer service in both transit operations and workforce training. Our marketing and customer information



Customer Communications and Services office.

efforts help customers understand what service is available and how to use it, and also raise awareness of the benefits of transit.

HOW WE'RE DOING: GOAL 5 OVERVIEW

Customer satisfaction remained consistent from 2014 to 2015, with 88% of our customers saying they are satisfied with Metro service. However, the number of customer complaints recorded increased in 2015—possibly the result of better comment tracking (see story box on C3, p. 22).

On-time performance of our service declined again in 2015. The likely causes were increases in both traffic congestion and ridership that slowed our operations. Service investments made by Metro and by the City of Seattle with funding from its November 2014 Proposition 1 are intended to improve reliability. The additional service should also reduce crowding, which remained at the same level it was in 2014.


Customer visits to Metro's website and Trip Planner both decreased in 2015, as there are now various other tools available to help with transit trip planning. Transit Alerts have proven to be an effective way to communicate in real time about service disruptions and adverse weather issues. Growth continues to be strong in both the number of subscribers and the number of messages sent.

MEASURES		TREND
1	Customer satisfaction	⬆️
2	Customer complaints per boarding	⬇️
3	On-time performance by time of day	⬇️
4	Crowding	⬆️
5	Use of Metro’s web tools and alerts	⬆️

1) **Customer satisfaction** ❶

Metro has achieved a customer satisfaction rate of around 90% over much of its history as measured in annual rider surveys. This was the case again in 2015. Responding to the question, “Overall, would you say you are satisfied or dissatisfied with Metro?” 88% of respondents said they are either “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied.” In 2012 and 2013, total satisfaction decreased below 90%, but it returned to that level in 2014. The 88% in 2015 was not statistically different from the 2014 result.

1) **Overall rider satisfaction**



C3—a new tool for managing customer comments

In September 2015, Metro’s Customer Communications and Services work unit launched its new Customer Relations Management System, called C3 (for customer communications and comments).

C3 is used to enter, track and analyze all customer comments and requests for information that come through Customer Communications and Services. It reports the progress through the system of each customer’s issue, and reminds those responsible for each step what needs to be done.

C3 has also automated much of the data entry required by the old system and allows customers to fill out web forms that can be easily incorporated into the database.

Since its rollout, C3 has brought about a more efficient customer comment process. This is shown in the statistic that best reflects our combined efforts to resolve and respond to our customers. We now process customer comments over five times faster than we did a year ago. We accomplished this while also tracking comments regarding Access service, the King County Water Taxi and DART as well as incorporating our old lost-and-found retrieval system.

With the new C3 system, management teams can now see at a glance how the agency is doing. If something piques their interest, they can easily get reports that drill down to details never seen in the system that preceded C3.

2) Customer complaints per boarding 

The number of customer complaints per million boardings increased by 14% in 2015, following a 10% decline the previous year. Complaints tend to spike with major changes in service. Metro’s new C3 system for tracking customer comments, complaints and requests for service came online in September and this new method of tracking may account for some of the increase.


3) On-time performance by time of day 

Metro has a target of at least 80% of bus trips being on time (between five minutes late and one minute early at key stops). In 2015, on-time performance was 74.9%, which was 1.4 percentage points below 2014. The recent decline started in the last quarter of 2014. Increased traffic congestion was a key contributor to that decline. More buses are late across the system, particularly in the PM peak (the 3 p.m.-7 p.m. period shown in the chart) and on service using highways. Increased ridership also plays a role—bus trips take a little longer when more people are getting on and off, especially if the bus is very crowded.

Data from late 2015, however, indicates on-time performance has begun to improve. The City of Seattle purchased additional bus service with funding from Proposition 1, approved by Seattle voters in November 2014. Many of Seattle’s investments focus on reducing crowding and improving reliability. Metro also made investments around the county.

In 2015, Metro’s Service Guidelines analysis found that 79 routes need a total investment of 23,550 service hours to improve reliability. We continue to identify and address “hot spots” where transit service slows down. We’ll be making changes like scheduling more time for travel on roads that have become more congested, adding more time between trips so that delays on one trip don’t affect later trips, and making other adjustments to schedules. These changes should improve on-time performance on many routes.

2) Complaints per million boardings



3) On-time performance by time of day

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
5 a.m. – 9 a.m.	81.3%	81.9%	82.1%	81.9%	79.2%
9 a.m. – 3 p.m.	74.9%	75.8%	78.2%	77.6%	75.8%
3 p.m. – 7 p.m.	69.0%	68.5%	69.2%	67.1%	65.3%
7 p.m. – 10 p.m.	73.0%	73.8%	75.4%	75.7%	76.3%
After 10 p.m.	80.7%	81.5%	82.6%	83.7%	83.8%
Weekday average	75.7%	76.3%	77.6%	76.0%	74.3%
Saturday	75.7%	75.7%	76.6%	76.5%	75.9%
Sunday	78.6%	77.9%	80.3%	79.1%	78.8%
Total system average	76.0%	76.4%	77.7%	76.3%	74.9%

A bus is considered to be on time if it is between one minute early and five minutes late at key stops. In 2014, the time periods were slightly revised to be consistent with the Service Guidelines. The changes varied by about 15 minutes to an hour. The pre-2014 numbers in the table reflect the previous definitions.

4) Crowding ⓘ

After increasing the past few years, the percentage of trips with more riders than seats remained steady between 2014 and 2015. Based on fall 2015 data, 5.5% of our trips had 20% more riders than seats, and 5% had 1 to 19% more riders than seats, for a total of 10.5%. Most likely, this flattening out of crowding was due to the addition of service hours in 2015, particularly with funding from the City of Seattle.¹

Part of the reason for increased crowding in prior years is that Metro, like transit systems across the country, has been moving to low-floor buses with fewer seats and more standing room than older buses have. RapidRide is one such coach type, and that service has seen tremendous ridership growth.

5) Use of Metro’s electronic media tools and alerts ⓘ

Metro has three major types of electronic media tools to help customers with their travel needs: the Metro Online and regional Trip Planner websites, Transit Alerts that are sent to subscribers via email and/or text messaging (which are also tweeted), and social media.

Total visits to Metro Online were 6.7 million in 2015 and visits to the online regional Trip Planner totaled 2.2 million visits. In January 2015, Metro launched the Puget Sound Trip Planner app for iOS and Android mobile devices. This new app allows riders to see schedules and real-time predictions for bus arrivals and to plan trips across 11 public transportation providers in our region while on the move.


