



City Council Joint Study Session with Planning Commission

AGENDA

May 8, 2011

6:30 pm – 8:00 pm

Call to Order

Public Comment

This is an opportunity for the public to address the Council. Three-minutes limit per person or 5 minutes if representing the official position of a recognized community organization.

Topics

- Environmentally Critical Areas (ECA) Review Process
- Transportation Comprehensive Plan Amendment/Level of Service Study/Transportation Impact Fees
- King County Metro Alternative Service Plan

Adjournment

City Council meetings are wheelchair accessible. American Sign Language (ASL) interpretation is available upon request. Please phone (425) 295-0500 at least 48 hours in advance. Assisted Listening Devices are also available upon request.



Memorandum

May 4, 2012

TO: Ben Yazici, City Manager

FM: Kamuron Gurol, DCD Director

RE: Joint City Council / Planning Commission Meeting on May 8, 2012

As you know, a draft agenda for the joint May 8, 2012 City Council and Planning Commission Study Session, was discussed at last night's Planning Commission meeting. The main topic is to provide an update on the Environmentally Critical Areas (ECA) code update process. The update would cover:

- Scope and schedule
- Overview of PC process
- Brief recap of meetings held so far
- Examples of policy choices under consideration
- Review documentation and draft decision table

Below is a little more information on these topics in advance. You have received a separate memo from Laura Philpot outlining the proposed process and timeframe for the Transportation Level of Service topic to be discussed that night as well.

Please let me know if you have questions or need more information, thanks!

ECA Update: Scope and schedule

The Commission is focusing its work on the set of Known Topics adopted by the City Council in late 2011 and the associated schedule. There has been public input requesting additional topics that would expand the scope and cause the schedule to slip. So far, the Commission's work is on schedule and staff is creating a list of additional topics that could be considered in the future as determined by the Council and City Manager.

Overview of the Process

The Commission created a graphical flow chart to illustrate the process it is using to take in Best Available Science (BAS) information, public input and staff recommendations. The Chair and Vice Chair reviewed the flow chart with the Deputy Mayor and other Councilmembers in several recent meetings, and they will present the process to the full Council on May 8th to seek any further guidance. The Commissioners are working hard to ensure that the process is fair, comprehensive, fact-based, and reflective of community values and within the bounds of adopted policy and law.

Brief recap of meetings held so far

The Commission started the process with 'ECA 101' meetings in February and began the first set of substantive issues in March. So far, they have held 5 meetings including 3 open houses and 5 opportunities for public comment and input. Public participation has been good, with meetings averaging 20-40 attendees.

The topics have been grouped and each group is handled in a two-step process. Step one involves presentation of the BAS information, a question & answer period for the consultant, and then a public open house opportunity for individual or small group discussions. Step two includes staff presenting a set of proposed changes to the ECA code arising from the BAS reports, public comment or staff experience. More public comment is taken and the Commission makes the decision to advance each proposed change to the next phase.

As the process goes on, specific amendment language will be developed and made available for public review, the Commission will hold one or more formal public hearings. Following testimony, the commissioners will deliberate and make their recommendations.

Policy choices under consideration

A variety of policy choices are under review, and all materials are available on the city website. Staff will provide a short overview of a few selected items to illustrate the choices. Since the Commission has not yet completed its work nor held its formal public hearing, no formal recommendations have been made as of yet.

Documentation overview

One of the Commission's goals is ensure that the documentation they produce is thorough, clear and helpful to the city council. To that end, staff have developed and are maintaining a series of documents to capture and respond to public comment and to show the recommendations and the associated rationale. We hope to briefly review these documentation types at the meeting.



Memorandum

DATE: May 2, 2012

TO: City Council
Planning Commission
Ben Yazici, City Manager

FROM: Laura Philpot, PE; Public Works Director

RE: Transportation Comprehensive Plan Update: Level of Service Standards and Street Impact Fees

At the joint City Council and Planning Commission Study Session on May 8, 2012 staff will be discussing the City's Transportation Comprehensive Plan (an element of the City's overall comprehensive plan), the current Level of Service (LOS) standards and the City's street impact fees.

