

King County Metro Transit

A Scenario for Service Reduction

July 1, 2010
Regional Transit Task Force

Note to Regional Transit Task Force Members

At the June 17, 2010 Regional Transit Task Force meeting, members asked Metro to bring forward a service reduction scenario for the task force's consideration of the criteria for service reduction and the rider experiences that would be expected to result from service reduction. The reduction scenario should be based on Regional Transit Task Force's (RTTF's) feedback to date. Given that request, this white paper provides an overview of scenario **RTTF R-1** depicting a transit network reduced by about 400,000 annual hours over the current system. RTTF R-1 is based on the Regional Transit Task Force's feedback relative to the design criteria. This white paper is intended to support task force member dialogue regarding the transit system design factors, rather than a specific discussion of lines on a map.

While Metro's current financial plan projections through 2015 could require reduction of Metro's bus services by the equivalent of 600,000 annual service hours, Metro is committed to pursuing further cost reduction or containment measures to minimize the impact on direct service. Metro is also proceeding with planned implementation of several significant 2009 Performance Audit recommendations as well as other savings not affecting basic bus service operation in the current biennium. Nevertheless, the 400,000 hours should be viewed as merely a working assumption for illustration purpose at this time. Ultimately, there are many variables that will affect Metro's balance of revenues and expenditures.

Although Metro operates many of the Sound Transit Regional Express bus routes, and some data presented to the RTTF has include these routes, the 400,000 hour reduction scenario applies only to Metro's own services.

Scenario: RTTF R-1

At the July 1, 2010 Task Force meeting, further description illustrating the concepts described below will be provided.

Reduction Network Development

Scenario RTTF R-1 is designed to reduce the overall cost of a transit network that sustains the primary function for Metro in 2010 – to support the economic activity of the region. In the event of possible major service reductions, any resulting system would be designed to provide maximum support to the county’s ongoing economic development.

Metro’s importance to the community is reflected in long-term trends that show almost three out of five of our 360,000 daily riders use Metro to get to work (50%) or school (7%).

Entertainment is the second most cited use of the bus system (23%). This strength is also reflected in the greater than 2,000 local employers and major institutions that provide transit subsidies as an employee benefit and recognizes the employer benefit in recruitment, productivity and health of its workforce that result. These employer purchases of transit passes represent about one-third of Metro’s nearly \$120 million in total fare revenues.

The relationship of Metro’s regional bus system to the job market is clear. Metro’s bus system operates a countywide network of routes that provide access and mobility between many places and serves a critical function in supporting the region’s economic development.

Criteria for Reducing the Transit System

The Regional Transit Task force discussions to date have identified that productivity should be a major factor in designing the transit system and making service allocation decisions.

Emphasizing productivity will tend to prioritize services to the corridors that serve the most people and job centers, while matching the frequency, hours of operation and type of transit services to the market. A transit network where productivity is a leading design element will be characterized by and measured by the key performance indicators of rider miles per service hour, cost per rider, and riders per service hour. The “key factors” of **financial sustainability, land use, and economic development** are closely linked to **productivity**.

While productivity would be the primary focus in service allocation decisions, the transit system must also address **social equity** by serving the mobility needs of people in low wage jobs, students and those dependent on transit service for basic mobility. In considering social equity, areas of King County and specific current Metro route corridors where higher concentrations of minority, senior or low income populations live, along with routes that serve secondary schools and colleges, are less likely to have service reductions in this scenario. To strive towards higher productivity, these areas and corridors are subject to network efficiency measures including route consolidation and elimination of routes that serve the same destinations or otherwise duplicate the function of Sound Transit’s regional bus, light rail and commuter rail network.

With a primary focus on productivity, the provision of services at lower cost (fewer trips, shorter hours) or provision of access to the fixed route transit system via the regional park-and-ride bus system are strategies used to ensure **geographic equity**. This includes operating bus services throughout the urban growth area of King County. However, in a service reduction scenario, Metro may operate only those bus routes where cost effectiveness and productivity has been closely examined. In considering geographic equity, this reduction scenario continues to provide

some bus service in each community currently served, however it may operate at less frequent headway, or local or hourly routes may be eliminated and peak commuter services retained, or vice versa. The description of system design parameters used to reduce total service hours by 400,000 includes some examples of the specific rider impacts that would be required as part of this scenario.

