



2013 King County Metro Transit Title VI Program Report

2011-2013 Report to the Federal Transit Administration
in Accordance with FTA Circular 4702.1B, *Title VI Program Guidelines for
Federal Transit Administration Recipients*

October 1, 2013



Department of Transportation
Metro Transit Division
Strategic Planning and Analysis
201 S Jackson St
Seattle, WA 98104

Contact: Chris O'Claire, christina.oclaire@kingcounty.gov

Alternative Formats Available

206-263-5277 TTY Relay: 711

Contents

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Introduction | 1 |
| SECTION I: General Reporting Requirements | 5 |
| Title VI Notice to the Public | 5 |
| Title VI Complaint Procedures and Form | 6 |
| Title VI Investigations, Complaints, and Lawsuits | 6 |
| Public Participation Plan..... | 7 |
| Membership of Committees | 18 |
| Language Assistance Plan..... | 19 |
| Monitoring Subrecipient Compliance with Title VI..... | 20 |
| Review of Facilities Constructed | 21 |
| Documentation of Governing Body Review and Approval of Title VI Program..... | 21 |
| SECTION II: Requirements of Transit Providers..... | 22 |
| Service Standards and Service Policies..... | 22 |
| Vehicle Load | 23 |
| Vehicle Headways | 25 |
| On-Time Performance | 27 |
| Service Availability | 30 |
| Vehicle Assignment | 31 |
| Distribution of Transit Amenities..... | 32 |
| Demographics and Service Profile Maps and Charts | 34 |
| Demographic Ridership and Travel Patterns Collected by Surveys | 39 |
| Public Engagement Process for Setting the Major Service Change Policy | 40 |
| Service and Fare Equity Analyses | 41 |
| APPENDICES | A-001 |
| A. Title VI Updates to Metro’s Strategic Plan and Service Guidelines | A-003 |
| B. Title VI Instructions and Complaint Form | A-007 |
| C. Metro’s Language Assistance Plan | A-015 |
| D. Subrecipients of Federal Funding..... | A-043 |
| E. NEPA Letters for Burien Transit Center and Kirkland Transit Oriented Development Project..... | A-047 |
| F. Service Standards and Service Policies..... | A-055 |
| G. Service and Fare Equity Analyses | |
| G-1 June 2012 Service Reinvestments: Title VI Analysis | A-095 |
| G-2 Fall 2012 Service Change Title VI Evaluation (includes RapidRide C and D) | A-107 |

2013 KING COUNTY METRO TRANSIT TITLE VI PROGRAM REPORT

G-3 Fall 2013 Service Change: Title VI Service Equity Analysis A-145
G-4 RapidRide A Line: Title VI Environmental Justice Analysis, December 2010..... A-175
G-5 RapidRide B Line Restructure: Title VI Analysis, Spring 2011 A-183
G-6 Ride Free Area Closure – Title VI Evaluation..... A-193
G-7 Report on Rates of Fare for the Transit Program 2011 Report A-209
H. Social Service Agencies Receiving Human Service Tickets in 2012 A-233
I. Documentation of Council Action A-239

Introduction

King County Metro Transit (Metro) prepared this report on our Title VI program to comply with requirements of the Federal Transit Administration, or FTA. The FTA requires that transit agencies receiving federal funds submit a Title VI program every three years. This report covers August 2010 through August 2013.

The FTA's authority to require this program stems from the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and subsequent regulations. As stated in circular FTA C 4702.1B, which provides guidance and instructions for complying with Title VI regulations, the purposes of the Title VI program are:

- a. *Ensure that the level and quality of public transportation service is provided in a nondiscriminatory manner;*
- b. *Promote full and fair participation in public transportation decision-making without regard to race, color, or national origin;*
- c. *Ensure meaningful access to transit-related programs and activities by persons with limited English proficiency.*

Circular FTA C 4702.1B includes a checklist of items that are to be included in the Title VI program. In general, this report is organized in the order of that checklist.

Metro has submitted its Title VI program to the FTA every three years, as required. Approval by the governing entity responsible for policy decisions is a new FTA requirement, included in the October 2012 update of the circular. It is pursuant to this new requirement that Metro is submitting the program to the King County Council for approval.

Equity and Social Justice in Foundational Plans and Policies

Metro and its parent government body, King County, have a deep and long-standing commitment to the principles embodied in Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This commitment has been newly expressed and expanded in County plans and policies adopted over the past five years. As affirmed in the foundational documents described below, Metro is committed not only to nondiscrimination but also to actively promoting equity and social justice in all the services we provide.

Equity and Social Justice Initiative

In 2008, King County launched the Equity and Social Justice Initiative. Its purpose was to examine the causes of racial disparities and inequities and to create conditions for all individuals and communities to reach their full potential. A report issued by the County showed the close relationship between factors of where people live, the color of their skin, how much money they have and their access to education, health care, and economic opportunities. A person's opportunities in turn have an impact on health, income, quality of life and even life expectancy. The initiative worked to identify the roots of inequities and move toward solutions.

King County Strategic Plan

Building on the Equity and Social Justice Initiative, the County included "fair and just" as a core principle in the *King County Strategic Plan 2010-2014*, adopted in July 2010. This principle is reflected in objectives and strategies pertaining to Metro, including "Meet the transportation needs of low-income and other underserved populations" and "Ensure that communication, outreach and engagement efforts reach all residents, particularly communities that have been historically underrepresented."

King County Ordinance 16948, adopted in October 2010, stated that through adoption of the strategic plan, the County transformed its work on equity and social justice from an initiative into an integrated effort that applies the “fair and just” principle intentionally in all the County does, to achieve equitable opportunities for all people and communities. This ordinance also defines determinants of equity, including “Transportation that provides everyone with safe, efficient, affordable, convenient and reliable mobility options including public transit, walking, carpooling and biking.”

King County Comprehensive Plan

Another fundamental policy document guiding Metro is the King County Comprehensive Plan, which provides guidance concerning land use and development as well as regional services, including transit. The 2012 update of the Comprehensive Plan incorporated “health, equity, social and environmental justice,” as a guiding principle. The transportation element of the plan states, as a general policy, that “King County should provide a system of transportation services and facilities that offers travel options to all members of the community, including people of color, low-income communities, people with limited English proficiency, and others who may have limited transportation options such as students, youth, seniors, and people with disabilities.”

Executive Order on Written Translation Process

Noting that a substantial number of people in King County have limited English proficiency, and that the County is dedicated to giving all of its residents fair and equal access to services, opportunities and protection, King County Executive Dow Constantine issued an executive order on translation of public communication materials in October 2010. This executive order requires County agencies to translate public communication materials and vital documents into Spanish, as soon as feasible within available resources, and into other commonly spoken non-English languages according to guidelines provided. The order provides for the use of alternative forms of language assistance, such as interpretation services, when they are more effective or practical.

Regional Transit Task Force

In 2010, the King County Executive and County Council formed the Regional Transit Task Force to consider a new policy framework for Metro that would guide the growth or, if necessary because of financial constraints, the contraction of the transit system. The Task Force was made up of 31 members who represented a broad diversity of interests and perspectives from across the county.

A key recommendation of this task force was that the policy guidance for making transit service reductions and service growth decisions should be based on the following priorities:

1. Emphasize productivity due to its linkage to economic development, land use, financial sustainability, and environmental sustainability.
2. Ensure social equity.
3. Provide geographic value throughout the county.

The Task Force also recommended that Metro develop guidelines for making service allocation decisions based upon the recommended policy direction, as well as a set of performance measures for tracking progress and improving public accountability.

Strategic Plan for Public Transportation and Service Guidelines

After the Regional Transit Task Force issued its recommendations, Metro developed a strategic plan that incorporates the proposed new policy direction. Metro’s plan also echoes the goals and principles of the King County Strategic Plan. The *Strategic Plan for Public Transportation 2011-2021* was adopted by the King County Council in July 2011.

Metro's strategic plan includes the following goals and strategies that promote nondiscrimination and full and fair access to services and participation in decision-making processes:

Goal 2: Human Potential. 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.

Strategy 2.1.1: Design and offer a variety of public transportation products and services appropriate to different markets and mobility needs.

Strategy 2.1.2: Provide travel opportunities for historically disadvantaged populations, such as low-income people, students, youth, seniors, people of color, people with disabilities, and others with limited transportation options.

Strategy 2.1.3: Provide products and services that are designed to provide geographic value in all parts of King County.

Goal 7: Public Engagement and Transparency. Promote robust public engagement that informs, involves, and empowers people and communities.

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

Strategy 7.2.1: Communicate service change concepts, the decision-making process, and public transportation information in language that is accessible and easy to understand.

Goal 8: Quality Workforce. Develop and empower Metro's most valuable asset, its employees.

Objective 8.1: Attract and recruit quality employees.

Strategy 8.1.2: Promote equity, social justice and transparency in hiring and recruiting activities.

Service Guidelines

Metro's strategic plan also incorporates service guidelines that include social equity as one of three priorities that Metro considers early in the service planning process.

These guidelines define a process by which Metro annually reviews and establishes target service levels for transit corridors. The process includes assignment of scores that are based on indicators of productivity, social equity, and geographic value. The social equity score, which represents 25 percent of the total score, is based on the percentage of people boarding in a census tract that has a low-income or minority population higher than the countywide average. The total score, which also includes scores for productivity and geographic value, establishes a preliminary target service level for each corridor. The preliminary target service level may be adjusted upward to accommodate current ridership. A corridor that is below its final target service level is identified as a service investment priority.

The overall result is that, other factors being equal, investments in routes that serve low-income or minority populations will be prioritized over routes that do not serve low-income or minority populations.

Updates to the Strategic Plan and Service Guidelines

Metro's strategic plan and service guidelines are regularly updated. In the 2013 service guidelines update, Metro responded to the new requirements in FTA 4702.1B to have Title VI policies adopted by the governing body. Reflecting the County's long-standing emphasis on equity and social justice, many of the

thresholds and practices for ensuring Title VI compliance were already in place. However, this service guidelines update provided a convenient opportunity for Metro’s governing board to adopt additional guidance in response to the new FTA requirements. The updates include definitions of “adverse effect,” “disparate impact” and “disproportionate burden” as well as policy guidance concerning the equitable distribution of facilities, fleet and amenities. The updates are presented in Appendix A.

Notable Recent Achievements

Metro actively follows the guidance and requirements of the County plans and policies described above as well as the Title VI statute and regulations. The following are some notable actions we have taken over the past few years to promote fair and equal access to Metro’s services and activities for all people in our service area, including minority populations and people who have limited English proficiency, disabilities, or low incomes:

- Adopted a new strategic plan in 2011 that incorporated goals, objectives, strategies and service guidelines promoting equity and social justice.
- Used the service guidelines to ensure that service to minority and low-income areas was given priority, along with productivity and geographic value, as we planned extensive restructuring and reallocation of service in 2012. As an example of the results, Metro now provides more frequent service in areas with diverse and low-income populations, including Burien, SeaTac, South Park, and White Center.
- Joined with the City of Seattle and Sound Transit to conduct extensive community outreach in southeast Seattle, which has a concentration of minority and low-income residents, to learn how we can improve transit service in that area. Results include improving bus stops and zones to make them more convenient, safe and comfortable; adding bus rapid transit features—real-time bus arrival signs and bus bulbs to speed boarding—to the heavily used Route 7 corridor; and revising the special bus service for Center Park, a residence for people with disabilities, including providing service to clients of the Asian Counseling and Referral Service and the Filipino Community Center.
- Through the King County Mobility Coalition, produced a series of videos for refugee and immigrant populations, in their native languages, about how to use transit. The videos feature respected immigrant-community elders as narrators, and have been distributed through trusted community organizations. The videos were produced in 10 languages: Spanish, Russian, Nepali, Amharic, Tigrinya, Somali, Burmese, Chinese, Vietnamese and English.
- Expanded our use of translated materials and interpreter services, and strengthened partnerships with community organizations trusted by those who have limited English proficiency, as we conducted outreach and provided information about Metro service changes.
- Made buying an ORCA card—including Regional Reduced Fare Permit and youth cards—easier for minority, low-income and limited-English populations who may face barriers in obtaining them. Metro purchased portable customer service terminals that we are using to sell ORCA cards at community locations in cooperation with local organizations. We also have quadrupled the number of retail outlets where ORCA cards can be purchased, including Saar’s Marketplace, Safeway, Bartell Drugs and QFC stores.
- Convened a Low Income Fares Advisory committee to assist in the review and development of new King County public transportation fare options for people with low incomes.

This report provides more information about these and other steps Metro has taken to comply with Title VI requirements and to move toward King County’s vision of a just and equitable society.

SECTION I: General Reporting Requirements

Title VI Notice to the Public

Metro uses a variety of means to notify the public that we comply with the requirements of Title VI and related statutes and regulations.

Placards displaying this notice, as well as information about how to file a complaint if a person believes Metro has discriminated against them, are posted inside all buses. The notice is translated into Cambodian, Chinese, Korean, Russian, Somali, Spanish, Tagalog, Tigrinya, and Vietnamese. A similar notice of Title VI obligations and remedies, also in multiple languages, is provided to customers of Metro's Access paratransit service. Metro's language assistance plan, attached as Appendix C, includes images of these placards. The notice is also posted on Metro's website, www.kingcounty.gov/metro, and in Metro's pass sales office.

The wording of the notice follows:

KING COUNTY TITLE VI NOTICE TO PUBLIC

King County hereby gives public notice that it is the policy of the county to assure full compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987, Executive Order (E.O.) 12898, and related statutes and regulations in all programs and activities. Title VI requires that no person in the United State of America shall, on the ground of race, color, national origin, or sex be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity for which King County receives federal financial assistance.

Any person who believes they have been aggrieved by an unlawful discriminatory practice under Title VI has a right to file a formal complaint with King County. Any such complaint must be in writing and filed with the King County Title VI Coordinator within one hundred eighty (180) days following the date of the alleged discriminatory occurrence. Title VI Discrimination Complaint Forms may be obtained from this office at no cost to the complainant by calling 206-296-7592.

In addition, the following notification is posted in English and Spanish on the King County website, www.kingcounty.gov/exec/CivilRights/TitleVI.aspx :

Title VI compliance

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states:

“No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

King County Title VI Policy Statement

King County assures that no person shall on the grounds of race, color, national origin, or sex, as provided by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as amended, and the Civil Right Restoration Act of 1987 (P.L. 100.259) be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

King County further assures every effort will be made to ensure nondiscrimination in all of its programs and activities, whether those programs and activities are federally funded or not.

In the event King County distributes federal aid funds to another governmental entity or other sub-recipient, King County will include Title VI language in all written agreements and will monitor for compliance.

King County’s Office of the Title VI Coordinator is responsible for initiating and monitoring Title VI activities, preparing required reports and other King County responsibilities as required by 23 CFR 200 and 49 CFR 21.

Dow Constantine
King County Executive

May 28, 2010

Title VI Complaint Procedures and Form

Instructions for filling out a Title VI complaint can be obtained from King County’s Office of Civil Rights (www.kingcounty.gov/exec/CivilRights/FileComplaint/~media/exec/civilrights/documents/TVIform.ashx) and from Metro’s Customer Information Office.

A copy of the complaint form is in Appendix B.

Title VI Investigations, Complaints, and Lawsuits

Four Title VI or civil rights complaints were filed since the 2010 Title VI program was submitted. One of the complaints was found to be without merit and one was withdrawn. Two complaints are still open and under investigation. The complaints and actions taken are listed in Table 1.