The Transportation Comprehensive Plan sets the overarching policies for the City's Transportation system, including the LOS. Once the policies are set that define the LOS for the City, the Growth Management Act (GMA) and state law require that a plan exists to assure growth and projects that maintain that LOS are completed concurrently (concurrently by state law means six (6) years).

The City has a transportation model that includes all of the current land use and predicted growth for the city and neighboring jurisdictions. This model predicts with a great deal of certainty where deficiencies will occur as growth occurs. Based on this, a project list was developed. The costs of the projects are the starting basis for the city's street impact fee. All new development must pay their associated impact fees. The city must expend the collected fees to correct existing or predicted system deficiencies in the adopted LOS within six (6) years.

Staff has heard some desire to modify the current project list. The policies that define the LOS must be reviewed and modified appropriately before the project list can be modified.

If the policies are modified in a way that changes the city's project list, the list will be updated and a new street impact fee calculated.

Staff will be presenting to both the City Council and the Planning Commission on Tuesday, May 8, 2012, following the outline that succeeds this paragraph to clarify the program and to help clearly define the scope of this work for the Planning Commission and for staff.

- A. Transportation Program History/ 101 Level information
- B. Explain the City's Transportation Model
 - a. How does it work
 - b. What does it looks like

Item 2

- c. Information on recent calibration work and effects of recently completed projects
- C. Review the current project list –
- a. Desire to review the cost/benefit for specific projects currently needed to meet the City's LOS standards
 - b. Recap why we cannot change the project list without looking at the whole program
 - c. Discuss adding projects associated with the Town Center development
 - d. Review options for SE 4th Street capacity needs within the Town Center
- D. Assumptions
- a. City maintains the current methodology for calculating level of service
 - b. City maintains the current methodology for calculating the traffic impact fee amounts
- E. Review alternatives to address any desired modifications to the project list
- a. Remove existing project(s) and run model to see if alternative projects can be added to the system to meet future capacity needs to maintain concurrency (share some pros/cons)
 - b. Adjust the city's level of service standards system wide (share some pros/cons)
 - c. Assign unique level of service standards for specific corridors that differs from the rest of the city (share some pros/cons)
 - d. Look at new ways of averaging capacity, e.g. adding a screen line across the north end of the city and averaging the capacity of ELSP, Sahalee and 244th Ave NE (share some pros/cons)
- F. Staff Recommendations/Direction needed:
- a. Staff will provide a concise recommendation as to scope of work for the Planning Commission in 2012
 - b. Staff will be seeking Council direction to move forward
- G. Discuss Recommended Schedule
- a. **JULY/SEPT:** Meet with Planning Commission in Late July if the Planning Commission calendar can accommodate; if not, meet in Early September
 - b. **OCTOBER:** Hold joint Planning Commission/City Council public hearing
 - c. **NOVEMBER:** Council adopts any necessary modifications as part of the 2013/2014 budget process