The drop in visits to Metro Online and Trip Planner likely stems from the proliferation of other online tools offering similar services (e.g. Google Transit) and from the metrics and methodology Google uses to track online visits, which is constantly evolving and appears to have changed significantly from 2013 to 2015.

Transit Alerts (and the Eye on Your Metro Commute blog and associated tweets posted on Metro Online), have proven to be effective ways to communicate in real time about service disruptions and adverse weather issues. Since the beginning of this service in 2009, growth continues to be strong in both the number of subscribers and the number of messages sent. In 2015, 2,320 alerts communicated important information to our subscribers. The number of Transit Alerts subscribers grew from 53,407 at year-end 2014 to 54,770 at the end of 2015, a 2.6% increase.

Find more information about Metro's use of electronic media on p. 34, under 3) Social media indicators.


¹ This methodology for calculating crowding differs slightly from the methodology we use in our Service Guidelines report.

4) Bus trips with more riders than seats*



*A different methodology is used in this year's report and is applied retroactively to all five years.

5) Visits to Metro Online and Trip Planner* (in millions)



*A different methodology was used prior to 2013, so the numbers are not comparable and only 2013-2015 are shown.

Exercise sound financial management and build Metro’s long term sustainability.

► **Objective 6.1: Emphasize planning and delivery of productive service.**

Intended outcome: Service productivity improves.

► **Objective 6.2: Control costs.**

Intended outcome: Metro costs grow at or below the rate of inflation.

► **Objective 6.3: Seek to establish a sustainable funding structure to support short- and long-term public transportation needs.**

Intended outcome: Adequate funding to support King County’s short- and long-term public transportation needs.

Metro continues to focus on financial stewardship. In recent years, we used our Service Guidelines to reallocate many service hours from our lowest-performing service to more productive service. We will continue to use the guidelines annually to improve system productivity while advancing social equity and serving residential, employment and activity centers across the county.

We are striving to reduce costs, and included a number of new cost-control actions in our 2015-2016 budget. We are actively using Lean techniques to increase customer value and minimize waste.

Metro’s financial situation improved again in 2015 as a result of higher-than-anticipated fare revenue driven by both the higher ridership and the 2015 fare change. However, Metro’s long-term financial sustainability and system stability requires a reliable, consistent source of funding going forward.

HOW WE’RE DOING: GOAL 6 OVERVIEW

The effectiveness of Metro’s efforts to boost productivity was evident in 2015. Both ridership and productivity continued on the upward trends that began in 2010.

We were able to offer more service in 2015, yet saw similar productivity in terms of boardings per hour and passenger miles per vehicle mile.

Metro was able to provide this productive service at a 0.3% higher operating cost per hour than in 2014, well below the rate of inflation. Cost on a per-boarding and a per-passenger mile basis remained remarkably consistent in 2015.

The cost per vanpool boarding fell again in 2015, largely because of lower fuel costs. Access operating cost per boarding increased by over 8% due to lower-than-anticipated productivity.

Metro’s fare revenue reached record highs, driving the fare recovery ratio to almost 31%.

The use of ORCA as fare payment continued to grow in 2015, with about two-thirds of weekday boardings being paid with ORCA cards.

MEASURES		TREND
1	Service hours operated	+
2	Service hours and service hour change per route	●
3	Boardings per vehicle hour	↓
4	Boardings per revenue hour	↓
5	Ridership and ridership change per route	↓
6	Passenger miles per vehicle mile	+
7	Passenger miles per revenue mile	+
8	Cost per hour	+
9	Cost per vehicle mile	-
10	Cost per boarding	+
11	Cost per passenger mile	↓
12	Cost per vanpool boarding	+
13	Cost per Access boarding	-
14	Fare revenues	+
15	Farebox recovery	+
16	ORCA use	+
17	Asset condition assessment	+

1) **Service hours operated** +


Metro increased the number of bus vehicle hours we operated in 2015 to 3.62 million, an increase of 0.7% over 2014. Although service reductions were made in late 2014, these were offset in 2015 when the City of Seattle purchased additional bus service with funding from the November 2014 Proposition 1.

A 2009 Performance Audit of Transit recommended that Metro improve its scheduling efficiency by reducing layovers (the time between the end of one bus trip and the next trip). Our efforts toward implementing this recommendation have ensured a higher proportion of Metro bus hours are spent in service. Since 2008, Metro has increased service hours by 9.7%. The percentage increase in service hours is three times the percentage increase in overall hours (including layover and deadheading).

2) **Service hours and service hour change per route** ●

A detailed table of hours and changes in hours for Metro's 200+ routes is in Appendix F of Metro's 2015 Service Guidelines Report. That report can be found at: <http://metro.kingcounty.gov/planning/pdf/2011-21/2015/service-guidelines-full-report.pdf>

1) **Hours operated (in millions)**



Note:

We use the bus costs from Metro's submittal in the National Transit Database (NTD) to calculate financial ratios. This provides consistency among Metro's many publications, such as the Peer Comparison Report that is in the appendix of this report. The NTD costs exclude such items as interest expenses, leases and rentals, and other reconciling items, which usually add less than 1% to the total costs. (The 2015 NTD report is not yet audited.)

The inflation rates used in this report are from the King County Office of Economic and Financial Analysis, and

are based on the Consumer Price Index—Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers (CPI-W) for Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton. In 2015 the rate was 1.1%. King County also uses a target measure to keep costs at the rate of inflation plus population. That would add another 1.8%, which is the Washington State Office of Financial Management estimate for King County population growth from 2014 to 2015. Total bus costs increased 0.9% during that time.

GOAL 6: FINANCIAL STEWARDSHIP

3) Boardings per vehicle hour ❶

Metro uses bus boardings per vehicle hour (called boardings per platform hour in our Service Guidelines Report) to measure the productivity of transit service. The 2015 ratio was essentially the same as in 2014, as ridership grew at about the same rate as vehicle hours (0.7%). In prior years, Metro had steadily improved on this measure as a result of increasing ridership, improved scheduling efficiency, and reallocations of service hours and restructuring of routes based on our service guidelines.


4) Boardings per revenue hour ❶

Revenue hours grew faster than vehicle hours in 2015 (1.7%), showing more efficient use of hours. This growth outpaced the growth in bus passenger boardings, so the boardings per revenue hour declined for the first time since 2010.