In considering social and geographic equity, and in response to reduction of services in lower density communities, or reduction of service later at night in any area, a mix of other Metro services including Commuter Vans (VanPool and VanShare), Rideshare, ACCESS paratransit, Community Transportation and Taxi Scrip provide some level of mobility alternatives. No estimate of specific alternative service investments are incorporated in this scenario.

The focus on high productivity services will generally tend to support employment centers and corridors where existing population and jobs are concentrated. During this period of economic downturn it is particularly important for the reduced transit system to support people’s ability to get to and from work. Service allocation policies should also support areas that are developing densities and traffic operations supportive of higher transit use. This could be achieved by creating transit service partnerships (i.e. “rewards” or “incentives”) with such communities.

A network reduced in size by over 10 percent, in which productivity is prioritized, means that service frequency will be concentrated in higher use, higher density corridors. Service frequency in these corridors would be improved to a point where the ridership demand is well served and where additional investments continue to contribute to increased system productivity, as measured by the key performance indicators mentioned above. The characteristics of the market determine the type of transit service offered. In some areas where demand is concentrated in the weekday peak period, all day coverage and service levels are limited. The majority of resources are invested in a network of two-way, frequent service with long hours of operation that operate mainly on principal arterials connecting riders to major employment and activity centers. These services serve many travel needs, connecting people to work sites and other activities throughout the day. In lower density residential areas service may be delivered using lower cost service strategies (e.g. lower frequency or reduced span, or shifting fixed route to DART service) and access to the fixed route transit system may only be available at a park and ride.

The results of a network reduction based on productivity would be an expected minimizing of the total daily riders affected by service cuts and an improvement in the key performance indicators of rides per service hour, rider miles per service hour and cost per rider for the system as a whole. Overall, Metro services would be more cost effective.

Comparison of Fall 2009 Metro network and Scenario RTTF R-1

	Total Annual Rides	Rides per Platform Hour	Cost per Ride
Fall 2009 Network	108,500,000	31.1	\$3.95
Service Reduction Scenario	105,800,000	34.6	\$3.52

Reduction Network Design – Application of Criteria

Using the key factors affecting the design and allocation of transit services and pursuing direction as heard to date, the following examples of service design criteria and parameters emerge:

Criteria	System Design Parameters
<p>1. Provide transit services to serve the mobility needs of students, people in low wage jobs and people dependent on transit for basic mobility in places where the highest numbers of such people live and work.</p> <p><i>Key Factors Affected: Social Equity, Economic Development, Productivity/Efficiency</i></p>	<p>Maintain and improve the design of the current network of <i>Frequent Arterial</i> all-day routes connecting centers and serving the places where the most people live and work.</p>
<p>2. Provide transit services with a priority on employment centers where the most people, jobs and job growth are present and in corridors with high park-and-ride demand and available capacity.</p> <p><i>Key Factors Affected: Economic Development, Land Use, Social Equity, Productivity/Efficiency, Financial Sustainability</i></p>	<p>Reconfigure and/or eliminate <i>Peak Commuter</i> service where Sound Transit Regional Express Bus, Sounder and Link provide adequate alternative travel option. Redirect some <i>Local</i> routes to feed Regional Express Bus, Link, Sounder and <i>Frequent Arterial</i> services. In doing so, maximize Sound Transit's regional bus and rail network by providing bus service from communities directed at making convenient connections with, or "feeding" ST services, rather than directed at the same regional destinations.</p>
<p>3. Match the frequency and hours of operation of transit services to the market.</p> <p><i>Key Factors Affected: Land Use, Productivity/Efficiency</i></p>	<p>Restructure routes to improve the productivity and efficiency of the Metro system, which may include shortening or creating more direct routing for some routes (within all families of service) and that may eliminate some geographic coverage.</p>