Item 3

Transportation options

King County



We'll Get You There

Products	Product Description	Cost per Boarding	Benefits	Constraints	Existing Implementations	Where it works	Applications
Access	Access provides door to door ADA paratransit service using accessible vans for ADA eligible customers who have a disability that prevents them from riding the bus and are registered for the service.	Cost per boarding is \$38.64	Complies with the requirements of the ADA. Provides equal access to public transit for people who have a disability that prevents bus use.	Less cost effective in areas where Access ridership is low. Ridesharing is essential to reducing the cost of the service.	All transit agencies in U.S.	In areas served by fixed route bus service.	Currently available where fixed route service is provided.
Bus	Bus service on fixed routes and schedules available to general public.	Cost per boarding is \$4.03	Provides consistent, cost-effective transportation service to general public and significantly reduces SOV usage in urban/suburban areas where it is used.	Less cost effective in areas where population density is low due to low ridership and fixed cost of service.	All transit agencies in U.S.	Works best in urban and suburban areas with significant population demand for mass transit services.	Service available in all urban, suburban and most rural communities.
CAT - Community Shuttles	King County creates partnerships with jurisdictions or agencies to set up their own transportation service. The County provides 8, 12, or 15 passengers accessible vans and operating grants to cover expenses such as gas, maintenance and labor. Agencies provide insurance, scheduling, drivers and monthly ridership reports. The service is currently set up for people with special transportation needs, but could be revised to include the general public	Cost per boarding is \$4.59. There is no cost to user for the Senior Services shuttles (including Hyde Shuttle). SVT charges 50 cents for general public, 25 cents for seniors. Maple Valley Shuttle is 50 cents.	Fills gaps in service; Cost effective alternative to ADA Paratransit Service and is adaptable to meet the needs of the community	Partnering agency or jurisdiction needed to run the service; Vehicles need to be purchased to meet demand; budget would have to be adopted to cover expansion.	King County; Snohomish County; Portland, Oregon	Could be implemented anywhere. Service is adaptable to meet the needs of the community	Currently implemented through community organizations.
Custom Bus	Custom Bus is an express bus service designed to meet the specific needs of commuters and students who subscribe to the service who travel to locations not well served by fixed route transit. Buses make a minimum of one round-trip each day. Employers and schools contract with King County Metro for these customized express bus routes. Fares are set to cover 100% of the operating costs and riders pay for the service with a monthly pass, or daily cash fare.	Cost per boarding is \$7.73.	Ability to provide revenue backed service to areas not served by fixed route. The service provides a fast trip time, using limited number of passenger stops, freeway express stops in areas where fixed route service is not provided. Provides access to transit to King County residents who work outside King County.	Cost is more than regular transit service. Requires employer investment.	Participating employers include Boeing, Lakeside School and University Prep.	Routes generally operate on freeways and stops or on major arterials. The service allows for close-in loading and unloading for the commuter at the work or school end of the trip and operates at times compatible with commuters' shift or school schedule requirements.	Allows for cost sharing among employer groups and institutions. It is a viable option to replace regular transit service where there is a service need.

Transportation options

King County



Products	Product Description	Cost per Boarding	Benefits	Constraints	Existing Implementations	Where it works	Applications