5) Ridership and ridership change per route ❶

The 2015 Service Guidelines Report mentioned in Measure 2 also contains a detailed table on ridership and changes in ridership for Metro's 200+ routes. Some routes saw strong growth. Most notable are the RapidRide lines. On the five lines that existed in all of 2014 and 2015, total annual ridership grew 9%, putting it 53% above the baseline ridership levels.

3 and 4) Boardings per hour



Service and financial statistics

Metro uses many service statistics and financial indicators to track our progress and to compare with peer agencies.

Vehicle hours and **vehicle miles** measure all the time and distance between the time a coach leaves the transit base and the time it returns to the base.

Revenue hours and **revenue miles** exclude the time and distance of deadheading—when a bus is traveling from the base to its first trip, when a bus has ended its last trip and is returning to the base, and the travel from the end of one trip to the start of another. Metro operates much peak-hour, one-directional service, so the return from the end of one trip back to the start of the next trip is part of deadheading. Revenue hours include layover time—the time between the end of one bus trip and the start of the next. Some of the measures discussed in this chapter remove these scheduled layover hours, resulting in an estimate of **in-service hours**.

Boardings are the number of passengers who board transit vehicles. Passengers are counted each time

they board, no matter how many vehicles they use to travel from their origin to their destination. **Passenger miles** are the sum of the total distance traveled by all passengers.

Important financial ratios are based on total bus operating cost divided by the measures above. **Cost per vehicle hour** and **cost per vehicle mile** are *cost-efficiency measures* that gauge the cost inputs of a unit of service, as much of the cost is directly related to time and distance. **Cost per boarding** and **cost per passenger mile** are *cost-effectiveness measures* that show how economically we provide our core service, getting passengers to their destinations.

Finally, two productivity ratios are key indicators in Metro's Service Guidelines. **Boardings per vehicle hour** are the number of passengers getting on a bus each hour. **Passenger miles per vehicle mile** works out to be the average number of passenger on a bus at any given time. We assess each route's performance by measuring its productivity in these ratios.

GOAL 6: FINANCIAL STEWARDSHIP

6) Passenger miles per vehicle mile +

Metro focuses on bus passenger miles per vehicle mile as another key measure of transit service productivity. This ratio is also one of the key statistics in Metro's service guidelines. This ratio grew in each of the past five years as passenger boardings, and thus passenger miles, grew faster than vehicle miles. Vehicle miles declined slightly in 2015 as a result of service reductions enacted in late 2014. The improving job market contributes to the growth in passenger miles.

7) Passenger miles per revenue mile +

The passenger miles per revenue mile metric increased at a rate similar to the above metric, though growth in this measure over the past four years was about 2% slower than for passenger miles per vehicle mile. As noted above, revenue miles grew faster than vehicle miles as a result of more efficient scheduling practices that Metro adopted in 2010 and more total miles in service. As with vehicle miles, the revenue miles declined slightly in 2015 as a result of the September 2014 service reductions.


8) Cost per hour +

A key theme in previous Strategic Plan Progress Reports has been Metro's focus on cost containment following the Great Recession. It appears that these efforts are continuing to pay dividends. In 2015, Metro's operating cost was \$142.95 per vehicle hour, a 0.3% increase compared to 2014. This is less than the inflation rate of 1.1% during this period. After adjusting for inflation, Metro's 2015 cost per hour was 2.8% higher than in 2011.


9) Cost per vehicle mile -

Even though Metro's cost per hour barely changed, its bus cost per vehicle mile increased 2.2% between 2014 and 2015. This occurred because while hours increased, total miles decreased. The reason for this is the City of Seattle's service investments, which generally were made in more congested areas where bus speeds are slower. Likewise, congestion has increased throughout the service area. Adjusted for inflation, the cost per mile increased 7.7% from 2011 to 2015.


6 and 7) Passenger miles per mile



8) Cost per hour




9) Cost per vehicle mile



10) Cost per boarding **+**

Metro’s bus cost per boarding has been very flat since 2012, as passenger boardings have grown at about the same rate as total costs. In inflation-adjusted dollars, Metro’s 2015 cost per boarding was 2.4% lower than in 2011.

10) Cost per boarding



11) Cost per passenger mile **I**

Metro’s bus cost per passenger mile increased by a penny in 2015 as our growth in passenger miles was a little slower than the increase in our total costs. But over the past five years, the inflation-adjusted cost per passenger mile is 5.3% below the 2011 level.

11) Cost per passenger mile




12) Cost per vanpool boarding **+**

Metro’s vanpool operating cost per boarding decreased sharply over the past year—a 16.9% reduction from 2014 to 2015. We saw a reduction in gas prices consistent with that we saw for other modes that use gas, and from a reduction in liability coverage costs that are a function of our vanpool program’s long-term liability history. Together these totaled about \$1.2 million less in 2015 than 2014. This large reduction in cost offset the growth in boardings.

Our vanpool program met its guideline for cost recovery in the past several years. The King County Code requires commuter-van fares to be reasonably estimated to recover the full operating and capital costs and at least 25 percent of the administrative costs of the vanpool program.

12) Cost per vanpool/vanshare boarding




13) Cost per Access boarding -

The cost per Access boarding increased 8.3% to \$51.99 from 2014 to 2015. Productivity is trending 4% under target, which leads to a higher cost per trip. This was mostly due to the elimination of a primary transfer point in 2015 that effectively made two trips into one, which was done to reduce the number of transfers a customer would have to make and provide them with a better transit experience. The other productivity impact came from hard coding driver breaks into the schedules; previously they took breaks when slack was available.

Ongoing declines in Access ridership have led to contractual rate changes for providers, resulting in fixed costs being spread over fewer trips. Decreases in Access ridership can be attributed in part to the expansion of the Community Access Transportation program, which is a lower-cost alternative for providing rides to clients.


13) Cost per Access boarding



14) Fare revenues +

Fare revenues continue to climb. Metro has experienced increases in each of the past five years, from \$128.6 million in 2011 to \$159.4 million in 2015. The 2015 fare revenue represents a 2.1% increase over 2014. At least part of this growth has been the result of ridership gains in all five years. Fare increases have also contributed, with Metro implementing our latest fare increase in March 2015.