Table 1
King County Office of Civil Rights - Complaints and Actions Taken

| Civil Rights Complaints | | | | |
|--|-------------------|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | Date filed | Summary/Allegations (includes basis of complaint: race, color, or national origin) | Status – April 15, 2013 | Action(s) Taken |
| 1. KCT 11-12-12 Miles E. Berry v. Metro | 10-7-11 | Adverse treatment by driver – Basis: race | File closed 10-11-11 | No reasonable cause finding |
| Metro/Public Accommodation Complaints | | | | |
| | Date filed | Summary/Allegations (include basis of complaint: race, color, or national origin) | Status – April 15, 2013 | Action(s) Taken |
| 2. KCPA 12-05-03 Worthy v. DOT-Transit Division | 5/18/12 | Adverse treatment by driver- Basis: race (African American) | File open | Under investigation at this time |
| 3. KCPA 12-06-04 McCalister v. DOT-Transit Division | 6/5/12 | Adverse treatment by driver- Basis: race (African American) | File closed | Complaint withdrawn by charging party |
| 4. KCPA 12-12-06 Collins v. DOT-Transit Division | 12/27/12 | Adverse treatment by driver- Basis: race (African American) and disability | File open | Under investigation at this time |

Public Participation Plan

King County and Metro have several policies and plans that establish expectations for how Metro engages minority and limited-English-proficient populations in our public engagement and outreach processes. These policies and plans reflect the fundamental principle that all those affected by a decision should be involved in shaping it.

1. The **King County Strategic Plan** establishes the following goal for public engagement: Promote robust public engagement that informs, involves, and empowers people and communities.

The plan defines three public engagement objectives:

- Expand opportunities to seek input, listen, and respond to residents.
- Empower people to play an active role in shaping their future.
- Improve public awareness of what King County does.

2. **Metro's Strategic Plan for Public Transportation 2011-2021** adopts the County's public engagement goal, and establishes two objectives:

- Empower people to play an active role in shaping Metro's products and services.
- Increase customer and public access to understandable, accurate and transparent information.

Metro's plan makes a commitment to targeting historically underrepresented populations, and states, "Metro considers equity and social justice in its decision-making process, particularly for people of color, low-income communities, and people with limited English proficiency, consistent with King County's Equity and Social Justice Initiative and federal law."

3. **King County's Equity and Social Justice program** seeks to embed fair and just principles into everything King County does, so that the County's work and service enables all to have access to the determinants of equity.
4. **The County's Executive Order on Translation** directs all agencies of the County, including Metro, to ensure that communications are culturally and linguistically appropriate to the target audiences, and provides guidance for translating public communication materials.

In the context of these policies, Metro's ongoing and project-based public engagement methods proactively seek to engage minority and limited-English-proficient populations in conversations that shape decision making.

Ongoing Engagement

The Transit Advisory Commission (TAC) was established in January 2011 by King County Ordinance 17025. This ordinance merged two previous advisory groups, the Transit Advisory Committee and the Accessible Services Advisory Committee.

The TAC improves transit services, planning, and programs by advising Metro's staff members and general manager, the King County Executive and Council, local jurisdictions, and subarea transportation boards concerning transit policy issues.

The commission's role is to:

- Advise Metro on the inception and development of long-range planning efforts.
- Advise Metro and King County on issues essential to transit service in King County, including matters of concern to the elderly and persons with disabilities.
- Serve as a resource for inter-jurisdictional transit promotion and coordination.

Commission members are appointed by the King County Executive and approved by the King County Council for two-year terms. The commission includes residents, business representatives, and other stakeholders concerned about transit service in the county. Most are bus riders. All live in King County, and collectively they reflect the county's diversity. At least half are people who have disabilities, are elderly, or work with these populations.

Over the past three years, 20 to 25 percent of TAC members have been people of color, 30 to 50 percent have been people with disabilities, and 20 to 25 percent have had incomes below the poverty level. Consistent with the County's Equity and Social Justice program, race, language, age, disability, and gender are factors used during recruitment to assure the TAC is representative of the diversity of the county, which is Metro's service area.

The TAC is invited to brief the County Council, including the Regional Transit Committee, on transit issues. The TAC designates a member to serve on each of Metro's sounding boards, described below.

Project-specific Engagement

In addition to involving the public through the Transit Advisory Commission, Metro develops public engagement processes to invite the general riding and non-riding public to help shape decisions regarding new transit service, changes to existing service, and reinvestments of existing service resources in accordance with Metro's strategic plan and service guidelines.

When developing major service changes, we design an engagement process that seeks to involve people affected by the change, including:

- Riders of affected routes
- Residents of areas around affected routes
- Community clubs and neighborhood councils
- Organizations that serve underrepresented and transit-dependent populations
- Staff and elected officials from local jurisdictions
- Major institutions (e.g. University of Washington)
- Employers
- Partner transit agencies (e.g. Sound Transit).

We use information and input from the public to develop service proposals that respond to the public's expressed needs. Service proposals often include alternatives for coverage, frequency and span of service. Alternatives may also present variations for peak and all-day service, local and express service, and other aspects of service.

We inform and solicit input from the public through methods such as public meetings, questionnaires, conversations with community groups, social media, news releases, advertisements, and sounding board meetings (see below). We involve people early in the planning process, presenting preliminary concepts and gathering input that is then used to develop proposals that are presented in a second round of outreach.

In every community engagement project, we research the demographics of those who may be affected by the change being considered. U.S. Census and American Community Survey data, school district data, and targeted research with organizations serving transit-dependent populations is used to determine the best way to reach minority and limited-English-proficient people in the community affected by the change.

We design outreach strategies to reach these populations, creatively seeking to engage those who would not otherwise learn about our process via mainstream communication channels.

A primary approach Metro takes is to partner with organizations serving minority populations to find out the most appropriate ways to engage those they serve. Other outreach efforts include:

- Distributing translated and large-print materials through community organizations, open houses and information tables.
- Hosting information tables at locations that serve minority and underrepresented populations, such as food banks, human service organizations, low-income housing and cultural organizations.
- Working with community partners to host meetings designed in formats, locations and at times that are appropriate for limited-English-proficient populations.
- Going door-to-door or boarding buses to reach people directly, using interpreters or translated materials as necessary.
- Providing information and purchasing advertising from ethnic media and community publications.
- Posting information at key community locations serving minority and underrepresented populations.
- Using six dedicated language phone lines, and adding additional lines as necessary, for people to comment or ask questions. We return phone calls using a phone-based interpreter service that helps us answer questions and solicit feedback in the caller’s native language.
- Arranging for interpreters (including deaf and deaf/blind) upon request, or working with community-based organizations to facilitate conversation when appropriate.
- Presenting to stakeholders groups such as the National Federation of the Blind’s Seattle Chapter, Catholic Community Services, the Seattle-King County Housing Authority, and the King County Mobility Coalition when a change is being planned that will affect the constituents.
- Having Metro’s Accessible Services staff members available at open houses to answer questions and provide support for people with special needs.

When Metro is considering major service changes, we often complement broad public engagement with a sounding board. King County Code 28.94.170.A defines sounding boards as “geographically, topically or community-based groups convened for a limited time to consider specific transit topics.” Sounding boards generally work with Metro staff members to develop proposals, review public feedback, and make advisory recommendations on transit service. A sounding board’s membership reflects the demographics of the area affected by the service change. Metro achieves this by using U.S. Census data to identify the minority groups in the service area, and then asks sounding board applicants to identify their minority status on applications. We sometimes contact community organizations to recruit potential sounding board members.

The research, approach, and results are reported in a public engagement report submitted to the King County Council. Sounding boards develop their own recommendations and reports for the King County Council on the particular changes being considered.

Summary of project-specific engagement

Metro conducted more than a dozen public engagement processes between August 2010 and August 2013. In total, these processes have engaged more than 12,000 people in helping shape service changes. These processes were for September 2012 service changes (two phases), RapidRide E Line routing and stop locations, RapidRide F Line routing and stop locations, elimination of the Ride Free Area in downtown Seattle, Route 120 corridor improvements, south-end transit pathways, southeast Seattle outreach, alternative service delivery, Renton transit restructure (two phases), and I-90 corridor service.

According to survey results for 12 projects in which participants chose to self-identify race, primary language spoken at home, and annual household income, the following tables show the percentage or number of participants in these categories.

**Table 2
Racial/Ethnic Identity of
Public Engagement
Participants Surveyed**

| Race/Ethnicity | Percentage |
|-------------------------------------|------------|
| African-American | 3% |
| Asian-American/ Pacific Islander | 7% |
| Caucasian | 83% |
| Hispanic | 2% |
| American Indian | 1% |
| Biracial | 6% |
| Other | 1% |

**Table 3
Primary Language Spoken at
Home by Public Engagement
Participants Surveyed**

| | |
|------------|-------|
| Chinese | 61 |
| English | 6,708 |
| Japanese | 19 |
| Korean | 15 |
| Russian | 29 |
| Spanish | 33 |
| Somali | 2 |
| Tagalog | 20 |
| Ukrainian | 4 |
| Vietnamese | 15 |
| Other | 151 |
| Total | 7,057 |

**Table 4
Annual Household Income
of Public Engagement
Participants Surveyed**

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Less than \$7,500 | 3% |
| \$7,500-\$15,000 | 4% |
| \$15,000-\$25,000 | 4% |
| \$25,000-\$35,000 | 9% |
| \$35,000-\$55,000 | 14% |
| \$55,000-\$75,000 | 15% |
| \$75,000-\$100,000 | 16% |
| \$100,000-\$140,000 | 21% |
| \$140,000 and up | 9% |
| Don't know | 4% |

Example Projects

The following four projects highlight Metro’s efforts to meaningfully engage minority, underrepresented, and limited-English-proficient populations in decision making.

Project # 1

September 2012 Service Change

Metro proposed to change bus service on approximately 50 routes in September 2012. The purpose of these changes was to complement the start of RapidRide C and D line service and to mitigate slower boarding times in downtown Seattle expected to result from elimination of the Ride Free Area. The changes were also intended to create a more efficient system through the application of Metro’s service guidelines and the goals in Metro’s strategic plan.

We conducted a four-month, two-phase community engagement process for this service change. The project area extended from Shoreline, just north of Seattle, to Des Moines, just south, and touched almost every neighborhood in Seattle. Nearly 10,000 people, representing 8 percent of the average daily ridership on the affected routes, shared their ideas and concerns.

The following is a summary of the engagement efforts for the two phases.

Phase 1

The first phase of engagement began in late October 2011 and continued through January 2012. After presenting preliminary service concepts, we heard from nearly 5,000 people, including 1,200 people at open houses, presentations and information tables and an additional 3,600 community members via the online survey, phone line, “Have a Say” email account, and meeting feedback forms. The project website had more than 32,500 visits from nearly 15,000 unique visitors.

We identified several common concerns, ideas and suggestions from riders for revising the initial service change concepts. More than 50 percent of the initial concepts were revised in response to public input before the second phase of engagement.

Phase 2

The second phase of engagement was February 1–29, 2012. Metro again heard from nearly 5,000 people—1,500 people at open houses, presentations and information tables and an additional 3,300 community members via the online survey, phone line, and “Have a Say” email account. The project website had more than 12,500 visits from 7,765 unique visitors.

For both phases of outreach, we targeted underrepresented populations by partnering with community organizations serving them and by making information available in a variety of forms and languages.

Survey results showed that approximately 23 percent of respondents to the demographic questions had low incomes, with an annual household income of \$35,000 or less. Nine percent of respondents said they had a disability, and of those, 66 percent were mobility impaired. Seventeen percent identified themselves as minorities and 2 percent indicated that English was not the primary language spoken at home.

Research completed prior to designing and conducting the engagement process indicated that both Spanish and Vietnamese are the primary languages spoken by 10 percent or more of the population in the project area. We translated materials and set up phone lines in these two languages. Additional activities that engaged minority and limited-English-proficient populations included:

- Providing translated and large-print materials to organizations via mail and making them available at open houses and information tables. Materials were translated into Spanish, Vietnamese, Somali, Arabic, and Cambodian.
- Hosting information tables at locations that serve minority and underrepresented populations, such as food banks and human service organizations.
- Posting information at key community locations serving minority and underrepresented populations.
- Arranging for interpreters (including deaf and deaf/blind) upon request.
- Giving presentations to the National Federation of the Blind’s Seattle Chapter, Catholic Community Services, the Yesler Terrace Vietnamese Group, and the Seattle Housing Authority Resident Action Council, King County Mobility Coalition
- Giving presentations to retirement facilities such as Horizon House, Exeter House, Tate Mason House, Hearthstone House, and the Hilltop House.
- Reaching out to community partners such as the White Center Community Development Association, VA Hospital, DisAbility Rights Commission, and the NW Kidney Center.
- Having Metro’s Accessible Services staff members available at open houses to answer questions and provide support for people with special needs.

Project #2

Southeast Seattle Outreach

Metro was asked by the King County Council to conduct a southeast Seattle outreach program, in consultation with community groups and the public, that would seek to improve passenger facilities and transfer connections between Metro routes as well as between Metro’s services and Sound Transit’s Link light rail; provide opportunities for increased access to ORCA fare media; and ensure maximum awareness and use of alternative transit services for people with disabilities, seniors and other southeast Seattle residents who have limited transportation access to jobs, education, health care, nutrition and other

human services. Southeast Seattle is one of the most diverse areas of King County; 59 languages are spoken in the 98118 zip code.

The engagement process happened in two phases over the course of six months—a listening phase and a solutions phase. The listening phase incorporated face-to-face and online community conversations. The solutions phase involved a series of meetings with community-based organizations and partner agencies, as well as a community workshop to create solutions to address concerns raised by riders during the listening phase. Metro continues working to respond to these community concerns.

Phase 1 – The Listening Phase

For this phase we asked community organizations, or “trusted advocates,” to host and facilitate conversations with targeted community groups to garner their input about transportation services. It was felt that minorities and people with low-incomes would be more forthcoming when their advocates were hosting the meeting. Topics included barriers to using services and how best to break those barriers and reach out to diverse communities.

We engaged three distinct groups:

- **Partner agencies – Sound Transit and the City of Seattle Department of Transportation.** Metro partners with these entities to effectively respond to community needs and to a requirement of Ordinance 17259. Metro and the agencies met regularly to strategize, learn from one another, and coordinate activities.
- **Community organizations** – those that are located in or serve underrepresented communities within the geographic footprint of this project.
- **Community members** – residents of southeast Seattle, clients of organizations in this area, and people who use Metro routes 7, 8, 39, and 42 or Link to travel within the geographic footprint of this project.

As the first step in our listening process, we worked with partner agencies to create a set of questions to gather feedback from underrepresented, transit-dependent populations who live and travel between Rainier Beach and the International District via Martin Luther King Jr. Way S.

Metro representatives worked with partner agencies to review and prioritize a list of more than 80 community organizations that are located in or serve southeast Seattle. Our aim was to balance inclusion and comprehensive representation of transit-dependent, minority populations with the limited time and resources available for this outreach. We identified a shorter list of priority community organizations and conducted one-on-one meetings with each.

In the one-on-one meetings, we shared the outreach approach and survey questions and asked for feedback. We invited organizations to host community conversations in which their constituents could talk with Metro staff members and partner agencies about their experiences and needs for transportation in southeast Seattle.