DART	Metro's Dial-a-Ride Transit (DART) offers variable routing in some areas within King County to the general public by using vans that can go off regular routes to pick up and drop off passengers within a defined service area, allowing passengers to arrange for transit service closer to a location. DART does not go door-to-door. It operates on a fixed schedule, but one that has more flexibility than regular Metro Transit buses.	Cost per boarding is \$7.30. Cost to user is same as regular bus fare.	Ability to provide revenue backed service to areas not served by fixed route. It operates on a fixed schedule, but one that has more flexibility than regular Metro Transit buses. Smaller vehicles can be deployed appropriate to customer demand in area.	Users need to plan trips in advance and may not be able to travel when they want to. Metro's contract with Local 587 limits DART operations to 3% of the total annual service hours provided by Metro. (DART service currently accounts for 2.7%.)	Most transit agencies offer some type of flexible transit service with route deviation.	Works best where there is consistent rider demand that can be met by a smaller vehicle. Service adaptable to meet customer demand in a defined service area.	DART service is being used in suburban and rural areas of King County where fixed-route service does not or would not have enough ridership.
Taxi Scrip	County provides Taxi Scrip equivalent to 50% of taxi trip for low-income King County residents age 18 to 64 who have a disability or age 65 and over for taxi trips. Registered participants purchase taxi scrip from Metro at a 50 percent discount. Customer pays driver the meter fare using taxi scrip instead of money. Most taxi companies accept taxi scrip. Existing taxi scrip could be expanded to service riders in locations previously served by transit routes that are not suited for other service products.	Cost per boarding is \$9.98. User cost is 50 percent of regular taxi fare.	Fills gap in service; service is adaptable to meet the needs of the community: Service for guaranteed ride home, errands, field trips or weekend service	Taxi scrip is currently only available for low-income residents 18 - 64 who have a disability or age 65 and over. Taxi service is not readily available in areas of the county.	Traditional taxi scrip programs available to seniors and persons with disabilities in available nationwide.	Works best in densely populated areas already served by taxicabs.	Established program in King County for low income, disabled, and senior populations.
Trip Pool	Serves as a connector to a transportation hub that follows a defined route with regular stops during regular commute hours limited to one inbound and one outbound trip per day. County provides 8, 12, or 15-passenger van, maintenance, gas, insurance, reservation system and guaranteed ride home. Customers provide volunteer drivers.	Under review, although there may be no user cost during demo period.	Fills gap in service; reduced SOV at park and ride lots; service available to transport riders to local transportation hubs; reduces congestion/SOV trips	Requires volunteer drivers. Limited to one round trip per day per Trip Pool.	None	Could be implemented at any employer site or serve any community.	This is a viable option for customers in urban or rural areas who may lose transit service. Pilot run in 2011 between Capitol Hill and Redmond.
Vanpool/ Vanshare/ MetroPool	The program provides a van to groups of 5 or more commuters commuting to and from a common work location. Rider must commute at least one day each week on the Metro provided vehicle. County provides 5 (EV), 7, 8, 12, or 15-passenger van, maintenance, gas, insurance, reservation system and guaranteed ride home. Customer provides liability insurance, volunteer driver, backup driver, bookkeeper and monthly reports.	Cost per boarding is \$1.69. Cost to user depends on number of people in van and trip distance.	Fills gap in service; reduces overload on buses; provides transit service in areas underserved by fixed route; reduces congestion/SOV trips. VanShare extends the reach of transit service and can reduce SOV trips to P&R lots.	Vanpool, VanShare and MetroPool require 5 or more people to form a group. They require volunteer drivers and bookkeepers. VanShare requires a fare payment in addition to the one charged by the transit service to which it connects.	King County, nation-wide	Could be implemented at any employer site or serve any community.	Established program in King County for commuter trips.