14) Fare revenues (in millions)



15) Farebox recovery +

Metro’s fund management policies, adopted in November 2011, establish a target of 25% for farebox recovery—total bus fares divided by total bus operating costs. From 2011 through 2015, farebox recovery in each year has exceeded our target, reaching a record-level 30.8% in 2015. As noted above, fares increased in March 2015. The \$0.25 across-the-board increase was at least partially offset through the creation of a new reduced fare for people with low incomes, which had a slight dampening effect on farebox recovery in 2015 and may result in a slightly lower farebox recovery rate in 2016 as the program continues to grow.


15) Farebox recovery



16) ORCA use +

The use of ORCA smart cards for fare payment has grown dramatically since their introduction in 2009. ORCA is used by seven Puget Sound agencies and provides a seamless fare medium for transferring among the systems. The use of smart card technology contributes to efficient operations and more accurate revenue reconciliation among the regional agencies. Virtually all passes are now on ORCA, and use of the ORCA E-purse has grown and cash payments have declined, which helps speed up operations. ORCA use on Metro buses has more than doubled since 2010. Nearly two-thirds of Metro’s weekday boardings are now paid with ORCA. The ORCA LIFT program should drive the ORCA market share higher by offering low-income cash customers a cheaper ORCA-based alternative.

16) ORCA taps on Metro Transit (in millions)



17) Asset condition assessment +

Metro was one of a select few transit agencies that worked with the Federal Transit Administration to develop a State of Good Repair Index for bus and trolley fleets. The 2013 assessment used a new methodology based on this work, so the score is not directly comparable to previous years. It will serve as the baseline for future measures. Metro Vehicle Maintenance continued to use the method established in 2013 for the 2015 assessment.

The 2015 assessment indicates that the fleet requires frequent minor repairs and infrequent major repairs. The average age of Metro’s buses decreased from 9.3 years in 2014 to 8.9 years as Metro placed 179 new buses into service in 2015. The resulting younger fleet changed total condition points from 60 (2014) to 64 (2015) on a scale of 1-100. As we continue to replace coaches over the next few years (242 in 2016 and 269 in 2017), including replacement of the 60-foot Breda trolleys (one of our oldest fleets), we can expect the condition of our fleet to improve and the age to decrease, resulting in a more reliable fleet.



Bus maintenance shop

Since 1985, Metro has maintained its fixed assets (buildings, systems and infrastructure) using a robust maintenance management program and a capital reinvestment strategy—the Transit Asset Management Program (TAMP). Through TAMP, Metro determines the condition of assets and plans long-range investment strategies and required funding. Since 2009, Metro has been working with the FTA’s Moving Ahead in the 21st Century Program (MAP-21) to update our decision-making and implementation strategies for preserving fixed and other assets. Metro completed assessments on an additional body of fixed assets including transit base and service support facilities. The summary report, which includes an update of previous findings, is scheduled for publication in third quarter 2016. Base asset condition data is being used to develop the 2017/2018 capital investment plan for fixed assets. When the MAP-21 general rules and guidelines become available in the near future, Metro will establish a measure consistent with them to assess fixed assets.

GOAL 7: PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND TRANSPARENCY

7

Promote robust public engagement that informs, involves, and empowers people and communities.

► **Objective 7.1: Empower people to play an active role in shaping Metro’s products and services.**

Intended outcome: The public plays a role and is engaged in the development of public transportation.

► **Objective 7.2: Increase customer and public access to understandable, accurate, and transparent information.**

Intended outcome: Metro provides information that people use to access and comment on the planning process and reports.



Long-range plan open house

Metro is committed to being responsive and accountable to the public. We uphold this commitment by involving the community in our planning process and making public engagement a part of every major service change or new service initiative. We also work to make our information and decision-making processes clear and transparent.

We reach out to customers and the public through a variety of forums and media channels, and make information available in multiple languages. We design

outreach and engagement strategies to involve a representation of all our riders and let the public know their participation is welcome and meaningful. Each engagement process is tailored to the target audiences.

Our Online Accountability Center (www.kingcounty.gov/metro/accountability) has detailed information on dozens of measures of ridership, safety and security, service quality, and finances; these are updated monthly. The site also features a number of Metro reports.

HOW WE’RE DOING: GOAL 7 OVERVIEW

Metro conducted a robust public engagement process in 2015 around integration of Metro bus service with new Link service to Capitol Hill and the University of Washington. The outreach gathered 16,000 comments from a broad spectrum of the public. We received 3,000 comments during long-range plan development.

Metro’s presence in social media continued to grow, with a 79% increase in the number of tweets, a 138% increase in Facebook followers, and triple the number of views of our Metro Matters blog.

To connect with hard-to-reach populations, we partnered with “trusted advocates,” translated materials, and placed information in ethnic media.

MEASURES		TREND
1	Public participation rates	+
2	Customer satisfaction regarding Metro’s communications and reporting	!
3	Social media indicators	+
4	Conformance with King County policy on communications accessibility and translation to other languages	!

GOAL 7: PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND TRANSPARENCY

1) Public participation rates

In 2015, Metro completed public engagement concerning integration of bus routes with Link light rail service to Capitol Hill and the University of Washington. This began with a first phase of outreach in 2014. During Phase 2, in March 2015, we asked riders and community members to comment on two service concepts. We used their feedback to create one proposed set of changes that we shared with the public in a final round of public outreach (Phase 3) in May 2015.

We received 16,000 comments in the following ways:

- Residents, students, and employees who travel in the project area provided feedback via online surveys and at outreach events.
- A community Sounding Board made up of 21 people who use transit in the project area, plus a selected group of transit riders and jurisdiction representatives who live and use transit along SR 520 corridor, met and provided advice.
- We invited more than 80 businesses, institutions, business and community groups, and organizations serving underrepresented populations to serve on the Sounding Board, provide feedback, and spread the word to their constituents.

The following are the numbers of people reached and the number that participated in Phase 2/Phase 3 of outreach:

People reached


- Website views: 25,500+/24,000+
- Social media: 32,000+/35,500+
- Street teams, information tables: 2,000+/4,500+
- Rack cards, posters: 25,000+/20,000+
- E-notifications: 35,000+/21,000+
- Stakeholders notified: 80+/80+
- Mailing to key community locations: 30+/30+

Participants

- Online survey responses: 6,000+/1,900+
- Public meetings, briefings: 200+/100+
- Phone/email: 60+/120+

Sixty-five percent of participants surveyed said they saw how public feedback shaped Metro's proposals.