A total of 459 community members participated in one of the 11 community conversations we held or in the online survey. A majority of participants were transit-dependent, had low incomes, and spoke English as a second language or not at all. Ninety percent or more use buses and Link. The major languages other than English spoken were Chinese (Mandarin and Cantonese), Vietnamese, Somali, Amharic, Oromo, Tigrinya, Laotian, Cambodian, Tongan, Samoan, and Tagalog.

Using interpreters, each meeting involved attendees responding to questions about ORCA, traveling in the community, transportation options, barriers to riding the system, and how we might better communicate

with the community. Facilitators encouraged participants to talk about both their personal stories and issues they were aware of in their community.

Phase 2 – The Solutions Phase

After submitting a report to the King County Council documenting the feedback gained from the community, we organized several activities to develop solutions. We held an interagency workshop, met with community organizations and agency partners, brought together agency staff and met with stakeholder organizations. Solutions were generated to improve transit service, access to ORCA, stop locations and safety, awareness of transit and alternative services, and communications with minority and limited-English populations.

Outcomes

Work is ongoing to implement the solutions identified during Phase 2. Lessons learned in this engagement effort are applicable to diverse communities throughout King County, so Metro is changing the way we communicate with and engage minority and limited-English riders to ensure that communities feel heard.

Project #3

RapidRide F Line Alignment and Service Change

Metro will be starting the RapidRide F Line between Burien and Renton in June 2014. In preparation for this service, Metro conducted a community engagement process from January-February 2012 to gather feedback on the proposed routing and stop locations. Metro conducted a second engagement process between November 2012 and February 2013 on possible service changes that would complement the F Line in Renton.

Alignment

The project area extended from Burien to Renton, following the general alignment of the F Line. More than 300 people shared their ideas and concerns.

Based on research into affected populations, we mailed a brochure and survey in English and Spanish to about 12,000 businesses and households within one-quarter mile of the F Line corridor. We emailed Transit Alerts to subscribers of affected routes. We also leveraged formal and informal networks of communication by reaching out to people's trusted sources of information. We sent notifications to more than 20 community partners and employers in the affected area, encouraging them to spread the word about the project via their own internal communication channels. We also mailed materials to more than a dozen organizations to share with their members. The media strategy included targeted releases to neighborhood blogs in the affected neighborhoods.

In addition to the mailing, we solicited feedback via new channels such as the "Have a Say" blog and Facebook page, and the kcmetrobus Twitter account. The survey was available online in both English and Spanish. During the outreach process, 320 people filled out the survey and 13 shared their comments via email or phone.

We held an open house in Renton as well as two information tables in the project area.

The following outreach activities were included to engage underrepresented populations:

- Distributing translated and large-type materials through organizations, open houses and information tables.
- Posting information at key community locations serving underrepresented populations.
- Providing dedicated Spanish and Vietnamese phone lines.
- Arranging for interpreters (including deaf and deaf/blind) upon request.

Survey analytics show that approximately 49 percent of respondents to the demographic questions would be classified as low-income, with an annual household income of \$35,000 or less. Twenty-four percent indicated they were a minority and 5 percent indicated English was not the primary language spoken at home.

Service changes

The Renton Transit Restructure project had two phases of outreach. The first phase was conducted from Nov. 16 through Dec. 7, 2012. The second phase was conducted from Feb. 1 through Feb.15, 2013. Metro shared initial concepts for Phase 1 with the public and sought feedback through an online survey, public meetings, and bus boardings on the routes being considered for change. After the first phase, Metro staff members considered the feedback and refined the changes under consideration. In Phase 2, we shared proposals with the public and sought feedback via an online survey and printed surveys distributed on the affected buses.

Metro combined face-to-face communication with other channels already in use by riders. The goal was to get the word out in a way that would provide input from a reflective sample in the most cost-effective manner.

We put up posters at stops along affected bus routes. During Phase 1, posters announced the outreach process and how to participate. During Phase 2, posters showed the proposed changes and avenues to give feedback. Staff members also boarded all affected bus routes to talk with riders. In Phase 1, fliers inviting the public to participate were distributed aboard all affected routes. In Phase 2, fliers with surveys were distributed and, where possible, staff members surveyed riders on board the affected bus routes.

Multiple Transit Alerts were sent to route subscribers of Renton-area bus routes. Notices were sent at the launch of each phase of outreach and to remind people of key dates.

We sent emails announcing the start of both phases of outreach and asked community partners in the Renton area to help spread the word. There were 70 partners, including social service, health, low-income, senior, youth, cultural, and neighborhood organizations and associations. Local news outlets, including ethnic media, also received news releases as the start of each phase of outreach.

In addition, we gave presentations to the South County Mobility Coalition and reached out to several social service agencies serving transit-dependent populations to seek creative ways to engage their constituents. These efforts resulted in special events at the Renton Housing Authority and the Renton Senior Center.

A survey was used to gather feedback for each phase of the Renton Transit Restructure engagement process. In the first phase, the survey was designed to capture thoughts and feelings about the concepts under consideration. In the second phase, the survey was designed to directly hear from riders who might be affected by the change.

During the first phase of outreach, we hosted two open houses and two special events. Open houses were held at Renton Technical College and at Renton High School.

An information table at the Renton Senior Center was staffed during a weekly lunch program and the Renton Housing Authority (RHA) hosted a multilingual open house at their administrative office. During the second phase of outreach, efforts focused on reaching riders who would be directly affected by proposed changes on the bus or at stops.

Based on data from the U.S. Census and the Renton School district about languages spoken, as well as input from the City of Renton and the RHA, Metro made accommodations for Spanish, Russian, Somali, Chinese-Cantonese, and Vietnamese speakers during both phases of engagement.

During Phase 1, all printed materials and the online individual and business surveys were fully translated into Spanish. Abbreviated information was translated into the other languages. During Phase 2, abbreviated information was translated into all languages in print and online. Phone lines were set up for each language and abbreviated information was made available on the project website in all languages.

Interpreters for every language attended a special multilingual open house at the RHA's administrative office. Metro also asked organizations that serve populations with limited English proficiency to share translated materials and invite participation in the multilingual open house.

Project #4

Bellevue-Redmond Connections

As part of planning for the RapidRide B Line, Metro conducted two rounds of outreach, one in fall 2010 and one in January 2011, to engage affected populations in planning service changes. Key elements of this outreach included:

- A community sounding board
- Distribution of publications and questionnaires
- Outreach to people with limited English proficiency
- Public meetings
- Presentations
- Website
- Media

In summer 2010, Metro recruited volunteers to serve on the Bellevue-Redmond Transit Connections Sounding Board via a news release, an e-mail to our transit email list, and a targeted mailing to 27 employers, libraries, community centers, and civic groups in east King County. Seventeen sounding board members were selected who reflected the diversity of east King County.

The role of the sounding board was to review and evaluate input from the east King County community, attend community discussions and open houses, and produce a final report with recommendations to Metro management.

In October 2010 and January 2011, we mailed a brochure to approximately 97,000 addresses in east King County. As a cost-saving measure, the brochure directed customers to the project website to complete an online questionnaire, and provided contact information as an alternative for those unable to fill out the questionnaire online.

The brochures contained the following:

- An outline of Metro's proposed bus changes, with the January 2011 publication presenting revised proposals that reflected feedback received during the fall outreach.
- Announcements of open houses.
- Key information in Spanish, with contact information for requesting a full translation.
- Information on how to find the project website and online questionnaire.

The fliers and questionnaires were also distributed by:

- Posting them on Metro Online.
- Sending copies to 27 employers, libraries, community centers, and civic groups in East King County.

- Sending e-mail versions to affected subscribers of Metro's e-mail list.
- Sending copies to employee transportation coordinators at worksites in Bellevue and Redmond.

Outreach to people with limited English proficiency included:

- A dedicated phone line for Spanish-speaking community members.
- Use of interpreters for phone communication with Spanish-speaking community members.
- Spanish translations of key information on all project mailings.
- Presentation to Asian Senior Concerns Foundation.
- Multiple phone calls and e-mails to Russian and Asian community centers and stakeholders.

During the fall and winter, we held four community open houses in Redmond and Bellevue. Approximately 200 people attended these events.

Metro staff members made presentations to:

- Bellevue College
- Seniors at the Eastside YMCA
- Asian Senior Concerns Foundation
- Clyde Hill City Council
- Medina City Council

We also notified riders about the proposed changes at bus stops, on bus routes, and at transit centers:

- Distributed 250 post cards about the proposals on two bus routes.
- Handed out flyers on morning trips of Route 256.
- Distributed flyers at the Bellevue Transit Center.
- Posted rider alerts at Route 234 bus stops seeking rider comments.
- Boarded all evening trips of Route 256 one weekday and distributed flyers, and alerted riders to the proposal to delete the route.
- Distributed 600 flyers about service change proposals at the Bellevue Transit Center.
- Distributed flyers to houses in the service change area.

We used the following means to publicize the proposed changes, public meetings, and comment periods:

- News releases to regional, local, neighborhood, and ethnic media and blogs.
- Tweets
- Metro Online's scrolling announcements.

The project website featured interactive and downloadable maps showing the proposed changes, as well as online questionnaires. The site had 6,632 unique visitors, with 20,752 page views.

In addition to the online questionnaire and public meetings, people could submit comments and ask questions via e-mail and two telephone message lines (English and Spanish).

Public Meetings, Presentations and Information Tables

The following table lists events held during the four public engagements processes described above.

Table 6
Public Engagement Meetings, Presentations and Information Tables

| Date | Area | Participants |
|--------------------------------------|---|---------------------|
| September 2012 Service Change | | |
| Public Meetings | | |
| 2/13/2012 | D line Ballard | 80 |
| 2/15/2012 | C line Admiral/Alki | 40 |
| 2/16/2012 | C line Delridge/White Center | 40 |
| 2/21/2012 | Downtown Seattle (C & D lines) | 60 |
| 2/23/2012 | D line Queen Anne | 160 |
| 2/27/2012 | Central Area (C & D line) | 66 |
| Presentations | | |
| 1/25/2012 | SODO Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) Meeting | 15 |
| 1/30/2012 | CBD CTR Meeting | 25 |
| 2/1/2012 | Southwest District Council | 16 |
| 2/2/2012 | Interbay CTR Meeting | 8 |
| 2/2/2012 | North Highline UAC | 28 |
| 2/6/2012 | Mount Baker Community Council | 28 |
| 2/6/2012 | First Hill CTR Meeting | 15 |
| 2/7/2012 | Northgate CTR Meeting | 4 |
| 2/7/2012 | Madrona Community Council | 72 |
| 2/8/2012 | South Lake Union CTR Meeting | 25 |
| 2/8/2012 | Ballard District Council | 41 |
| 2/8/2012 | SHA Resident Action Council | 20 |
| 2/9/2012 | Hearthstone House | 60 |
| 2/9/2012 | Central Area District Council | 18 |
| 2/9/2012 | U District CTR Meeting | 10 |
| 2/10/2012 | Horizon House (100+ attendees) | 120 |
| 2/13/2012 | Magnolia/Queen Anne District Council | 20 |
| 2/14/2012 | First Hill Improvement Association | 30 |
| 2/15/2012 | Delridge District Council | 10 |
| 2/16/2012 | Fremont Chamber | 20 |
| 2/16/2012 | First Hill - Tate Mason House (Seattle Housing Authority) | 30 |
| 2/17/2012 | Hilltop House (senior housing) | 50 |
| 2/21/2012 | King County Mobility Coalition | 20 |
| 2/22/2012 | Southeast District Council | 15 |
| 2/22/2012 | Northwest District Council | 20 |
| 2/22/2012 | Duwamish District Council | 10 |
| 2/23/2012 | Catholic Community Services | 50 |
| 2/29/2012 | Yesler Terrace Vietnamese Group | 50 |
| Information Tables | | |
| 2/8/2012 | White Center Food Bank | |
| 2/9/2012 | West Seattle Water Taxi | |
| 2/9/2012 | Northgate Transit Center | |
| 2/13/2012 | Fremont (D line) | |
| 2/13/2012 | South Seattle Community College | |
| 2/13/2012 | Burien Transit Center | |
| 2/16/2012 | South Lake Union | |
| 2/17/2012 | Wallingford QFC | |
| 2/18/2012 | South Park Food Bank | |

**Table 6
Public Engagement Meetings, Presentations and Information Tables**

| Date | Area | Participants |
|--|---|---------------------|
| 2/18/2012 | Seward Park | |
| 2/22/2012 | Ballard Library (D line) | |
| 2/22/2012 | 23rd & Jackson | |
| 2/23/2012 | Highline Community College | |
| Southeast Seattle (primary languages spoken) | | |
| Public Meetings | | |
| 4/18/12 | Chinese Information Service Center (Vietnamese) | 16 |
| 4/23/12 | Filipino Community Center (Tongan, Samoan) | 44 |
| 4/24/13 | Yesler Terrace-Seattle Housing Authority (Vietnamese) | 66 |
| 4/30/12 | Rainier Vista (Vietnamese, Somali, Oromo, Chinese, Tigrinyan) | 40 |
| 5/4/12 | Beacon Hill Tower-Seattle Housing Authority (Chinese) | 11 |
| 5/10/12 | Refugee Women's Alliance (Oromo, Somali, Vietnamese, Laotian, Tigrinyan, Amharic) | 44 |
| 5/17/12 | South Shore School-route subscriber focus group | 2 |
| 5/21/12 | Chinese Information Service Center (Chinese) | 12 |
| 5/22/12 | New Holly (Vietnamese, Chinese-Cantonese, Oromo) | 16 |
| 5/24/12 | Filipino Community Center (Tagalog) | 104 |
| F Line | | |
| Public Meetings | | |
| 11/27/2012 | Renton Technical College | 10 |
| 11/28/2012 | Renton Housing Authority | 10 |
| 11/29/2012 | Renton High School | 10 |
| 11/29/2012 | Renton Senior Center | 40 |
| Presentations | | |
| 11/8/2012 | South County Mobility Coalition | 15 |
| 1/10/2013 | South County Mobility Coalition | 15 |
| Bellevue-Redmond Connections | | |
| Public Meetings | | |
| 11/3/2010 | North Bellevue Community Center | 50 |
| 11/4/2010 | Old Redmond Schoolhouse | 50 |
| 1/25/2011 | Redmond City Hall | 70 |
| 1/26/2011 | Bellevue City Hall | 50 |
| Presentations | | |
| Fall 2010 | Bellevue College | |
| Spring 2010 | Seniors at the Eastside YMCA | |
| Winter 2009 | Asian Senior Concerns Foundation | |
| 2/8/2011 | Clyde Hill City Council | |
| 2/15/2011 | Medina City Council | |

Membership of Committees

The table on the following page shows the racial/ethnic breakdown of Metro's advisory committee membership, as well as members who have limited English proficiency, those who have disabilities, and those who represent people with low incomes.

The Transit Advisory Commission is a permanent committee; the others were ad hoc committees whose work is complete. The Bellevue-Redmond Connections Sounding Board, active in 2010, advised Metro on the alignment and stop-spacing for the RapidRide B Line; the Regional Transit Task Force, active in

2010, recommended a new policy framework to guide Metro service; the Low-Income Fare Options Advisory Committee, active in 2013, advised Metro on options for a new fare category for low-income customers.