Item 3

Transportation options

King County



We'll Get You There

Products	Product Description	Cost per Boarding	Benefits	Constraints	Existing Implementations	Where it works	Applications
Water taxi (passenger-only ferry)	Passenger-only ferry service is available to the general public and links Vashon Island to Downtown Seattle and West Seattle to Downtown via a 77 foot catamaran with capacity for 150 passengers and 18 bicycles.	Cost is about \$12 per trip. Funded through a property tax, which barely covers the cost of operating the service.	Short crossing time, fun trip	Limited locations for the boats to dock in areas with the needed population density; connections between the docks and residential areas and employment sites; financial constraints; striking the right balance between speed and impacts on equipment and maintenance.	Baltimore, New York, Hawaii	Works best in areas isolated by bodies of water with limited transportation options available.	When the King County Ferry District was established, there were five demonstrations proposed. These included service between Kirkland & Madison Park/UW; Eastside to South Lake Union; Kenmore to Madison Park or Sandpoint; and Renton to the west side or South Lake Union.

Transportation options

Private sector

Products	Product Description	Cost Considerations	Benefits	Constraints	Existing Implementations	Where it works	Application in King County
Bike library	A community-based system allowing users to check out and borrow bicycles on a daily, weekly or several month basis.	This type of system usually operates out of storefront locations within a community. Cost in Fort Collins, Colorado is about \$80,000 per year. There is no cost to the user.	Usually low cost for both operator and user. Works well for tourist market and low-income populations.	If bicycles are borrowed on a long-term basis, they are not available to others during that time period.	Fort Collins, Colorado; Arcata, California; Annapolis, Maryland.	Small towns, college towns.	Could be a good option for downtown areas in suburban or rural areas that do not have a high enough density to support traditional bike sharing. Could be part of a multi-modal transportation center.
Bike sharing	A public bike system with high-tech, 3 - speed utilitarian bikes available for short trips. Provider pays for bicycles and maintains bikes; helmets may be available for rent at the stations for a small added cost. The first 30 – 60 minutes are free. Suitable for residents, employees, students and tourists.	Most systems financed through public/private partnerships, using a combination of corporate sponsorships and federal grants for capital and user revenue and station sponsorships for operating. Cost per trip averages \$4.00. User cost is normally \$75 for annual membership or \$5-7 for a daily membership. First half hour is free, then an increasing cost per hour.	Provides "last mile" connection to transit; health benefits; creates a new mobility option in urban centers. Has been transformative in most of the cities where implemented; actually found to increase safety for cyclists; promotes tourism; creates jobs; gets new segment of community on bicycles.	Combination of public/private funding must be raised to launch system; King County helmet law, topography and weather present unknowns for estimating demand	Washington, D.C. , Boston, Montreal, Miami, Boulder, Denver, Minneapolis, London	Urban and suburban city centers with high residential density, employment density, tourist attractions and transit hubs. Used for short-distance trips of three miles or less and for "last mile" connections to transit	Bike share program proposed for implementation in late 2012 by Bike Share Partnership Team (Cities of Seattle, Redmond, Kirkland, King County, UW, Seattle Children's, Microsoft, Cascade Bicycle Club, Sound Transit , PSRC). First launch area would be Downtown Seattle, SLU, Capitol Hill, U District, Sand Point). Would expand to other Seattle neighborhoods and other parts of King County as system grows.
Car sharing (traditional)	A neighborhood-based transportation service that allows people to use a car when needed, without the costs and responsibilities of ownership. Provider pays for vehicles, gas, insurance, parking. Different types of cars and pick-up trucks in the fleet. Target market is residents of urban neighborhoods where vehicle ownership is low and parking difficult.	Annual membership of \$60 plus hourly rate of about \$8	Makes it more practical for people to use transit on a regular basis when they have access to a car on an occasional basis. Cars available to those who need them only occasionally without the cost of ownership. Also used by businesses as an alternative to fleet cars.	In most services, cars must be returned to the same location where they were rented. To be successful, the financial model relies on each car making multiple trips per day.	Seattle, Portland, Washington, D.C., Chicago, San Francisco, Boston, Toronto, Vancouver, B.C., London, many cities in Europe	High-density residential neighborhoods and suburban city centers; employment sites; university campuses	Zipcar already operating in areas of the County where the business can succeed; would require a subsidy in areas of lower density.