Metro also began outreach for our long-range plan in February 2015. We conducted an online survey that gathered almost 3,000 responses, formed a Community Advisory Group, and held three visioning events attended by about 250 people. The second phase of outreach, from June through December 2015, attracted more than 6,000 survey responses and about 350 participants at open



U Link Sounding Board meeting

GOAL 7: PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND TRANSPARENCY

houses. We also invited more than 40 organizations to participate in a roundtable of organizations that serve transit-dependent communities and briefed key organizations.

Also in 2015 we conducted alternative service delivery engagement in southeast King County and Vashon Island. This included the formation of a project working group and a several-phase engagement process to learn about mobility needs and potential solutions. Thousands of people provided feedback via the working group, online surveys, information tables, face-to-face outreach on buses and at transit centers, and public meetings.

Metro concluded 2015 by engaging the public in shaping changes to bus service in southeast Seattle. We solicited feedback on our proposal via:

- An online survey: 674 responses
- Public meetings at the Filipino Community Center with 30+ attendees, and at a Georgetown Community Council-hosted public information session
- "Trusted advocate" outreach sessions and surveys: heard from approximately 250 people through face-to-face conversations in their native languages and paper surveys
- Phone, email, and written correspondence: input received from more than 100 residents and community organizations

We received more than 1,000 comments during this outreach.

2) Customer satisfaction with Metro's communications

In Metro's most recent Rider/Nonrider Survey, 62% of riders said they are very satisfied with their ability to get information about Metro, and most of the remainder said they are somewhat satisfied. These figures are consistent with the past few years. Respondents were also asked about the availability of information at Metro Online, and 61% reported being very satisfied. This is a decline from the 71% in 2014, but about equal to the 2013 figure.

3) Social media indicators


Metro continues to find innovative ways to reach out to our customers using social media. Below are some facts about four of our social media channels:

Metro Matters Blog

(<http://metrofutureblog.wordpress.com>)

- There were 60,102 views of the Metro Matters blog in 2015—nearly triple the views from 2014—by 37,452 unique visitors. Metro published 50 blog posts during the year, the most popular of which warned riders of upcoming regional traffic concerns (10,000 views for our most popular post—quadruple the views of the most popular post from 2014).

2) Satisfaction with overall ability to get information about Metro



GOAL 7: PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND TRANSPARENCY

King County Metro Transit Facebook page

(www.facebook.com/kcmetro)

- Metro's Facebook page followers increased 138%, from 2,568 followers in 2014 to 6,118 in 2015.
- We posted 408 stories about news, service disruptions, employment information, and opportunities for public participation and feedback, compared to 316 stories in 2014—a 29% increase.

Have a Say Facebook page

(www.facebook.com/haveasayatkcmetro)

Page "likes" grew from 507 in 2014 to 520 in 2015.

King County Metro Twitter

(@kcmetrobus)

- Used for sharing news, links, photos and videos with followers. The number of followers increased by 62 percent in 2015—from 25,292 to 40,908.
- During 2015, we tweeted 8,643 times (79% more than 2014). The tweets were marked as "favorite" 3,118 times (up 99%), retweeted 6,574 times (up 89%), and replied to 2,779 times (up 89%).
- Twitter activity generated 12.5 million impressions (up 76%), 109,418 engagements (up 71%) and 29,908 URL clicks (up 50%).

4) Conformance with King County policy on communications accessibility and translation to other languages ⓘ

To ensure that all voices are included in Metro's decision-making processes, we research demographics and design outreach strategies to reach people who are unlikely to learn about our process via mainstream channels. We comply with King County's executive order on translation, which mandates translation or accommodation where more than 5% of an affected population speaks a language other than English.

We reach historically underrepresented populations by partnering with organizations and making information available in a variety of forms and languages. We work with organizations to be present at events that serve their clientele—such as staffing information tables. We go door-to-door or board buses to reach people directly, work with ethnic media outlets and small community publications, make our materials and surveys available in large print, provide language lines, and offer interpreters (including those for people who are deaf or deaf/blind). We document our outreach in public engagement reports.

In 2015, we provided materials, hosted language lines, and conducted outreach activities in:

- Amharic
- Arabic
- Cambodian/Khmer
- Chinese – Mandarin and Cantonese
- Hmong
- Korean
- Oromo
- Punjabi
- Russian
- Somali
- Spanish
- Tagalog
- Tigrinyan
- Ukrainian
- Vietnamese

In an effort to recruit and diversify King County's Transit Advisory Commission, we translated commission information and the application into Spanish and have begun a recruitment effort targeted to Spanish speakers.

Develop and empower Metro’s most valuable asset, its employees.

► **Objective 8.1: Attract and recruit quality employees.**

Intended outcome: Metro is satisfied with the quality of its workforce.

► **Objective 8.2: Empower and retain efficient, effective, and productive employees.**

Intended outcome: Metro employees are satisfied with their jobs and feel their work contributes to an improved quality of life in King County.

Metro’s products and services are a reflection of the employees who deliver them. Metro strives to recruit quality, committed employees and create a positive work environment. We value a diverse and skilled workforce and strive to support our employees, empower them to excel, recognize their achievements, and help them develop professionally.

To help us achieve our objectives, our Workforce Development Program focuses on the development and ongoing support of employees. The program’s priorities include the following:

- Build a robust talent pipeline that attracts high-quality talent early in their academic or professional careers to consider employment at Metro.
- Ensure that Metro leaders can effectively engage, develop, and support staff members in being



Driver Appreciation Day

- successful, productive, and committed to continuous improvement.
- Provide leaders with tools and processes to effectively manage performance.
- Facilitate staff and leader career development opportunities (both lateral and vertical).
- Implement meaningful selection and development processes to grow highly skilled talent that is capable of leading Metro into the future.
- Align all talent and workforce development activities with Metro’s strategic priorities.

HOW WE'RE DOING: GOAL 8 OVERVIEW

Metro considers the diversity of its workforce one of its key strengths. Changes in workforce demographics occur gradually without much year-to-year change. King County placed a renewed emphasis on employee engagement as part of its 2015 employee survey, which found that almost three-fourths of Metro’s employees would recommend King County as a great place to work. Following a decline in promotion rates in 2014, driven primarily by budget concerns, Metro has responded in 2015 by offering 80% more promotions in 2015, a five-year high.