The Transit Advisory Commission currently has five vacant positions and is recruiting at least three people who have disabilities. Metro’s recruitment process targets ethnic media and organizations that work with people with limited English proficiency to generate a diverse applicant pool. We make accommodations as needed to assist people in completing the application form and interview process. We also assure that accommodations are made for our members who are disabled or need interpreter services, such as one member who is deaf and blind.

**Table 7
Advisory Committee Membership**

| | Transit Advisory Commission | Bellevue-Redmond Connections Sounding Board | Regional Transit Task Force | Low Income Fare Options Advisory Committee |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|---|
| African American | 2 | | 2 | 1 |
| Asian-Pacific Islander | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Caucasian | 11 | 13 | 26 | 18 |
| Hispanic | | | 1 | |
| Limited English proficiency | 2 | | | |
| Person with disabilities | 6 | | | |
| Low income representatives | NA | NA | NA | 2 |

Language Assistance Plan

Metro has a program in place to ensure that people with limited English proficiency have access to our services and to public participation opportunities. The following is a synopsis of the program; the full implementation plan is attached as Appendix C.

Our practice is to translate public communication materials and vital documents into Spanish—by far the most commonly spoken non-English language in King County—when translation is feasible within available resources. We will translate materials into the other commonly spoken non-English languages when those are the primary language spoken by 5 percent or more of the target audience. We may use alternative forms of language assistance, such as offering interpretation service upon request, when the alternative is more effective or practical.

King County—Metro’s parent agency—has identified the non-English languages most commonly spoken in the county (Metro’s service area). We rely on these findings, which are based on five data sources, in our language assistance program. In addition, Metro staff members become familiar with limited-English populations and their translation needs by working with community organizations that serve these populations.

Available data and Metro’s experience affirm that many refugees and immigrants who may have limited English proficiency rely on transit, and we offer a number of language resources to assist these customers. These include translated communication materials about Metro service, interpretation offered through Metro’s Customer Information Office, signage that uses widely recognized symbols, notices of Title VI

obligations and remedies in nine commonly spoken languages on Metro coaches, and multi-language community travel videos that are posted online and have been distributed to community organizations.

When Metro conducts public outreach concerning proposed service changes, we provide or offer translated descriptions of the proposals and questionnaires, offer interpretation at public meetings, work with community organizations that can assist us in communicating with people who have limited English proficiency, and provide telephone comment lines for non-English-speakers.

Monitoring Subrecipient Compliance with Title VI

To ensure that all subrecipients comply with Title VI regulations, grants staff and program managers monitor the performance of subrecipients annually. The subrecipient monitoring process is summarized below. Note: If a subrecipient is already a direct recipient of FTA funds, King County is not responsible for monitoring the subrecipient's Title VI compliance. A list of subrecipients is in Appendix D.

Grants staff:

- Ensure that project agreements with subrecipients contain all required federal documents and clauses, including sample notices to the public informing them of their rights under Title VI, sample procedures on how to file a Title VI complaint, sample procedures for tracking and investigating Title VI complaints and information regarding expectations for notification from the subrecipient to King County when a Title VI complaint is received.
- Request subrecipients provide us with Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) information and requests subrecipients provide us with a copy of a Title VI plan.
- Review Title VI plan, if required.
- File copy of agreement/contract, FFATA form and Title VI plan, if available, in Grants Official Subrecipient File.
- Submit FFATA information in the www.FSRS.gov website.
- On an annual basis, send a letter to subrecipient requesting a copy of A-133 audit report or other financial documentation if the subrecipient received less than \$500,000 in federal funding from all sources.
- Review financial paperwork and communicate information to project managers. If necessary, request that project managers closely monitor the subrecipient.

Project managers:

- Maintain ongoing communication with subrecipient and manage subrecipient agreement/contract and approve invoices.
- Report subrecipient progress on FTA quarterly milestone progress reports.
- Gather documents from subrecipients to ensure they are complying with Title VI, if applicable.

Program Example: Jobs Access Reverse Commute Program

Metro's Jobs Access Reverse Commute program (JARC) partners with other government and social service agencies to provide special transportation assistance for low-income and welfare clients who are entering the workforce or going to training. The program is funded by a Jobs Access Reverse Commute grant from the Federal Transit Administration. The program leases vans to community agencies, provides targeted case managers and populations with information on riding the bus or forming vanpools and carpools, and provides a van program for employers that focuses on workers whose schedules or locations make it difficult to use fixed-route transit to get to and from employment sites. Partner organizations

include Neighborhood House, Casa Latina, Refugee Women’s Alliance, Hero House, King County Employment and Education Resources and Youthcare.

The JARC program also supports Metro’s In Motion project, which provides community-based outreach to help low-income residents adapt to major Metro service changes and transportation projects. The program materials are often translated into a number of languages. Staff members work with community groups, educational institutions, local employers and housing groups to increase awareness of how to use the transit system and other travel options. Many of these efforts are done in partnership with the King County Mobility Coalition, which works with a number of social service agencies to reduce transportation barriers for special-needs populations, including low-income individuals seeking employment.

Review of Facilities Constructed

Metro did not build any storage facilities, maintenance facilities or operation centers that require a Title VI analysis. However, Metro did expand two transit facilities that were reviewed using the NEPA review process: the Burien Transit Center and the Kirkland Transit Oriented Development project. The NEPA approval letters are in Appendix E. Northgate TOD is in the planning stage and the NEPA analysis has not begun.

Documentation of Governing Body Review and Approval of Title VI Program

On July 17, 2013, King County’s Regional Transit Committee reviewed the proposed update of the *Strategic Plan for Public Transportation 2011-2021*, which includes required Title VI policies and revisions to the Service Guidelines, and recommended “do pass” to the County Council. The King County Council approved the updated plan on Aug. 19, 2013.

The King County Council also approved this Title VI Program.

Documentation of committee and County Council actions is in Appendix I.

SECTION II: Requirements of Transit Providers

Service Standards and Service Policies

Metro's service standards and service policies are in Appendix F and are discussed below.

The analyses using the service standards and policies compare minority routes and areas with non-minority routes and areas. They also separately compare low-income routes and areas with non-low-income route and areas. Unless otherwise noted, the data for these comparisons come from Metro's spring 2012 service period, February 18 to June 8. This is the most recent full service period for which the data necessary for these analyses was available at the time of this report.

The methodology Metro developed to identify minority and low-income routes is based on boardings in minority and low-income census tracts. Metro sent this methodology to FTA for review on March 13, 2013. The methodology for designating "minority routes" follows. The "low-income" designation is based on a similar methodology.

Minority Route Methodology

Metro uses data from the U.S. Census and from automatic passenger counters (APC) to define bus routes that serve predominately minority census tracts. Metro classifies a census tract as a minority tract if the percentage of non-white and Hispanic residents in that tract is higher than the percentage in King County as a whole (35 percent).

Metro next identifies an "inbound direction" for each route. Boardings on "inbound trips" best reflect the residential location of riders on that route. The inbound direction is easily determined for routes serving Seattle's central business district (CBD). If a route does not serve the Seattle CBD, the "inbound direction" generally is chosen as the direction to a major employment center. Using data from the automatic passenger counters, Metro counts inbound passenger boardings for each route by census tract.

Although the Seattle CBD contains both minority and non-minority census tracts, boardings in these CBD tracts are excluded from this analysis. Approximately 100,000 employees work in the Seattle CBD, compared to roughly 15,000 residents in the area. A 2010 study for Commute Seattle found that more than 40 percent of all commute trips to downtown were made by transit. These commuters also use transit for trips within downtown during the day. Therefore, bus riders boarding in the CBD are more likely to reflect the race and ethnicity of commuters, and of riders making transfers, than the race and ethnicity of CBD residents.

We next compare the percentage of each route's inbound boardings that are in minority tracts with the percentage of all inbound boardings in minority tracts systemwide. If a route's percentage of minority tract boardings is higher than the system average, that route is classified as a minority route. Based on the latest available APC data (spring 2012), 54 percent or more of boardings on a route must be in a minority tract for that route to be classified as a minority route.

Metro does not have APC data for its Dial-A-Ride Transit (DART) service, so the number of stops in minority tracts is used to define minority DART routes. If the percentage of a DART route's stops that are in minority tracts is higher than the system average for all routes, that DART route is defined as a minority route. DART makes up less than 3 percent of Metro's service hours. In spring 2012, 46 percent of bus stops must be in a minority tract for a DART route to be classified as a minority route.

Vehicle Load

Metro’s load standard is defined in our service guidelines. The guidelines state that:


- When a route operates every 10 minutes or better, an individual trip should not exceed a load factor (loads/seats) of 1.5
- When a route operates less than every 10 minutes, an individual trip should not exceed a load factor of 1.25
- No trip on a route should have a standing load for 20 minutes or longer.

Table 8 shows the average vehicle loads and load factors for Metro routes. Loads and load factors are generally similar for minority and non-minority routes in the peak periods. In midday, when average loads are lower than they are in the peak periods, minority routes have slightly higher loads relative to seats than non-minority routes have (Table 8). At all times of day, the average loads on Metro buses are well below the number of seats per bus, which generally ranges from 35 to 64 seats depending on bus size.

**Table 8
Loads by Minority Classification, Spring 2012**

| | AM Peak IB | | Midday IB & OB | | PM Peak OB | |
|--------------------|-------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
| | Load/Seats | Avg Load | Load/Seats | Avg Load | Load/Seats | Avg Load |
| Minority route | 0.61 | 28 | 0.55 | 23 | 0.65 | 29 |
| Non-minority route | 0.62 | 31 | 0.50 | 23 | 0.62 | 30 |
| <i>System</i> | <i>0.62</i> | <i>29</i> | <i>0.52</i> | <i>23</i> | <i>0.63</i> | <i>30</i> |

**Figure 1
Weekday Average Loads by Minority Status of Route**




As shown in Table 9, loads and load factors are generally similar for low-income and non-low-income routes in the AM peak period, and slightly higher for low-income routes in the PM peak period. Low-income routes have higher midday loads and load factors. In midday, the average loads even on low-income routes fall below the number of seats per bus, which generally ranges from 35 to 64 seats.

Table 9
Loads by Low-Income Classification, Spring 2012

| | AM Peak IB | | Midday IB & OB | | PM Peak OB | |
|----------------------|-------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
| | Load/Seats | Avg Load | Load/Seats | Avg Load | Load/Seats | Avg Load |
| Low-income route | 0.61 | 28 | 0.58 | 26 | 0.66 | 30 |
| Non-low-income route | 0.63 | 30 | 0.44 | 19 | 0.61 | 29 |
| <i>System</i> | <i>0.62</i> | <i>29</i> | <i>0.52</i> | <i>23</i> | <i>0.63</i> | <i>30</i> |

Figure 2
Weekday Average Loads by Income Status of Route



Average loads within all time periods indicate significant available capacity in the Metro system. However, specific trips can be crowded even if there is capacity available on average. In spring 2012, six routes were identified as needing additional trips to reduce crowding based on Metro’s loading guidelines. The addition of trips to reduce overcrowding is the first investment priority in Metro’s service guidelines. The routes needing trips to reduce crowding as of spring 2012 are listed in Table 10. Of these six, three were minority and low-income routes, and three were non-minority and non-low-income routes.

Table 10
Routes Needing Investment to Reduce Passenger Crowding, Spring 2012

| Route | Day Needing Investment | Minority Route | Low Income Route |
|---------|------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| 3 South | Weekday | Yes | Yes |
| 4 South | Weekday | Yes | Yes |
| 16 | Weekday | No | No |
| 44 | Weekday | No | No |
| 60 | Weekday | Yes | Yes |
| 358 Ex | Weekday | No | No |

Vehicle Headways

Metro defines five service families based on frequency of service. These families are shown in Table 11:

**Table 11
Summary of Typical Service Levels by Family**

| Service family | Frequency (minutes) | | | Days of service | Hours of service |
|----------------|---------------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| | Peak ¹ | Off-peak | Night | | |
| Very frequent | 15 or better | 15 or better | 30 or better | 7 days | 16-20 hours |
| Frequent | 15 or better | 30 | 30 | 7 days | 16-20 hours |
| Local | 30 | 30 - 60 | -- ² | 5-7 days | 12-16 hours |
| Hourly | 60 or worse | 60 or worse | -- | 5 days | 8-12 hours |
| Peak | 8 trips/day minimum | -- | -- | 5 days | Peak |

¹ Peak periods are 5-9 a.m. and 3-7 p.m. weekdays; off-peak are 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. weekdays and 5 a.m. to 7 p.m. weekends; night is 7 p.m. to 5 a.m. all days.

² Night service on local corridors is determined by ridership and connections.

The service families are:

Very frequent – the highest level of all-day service, generally serving very large employment and transit activity centers and high-density residential areas.

Frequent – a high level of all-day service, generally serving major employment and transit activity centers and high-density residential areas.

Local – a moderate level of all-day service, generally serving regional growth centers and low- to medium-density residential areas.

Hourly – all-day service no more frequent than every hour, generally connecting low-density residential areas to regional growth centers.

Peak – specialized service in the periods of highest demand, generally connecting to a major employment center in the morning and away from the center in the afternoon.

In spring 2012, average headways were similar for minority and non-minority routes during peak and midday time periods on weekdays. Average headways were three to five minutes longer for minority routes than for non-minority routes on weekday evenings and nights and on weekends. However, minority routes had more service overall. Minority routes had longer average spans (operated during more hours per day) and had more average trips per day than non-minority routes (Table 12).

Average headways were lower for weekday routes, particularly in peak periods, which is expected given the high concentration of service and demand in those periods. Peak-only routes typically operate less than 20 trips per day and many operate less than 10.

Table 12
Average Headways (Minutes between Buses) by Minority Classification, Spring 2012

| WEEKDAY | Average Headway | | | | | Average Span (Hours) | Average # Trips |
|--------------------|-----------------|---------|---------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| | AM Peak | Midday | PM Peak | Evening | Night | | |
| Minority route | 23 | 29 | 22 | 29 | 33 | 12.0 | 33 |
| Non-minority route | 21 | 30 | 21 | 25 | 28 | 10.5 | 25 |
| <i>System</i> | 22 | 30 | 22 | 27 | 30 | 11.2 | 28 |
| SATURDAY | Average Headway | | | Average Span (Hours) | Average # Trips | | |
| | Daytime | Evening | Night | | | | |
| Minority route | 34 | 33 | 33 | 14.8 | 53 | | |
| Non-minority route | 31 | 27 | 28 | 14.2 | 50 | | |
| <i>System</i> | 33 | 31 | 30 | 14.5 | 52 | | |
| SUNDAY | Average Headway | | | Average Span (Hours) | Average # Trips | | |
| | Daytime | Evening | Night | | | | |
| Minority route | 39 | 36 | 35 | 16.0 | 50 | | |
| Non-minority route | 34 | 30 | 30 | 14.3 | 40 | | |
| <i>System</i> | 37 | 33 | 32 | 15.1 | 44 | | |

In spring 2012, low-income routes had generally similar or lower headways than non-low-income routes, except at night. Low-income routes had longer spans of service and more average trips per day (Table 13).