Criteria	System Design Parameters
<p>4. Provide transit services that are designed to maximize productivity and cost effective use of resources.</p> <p><i>Key Factors Affected: Productivity/Efficiency</i></p>	<p>Consolidate multiple routes into fewer or one <i>Frequent Arterial</i> route in corridors with more than one route, except in locations close to urban and activity centers where routes converge.</p>
<p>5. Deliver transit service throughout Metro's service area and match the right type of service with the market served.</p> <p><i>Key Factors Affected: Geographic Equity, Land Use, Social Equity, Productivity/Efficiency</i></p>	<p>Create or maintain <i>Local</i> routes that will complement the <i>Frequent Arterial</i> and Sound Transit's regional bus and rail network in locations when demand warrants and resources are available. Maintain geographic coverage and service to people who are dependent on transit with <i>Local</i> or <i>Hourly</i> routes or other Metro services providing basic mobility.</p>
<p>6. Prioritize services to the most productive corridors that serve the most people, while matching the frequency, hours of operation and type of transit services to the market.</p> <p><i>Key Factors Affected: Productivity/Efficiency, Financial Sustainability</i></p>	<p>Discontinue nonproductive neighborhood segments of <i>Peak Commuter</i> routes, requiring riders to drive to a park-and-ride even as some low use park and rides would be closed and underperforming routes' resources are re-allocated to more productive services.</p>
<p>7. Control costs and provide a stable baseline service level of transit services and programs.</p> <p><i>Key Factors Affected: Financial Sustainability, Productivity/Efficiency, Geographic Equity</i></p>	<p>Eliminate, reduce or redesign routes that fall below a productivity threshold of 10 rides per platform hour or 50 passenger miles per platform hour. Exceptions include routes which provide minimal levels of service to rural areas and routes established by a partnership.</p>

Families of Bus Service

Metro's bus service routes can be classified into the following service families. These families of service are further summarized below in a table showing what proportion of the total Metro system they represent and the key performance indicators by type.

Frequent Arterial: 2009 Characteristics

Number of Routes	56
Annual Ridership	73,800,000
Number of Total Hours/Percent of Total	1,950,000/56%

Frequent Arterial routes include planned RapidRide bus rapid transit corridors and other routes that operate frequently (5-20 minutes) during at least some period during the day and operate at least every 30 minutes for a span of 16-18 hours per day. As resources allow, additional trips are added to *Frequent Arterial* routes at times when and in locations where high ridership and passenger crowding exist. The demand for services on these routes is highly correlated with land use – the density of population and jobs – as well as the demographics of *Frequent Arterial* route corridors. The family of *Frequent Arterial* routes operates two-way service primarily on principal arterials providing connections to, between and within the region's major employment and commercial centers. The network of *Frequent Arterial* routes combines to enable travel through a ride on one route to a transfer on another route to get to the desired destinations. The *Frequent Arterial* network complements Sound Transit's Regional Express Bus service and rail services provided by Sound Transit.

Peak Commuter: 2009 Characteristics

Number of Routes	99
Annual Ridership	10,530,000
Number of Total Hours/Percent of Total	505,000/14%

Peak Commuter routes operate during the peak weekday travel periods and provide direct service to regional employment centers designed to meet the "peak" of commuter demand, and are designed to provide competitive travel options to driving alone. *Peak Commuter* routes operate primarily on the region's HOV system or principal arterials in areas where densities are sufficient to support walk access. *Peak Commuter* routes in the suburban areas often pick up the majority of riders at a park and ride, but may have tails that enter neighborhoods. As resources allow, additional trips are added to *Peak Commuter* routes at times when and in locations where high ridership and passenger crowding exist, with a target average of .8 passengers to seats ratio (also referred to as 80% average load) through the peak demand period.

Local: 2009 Characteristics

Number of Routes	60
Annual Ridership	22,955,000
Number of Total Hours/Percent of Total	935,000/27%

Local routes operate no better than every 30 minutes at any time of day and often operate primarily in day time hours or less than seven days per week. Often the time between buses (headway) is based on policy rather than demand. *Local* routes serve many areas and varying

land uses and serve many different travel needs. *Local* routes operate on principal and minor arterials and may favor access (the number of stops) over speed of the service. *Local* routes serve lower density residential and smaller activity areas and connect to *Frequent* and *Peak Commuter* services that provide regional connections and mobility.

Hourly: 2009 Characteristics

Number of Routes	25
Annual Ridership	1,205,000
Number of Total Hours/Percent of Total	100,000/3%

Hourly routes expend the minimal resources required to provide basic transit service access and coverage in low density, low use areas and offer frequencies no better than every 60 minutes at any time of the day. The primary function of *Hourly* routes is to provide service with only minimal travel choices. *Hourly* routes provide connection to activity within the local community or where connections to other transit services are available.

Local and *Hourly* service families include Dial-a-Ride-Transit, or *DART* routes. These are usually based on a fixed route with deviation within a specific neighborhood area using advanced phone reservations for pick-ups and drop-offs not along the fixed route segment. *DART* service is operated under contract.