MEASURES		TREND
1	Demographics of Metro employees	↓
2	Employee job satisfaction	○
3	Promotion rates	+
4	Probationary pass rate	↓

GOAL 8: QUALITY WORKFORCE

1) Demographics of Metro employees

Metro strives to maintain a diverse workforce. The table at right shows the race and gender makeup of our workforce in 2015. The workforce does not differ significantly from year to year, and this demographic makeup is very similar to that of the past two years. Compared with the county population as a whole, our workforce continues to be more male, less Asian, less Hispanic, and less white. Metro follows an established outreach plan for advertising job opportunities to a diverse applicant pool. These efforts include advertising in a variety of community publications, attending career fairs, working with community-based organizations, establishing relationships with apprenticeship and trade schools, and maintaining an internet presence that promotes Metro job openings.

1) Demographic of Metro employees

	Male	Female	Total	
White	2,146	635	2,781	59%
Black	765	280	1,045	22%
Asian	456	69	525	11%
Hispanic	147	43	190	4%
American Indian	52	22	74	1%
Pacific Islander	48	10	58	1%
Multiple	36	12	48	1%
Not Specified	5	4	9	1%
Total	3,655	1,075	4,730	
Percentage	77%	23%		

2) Employee job satisfaction

In the 2015 King County employee survey, Metro’s overall engagement score was 69%, with 73% of respondents recommending King County as a great place to work, and 53% indicating they would stay at King County if offered a similar job with the same pay and benefits. This employee survey will be conducted annually and used to identify the issues most important to employees. Action plans are being developed at every level of the organization to address these issues.




3) Promotion rates

Metro saw an approximate 80% increase in promotions in 2015 compared to 2014. With significant addition of jobs as a result of service investments, many opportunities became available for internal staff to promote from within. (Promotions include career service, temporary term-limited temporary, and part-time transit operators but do not include voluntary transfers, rehires or movement of operators from part-time to full-time.) A primary focus of Metro’s Workforce Development Program is to support the growth and development of our staff. Specific program elements include:

- Successful launch of the Aspiring Leadership Program pilot; currently working to scale up across division
- Launch of the first iteration of the Chief’s Toolbox, a division-wide repository of information and support for frontline leadership

3) Promotions and hires



GOAL 8: QUALITY WORKFORCE


- Leadership Excellence And Development project (to develop superintendent and supervisor candidates)
- Newly designed leader and employee onboarding process
- Lean leadership development programs for senior leadership team
- Career development workshop piloted and transitioning to focus on apprenticeships as viable career paths



4) Probationary pass rate ①

Metro continues to maintain a low probationary turnover rate, maintaining a 4% average as in previous years. Overall, Metro has a fairly low rate of employees leaving during their probationary periods, and our training and onboarding efforts will help us ensure that new employees acquire the knowledge and skills they need to become effective members of Metro's team. (The "retained" category does not include transit operator trainees, only regular career service positions. "Terminated" does not include 19 transit operators who passed training but terminated within one year. Out of 510 trainees hired in 2015, 137 failed to graduate.)

4) Turnover rate of new hires





Peer Agency Comparison on Performance Measures

May 2016



Department of Transportation
Metro Transit Division
King Street Center, KSC-TR-0415
201 S. Jackson St
Seattle, WA 98104
206-553-3000 TTY Relay: 711
www.kingcounty.gov/metro

Alternative Formats Available
206-477-3832 TTY Relay: 711

Peer agency comparison on performance measures

Every year, King County Metro Transit compares its performance to that of peer agencies using data from the National Transportation Database (NTD). Metro compares itself to 29 of the other largest¹ bus transit agencies in the U.S. on eight indicators. The comparisons include only the agencies' bus modes (motor bus, trolley bus, commuter bus, and rapid bus, as defined by the NTD).

The measures presented are from 2014, with comparisons to previous years. NTD annual data are not available until the end of the following year at the earliest, so the analysis is delayed by at least one year. Other challenges to peer analyses include the fact that only bus performance measures are measured, but many of the peer agencies also operate significant rail systems around which they structure their bus networks. This may affect their performance on the measures compared.

Also, it is not always clear what has been included and excluded in the NTD reports. In previous years, Metro reports included Sound Transit bus service operated by Metro. This year's analysis does not include Sound Transit service, but the composition of other agencies' reports is uncertain. That is one reason Metro uses a robust cohort of 30 peers and shows the averages among them.²

The key measures compared are based on service and financial statistics. Service measures are: boardings (the total number of times passengers board buses during the year), vehicle hours and vehicle miles (the hours and miles a bus travels from the time it leaves its base until it returns), and passenger miles (the total miles traveled by all passengers).

Financial measures are the total bus operating cost divided by the service statistics. Farebox recovery is the total bus fare revenue divided by operating costs.

Among its peers, Metro was one of the fastest growing agencies in boardings and passenger miles over the past 10 years, and was the fastest growing agency in terms of boardings in the years 2010-2014. The ridership increase reflects a local economy that has weathered the effects of the Great Recession better than most of Metro's peers. It also reflects Metro's focus on increasing service on some of our most productive routes, such as the RapidRide lines.

Metro was near the middle of its peers in cost-related indicators. Coming out of the recession, Metro raised fares, collected a short-term "congestion reduction charge," and took many actions to cut costs and improve efficiency in order to maintain service. As a result, expenses during this five-year period had modest growth and service levels remained stable. With the increase in ridership, Metro has one of the slowest growth rates in costs per boarding and per passenger mile during this period.

After the temporary funding was phased out and not replaced by another funding source, Metro had to make significant service reductions in September 2014. While this had a dampening impact on costs, it also had a dampening impact on the service provided in terms of bus hours and vehicle miles as well as service consumed (i.e. boardings and passenger miles).