Table 13
Average Headways (Minutes between Buses) by Low-Income Classification, Spring 2012

| WEEKDAY | Average Headway | | | | | Average Span (Hrs) | Average # Trips |
|----------------------|-----------------|---------|---------|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| | AM Peak | Midday | PM Peak | Evening | Night | | |
| Low-income route | 21 | 27 | 21 | 26 | 32 | 12.7 | 38 |
| Non-low-income route | 23 | 32 | 23 | 27 | 27 | 10.0 | 22 |
| <i>System</i> | 22 | 30 | 22 | 27 | 30 | 11.2 | 28 |
| SATURDAY | Average Headway | | | Average Span (Hours) | Average # Trips | | |
| | Daytime | Evening | Night | | | | |
| Low-Income route | 31 | 30 | 32 | 14.6 | 56 | | |
| Non-low-income route | 34 | 31 | 27 | 14.3 | 47 | | |
| <i>System</i> | 33 | 31 | 30 | 14.5 | 52 | | |
| SUNDAY | Average Headway | | | Average Span (Hours) | Average # Trips | | |
| | Daytime | Evening | Night | | | | |
| Low-income route | 35 | 33 | 33 | 15.7 | 50 | | |
| Non-low-income route | 39 | 34 | 29 | 14.5 | 39 | | |
| <i>System</i> | 37 | 33 | 32 | 15.1 | 44 | | |

On-Time Performance

Metro measures on-time performance for every route and systemwide. “On-time” is defined as service passing a scheduled time point between one minute before and five minutes after scheduled time. Metro has a general goal of 80 percent on-time performance at the system level, with additional specific guidelines at the route level.

In spring 2012, there was very little difference in on-time performance between minority and non-minority routes (Table 14), or between low-income and non-low-income routes (Table 15). On-time performance was one to two percentage points better for minority routes on Saturdays and Sundays, and one to two percentage points worse for low-income routes on weekdays and Sundays.

Table 14
Average On-Time Performance by Minority Classification, Spring 2012

| WEEKDAY | % On Time | % Late | % Early |
|--------------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Minority route | 76% | 19% | 5% |
| Non-minority route | 76% | 20% | 4% |
| <i>System</i> | 76% | 19% | 5% |
| SATURDAY | % On Time | % Late | % Early |
| Minority route | 76% | 18% | 6% |
| Non-minority route | 74% | 21% | 5% |
| <i>System</i> | 75% | 20% | 5% |
| SUNDAY | % On Time | % Late | % Early |
| Minority route | 78% | 15% | 6% |
| Non-minority route | 77% | 18% | 5% |
| <i>System</i> | 78% | 17% | 6% |

Table 15
Average On-Time Performance by Low-Income Classification, Spring 2012

| WEEKDAY | % On Time | % Late | % Early |
|----------------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Low-income route | 75% | 20% | 5% |
| Non-low-income route | 77% | 19% | 4% |
| <i>System</i> | 76% | 19% | 5% |
| SATURDAY | % On Time | % Late | % Early |
| Low-income route | 75% | 19% | 6% |
| Non-low-income route | 74% | 21% | 5% |
| <i>System</i> | 75% | 20% | 5% |
| SUNDAY | % On Time | % Late | % Early |
| Low-income route | 77% | 16% | 7% |
| Non-low-income route | 79% | 17% | 4% |
| <i>System</i> | 78% | 17% | 6% |

At the route level, Metro defines routes as having schedule reliability problems based on weekday, weekday PM peak, and weekend averages, as shown in Table 16. This data helps us determine where service investments are needed.

Table 16
Lateness Threshold by Time Period

| Time Period | Lateness threshold (Excludes early trips) |
|-------------------------|--|
| Weekday average | > 20% |
| Weekday PM peak average | > 35% |
| Weekend average | > 20% |

Using data from September 2011 through September 2012, Metro identified 46 routes needing service hour investments to improve their reliability (Table 17, on the following page). Investment in routes with reliability problems is the second priority in Metro’s service guidelines, after investment in routes with crowding problems. Of these 46 routes, 21 are minority routes and 22 are low-income routes, with 15 being both minority and low-income. This is consistent with the previous data indicating that on-time performance problems are affecting minority and non-minority service as well as low-income and non-low-income service in roughly equal proportions.

Table 17
Routes Needing Investment to Improve Schedule Reliability, Spring 2012

| Route | Day Needing Investment | Minority Route | Low Income Route |
|--------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| 1 | Weekday | Yes | No |
| 2 | Weekday, Saturday | No | No |
| 8 | Weekday, Sat, Sun | Yes | No |
| 11 | Sunday | Yes | No |
| 16 | Sunday | No | No |
| 17 Ex | Weekday | No | No |
| 18 Ex | Weekday | No | No |
| 24 | Weekday, Saturday | No | No |
| 26 | Weekday, Sat, Sun | No | No |
| 27 | Saturday | No | Yes |
| 28 | Weekday | No | No |
| 28 Ex | Weekday | No | No |
| 33 | Saturday | No | No |
| 36 | Weekday | Yes | Yes |
| 37 | Weekday | No | No |
| 48 | Saturday, Sunday | Yes | Yes |
| 49 | Weekday | Yes | No |
| 57 | Weekday | No | No |
| 60 | Saturday | Yes | Yes |
| 66 Ex | Weekday | No | No |
| 71 | Weekday | Yes | Yes |
| 72 | Weekday | Yes | Yes |
| 99 | Saturday, Sunday | Yes | No |
| 101 | Saturday, Sunday | No | Yes |
| 105 | Weekday | Yes | Yes |
| 106 | Weekday | Yes | Yes |
| 124 | Weekday, Saturday | Yes | Yes |
| 128 | Weekday | Yes | Yes |
| 131 | Weekday, Saturday | Yes | Yes |
| 132 | Saturday | Yes | Yes |
| 150 | Weekday, Sunday | Yes | Yes |
| 166 | Weekday | Yes | Yes |
| 169 | Weekday | No | Yes |
| 177 | Weekday | Yes | Yes |
| 179 | Weekday | Yes | Yes |
| 181 | Weekday | Yes | No |
| 187 | Weekday | No | Yes |
| 196 | Weekday | No | Yes |
| 202 | Weekday | No | No |
| 221 | Weekday | No | Yes |
| 224 | Weekday | No | No |
| 245 | Saturday | No | Yes |
| 255 | Saturday | No | No |
| 265 | Weekday | No | No |
| 311 | Weekday | No | No |
| 358 Ex | Saturday | No | No |

Service Availability

Metro addresses service availability in accordance with strategic plan Goal 2, “Provide equitable opportunities for people from all areas of King County to access the public transportation system.” Availability is measured by calculating the number of housing units within one-quarter-mile walk of a bus stop; within two miles of a permanent park-and-ride, a Sounder commuter train or Link light rail station, or a transit center with parking; or within an area served by a DART bus route. To gauge the access of minority populations, census blocks were defined as minority if more than 35 percent of the population (the minority proportion for King County as a whole) belongs to a minority group. To gauge the access of low-income populations, census blocks were defined as low-income if more than 10 percent of the population (the low-income proportion for King County as a whole) is below the poverty line.

In 2012, 87 percent of King County housing units had access to transit using the criteria defined above. A greater proportion of housing units in areas with relatively high minority and low-income populations had access to transit. In 2012, 93 percent of housing units in minority census tracts and 95 percent of housing units within low-income census tracts had access to transit.

Comparison of Travel Time to Major Employment Centers

Another measure of transit accessibility in an area is how long it takes to travel by bus to major centers. The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) has a travel-time model that estimates travel time by transit between transportation analysis zones (TAZs) using all transit agency service. While other transit agencies provide service, Metro coordinates its service with these agencies, and the ORCA card supports free transfers among agencies. For these reasons, all agencies are included in the analysis of transit travel times between TAZs.

PSRC picked TAZs that fall near the center of the six zones. Table 18 shows the estimated average travel time from minority and non-minority TAZs to the six zones. In each case, the travel time from minority TAZs to the centers is significantly less than the travel time from non-minority TAZs.

Table 18
Travel Time (Minutes) by Bus from Minority and Non-Minority Areas to Major Centers
 (Transportation Analysis Zones, All Transit Agencies)

| Major Centers | Minority | Non-Minority | <i>Difference Non-Minority - Minority</i> |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--|
| Seattle CBD | 34.3 | 55.0 | 20.8 |
| University of Washington | 46.8 | 66.8 | 20.0 |
| Duwamish Industrial Area | 35.9 | 64.8 | 28.9 |
| South Center | 49.1 | 93.7 | 44.6 |
| Bellevue CBD | 46.9 | 70.8 | 23.8 |
| Microsoft Campus in NE Bellevue | 54.7 | 80.0 | 25.4 |

Source: Model data prepared by the Puget Sound Regional Council, May 2013

Recognizing that TAZs in the eastern part of the county have very low density and very long travel times, we weighted the data by the population in the TAZs. Weighting ensured that census tracts with the most people had a greater impact on the average travel time than census tracts with few people. Weighting resulted in travel times increasing. The minority travel time increased more than the non-minority travel times. While this reduced the travel time differential, the travel time to each of the major centers was still less from minority TAZs.

Table 19
Travel Time by Bus from Minority and Non-Minority Areas to Major Centers
 (Transportation Analysis Zones, All Transit Agencies)
 (Travel time weighted by the total population of the TAZ)

| Major Centers | Minority | Non-Minority | Difference Non-Minority - Minority |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---|
| Seattle CBD | 54.0 | 61.7 | 7.6 |
| University of Washington | 71.9 | 73.0 | 1.1 |
| Duwamish Industrial Area | 56.8 | 71.2 | 14.4 |
| South Center | 72.4 | 97.9 | 25.4 |
| Bellevue CBD | 70.6 | 74.1 | 3.5 |
| Microsoft Campus in NE Bellevue | 81.2 | 82.5 | 1.2 |

Source: 2010 Model data prepared by the Puget Sound Regional Council, May 2013

Vehicle Assignment

Metro’s fleet includes diesel, hybrid, and trolley buses ranging from small 30' buses to 60' articulated buses. In spring 2012, the average fleet age was 8.8 years old, down from 9.1 years old at the end of 2011 and 9.3 years old at the end of 2010. The average fleet age is expected to continue declining as Metro procures new trolley buses and a new 35' fleet to replace the existing 30’ and 35' fleets over the next few years.

The table below shows the average age of buses in relation to the minority route classification. Buses on minority routes had an average age of 7.4 years, lower than the system average of 8.6 years.

Table 20
Average Assigned Vehicle Age by Minority Classification, Spring 2012

| Minority Classification | Average Assigned Vehicle Age | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| | Weekday | Saturday | Sunday |
| Minority route | 7.4 | 7.8 | 8.2 |
| Non-minority route | 9.5 | 9.5 | 9.9 |
| <i>System</i> | 8.6 | 8.8 | 9.2 |

The table below shows the average age of buses in relation to the low-income route classification. Buses on low-income routes had an average age of 8.2 years, lower than the system average of 8.6 years.

Table 21
Average Assigned Vehicle Age by Income Classification, Spring 2012

| Income Classification | Average Assigned Vehicle Age | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| | Weekday | Saturday | Sunday |
| Low-income route | 8.2 | 8.5 | 8.8 |
| Non-low-income route | 9.2 | 9.3 | 9.9 |
| <i>System</i> | 8.6 | 8.8 | 9.2 |

Distribution of Transit Amenities

Stops

Metro provides a variety of amenities at bus stops. The service guidelines address bus stop spacing and bus shelters. Bus stop spacing guidelines are listed in Table 22, below. These guidelines exclude areas where riders cannot access service such as on limited-access roads or freeways.

**Table 22
Bus Stop Spacing Guidelines**

| Service | Average Stop Spacing |
|--------------------|----------------------|
| RapidRide | ½ mile |
| All other services | ¼ mile |

Bus Shelters

Metro also has a guideline indicating that bus shelters should be installed on the basis of ridership in order to benefit the largest number of riders. Special consideration is given to areas where high numbers of transfers are expected, where waiting times for riders may be longer, or where stops are close to facilities such as schools, medical centers, or senior centers. Other considerations include the physical constraints of bus sites, preferences of adjacent property owners, and construction costs. Thresholds for shelters are shown in Tables 23 and 24.

**Table 23
Amenity Thresholds for RapidRide Routes**

| Level of Amenity | Daily Boardings |
|------------------|-----------------|
| Station | 150+ |
| Enhanced stop | 50-149 |
| Standard stop | Less than 50 |

Stations have shelters, benches, real-time bus arrival signs and ORCA readers; enhanced stops have small shelters and benches; standard stops have blade markers.

**Table 24
Thresholds for Bus Shelters on Other Routes**

| Location | Daily Boardings |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| RapidRide | 50 |
| All other services | 25 |

The distribution of transit amenities by income and minority classification is summarized in Table 25, on the following page. In all cases, census tracts classified as low-income or minority have higher percentages of an amenity or are within two percentage points of census tracts classified as non-low-income or non-minority.


**Table 25
Passenger Amenities at Bus Stops in Low-Income and Minority Tracts, January 2013**

| Amenity | Low Income | Non-Low Income | Minority | Non-Minority | All Zones |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---------------------|------------------|
| % Wheelchair accessible | 93% | 89% | 90% | 90% | 90% |
| % With benches | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| % With information signs | 5% | 1% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| % With schedule holders | 39% | 35% | 35% | 37% | 36% |
| % With real-time information | 1% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| % With shelters | 30% | 17% | 25% | 21% | 23% |
| % With lighting | 14% | 8% | 12% | 8% | 10% |
| Number of Zones | 3,249 | 4,968 | 3,809 | 4,408 | 8,217 |


*A number of locations were not able to be geo-coded resulting in the active zones being missing. Therefore, the percentage of wheel chair accessible stops for all activity zones is slightly different than the percentage for minority and non- minority tracts.

Demographics and Service Profile Maps and Charts


Map 1 is the base map showing minority census tracts based on the 2010 Census of Population and Housing data. Metro routes are shown along with bus stops and key transit facilities. Sound Transit routes operated by Metro are also shown so that the map shows a complete picture of service provided.




Map 1B shows minority census tracts and recent and planned transit facilities. The four current RapidRide lines (A, B, C, and D) and the two planned lines (E and F, to start in 2014) are shown as well as new parking garages (Burien and Kirkland) and the planned South Bellevue Park and Ride and Northgate Transit Oriented Development project.




Map 2 shows both demographics and facilities. The facilities include bus bases, transit centers, Sounder and Link stations, and park-and-ride facilities. Major generators of transit ridership are also included. Bus stops are shown in Map 1 and are omitted from this map so the other facilities are visible.



Map 3 is the environmental justice map, showing transit routes and facilities as well as low-income census tracts (those in which the percentage of people living in poverty is greater than the county average percentage). This map includes all Metro-operated routes, service stops, and facilities.



Map 4 shows the overlap between minority and low-income areas. Metro facilities and routes operated by Metro as well as minority and low-income census tracts are shown.



Demographic Ridership and Travel Patterns Collected by Surveys

King County and Metro conduct several types of customer surveys.

With a few exceptions over the past 10 years, Metro conducted an annual telephone survey of riders to gather information on ridership, trip purpose, travel time, customer satisfaction, demographics and topical subjects.

In alternate years, this survey is supplemented by a survey of non-riders to compare riders and non-riders and assess barriers to riding transit among non-riders. Table 26 compares the ridership characteristics of Metro’s minority and non-minority riders from the 2011 survey—the last survey that has been analyzed. Metro’s minority riders take more trips and use Metro for more of their transportation needs than non-minority riders do. Minority and non-minority riders are equally likely to use Metro to get to and from work. Minority riders are more likely to use Metro to get to school and less likely to use Metro for recreation-related trips.