Metro's Families of Service: Routes, Resources and Performance Summary – Fall 2009 Baseline Information¹

Service Family	Number of Routes	Approximate Annual Platform Hours	Percent of total Platform Hours	Fall 2009 Riders per Platform Hour	Fall 2009 Rider Miles per Platform Hour	Fall 2009 Cost per Rider
Frequent Arterial	56	1,975,000	56.5%	37.4	144	\$3.23
Peak Commuter	99	505,000	14.5%	20.8	198	\$6.69
Local	60	915,000	26%	25.1	97	\$4.69
Hourly	25	100,000	3%	12.0	60	\$9.64
Totals	240	3,495,000	100%	31.1	137	\$3.95

Metro's Families of Service: Routes, Resources and Performance Summary – Scenario RTTF R-1 Information

Service Family	Number of Routes	Approximate Annual Platform Hours	Percent of total Platform Hours	Projected Riders per Platform Hour	Projected Rider Miles per Platform Hour	Projected Cost per Rider
Frequent Arterial	46	2,020,000	64%	39.6	n/a	\$3.09
Peak Commuter	69	440,000	14%	24.2	n/a	\$5.67
Local	38	570,000	18%	23.5	n/a	\$4.88
Hourly	22	135,000	4%	14.1	n/a	\$8.18
Totals	175	3,035,000²	100%	34.6	n/a	\$3.52

¹ Fall 2009 Baseline Information is based on annualizing bus platform hours and riders using the Fall 2009 shakeup period (for routes operated between September 2009 and February 2010); actual 2009 costs and fares are allocated to each route in the system.

² Current Metro financial and service plans would add 118,000 hours in RapidRide corridors and 28,000 hours in the SR520 Urban Partnership corridor. Additionally, the 2009-10 biennial budget assumes (125,000) hour reduction in scheduling efficiencies and (75,000) hours in minor service cuts.

**Metro's Families of Service: Routes, Resources and Subarea Summary –
Fall 2009 and Scenario RTTF R-1 Information**

	Fall 2009				Investments and Efficiencies			R1 400,000 Hours Reduction Network			
	# of Routes	Approx Annual Platform Hours	% of total Plat Hours	Estimated Annual Riders	Rapid Ride	Urban Part SR520	Efficiency	# of Routes	Approx Annual Platform Hours	% of total Plat Hours	Estimated Annual Riders
EAST											
Frequent Arterial	5	130,000	22%	3,260,000	23,000	16,600	(7,459)	5	165,000	33%	5,040,000
Peak Commuter	33	180,000	31%	3,180,000		4,700	(10,328)	15	140,000	28%	2,520,000
Local	18	255,000	43%	3,830,000			(14,631)	12	160,000	31%	2,490,000
Hourly	4	25,000	4%	145,000			(1,434)	8	45,000	9%	425,000
SOUTH											
Frequent Arterial	11	300,000	40%	9,640,000	52,000		(17,030)	11	345,000	49%	11,505,000
Peak Commuter	32	155,000	21%	2,720,000			(8,799)	24	115,000	16%	2,255,000
Local	17	235,000	31%	5,820,000			(13,340)	10	160,000	23%	4,300,000
Hourly	13	60,000	8%	815,000			(3,406)	13	85,000	12%	1,405,000
WEST											
Frequent Arterial	39	1,520,000	71%	60,905,000	43,000	6,400	(87,238)	30	1,510,000	78%	63,425,000
Peak Commuter	34	170,000	8%	4,630,000			(9,757)	30	185,000	10%	5,870,000
Local	26	445,000	21%	13,305,000			(25,540)	16	245,000	13%	6,525,000
Hourly	8	15,000	1%	245,000			(861)	1	10,000	1%	80,000
SYSTEM TOTALS	240	3,495,000		108,495,000	118,000	28,000	(200,000)	175	3,035,000		105,840,000

Applying Scenario RTTF R-1 Criteria – Sampling of Results

The following summarizes the nature of changes to the current network that could be undertaken to achieve a 400,000 annual service hours savings and the expected rider impacts.

System design in response to Criteria 1: Maintain and improve the design of the current network of *Frequent Arterial* all-day routes connecting centers and serving the places where the most people live and work.

Illustrative examples of routes affected by Criteria 1

Route (Area Served)	Description of change	Description of impact
5 (Greenwood, Fremont)	Consolidate service on a single corridor and re-route to serve Fremont	Improved connections between North Seattle locations. Slower trip for customers north of Fremont
F (Burien, Tukwila, Renton)	Develop F Line Rapid Ride Line	Improved frequency during most times of the day. More convenient transfers from connecting routes.
271 (Bellevue, U. District)	Shorten route to highest ridership segment	Improved frequency during most times of the day. Transfer required by current riders from Issaquah and Eastgate segments.