Transportation options

Private sector

Products	Product Description	Cost Considerations	Benefits	Constraints	Existing Implementations	Where it works	Application in King County
Car sharing (peer-to-peer)	A new type of car sharing service that allows private individuals to rent out and get paid for use of their personal cars on a part-time basis.	Private individuals determine the hourly rate they want to charge (normally \$7 - 35 per hour, depending on the type of car); a third party broker takes about a 40 percent cut and provides insurance and marketing through social media.	Allows individuals to make money during the time their cars are not being used; individuals putting cars into the fleet have the flexibility to set their own rates and determine the hours they want to make their cars available. Brings car sharing down to the community level even more than traditional car sharing. Takes advantage of unused capacity.	Service quality depends on ratings by users. A bill being adopted in the Washington State legislature will provide the legal framework for the insurance. This product has not yet been tested in Washington.	San Francisco Bay Area; Portland, Oregon	Has the potential to work in suburban and rural areas where traditional car sharing does not tend to succeed.	Zipcar has just announced that it is getting into the peer-to-peer car sharing business. There are other companies that also provide this service in other areas and may end up doing business in King County.
Carpools	A group of two or more persons who commute together in a privately owned vehicle on semi-regular schedule. Free web-based and emerging pay- and-ride software programs available to facilitate matching. Cost-sharing is handled either among passengers or via third party tool. Target market is commuters, families taking kids to after-school activities.	For a round-trip commute of 30 miles with gas at \$3.65 per gallon, and no parking cost, RideshareOnline.com calculates an annual cost for driving alone at \$5238 per year and half that amount for a two-person carpool.	Makes more efficient use of a vehicle that would otherwise be making a solo trip; saves money on gas, tolls and parking; provides access to HOV lanes; fills gap in service; reduces overload on buses	Must synchronize schedules with other riders in carpool; Viability of pay and ride software is still to be determined	RideshareOnline provides free web-based carpool matching; DividetheRide.com is a free internet-based service serving families throughout the country; Avego, RideAmigos and Zebigo have implemented various carpool and pay pilots	Anywhere	Potential for expansion for public and private events and to reduce drop-off traffic at schools.
Flexible carpools (dynamic ridesharing)	Emerging technology that facilitates the ability of drivers and passengers to make one-time ride matches close to their departure time via their computer or smart phone. Free web-based and emerging pay-and-ride software programs available to facilitate matching. Cost-sharing is handled either among passengers or via third party tool.	Requires a net public cost of about \$0.69 per boarding (estimate from a 2008 study)	Allows part-time, spur-of-the moment ridesharing; registration and screening by the rideshare service reduces concerns about security; having car pool partners meet in cyberspace rather than at physical locations eliminates the requirements for curb space, adjacent parking and residential density.	Creating "critical mass" has been the main issue. Number of participants must be high enough that users have a good chance of finding a match.	Demonstrations done by Avego on SR 520; by Goose Networks at Microsoft.	Works best at high-tech companies. Requirements for success are: 1) an institutional sponsor committed to the project; 2) sufficient incentives, such as scarce parking spaces provided to projects participants, and 3) sufficient marketing to create critical mass	Has great potential for use in King County. More demos planned by Avego and Metro Rideshare Operations.
Jitney	A mode of transport that falls between taxis and conventional buses. Private, for-hire taxis or vans take general public on a fixed or semi-fixed route without timetables, usually leaving when all seats are filled. Target market is commuters, shoppers, and tourists.	Service generally costs less than taxicabs (\$2.25 per trip in Atlantic City, New Jersey)	Frequent trips and unsubsidized when unregulated.	Jitney service is now regulated in most cities and operates in much the same manner as fixed-route bus.	Miami, Detroit, New York, Atlantic City	Most successful in inner cities with little regulation.	Best potential in high-density areas of King County.

Transportation options

Private sector

Products	Product Description	Cost Considerations	Benefits	Constraints	Existing Implementations	Where it works	Application in King County
Moped loan program	Mopeds (two-wheeled vehicles which are a hybrid of both motorized and human pedaling power) are loaned for a temporary period (in some programs to allow participants to get to work or to get an education). Basic equipment such as helmets, lights, etc. Agency provides the vehicle, insurance, training, servicing, provides personalized transportation plan for when program ends.	One program in the U.K. charges participants about \$100 per month.	Provides residents with transportation in areas with little or no existing fixed-route service.	Case study customers were generally young adults. After the 6-12 month loan period, many of the youths buy a car, which is not a sustainable solution. Only resolves the transportation problem for a temporary period unless participants are allowed to buy the moped, perhaps at a subsidized price.	Edington, Bridgwater, Somerset and other rural areas in the U.K.	Targeted to rural areas with few or no public transportation options, but could work anywhere.	Could work well in rural areas, but would need to be run by an agency. Could consider letting participants keep the bikes, using a payment plan. Could also consider use of electric bikes.
Private shuttles	Contracted transportation service that generally provides a driver and motor coaches, vans or accessible vehicles exclusively for employees through an employer, often as a fully subsidized benefit. Although the target market is employees, hospital shuttles may serve patient families in addition to employees.	A 25-passenger shuttle bus costs about \$100-\$175K per year to operate. Passenger revenue generally covers only the cost of administration.	Fills a very specific niche market for a distinct clientele. Benefits include direct service at low or no cost to user and provision of passenger amenities, such as Wi-Fi. Frequent service is also typical of employee shuttles between worksites.	Transportation limited to direct employees; could be conflicts between public and employer-based service at transit facilities.	King County Microsoft Connector, Seattle Children's shuttle Bay Area - Golden Gate Transit Club buses MBTA, Massachusetts	Works where people are traveling from a variety of locations to a single work site, especially when the employer is located in a place that is not adequately served by public transit.	In Massachusetts, MBTA provided operating subsidies to open the program to the public. Enabled MBTA to respond to need for transit in lower density parts of the region.
School buses	Supplemental service to outlying areas is provided to the public with school buses through a contract with a school district; buses deviate from their route to pick up residents who call ahead for a reservation.	Greatly reduced cost for serving low-density areas, compared with provision of fixed-route service by transit agency.	Provides supplemental transportation service on buses already traveling to outlying areas; Does not necessitate additional labor and capital investment on the part of the transit agency Provides an added transportation option to residents who may have few other options at times when it's available. Makes more efficient use of an existing resource.	Only available on days when school is in session and during very limited hours	Mason Transit has a contract with Shelton School District	In most any area with a school district whose buses have low demand at certain times of day.	Has potential to be used as a flexible transportation service in King County rural areas