Minority riders wait longer on average when they transfer (11.1 minutes compared to 10.4 minutes) and are slightly more likely than non-minority riders to use an ORCA card for fare payment. ORCA cards are used by minorities 65.7 percent of the time compared to 62.4 percent by non-minorities.

Table 26
Comparison of Minority to Non-minority Responses
2011 Rider/Non Rider Survey
 For those that use transit

| Question | Minority | Non Minority |
|--|----------|--------------|
| Number of one way trips in last 30 days | | |
| 1 - 4 | 31.4% | 37.9% |
| 5 - 7 | 9.8% | 10.6% |
| 8 - 10 | 9.9% | 10.0% |
| 11 - 20 | 15.6% | 16.4% |
| 21 or more | 33.3% | 25.1% |
| To what extent do you use the bus or streetcar to get around? | | |
| All transportation needs | 13.3% | 6.1% |
| Most transportation needs | 38.2% | 24.8% |
| All or most needs | 51.5% | 30.9% |
| Some transportation needs | 30.1% | 39.5% |
| Very little of transportation needs | 18.3% | 29.6% |
| Primary Trip Purpose when using transit | | |
| To/from work | 46.9% | 47.9% |
| To/from school | 16.3% | 5.7% |
| to/from volunteering | 2.1% | 0.6% |
| Shopping/errands | 12.4% | 12.8% |
| Appointments | 7.6% | 4.3% |
| Fun | 7.3% | 18.3% |
| Special events | 1.7% | 2.1% |
| Downtown | 2.7% | 6.4% |
| Airport | 1.4% | 0.7% |
| Other | 1.6% | 1.10% |
| | 100.0% | 99.9% |

Minority riders are slightly more likely than non-minority riders to feel neutral or dissatisfied with Metro service, but are slightly more likely to be very satisfied (Table 27).

Table 27
Overall Satisfaction with Metro Service for Those who Use Metro by
Minority/ Non-Minority
 For those that ride Metro
 Rider/Non Rider Survey 2011

| | Very satisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Neutral/Dissatisfied |
|---------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| Minority | 52.4% | 34.1% | 13.5% |
| Non-Minority | 48.6% | 43.5% | 7.8% |

King County conducted the King County Residential Survey in 2011 to assess residents’ use of and satisfaction with a wide range of services provided by King County. The survey asked residents how satisfied they were with Metro service, regardless of whether they use Metro services. Since residents were sampled, not riders, the results are not comparable to the Rider/Non-Rider survey.

According to this survey, minorities and non-Hispanic whites have similar levels of satisfaction with Metro’s service. Twenty-two percent of minorities said they were satisfied or very satisfied with the service compared to 22 percent of non-Hispanic whites (Table 28).

Table 28
Satisfaction with Metro Transit by Ethnicity
 2011 King County Residential Survey

| | Very Satisfied or Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied | # Responding |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Non-Hispanic White | 19% | 26% | 55% | 573 |
| Minority | 22% | 23% | 56% | 281 |
| Total | 20% | 25% | 55% | 854 |

As a result of the updated regulations requiring route-level demographic data (race, income, ability to speak English), Metro added demographic questions to surveys used to evaluate passenger attitudes about the fall 2012 service change. The data was not available when this report was prepared, but will be helpful in designing future route-level surveys.

Public Engagement Process for Setting the Major Service Change, Disparate Impact, and Disproportionate Burden Policies

The County Council followed a public notification and participation process in setting policies concerning major service change policy, disparate impact policy, and disproportionate burden policy. Metro transmitted recommended policies to the King County Executive. The Executive reviewed the recommendations and then submitted them to the County Council for review. The Regional Transit Committee and the Council’s Transportation, Economy and Environment Committee reviewed the legislation and forwarded it to the full Council. The Council held a public hearing and acted on it.

Service and Fare Equity Analyses

The following is a summary of the service and fare equity analyses Metro conducted between August 2010 and August 2013.

Metro evaluated major service changes in 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013; fare increases in 2011; and the elimination of the Ride Free Area in Seattle's central business district in 2012. In May 2013, the King County Council approved service changes that were initially scheduled for 2013, but the date has been postponed until 2014 for the E and F lines.

Service changes

Metro determined that none of the service changes would have a negative disproportionate impact.

Summary information about the service changes is in Table 29, on page 44. The table identifies the service changes and shows the primary affected areas and routes, the date on which the King County Council approved them and the ordinance number, and the month the service change went into effect. The equity analyses for the service changes are in Appendix G.

The Council minutes recording approval of the service changes and ordinances are in Appendix I. To aid the reader, only the portion of the minutes dealing with approval of the service changes are in the appendix. The ordinance number is listed in Table 33 to enable the reader to find the corresponding minutes. Because the descriptions of the changes are in the equity analysis, and also because the ordinances can be more than 30 pages, the ordinances are not included. Metro will provide them upon request.

Fare changes

Methodology

To determine whether a fare change would have a discriminatory impact on the basis of race, color or national origin, Metro first determines if the proposed change includes a change in the fare structure or a change in fares by fare payment method.

If the proposed fare change involves an equal fare increase across all adult fare categories and an equal increase across all fare payment methods, then this fare change would not have a disparate impact requiring further analysis.

Any proposal that involves a change to fare structure or to relative fares by fare payment method is assessed to determine whether it would have a disparate impact on minority riders or a disproportionate burden on low-income riders.

A fare change that results in a differential percentage change of greater than 10 percent by customer fare category or payment method is evaluated to determine whether it would have a disparate impact on minority riders or a disproportionate burden on low-income riders. For instance, a surcharge on cash fare payment compared to ORCA smart card fare payment of 10 percent or more would be evaluated to determine whether it would have a disparate impact or a disproportionate burden. If the average percentage fare increase for minority riders is five percentage points or more higher than the average percentage fare increase for non-minority riders, then the fare change would be determined to have a disparate impact. Similarly, if the average percentage fare increase for low-income riders is five percentage points or more higher than the average percentage fare increase for non-low-income riders, then the fare change would be determined to have a disproportionate burden.

2011 Fare Changes

Metro adopted a \$0.25 across-the-board fare increase for all adult fares effective January 1, 2011. Also on this date, the monthly pass price for seniors and riders with disabilities was increased by \$9 to bring pass prices for this group into alignment with regional pass pricing standards. Cash fares for seniors and riders with disabilities were not increased.

Youth fares were increased by \$0.50 (with a corresponding increase in pass prices) on Sept. 1, 2011, to better realign youth fare discounts with adult fares after four years of adult fare increases with no corresponding youth fare increase.

None of these fare changes was determined to result in a disparate impact or disproportionate burden.

Elimination of Ride Free Area

Elimination of the downtown Seattle Ride Free Area was determined to have a disproportionate burden on low-income residents.

To mitigate the impacts, the County increased the number of Metro bus tickets offered at an 80 percent discount to human services agencies for their homeless and low-income clients. The County increased the \$1.875 million annual ticket subsidy by \$250,000 for 2012. In addition, county residents donated 174,216 bus tickets (\$296,167 value) through Metro's Transit Incentives Program from June 2012 (when the program began) through April 2013; this donation program continues until mid-2014.

Metro also provided vans for the City of Seattle's free downtown shuttle to help meet the mobility needs of low-income riders. As of May 2013, this service had approximately 230 boardings per day.

The Ride Free Area – Title VI Evaluation is attached as Appendix G-6.

**Table 29
Major Service Changes by Implementation Year, With Council Approval Between 2010-2013**

| Year | Primary Affected Areas | Affected Routes | KC Council Approval Date & Ordinance # | Service Change Date |
|---|--|---|--|----------------------------|
| 2010 | | | | |
| RapidRide A Line, SR-520 Urban Partnership, SE King County Connectors, service partnerships | Kent, Covington, Maple Valley, Federal Way, Des Moines (<i>Midway, Redondo Heights</i>), SeaTac, Auburn, Kent, Kirkland (<i>Kingsgate, Totem Lake, Juanita, Houghton</i>), Seattle (<i>Montlake, downtown</i>) | A Line, 149, 164, 168, 174, 255, 265, 903, 910, 919 | May 2010, July 2010, Sept 2010 #16844 #16877 #16935 | Oct 2010 |
| 2011 | | | | |
| SR-520 Urban Partnership, service partnerships | Kirkland (<i>Kingsgate, Totem Lake, Juanita, Houghton</i>), Seattle (<i>Montlake, downtown, First Hill, University District</i>), Bellevue (<i>Eastgate, Bellevue CC, Bellevue Transit Center</i>), Woodinville, <i>Brickyard Park and Ride</i> | 200, 255, 271, 309, 311 | May 2010, Sept 2010 #16844 #16935 | Feb 2011 |
| Bellevue-Redmond Connections (RapidRide B Line), Route 54 (future RapidRide C Line), service partnerships | Bellevue (<i>downtown, Crossroads, Eastgate, S Bellevue, Phantom Lake, Lake Hills, SE Bellevue, Bellevue College, SE Newport Way, Factoria, Surrey Downs, Somerset, Woodridge</i>), Redmond (<i>downtown, Overlake, Redmond Town Center</i>), Seattle (<i>Westwood, Fauntleroy, Alaska Junction, downtown, Lake City, South Lake Union, First Hill, Univ. District, Northgate</i>), Tukwila, Federal Way, Kent-Des Moines, Star Lake, Issaquah, Mercer Island, Kirkland (<i>downtown, Totem Lake, Juanita</i>), Kenmore, Clyde Hill, Kent, Renton, Medina, Shoreline, Lake Forest Park | B Line, 54, 156, 193, 211, 212, 221, 222, 225, 226, 229, 230, 233, 234, 235, 238, 240, 241, 245, 246, 247, 249, 250, 253, 255, 256, 261, 265, 266, 271, 272, 303, 309, 926 | June 2011 #17100 | Oct 2011 |
| 2012 | | | | |
| Service reinvestments | Seattle, Vashon Island, SeaTac, Tukwila, Burien, Kent, Federal Way, Des Moines, Auburn, Bellevue, Newcastle, Enumclaw, Black Diamond, Covington, Kenmore, Kirkland | 25, 38, 79, 99, 119, 129, 139, 162, 175, 177, 178, 180, 196, 219, 600, 912, 925, 935 | Jan 2012 #17259 | June 2012 |
| RapidRide C and D lines | Seattle, Shoreline, Des Moines, Normandy Park, Burien, SeaTac, Tukwila, Kent | RapidRide C and D lines, 2, 5, 14, 15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 28, 30, 32, 34, 35, 37, 39, 45, 46, 47, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 60, 61, 75, 81, 85, 120, 123, 124, 125, 128, 131, 132, 133, 156, 166 | May 2012 #17320 | Sept 2012 |
| 2013 | | | | |
| Service reinvestments | Seattle (<i>Columbia City, Mount Baker, Pioneer Square/downtown</i>) | 42 | Jan 2012 #17259 | Feb 2013 |
| I-90 commuter service, Snoqualmie Valley alternative service delivery | Sammamish, Issaquah, Bellevue, Seattle, Redmond, Duvall, Carnation, Snoqualmie, North Bend, Fall City, Redmond Ridge | 208, 209, 211, 215, 216, 218, 219, 224, 311 | May 2013 #17284 | Sept 2013 |
| 2014 | | | | |
| RapidRide E Line | Shoreline, Seattle | RapidRide E Line, 358 | May 2013 #17584 | Feb 2014 |
| RapidRide F Line | Burien, SeaTac, Tukwila, Renton | RapidRide F Line, 110, 140 | May 2013 #17584 | June 2014 |

APPENDICES

- A. Title VI Updates to Metro's Strategic Plan and Service Guidelines
- B. Title VI Instructions and Complaint Form
- C. Metro's Language Assistance Plan
- D. Subrecipients of Federal Funding
- E. NEPA Letters for Burien Transit Center and Kirkland Transit Oriented Development Project
- F. Service Standards and Service Policies
- G. Service and Fare Equity Analyses
 - G-1 June 2012 Service Reinvestments: Title VI Analysis
 - G-2 Fall 2012 Service Change Title VI Evaluation (includes RapidRide C and D)
 - G-3 Fall 2013 Service Change: Title VI Service Equity Analysis
 - G-4 RapidRide A Line: Title VI Environmental Justice Analysis, December 2010
 - G-5 RapidRide B Line Restructure: Title VI Analysis, Spring 2011
 - G-6 Ride Free Area Closure: Title VI Evaluation
 - G-7 Report on Rates of Fare for the Transit Program 2011 Report
- H. Social Service Agencies Receiving Human Service Tickets in 2012
- I. Documentation of Council Action

Appendix A
Title VI Updates to Metro's Strategic Plan and Service Guidelines

Title VI Updates to Metro's Strategic Plan and Service Guidelines

Additions are underlined.

Strategic Plan

Strategy 2.1.2: Provide travel opportunities and supporting amenities for historically disadvantaged populations, such as low-income people, students, youth, seniors, people of color, people with disabilities, and others with limited transportation options.

Metro serves historically disadvantaged populations with a wide variety of public transportation services and supporting amenities such as bus stops, bus shelters, seating, lighting, waste receptacles, and public information. All buses on the fixed-route system are accessible for people using mobility devices; complementary paratransit services are available for eligible individuals with disabilities; and facilities are accessible in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Metro offers other services as well, such as the innovative Community Transportation Program which includes the Taxi Scrip Program, Transit Instruction Program, and Community Access Transportation (CAT). Metro also provides programs such as Jobs Access and Reverse Commute (JARC), a federal program that is intended to connect low-income populations with employment opportunities through public transportation. Metro also works with local school districts to respond to student transportation needs. Metro regularly reports on its services in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Service Guidelines

Additions to page SG-14 in the Service Design section

8. Operating Paths and Appropriate Vehicles

Buses are large, heavy vehicles and cannot operate safely on all streets. Buses should be routed primarily on arterial streets and freeways, except where routing on local or collector streets is necessary to reach layover areas or needed to ensure that facilities and fleet used in all communities is equivalent in age and quality. Bus routes should also be designed to avoid places where traffic congestion and delay regularly occur, if it is possible to avoid such areas while continuing to meet riders' needs. Bus routes should be routed, where possible, to avoid congested intersections or interchanges unless the alternative would be more time-consuming or would miss an important transfer point or destination. Services should operate with vehicles that are an appropriate size to permit safe operation while accommodating demand. Appropriate vehicles should be assigned to routes throughout the county to avoid concentrating older vehicles in one area, to the extent possible given different fleet sizes, technologies and maintenance requirements. All new vehicles will be equipped with automated stop announcement systems.

Additions to page SG-14 in the Service Design section

11. Bus Stop Amenities and Bus Shelters

~~Bus shelters~~ stop amenities should be installed based on ridership in order to benefit the largest number of riders. Bus stop amenities include such things as bus shelters, seating, waste receptacles, lighting, and information sign, maps, and schedules. In addition to ridership, special consideration may be given to areas where high numbers of transfers are expected, where:

- waiting times for riders may be longer;
- stops are close to facilities such as schools, medical centers or senior centers; or

- the physical constraints of bus stop sites, preferences of adjacent property owners, and construction costs would require variance from standards.

Major infrastructure such as elevators and escalators will be provided where required by local, state, and federal regulations.

Edits to page SG-17: Implementation after third bullet “Any changes in route numbers”

Adverse Effect of a Major Service Change

An adverse effect of a major service change is defined as a reduction of 25 percent or more of the transit trips serving a census tract, or 25 percent or more of the service hours on a route.