System design in response to Criteria 2: Reconfigure and/or eliminate *Peak Commuter* service where Sound Transit Regional Express Bus, Sounder and Link provide adequate alternative travel option. Redirect some *Local* routes to feed Regional Express Bus, Link, Sounder and *Frequent Arterial* services. In doing so, maximize Sound Transit’s regional bus and rail network by providing bus service from communities directed at making convenient connections with, or “feeding” ST services, rather than directed at the same regional destinations.

Illustrative examples of routes affected by Criteria 2

Route (Area Served)	Description of change	Description of impact
7 EX (Rainier Valley)	Eliminate Route	Riders use Link or local bus route
158, 159 (Kent)	Eliminate Routes	Riders use local bus routes or drive to reach Sounder
266 (Redmond, Overlake)	Eliminate Route	Riders use Regional Express bus

System design in response to Criteria 3: Restructure routes to improve the productivity and efficiency of the Metro system, which may include shortening or creating more direct routing for some routes (within all families of service) and that may eliminate some geographic coverage.

Illustrative examples of routes affected by Criteria 3

Route (Area Served)	Description of change	Description of impact
21 (West Seattle)	Shorten route to operate between Westwood Village and Alaska Junction only	Riders in Arbor Heights would only have commuter service.
123 (Gregory Heights)	Operate route via SR-509	Riders along current routing would use Routes 23 or 132
260 (Finn Hill)	Operate route via Kingsgate P&R	Riders along current routing would use Route 255 or 935.

System design in response to Criteria 4: Consolidate multiple routes into fewer or one *Frequent Arterial* route in corridors with more than one route, except in locations close to urban and activity centers where routes converge.

Illustrative examples of routes affected by Criteria 4

Route (Area Served)	Description of change	Description of impact
66, 67, 68, 71, 72, 73 (NE Seattle)	Consolidate into a single new route connecting Northgate, U. District and downtown Seattle	Customers on tails of routes would need to transfer from local route to frequent route.
B (Redmond – Bellevue)	Consolidate several routes into a single Rapid Ride Route	Some riders would need to transfer.

System design in response to Criteria 5: Create or maintain *Local* routes that will complement the *Frequent Arterial* and Sound Transit’s regional bus and rail network in locations when demand warrants and resources are available. Maintain geographic coverage and service to people who are dependent on transit with *Local* or *Hourly* routes or other Metro services providing basic mobility.

Illustrative examples of routes affected by Criteria 5

Route (Area Served)	Description of change	Description of impact
69 (View Ridge)	New 30-minute route replacing Route 71 tail to View Ridge	Riders will need to transfer from local to frequent route to reach downtown Seattle or U. District
166 (Des Moines, Kent)	Maintain 30-minute service connecting Kent and Des Moines	Allows riders to connect between RapidRide A Line and routes in Kent.
227 (Bellevue)	New route to replace service coverage lost during creation of B Line. Provides new service connection to Eastgate.	Riders will need to transfer to RapidRide B Line to reach Redmond or Bellevue

System design in response to Criteria 6: Discontinue nonproductive neighborhood segments of *Peak Commuter* routes, requiring riders to drive to a park-and-ride even as some low use park and rides would be closed and underperforming routes' resources are re-allocated to more productive services.

Illustrative examples of routes affected by Criteria 6

Route (Area Served)	Description of change	Description of impact
196 (South Federal Way)	Discontinue route and close park-and-ride	Riders drive to one of five other park-and-rides in and around Federal Way
225, 229 (East Bellevue)	Discontinue routes and add trips to Route 212.	Riders either drive to Eastgate P&R or take a local route and transfer.

System design in response to Criteria 7: Eliminate, reduce or redesign routes that fall below a productivity threshold of 10 rides per platform hour or 50 passenger miles per platform hour.

Illustrative examples of routes affected by Action 7

Route (Area Served)	Description of change	Description of impact
912	Delete route. Segment between Black Diamond and Enumclaw replaced by Route 149	Some riders have no service. Most riders have other service on Routes 149 or 168
201	Delete route	No other service

Reduction Network Design – Other Metro Services

Employer and Local Partnerships

Under a reduction scenario the Transit Now Service Partnership program could be expanded to capture more external resources to support the Metro system. A priority would be placed on the provision to employers and other organizations with products and services to allow employees, students, and others to have easy access to all options for travel: transit, ridesharing, bike, walk, and telework. Work in partnership with jurisdictions and community groups would continue to help county residents to understand the new transit network and what connections it provides.