	2014		1-year Annual Growth			5-year Annual Growth			10-year Annual Growth		
	Metro	Rank	Metro	Peer Avg	Rank	Metro	Peer Avg	Rank	Metro	Peer Avg	Rank
Boardings	120.1	9	118.2	0.6%	2	2.5%	0.2%	1	2.7%	0.2%	3
Boardings per hour	33.4	10	33.8	-0.2%	2	2.0%	0.5%	6	1.6%	-0.3%	2
Passenger miles per mile	12.0	9	10.8	-5.8%	8	3.8%	1.8%	9	1.1%	1.0%	16
Cost per hour	\$142.46	9	\$129.17	2.4%	12	3.1%	2.4%	12	2.5%	3.9%	21
Cost per mile	\$11.58	10	\$11.02	3.0%	10	3.5%	2.9%	14	3.1%	4.4%	22
Cost per boarding	\$4.27	11	\$4.04	4.5%	25	1.1%	1.9%	18	0.9%	4.1%	28
Cost per passenger mile	\$0.96	17	\$1.04	3.8%	20	-0.2%	1.2%	19	1.9%	2.8%	22
Farebox recovery ¹	30.5%	9	27.5%	-0.8%	5	1.1%	0.8%	16	8.2%	1.2%	5

Ranking compared to previous year:

Improving **Declining** No change

¹By number of boardings.

²The 2014 peer comparison added Santa Clara and removed Austin, which is no longer in the top 30 by boardings.

³The growth is the total percentage-point growth.

Service measures

Productivity, measured as boardings per vehicle hour, is one of the key priorities for Metro service investments, along with social equity and geographic value. Metro has seen more growth in this productivity measure than many of its peer agencies. This is likely a function of two factors:

1. Metro continued to add service to productive routes and to routes that were experiencing crowding issues brought on by development and increasing population densities in key suburban areas. For example, Metro increased its investment in the busy Route 212 from Eastgate into downtown Seattle.
2. Budget-driven service reductions resulted in fewer service hours without significantly impacting the demand for Metro service. As a result, the previously noted ridership gains outweighed reductions in service hours.


Metro's productivity ratio also continues to benefit from the service guidelines that were adopted in 2011. These guidelines moved some investment from routes in east and south King County, with their lower density and productivity, to routes in denser, highly productive areas such as Seattle's urban core.

As mentioned earlier, the growth in employment over the past few years has also added significantly to boardings and thus boardings per hour. Coupled with Metro's efforts to reduce layover time, as recommended in King County's 2009 Performance Audit of Transit, these factors increased Metro's boardings per hour.




Bus Boardings 2014

(in millions)




Metro had 120.1 million bus boardings in 2014 (peer rank: 9).

**Bus Boardings
Percentage Change 2013–2014**



One-year change: Metro boardings increased 2% in 2014 (peer rank: 2), while the peers averaged a 0.6 loss in ridership.

**Bus Boardings
Average Annual Percentage Change 2010–2014**




Five-year change: Metro boardings increased by a yearly average of 2.5% from 2010 to 2014 (peer rank: 1), while the peers averaged a slight increase.

Metro appears to be bucking the national trend of low growth or declining ridership brought on by low inflation and low fuel prices which make automobile operations comparably cheaper.

Metro likely benefits from a strong local economy, which creates a higher demand for transit commute trips. Investments in highly productive routes (such as RapidRide) have helped offset ridership losses from the budget-driven service reductions in September 2014.




Bus Boardings Average Annual Percentage Change 2005–2014




10-year change: Metro's boardings increased by a yearly average of 2.7% from 2005 to 2014 (peer rank: 3), while the peers had flat ridership.

Boardings Per Vehicle Hour 2014




2014: Metro had 33.4 boardings per hour (peer rank: 10).

Boardings Per Vehicle Hour Percentage Change 2013-2014




One-year change: Ridership grew 2% while hours decreased 0.1%, resulting in a net gain of 2.2% in boardings per hour (peer rank: 2). The peers averaged a decline of 0.2% in 2014.

**Boardings Per Vehicle Hour
Average Annual Percentage Change 2010–2014**




Five-year change: Metro's boardings per hour increased by a yearly average of 2% from 2010 to 2014 (peer rank: 6), while the peers averaged a 0.5% increase.

**Boardings Per Vehicle Hour
Average Annual Percentage Change 2005–2014**




10-year change: Metro's boardings per hour increased by a yearly average of 1.6% from 2005 to 2014 (peer rank: 2). This reflects the strong long-term growth in boardings mentioned in the previous section.

Passenger Miles Per Vehicle Mile 2014




2014: Metro had 12 passenger miles per vehicle mile (peer rank: 9). This measure is really an indication of the average number of passengers that are on a bus at any particular time; the number varies significantly by route, day of week and time of day.

Passenger Miles Per Vehicle Mile Percentage Change 2013-2014




One-year change: Metro's passenger miles per vehicle mile increased 2.8% from 2013 to 2014 (peer rank: 8). Metro's vehicle miles fell in 2014 by 0.9%.

**Passenger Miles Per Vehicle Mile
Average Annual Percentage Change 2010–2014**



Five-year change: Strong ridership growth from 2012 to 2014 helped stem the five-year trend of falling passenger miles per vehicle mile. From 2010 to 2014, this ratio increased at an average annual rate of 3.8% (peer rank: 9). The change in passenger miles reflects changes in both ridership and trip length, while vehicle miles reflects service levels. Since vehicle miles in 2014 were nearly identical to those in 2010, the improvement in this measure came primarily from the increase in passenger miles that resulted from the closure of the downtown Seattle Ride Free Area, a source of numerous short trips, and from increased employment and longer commute trips.

**Passenger Miles Per Vehicle Mile
Average Annual Percentage Change 2005–2014**



10-year change: Over 10 years, Metro's passenger miles per vehicle mile increased at an annual rate of 1.1% (peer rank: 16), slightly better than the peer average of 1%.


Financial measures

The cost of operating transit service tends to fall into two categories:


1. The direct costs of putting buses on the road, such as fuel or power (for trolley buses), vehicle maintenance, driver wages and insurance. Direct costs total about 70% of the cost of operating bus service.
2. Indirect cost (about 30% of total operating costs) are for things such as information technology, safety and security, administrative services and maintenance of transit-related facilities.

Metro has a couple of other costs that other transit agencies do not have. Because Metro is part of a large, general-purpose government, it pays for support that is provided by other county agencies. In addition, Metro maintains and operates the Downtown Seattle Transit Tunnel. While adding to Metro's total costs, this facility also supports efficient operation and quality of service in the busy Seattle core, reducing the number of service hours needed and providing the added benefit of reducing congestion on Seattle's crowded streets. Both of these costs fall into the indirect cost category.

Metro also relies on a broad array of vehicle sizes and types to operate its service. This fleet mix can have a significant influence on operating cost. Large articulated buses allow Metro to carry more passengers during periods of high demand. Electricity-powered trolleybuses minimize pollution, operate more quietly, and are well-suited for climbing the steep hills of Seattle. However, articulated buses and trolleybuses tend to be more expensive to run on a per-hour and per-mile basis.