Disparate Impact Threshold

A disparate impact occurs when a major service change results in adverse effects that are significantly greater for minority populations than for non-minority populations. Metro’s threshold for determining whether adverse effects are significantly greater for minority compared with non-minority populations is ten percent. Should Metro find a disparate impact, Metro will consider modifying the proposed changes in order to avoid, minimize or mitigate the disparate impacts of the proposed changes.

Metro will measure disparate impacts by comparing changes in the number of trips serving minority or non-minority census tracts, or by comparing changes in the number of service hours on minority or non-minority routes. Metro defines a minority census tract as one in which the percentage of minority population is greater than that of the county as a whole. For regular fixed route service, Metro defines a minority route as one for which the percentage of inbound weekday boardings in minority census tracts is greater than the average percentage of inbound weekday boardings in minority census tracts for all Metro routes.

Disproportionate Burden Threshold

A disproportionate burden occurs when a major service change results in adverse effects that are significantly greater for low-income populations than for non-low-income populations. Metro’s threshold for determining whether adverse effects are significantly greater for low-income compared with non-low-income populations is ten percent. Should Metro find a disproportionate burden, Metro will consider modifying the proposed changes in order to avoid, minimize or mitigate the disproportionate burden of the proposed changes.

Metro will measure disproportionate burden by comparing changes in the number of trips serving low-income or non-low-income census tracts, or by comparing changes in the number of service hours on low-income or non-low-income routes. Metro defines a low-income census tract as one in which the percentage of low-income population is greater than that of the county as a whole. For regular fixed route service, Metro defines a low-income route as one for which the percentage of inbound weekday boardings in low-income census tracts is greater than the average percentage of inbound weekday boardings in low-income census tracts for all Metro routes.

Appendix B
Title VI Instructions and Complaint Form

COMPLAINT OF DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF TITLE VI AGAINST KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Who can file a Title VI complaint?

- A person who believes he or she has experienced discrimination based on race, color, national origin or sex as provided by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987.
- Someone may file on behalf of classes of individuals. .

How do I file a complaint?

Fill out this form completely to help us process your complaint. Submit the completed form to OCR within 180 calendar days of the alleged discriminatory act.

What happens when I file a complaint?

OCR will send you a written receipt of your complaint and will forward a copy of your completed complaint form to the King County department named as Respondent. An OCR Compliance Specialist will facilitate and coordinate responses to your Title VI complaint.

The Specialist can provide a variety of services such as:

- technical assistance to the department on requirements and regulations
- coordination of meetings between the parties, if needed
- monitoring completion of any future activities included in a complaint response
- other services as requested or deemed appropriate.

What if I don't agree with the department's letter of resolution?

A complainant who does not agree with the letter of resolution may submit a written request for a different resolution to the OCR Director within 30 days of the date the complainant receives the department's response.

Do I need an attorney to file or handle this complaint with OCR?

No. However, you may wish to seek legal advice regarding your rights under the law.

Return this form to:

King County Office of Civil Rights
400 Yesler Way, Room 260
Seattle, WA 98104-2683
Yesler Building (mail stop: YES-ES-0260)

Phone 206-296-7592
TTY Relay: 711
Fax 206-296-4329

This form is available in alternate formats upon request. Contact OCR for help completing this form or with questions about the grievance procedure.

**COMPLAINT OF DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF TITLE VI AGAINST KING COUNTY, WA
DENUNCIA DE DISCRIMINACIÓN CONTRA EL CONDADO DE KING - LA LEY DEL TÍTULO VI**

**FORMULARIO DE DENUNCIA DE DISCRIMINACIÓN CONTRA EL
CONDADO DE KING - LA LEY DEL TÍTULO VI**

¿Quién puede interponer una queja del Título VI?

- Una persona protegida por el Título VI que cree que ha sido discriminado por motivos de raza, color, origen nacional o sexo.
- Una persona puede presentar una queja en nombre de las clases de individuos protegidos por el Título VI.

¿Cómo presento una queja?

Por favor complete este formulario en su totalidad, con tinta negra. Firme y regrese el formulario a la OCR dentro de los 180 días de la fecha cuando la discriminación alegada ocurrió.

¿Qué sucederá después de presentar una queja?

OCR le enviará un recibo por escrito confirmando la llegada de su queja y le enviará una copia de la queja al departamento del Condado de King nombrado como demandado. Un especialista de OCR facilitará y coordinará las respuestas a su queja del Título VI.

El especialista puede ofrecer una variedad de servicios tales como:

- asistencia técnica para el departamento sobre los requisitos y regulaciones de la ley
- coordinación de las reuniones entre los partidos, si es necesario
- asegurar el cumplimiento del departamento con un acuerdo resolviendo la queja
- otros servicios según se solicite o se considere oportuno.

¿Qué pasa si no estoy de acuerdo con la carta de resolución por el departamento?

Un demandante que no está de acuerdo con la carta de resolución podrá presentar una solicitud proponiendo una resolución diferente a la Directora OCR dentro de los 30 días de recibir la resolución propuesta por el departamento.

¿Necesito un abogado para presentar o manejar esta queja ante la OCR?

No. Sin embargo, tiene el derecho de obtener consejo legal sobre sus derechos legales.

Devuelva este formulario a:

King County Office of Civil Rights
400 Yesler Way, Room 260
Seattle, WA 98104-2683
Yesler Building (mail stop: YES-ES-0260)

Phone 206-296-7592
TTY Relay: 711
Fax 206-296-4329

Este formulario está disponible en formatos alternativos a pedido del interesado. Póngase en contacto con OCR para ayudar a completar este formulario o si tiene preguntas sobre el procedimiento de la queja.

**COMPLAINT OF DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF TITLE VI AGAINST KING COUNTY, WA
DENUNCIA DE DISCRIMINACIÓN CONTRA EL CONDADO DE KING - LA LEY DEL TÍTULO VI**

Complainant Contact Information / Datos de Contacto del Denunciante:

Name/Nombre

Street address/Dirección City/Ciudad State/Estado Zip code Código Postal

Work phone #/ Home phone # Message phone #
Teléfono de trabajo Teléfono del hogar Teléfono de Mensaje

Email address/correo electrónico

Additional mailing address/Dirección alternativa

If you are an inmate at a county correctional facility, include your BA number here
Si usted esta encerrado en un centro penitenciario, incluya su número de "BA" aquí

Aggrieved party contact information (if different from complainant):

Persona discriminada (en caso de no ser el denunciante):

Name/Nombre

Street address/Dirección City/Ciudad State/Estado Zip code Código Postal

Work phone #/ Home phone # Message phone #
Teléfono de trabajo Teléfono del hogar Teléfono de Mensaje

Email address/correo electrónico

Name of respondent – King County Government, Washington

(el gobierno que usted cree que ha discriminado)

Department or agency (if known): _____
Departamento o agencia (si lo sabe)

**COMPLAINT OF DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF TITLE VI AGAINST KING COUNTY, WA
DENUNCIA DE DISCRIMINACIÓN CONTRA EL CONDADO DE KING - LA LEY DEL TÍTULO VI**

**I believe the above actions were taken because of my:
Yo creo que las acciones fueron debidas a mi:**

_____ Race/Raza _____

_____ Color (de piel)

_____ National Origin/ País de Origen/Ascendencia: _____

_____ Sex / Gender Sexo/Genero (circle): Male/Masculino Female/Femenino

_____ Religion (Religión/Credo): _____

_____ Other/Otro: _____

Name, position, and agency of county employees you have dealt with regarding the incident(s).

Nombre, titulo, y agencia de los empleados del Condado con quienes ha tratado sobre el/los incidente(s).

Witnesses or others involved – provide name, address, telephone number(s). Attach additional sheets if needed.

Testigos o otras personas involucrados (proporcione el nombre, dirección, # de teléfono). (adhiera una página adicional si es necesario):

If you have filed a grievance, complaint or lawsuit regarding this matter anywhere else, give name and address of each place where you have filed. Attach additional sheets if needed.

Si haya presentado la denuncia ante otra oficina u otra agencia de derechos civiles o tribunal local, estatal o federal, proporcione el nombre y dirección de la oficina. (adhiera una página adicional si es necesario):

**COMPLAINT OF DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF TITLE VI AGAINST KING COUNTY, WA
DENUNCIA DE DISCRIMINACIÓN CONTRA EL CONDADO DE KING - LA LEY DEL TÍTULO VI**

**In the complainant's view, what would be the best way to resolve the grievance?
¿En la opinión del denunciante, que seria el mejor modo resolver la denuncia?**

I affirm that the foregoing information is true to the best of my knowledge and belief. I understand that all information becomes a matter of public record after the filing of this complaint.

Yo afirmo que que lo anterior es verdadero y correcto a lo mejor de mi conocimiento y creencia. Yo entiendo que toda la información se convierte en un asunto de interés público después de la presentación de esta queja.

Complainant/Denunciante

Date/Fecha

Aggrieved Party/Persona Discriminada

Date/Fecha

Appendix C

Metro's Language Assistance Plan



Access to King County Metro Transit Services for People with Limited English Proficiency Four-Factor Analysis and Implementation Plan

June 2012
Updated August 2013

Contact:
Chuck Sawyer
King County Metro Transit
201 S Jackson St
Seattle, WA 98104
chuck.sawyer@kingcounty.gov

Access to King County Metro Transit Services for People with Limited English Proficiency

Four-Factor Analysis and Implementation Plan

Introduction

King County Metro Transit (Metro) prepared this analysis and plan to meet requirements stemming from Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 concerning access to services for people with limited English proficiency (LEP). It also responds to Executive Order 13166, *Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency*, which directs recipients of federal funding to take reasonable steps to ensure that people with limited English proficiency have meaningful access to their programs and activities.

This plan will also help Metro comply with the King County Executive Order on Written Language Translation Process.

The analysis and plan are based on the guidance provided by the Federal Transit Administration in its handbook for public transportation providers, *Implementing the Department of Transportation's Policy Guidance Concerning Recipients' Responsibilities to Limited English Proficient (LEP) Persons*, published April 13, 2007.

Four-Factor Analysis

Factor 1: The number and proportion of LEP persons served or encountered in the eligible service population

Metro's service area is all of King County, Washington. Metro is part of King County government. In preparing this plan, Metro relied on the county's analysis of the most common languages other than English spoken in King County. This analysis used five sources:

- US Census Bureau, American Community Survey data for King County, language spoken at home, 2006-8.
- Washington Superintendent of Public Instruction, limited English proficiency students in King County, 2008-9.
- King County District Court data of court cases requesting interpretation, 2007.
- Seattle-King County Public Health Women-Infant-Children program, cases requesting interpretation, 2007.
- Seattle-King County Public Health clinic visits, cases requesting interpretation, 2007.

The non-English languages most commonly spoken in King County can be grouped into three tiers, as shown below. The tiers indicate the relative need for translation or interpretation services countywide, and reflect each language's rank based on the average of all five data sources.

| Tier 1 | Tier 2 | Tier 3 |
|---------|------------|-----------|
| Spanish | Vietnamese | Tagalog |
| | Russian | Cambodian |
| | Somali | Laotian |
| | Chinese | Japanese |
| | Korean | Hindi |
| | Ukrainian | Arabic |
| | Amharic | Farsi |
| | Punjabi | Tigrinya |
| | | Oromo |
| | | French |
| | | Samoan |

Detailed data from the five sources is shown in the table below:

| Rank | Census ACS: English "less than very well" 2006-8 | OSPI Limited English Proficiency 2008-9 | District Court (case count) 2007 | King County WIC 2007 | King County Public Health (clinic visits) 2007 |
|------|--|---|----------------------------------|----------------------|--|
| 1 | Spanish 52,000 | Spanish 12,600 | Spanish 7,900 | Spanish 14,500 | Spanish 56,200 |
| 2 | Chinese 28,100 | Vietnamese 2,100 | Russian 1,100 | Vietnamese 1,400 | Vietnamese 5,000 |
| 3 | Vietnamese 19,400 | Somali 2,100 | Vietnamese 800 | Somali 1,300 | Russian 4,000 |
| 4 | Korean 12,100 | Chinese 1,200 | Korean 500 | Russian 800 | Somali 3,500 |
| 5 | "African Lang" 11,900 ¹ | Russian 1,000 | Chinese 400 | Ukrainian 600 | Chinese 700 |
| 6 | Tagalog 9,300 | Korean 900 | Somali 200 | Chinese 600 | Ukrainian 600 |
| 7 | Russian 9,200 | Ukrainian 900 | Samoan 200 | Amharic 200 | Amharic 600 |
| 8 | "Other Slavic" 4,800 ² | Tagalog 700 | Amharic 200 | Arabic 200 | Korean 300 |
| 9 | "Other Indic" 4,500 ³ | Punjabi 600 | Punjabi 100 | Korean 100 | Arabic 300 |
| 10 | Japanese 4,300 | Cambodian 400 | Farsi 100 | Cambodian 100 | Punjabi 300 |

Notes:

1. Census does not distinguish African languages; based on other sources, probably chiefly Somali, Amharic.
2. Census lumps other Slavic languages; based on other sources, probably chiefly Ukrainian.
3. Census lumps other Indic languages; based on other sources, probably chiefly Punjabi.

Key:

| |
|--------|
| Tier 1 |
| Tier 2 |
| Tier 3 |

The county used U.S. Census data to map census tracts with concentrations of people who speak a language other than English at home; the maps are attached as Appendix A.

In addition to analyzing data, Metro staff members have become familiar with LEP populations in King County by working with community organizations that serve these populations. Metro regularly works with these organizations when conducting outreach concerning service changes or other matters, such as how to use the regional fare payment card. Metro turns to these organizations for assistance in identifying language translation needs and in planning the best ways to inform and involve people with limited English proficiency. Key organizations include the following:

| | |
|--|--|
| Asian Counseling and Referral Services | International Family Center |
| Asian Senior Concerns Foundation | International Rescue Committee |
| Casa Latina | Northwest Immigrant Rights Project |
| Chinese Information and Service Center | One America |
| Consejo Counseling and Referral Services | Organization of Chinese Americans |
| El Centro de la Raza | Refugee Women's Alliance |
| Filipino Community of Seattle | Southwest Youth and Family Services |
| International Community Health Center | Sunshine Garden Senior Day Care Center |
| International District Housing Alliance | Vietnamese Friendship Association |

Factor 2: The frequency with which LEP individuals come into contact with Metro's programs, activities, and services

People with limited English proficiency regularly use Metro's fixed-route bus service and in doing so come into contact with Metro's operators as well as signage, timetables and other materials. Metro's commuter van and Access paratransit services also serve people who do not speak English or speak it as a second language. Metro does not have a way to collect data about frequency of use by people who do not speak English well.