ACCESS Transportation

Policy choices should be considered to continue service where not required by the Americans with Disabilities Act to deliver service. The ADA requires complementary paratransit be offered to people with disabilities who are unable to use regular transit services due to their disability, and in areas and times consistent with regular service. The policy choices include continuing ACCESS service as a mobility alternative in areas where *Local* routes may be discontinued or reduced; or, discontinuing ACCESS as a further cost saving measure because it would no longer be required under the ADA. The choice to continue or not could mitigate specific bus service reductions or applied across Metro's entire service area.

Community Transportation Program

- Enhanced ACCESS Service – provision of ACCESS beyond the requirements of the ADA
- Community Access Transportation – donated vans and support to community agencies serving people otherwise eligible to use ACCESS
- Taxi Scrip – provision of subsidized tickets or vouchers (accepted for payment by participating taxi companies) to seniors and people with disabilities who are low income
- Transit Instruction Program – group or one-on-one training of seniors and people with disabilities to use the regular transit system rather than or in addition to ACCESS.

Where bus services are discontinued these programs and services could be used to close some gaps. Where it would be less expensive than providing *Hourly* or *Local* bus service or ACCESS service, marginal increases in investment in these programs could be considered. For example, a frequent barrier to community agencies in fully using a donated van is the inability to hire a paid driver. Metro grants to participating community agencies could be considered that would allow expansion of these community transportation options.

Commuter Vans (VanPool and VanShare)

King County Metro administers the largest publicly owned and operated vanpool and vanship program in the nation for commuters who live and or work in King County. In 2009 over 1,000 commuter vans in operation carried a record ridership with 3.18 million trips. Metro's vanpool program complements the public transportation network by providing connections that would be inefficient to provide by traditional bus service. Commuter vans are very efficient. By current policy, fares recover 100% of operating costs, 100 % of capital costs and at least 25% of administrative costs.

Metro's 916 vanpools in operation complete an average 50-mile round trip each workday. As the transit network is reduced, vanpooling may become a more attractive option for commuters with fewer public transit options. Vanpooling could, at a very low cost to Metro, absorb a substantial number of bus riders impacted by reductions in service. Over 50% of vanpool riders pay their fare with an employer-provided FlexPass or ORCA Passport.

VanShare addresses the connectivity needs of commuters riding the bus, rail, vanpool, or ferry. The program makes available to commuters 8, 12, or 15 passenger vans to bridge the distance between a transportation terminal and the workplace or home. Vanshares are vanpool vehicles that are retired from regular service and repurposed to cover "last mile" gaps in employees' commutes. This last mile coverage has shown great utility in building ridership on Sounder commuter rail service. Most Sounder stations are not in immediate proximity to large employment centers. And, while local Metro transit service does provide connections to some employment centers from rail stations, with a reduced service network Vanshare is a logical way to connect commuters to their workplace from regional rail and transit service. There are currently 146 Vanshare groups in operation. Vanshare is available to collect people on their first mile of a commute to access other forms of transit service.

Rideshare/Ridematch

Metro administers a multi-state ridematching tool on behalf of the Washington State Department of Transportation. RideshareOnline.com was recently updated to provide more utility to many different user groups with new tools and features to help save money, time and the environment:

- Interactive ridematching to help you find a carpool, or vanpool anywhere along your route with over 10,000 individuals registered in the system.
- Bus options along your route (in areas that offer Google Trip Planner)
- Expanded ridematching for one-time trips, such as meetings, errands and special events. Go to the game, concert or show; use the HOV lanes; and split the cost of parking.
- New commute calendar to track your trips, estimate your cash savings and greenhouse gas reductions and earn rewards
- New security enhancements that give you greater control over your information
- Ability to establish various networks to expand carpooling beyond the commute.

Employee Transportation Coordinators at employment sites have new commute program management and tracking tools to provide employee incentives and monitor effectiveness. The upgraded RideshareOnline.com tool will significantly open up opportunities to non-work related organizations and events to help people find rides to anywhere within the region. Metro will promote RideshareOnline.com as a vehicle to connecting more people to ridesharing opportunities as reductions to the transit network limit their public transportation options.