Transportation options

Private sector

Products	Product Description	Cost Considerations	Benefits	Constraints	Existing Implementations	Where it works	Application in King County
Shared-ride taxi	Private or contracted taxi provides subsidized or flat fee service to the general public. Mix of models available including service along a transit route at set intervals, picking up and dropping passengers off at bus stops or taxi dispatched at customer request. Service may be mileage-based fee (taxicab) or flat fee (for-hire vehicle). It is a shared-ride service, so the cab may pick up and/or drop off passengers during the ride.	A study done by the Center for Urban Transportation Research in Florida in 2002 provides a figure of \$8.19 as the cost per trip. Ben Franklin Transit has a user cost of \$1 - 3 for its shared taxi feeder service.	Can provide basic mobility at times of lower demand when it would otherwise be cost-prohibitive to provide fixed-route service. Reduces the cost of a solo taxi ride and provides a mobility option to get to and from transit hubs.	Could be difficult for private providers to use public infrastructure and challenging to establish a fare structure that meets the needs of the taxi driver, Metro and the user. Service quality can be difficult to ensure.	Washington County, Wisconsin; Ben Franklin Transit; Ann Arbor	Need enough people for shared taxis to be worthwhile. Could end up being most successful in areas of the County where fixed-route service is also most successful.	Could be used to provide late night or weekend service. Could provide supplemental fixed-route service in certain areas or at certain times of day. In some areas, could be the primary service. Metro could contract out some service or form partnerships with taxi companies.
Slug lines (casual carpooling)	Informal carpools that form when drivers and passengers meet without specific prior arrangement at designated locations and commute together in a privately owned vehicle.	How much individuals pay for a ride is up to each driver. This is normally worked out by the individuals sharing the ride. The driver saves money on tolls. There is no clear standard for sharing the toll or splitting the cost of gas.	Allows part-time, spur-of-the-moment ridesharing; saves money; not run by any organization.	No clear standard has evolved for payment since tolls for carpools started in the Bay Area; normally a limited number of drop-off points. Studies have shown that the biggest constraint is not fear for safety, but concerns about time.	San Francisco, New York, Washington, D.C. area; Houston	Works where carpools can take advantage of HOV lanes and bypass long delays at toll plazas. Carpoolers normally wait in queues near on-ramps to bridges and freeways, sometimes at major park-and-ride lots.	Has potential in King County when tolling goes into affect.
Volunteer drivers	Use of volunteers to provide rides to older adults in private vehicles, generally using a reimbursement or transportation credit system. Available to seniors and persons with disabilities.	Some programs use public funds for reimbursement of a driver's expenses or to offset organizational costs. With <i>ITNAmerica</i> programs, members can also trade in their existing vehicle to pay for rides. The cost per trip to Senior Services is currently \$15.57, but planning to change to the TRIP program model, which costs \$5.40 per trip	Volunteer driver programs provide an alternative transportation option for seniors and persons with disabilities who do not qualify for paratransit services. Provides mobility to older adults without the need to ask for favors. Service is adaptable to meet the needs of the community.	Availability of sponsoring organizations to run volunteer driver program; sufficient volunteer drivers to meet demand.	Riverside, California; Mercer County, New Jersey, Washington (e.g. Senior Services in King County)	Anywhere sponsoring organization is available.	Could be set up through an agency