Operating Cost Per Vehicle Hour 2014




2014: Metro's operating cost per hour was \$142.46 (peer rank: 9th most expensive).

Operating Cost Per Vehicle Hour Percentage Change 2013-2014




One-year change: From 2013 to 2014, Metro's operating cost per hour increased 2.3%, which kept it below the average growth of its peers (peer rank: 12). Metro's focus on controlling costs continued in 2014, resulting in another year-to-year change showing a slower growth rate than the previous year.

Operating Cost Per Vehicle Hour Average Annual Percentage Change 2010-2014



Five-year change: Metro's has sought to control costs over the past five years with the annual growth in expenses averaging about 3% during this period. On a cost per hour basis, however, Metro is slightly above the average of its peers due in large part to the limited growth in hours resulting from the September 2014 service reductions.




Metro's operating costs per vehicle mile (shown on the next page) are affected by the geography and topography of Metro's service area. Puget Sound, Lake Washington and Lake Sammamish limit the street network, causing increased traffic congestion, and the region has steep hills along key travel corridors. Together, these factors slow the travel speeds of Metro's buses. Since many costs accrue regardless of distance traveled (i.e. driver wages), slower travel times mean higher costs per mile.

It's no surprise that service in other congested cities (New York, Chicago, Baltimore) and in other cities that have similar geographical constraints (San Francisco) is more expensive per mile. Cities without these constraints (Dallas, Las Vegas, Phoenix) are among the least expensive to operate.


10-year change: Metro saw rosier results over a 10-year period with an average annual percentage growth in cost per hour of 2.5% (peer rank: 21), well below the peer average. While the growth in expenses averaged 4% annually during this time, the growth in hours topped 10%.

Operating Cost Per Vehicle Mile 2014




2014: Metro's operating cost per vehicle mile was \$11.58 (peer rank: 10).

Operating Cost Per Vehicle Mile Percentage Change 2013-2014




One-year change: Metro's operating cost per vehicle mile increased 3% in 2014 (peer rank: 10). Metro's miles decreased by 0.9% and vehicle hours decreased by 0.1%, so cost per mile increased more than cost per hour.

**Operating Cost Per Vehicle Mile
Average Annual Percentage Change 2010–2014**




Five-year change: Metro's average annual growth was 3.5% over five years (peer rank: 14). As with the operating cost per hour measure, Metro cost containment efforts were overshadowed by the lack of five-year growth in vehicle miles, primarily as a result of the 2014 service reductions.

**Operating Cost Per Vehicle Mile
Average Annual Percentage Change 2005–2014**




10-year change: Metro's average annual growth in cost per mile was 3.1% (peer rank: 22), much lower than the peer average of 4.4%.

Operating Cost Per Boarding 2014




2014: Metro's operating cost per boarding was \$4.27 (peer rank: 11). Many of the issues that make Metro's cost high on per-hour and per-mile measures also drive Metro's relatively high cost per boarding, including trip length, fleet mix, and vehicle speed. As Metro's productivity continues to grow, cost per boarding will fall.

Operating Cost Per Boarding Percentage Change 2013-2014




One-year change: Operating cost and boardings grew at similar rates from 2013 to 2014, causing the ratio to increase by only 0.1% and leaving the cost growth rate well below many of Metro's peers (peer rank: 25).

**Operating Cost Per Boarding
Average Annual Percentage Change 2010–2014**




Five-year change: The recent flattening of growth in Metro's operating cost coupled with its growth in boardings during this period resulted in Metro falling below many of its peers in average annual growth over five years, up 1.1% (peer rank: 18—the further down the chart, the better).

**Operating Cost Per Boarding
Average Annual Percentage Change 2005–2014**




10-year change: As with five-year growth, Metro's average annual growth in cost per boarding of 0.9% over the past 10 years remains low compared to its peers (peer rank: 28), and significantly below the average of 4.1%.

Operating Cost Per Passenger Mile 2014




2014: Metro's operating cost per passenger mile was \$0.96 in 2014 (peer rank: 17), below the peer average of \$1.04. One of the impacts of the geographical constraints noted previously is that narrower corridors tend to extend trip lengths as activity centers and housing are spread over further distances. As a result, Metro tends to accumulate a greater number of passenger miles per boarding than most of its peers, so the operating cost per passenger mile tends to be lower than its peers.

Operating Cost Per Passenger Mile Percentage Change 2013-2014




One-year change: Metro's operating cost per passenger mile grew 0.3% from 2013 to 2014 (peer rank: 20). This compares to a peer average of 3.8% growth in cost per passenger mile.

**Operating Cost Per Passenger Mile
Average Annual Percentage Change 2010–2014**




Five-year change: The recent reduction in operating cost per passenger mile lowered Metro's average annual growth to -0.2% over five years, putting it below the average among its peers (peer rank: 19). Previous reductions in passenger miles and average trip length were erased in 2014, with passenger miles showing growth from almost 459 million in 2010 to nearly 533 million in 2014.

**Operating Cost Per Passenger Mile
Average Annual Percentage Change 2005–2014**




10-year change: Metro's average annual growth in cost per passenger mile over 10 years was 1.9% (peer rank: 22), less than the average of 2.8%. As with the other cost metrics, the cost containment discussed earlier benefits Metro's performance on this metric over five- and 10-year periods.

Farebox Recovery 2014




2014: Metro's revenue from sales tax, its primary source of funding, fell as a result of the Great Recession and took a number of years to recover. To replace a portion of the lost revenue, Metro raised fares each year from 2009 through 2011, driving farebox recovery (bus fare revenue divided by bus operating cost) to 30.5% (peer rank: 9).

Farebox Recovery Difference 2013-2014




One-year change: With no fare increase in 2014, and increases in ridership and operating expenses being roughly equal, Metro's farebox recovery rate grew 1.4 percentage points in 2014 (peer rank: 5).

Farebox Recovery Difference 2010–2014



Five-year change: Farebox recovery increased by a total of 1.1 percentage points over five years (peer rank: 11). This increase is due primarily to fare increases that brought in more revenue during the first few years of this time period.

Farebox Recovery Difference 2005–2014



10-year change: Farebox recovery increased by a total of 8.2 percentage points over 10 years (peer rank: 4). This was driven by ridership increases and fare increases.