Metro's Customer Information Office receives approximately 50 phone calls per month from people who do not speak English well and request Language Line assistance (see table below.)

| Language | Jan '12 | Feb '12 | Mar '12 | Apr '12 | May '12 | June '12 | July '12 | Aug '12 | Sep '12 | Oct '12 | Nov '12 | Dec '12 |
|------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Spanish | 17 | 27 | 22 | 18 | 34 | 39 | 21 | 29 | 28 | 26 | 20 | 21 |
| Vietnamese | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | 5 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| Arabic | | | 3 | | 1 | | | | 1 | 2 | | 1 |
| Amharic | 1 | | 1 | | 3 | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | |
| Somali | | | | | 2 | 2 | | | 1 | 2 | | 2 |
| Hindi | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cambodian | | | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| Korean | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 4 | 4 | | 3 | 1 | | 4 | 3 |
| Mandarin | 2 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 11 | 13 | 4 | 22 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 3 |

| Language | Jan '12 | Feb '12 | Mar '12 | Apr '12 | May '12 | June '12 | July '12 | Aug '12 | Sep '12 | Oct '12 | Nov '12 | Dec '12 |
|------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|----------|----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Nepali | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ukrainian | | | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| Tigrinya | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Cantonese | 1 | 4 | | 2 | 8 | 4 | 3 | 3 | | 4 | 6 | |
| Russian | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| Oromo | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| Portuguese | | | | | | | 1 | | | | | |
| French | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | | | | 1 | | | |
| Toishanese | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| Lithuanian | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tagalog | | | | 3 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | |
| Punjabi | | 1 | | | | | | 2 | | | | |
| Swahili | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Thai | | | | | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Japanese | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | |
| Farsi | | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Laotian | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | |
| Romanian | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |

Factor 3: The importance to LEP persons of Metro’s programs, activities and services

King County is home to many refugees and immigrants who are re-establishing their lives with limited resources and may not speak English well. Abundant anecdotal evidence makes it clear that many of these people rely on Metro’s services.

Census tract data also suggest that a large number of people with limited English proficiency use Metro. Many of the census tracts in King County where more than 5 percent of the population speaks a language other than English have heavily used bus routes.

A number of community organizations that participate in Metro’s Human Services Ticket Program serve people with limited English proficiency. This program provides deeply discounted bus tickets to human service agencies for distribution to their clients. These agencies include the following:

- Asian Counseling and Referral Service
- Casa Latina
- Consejo Counseling and Referral Services
- El Centro de la Raza
- Vietnamese Friendship Association
- International District Housing Alliance
- Neighborhood House
- Kent School District/Refugee Transition Center
- Southwest Youth and Family Services

Metro’s Rideshare Operations staff work with a number of industries that have low-wage positions which are often filled by employees with limited English proficiency. Using

Jobs Access Reverse Commute (JARC) resources, Metro offers commuting assistance that enables individuals to form or join a vanpool. The work sites are often in outer suburban areas that are not well-served by fixed-route bus service.

Metro also partners with organizations that offer employment training, assisting them with transportation. The JARC van programs works with Youthcare, Neighborhood House, Casa Latina, King County Work Training Program, and Hero House; many of their clients are low-income people who do not speak English well.

Factor 4: The resources available to the recipient and costs

Metro has a number of language assistance measures in place.

Printed materials. Basic public communication materials have been translated into languages commonly spoken in King County (Spanish, Cambodian, Chinese, Korean, Laotian, Russian, Somali, Tigrinya, Vietnamese and Oromo). These materials include *Riding the Bus: a Multi-language Guide to Using Metro* and *Riding Together: Vans and Cars*, about Metro’s rideshare programs. Other brochures are translated, or include translations of summary information, as appropriate for the intended audience. An example is a brochure about Metro’s new RapidRide bus rapid transit program, which included basic information translated into Korean, Russian, Ukrainian, traditional Chinese, Japanese, Somali, Spanish, and Tagalog. Costs to translate, print and produce the multi-language bus and vans/cars guides were approximately \$23,000 for an approximate one-year supply.

In 2010, Metro developed an “interpreter” symbol to place on printed materials along with a customer information phone number that people may call to request an interpreter’s assistance. This symbol is now placed on all Metro timetables and most other materials. Metro has updated its Rider Alert template to include the interpreter symbol as well. Rider Alerts are temporary signs/notices that are placed at bus stops whenever a service change is planned at a particular stop. The addition of the interpreter symbol to these communication materials does not involve real incremental costs.

Language Line assistance. Metro contracts with Language Line to provide interpretation over the phone for non-English speakers who call the Customer Information Office and request this assistance. Metro receives about 50 requests per month; total annual cost has been approximately \$6,000. Metro makes available to bus operators special assistance cards that have information about how a rider can call and request interpretation service. Metro encourages operators to hand these cards to riders who have difficulty with English. The cards cost 4.5¢ each to produce.

New signage. Metro has developed new bus-stop signs that are designed to be easily understood by riders with limited English. The signs incorporate widely recognized symbols for route destinations, such as an airplane for routes that serve the airport. The signs also include the specific bus stop number and Metro’s website address and customer service phone number together with the widely used help symbol, “?” As of

May 1, 2012, 26 large and medium-sized versions of the new bus stop information signs had been installed throughout King County. In addition, hundreds of the regular-size bus stop flags have been installed across the county. Metro's budget for 2012-2013 provides for continued installation of the new signs in downtown Seattle, transit centers, park-and-rides, and the University District. Metro expects to complete installation of the signs at key locations by the end of 2015, if the budget provides for this.

Notice of Title VI obligations and remedies. Metro has placards continually posted inside all of its coaches notifying customers that Metro does not discriminate in the provision of service on the basis of race, color, and national origin, and informing them of how they can complain if they feel Metro has discriminated against them. The placards are translated into Cambodian, Chinese, Korean, Russian, Somali, Spanish, Tagalog, Tigrinya, and Vietnamese. All nine translations do not fit on one placard, so two placards have been produced and are rotated throughout the Metro system. A similar notice of Title VI obligations and remedies, also in multiple languages, is provided to customers of Metro's Access paratransit service. The cards cost a total of \$9,000 to produce.

Public outreach services. When Metro conducts public outreach concerning proposed service changes, it provides or offers translated descriptions of the proposals and questionnaires, offers interpretation at public meetings, works with community organizations that can assist Metro in communicating with people who do not speak English well, and may provide telephone comment lines for non-English-speakers.

Vanpool and loaned van transportation. Metro's Vanpool program uses federal Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) funds to help form and financially assist vanpool groups among low-income, entry-level, and/or reverse commuters. Currently 37 vanpool groups operate with JARC financial assistance. Although comprehensive data are not available about languages spoken by vanpool members, anecdotal evidence tells us that many of these vanpools serve people who do not speak English or speak it as a second language. Metro's JARC program also loans retired vans to community organizations for commute and work-training trips. An example is Casa Latina, which reports that almost 60 percent of the workers they transport to jobs use Metro's loaned vans.

Customer Research. Metro's customer research routinely includes opportunities for LEP populations to respond. Metro conducts an annual program of on-board and/or intercept surveys to evaluate customer ridership patterns on certain routes, and to evaluate customer responses to service changes. Translation of questionnaires into languages appropriate for the geographic area of interest is done in coordination with Community Relations and according to County guidelines. Metro's post implementation RapidRide A Line research conducted in 2011 included questionnaires translated into Spanish, Korean and Vietnamese. Metro's fall 2011 service change research included questionnaires translated into Spanish, Chinese, Russian and Korean. The September 2012 service change questionnaire will be translated into Spanish, and the October 2012 RapidRide B Line survey will be translated into Spanish, Chinese, Russian and Korean. Questionnaire translation typically costs between \$250 and \$400 for each language. Metro also made Spanish language translation available to respondents to the fall 2011

telephone survey of riders and non-riders. The cost of providing Spanish translation was about \$2,500.

Multi-language community travel video series. Metro partnered with the King County Mobility Coalition to produce a three-part video series: “Riding the bus,” “Paying to ride the bus and light rail,” and “Other ways to travel.” This series targeted recent-immigrant populations and was done in Somali, Amharic, Burmese, Bhutanese, Russian, Spanish, Tigrinya, and English. The videos are posted online and have been distributed with translated scripts to social service agencies, which are using the series in a number of forums for their clients. Videos in additional languages, including Chinese, Vietnamese, and Tagalog, will be produced in 2012.

II. Implementation Plan

Identifying LEP Individuals Who Need Language Assistance

The data assembled in the four-factor analysis shows that Spanish is by far the most prevalent of the non-English languages spoken in King County.

-The next most commonly spoken non-English languages (second tier) are Vietnamese, Russian, Somali, Chinese, Korean, Ukrainian, Amharic and Punjabi.

Third-tier non-English languages spoken are Tagalog, Cambodian, Laotian, Japanese, Hindi, Arabic, Farsi, Tigrinya, Oromo, French, and Samoan.

Language Assistance Measures

Based on the language distribution data summarized above, and consistent with King County’s Executive Order on Written Translation, Metro will translate public communication materials and vital documents into Spanish when feasible within available resources. Metro will translate materials into the other commonly spoken non-English languages when those are the primary language spoken by 5 percent or more of the target audience.

Metro will use alternative forms of language assistance when the alternative is more effective or practical. One alternative approach is to place a notice on public communication materials about the availability of interpretation service. Another alternative is to include a summary of a communication piece in Spanish and other languages as relevant and offering a full translation upon request.

Specific language assistance measures that Metro provides or plans to provide are listed in the table on the following page

| Language Assistance Measure | How Provided | Timeline | Responsibility |
|--|--|-----------|---|
| Notice of Title VI obligations and remedies, translated into languages commonly spoken in King County | Placed on all Metro coaches (All translations do not fit on one placard, so two placards have been produced and are rotated throughout the Metro system.) | Ongoing | Marketing and Customer Communications |
| Brochure: <i>Riding the Bus: a Multi-language Guide to Using Metro</i> , translated into 12 languages | Metro brochure racks | Ongoing | Marketing and Customer Communications |
| Brochure: <i>Riding Together: Vans and Cars</i> , translated into eight languages | Metro brochure racks | Ongoing | Marketing and Customer Communications |
| Notice of availability of telephone interpretation service | Notice is on basic Metro materials, including timetables, and other materials when applicable, and in Customer Information Office phone recording | Ongoing | Marketing and Customer Communications |
| Special assistance cards that operators can hand to customers with information about interpretation service | Available to operators at bus bases | Ongoing | Marketing and Customer Communications |
| Translation of public communication materials concerning proposed Metro service changes into Spanish and other languages primarily spoken by at least 5 percent of the target population | Mailed, distributed in target communities, posted in rider alerts at bus stops or on coaches, or placed in ethnic news media as appropriate to reach target audiences. | As needed | Department of Transportation Communications (responsible for Metro public outreach) |
| Availability of interpreters at public meetings concerning proposed Metro service changes, upon request | Notices placed on published materials and Metro Online | As needed | Department of Transportation Communications |
| Availability of telephone lines for people to comment on proposed Metro service changes in Spanish or other languages as needed | Phone lines maintained by DOT Communications | As needed | Department of Transportation Communications |

| Language Assistance Measure | How Provided | Timeline | Responsibility |
|---|--|----------------------------|--|
| Provision of interpretation service upon request | Available upon request by calling Metro's Customer Information Office | Ongoing | Customer Service |
| Improvement of Metro customer information phone system to provide easier access to interpretation services for callers with limited English | Metro's 2012-2013 budget provides funding for this upgrade | Completed in February 2013 | IT and Sales and Customer Service groups |
| Translated information online | On website (www.kingcounty.gov/metro) | Ongoing | Marketing and Customer Communications |
| Work with community organizations that serve LEP populations to identify ways Metro can better serve them. | Continue JARC program, which works with five community agencies; continue membership in King County Mobility Coalition; develop relationships with community organizations as part of public outreach process and maintain ongoing relationships; work with human service agencies through Metro's Human Services Ticket Program | Ongoing and as needed | Various Metro agencies |
| Translated rider surveys | Distributed on buses as part of ongoing research related to service changes. | Ongoing | Research and Management Information |

Training Staff

Metro's Customer Information Office staff members receive training in how to use the Language Line to interpret Metro materials or answer service-related questions.

Metro's bus operators receive training in how to assist customers who have questions about service, fare payment, and other matters. Through extensive community outreach, Metro has learned that people with limited English often rely on bus operators as their primary source of information about bus service. By emphasizing that customer service is an important part of an operator's job, this training contributes to a transit system that is accessible to limited-English-speakers.

King County makes extensive resources available to guide staff members who are responsible for producing public communication materials. These resources include data about the distribution of people in King County who speak languages other than English, a guide to using plain language in communication materials, and a manual for using translation vendors.

Providing Notice to Customers with Limited English Proficiency

A variety of methods for providing notice are described earlier in this plan. Key methods include the Notice of Title VI obligations and remedies that is posted on all Metro coaches, and the notice of availability of interpretation services that is placed on most Metro materials and stated in the Customer Information Office's recorded phone greeting.


Monitoring and Updating the LEP Plan


Metro will annually assess the effectiveness of this LEP Plan and update it as appropriate. The assessment will include reviewing the use of Metro's language assistance measures, reviewing Metro rider survey data, and gathering information from staff members who interact with people who do not speak English well.


Metro will work with King County's demographer to maintain up-to-date data about populations that may need language assistance.


Community relations staff members have conducted extensive public outreach concerning service changes in 2011-2012, and are compiling data about non-English speaking populations in the communities where they have been working. Metro will use this information to inform future public outreach and communications and to update this plan.


Appendix A: Maps showing concentrations of people who speak a language other than English at home
















Appendix B: Examples of Metro’s Translated Materials

Translated notices of Title VI obligations and remedies that are posted on Metro coaches. Metro plans to produce cards with additional languages to be rotated among coaches.

King County Metro Transit does not discriminate in the provision of service...

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><small>English-Korean-Tagalog</small></p> <p>King County Metro Transit does not discriminate in the provision of service on the basis of race, color, and national origin. For more information on Metro’s nondiscrimination obligations, or to file a discrimination complaint, you may call Metro’s Customer Information Office at 206-553-3000. You may also contact Metro in writing at the address below.</p> <p>King County Metro Transit does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, and national origin. For more information on Metro’s nondiscrimination obligations, or to file a discrimination complaint, you may call Metro’s Customer Information Office at 206-553-3000. You may also contact Metro in writing at the address below.</p> <p>King County Metro Transit does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, and national origin. For more information on Metro’s nondiscrimination obligations, or to file a discrimination complaint, you may call Metro’s Customer Information Office at 206-553-3000. You may also contact Metro in writing at the address below.</p> | <p><small>Cambodian-Somali</small></p> <p>King County Metro Transit មិនមានការប្រកាន់ជំនឿនៅក្នុងការផ្តល់សេវាកម្មលើមូលដ្ឋាននៃពណ៌សម្បុរ, ពណ៌សម្បុរ, និងសញ្ជាតិដើមនោះទេ។ ដើម្បីព័ត៌មានច្រើនថែមទៀតលើផ្នែកការមិនប្រកាន់ជំនឿចាំបាច់នៃក្រសួង Metro, ឬដើម្បីដាក់បណ្តឹងនៃការប្រកាន់ជំនឿ, អ្នកអាចទូរស័ព្ទទៅការិយាល័យព័ត៌មានផ្តល់ជំនួយនៃក្រសួង Metro តាមលេខ (206) 553-3000 ។ អ្នកក៏អាចទាក់ទងទៅក្រសួង Metro ដោយសារលេខសំបុត្រតាមអាសយដ្ឋានខាងក្រោម។</p> <p>Maamulka Gaadiidka Dadweynaha ee King County “King County Metro Transit” adeegga ay bixiyaan cidna ma ay ku takooraan arrimaha la xidhiidha jinsiyadda, midabka, iyo asalka qoomiyadda. Wixii macluumaad dheeraad ah ee la xidhiidha waajibaadka ku saabsan takoor la’aanta ee Metro, ama sida loo gudbiyo wixii cabasho ah ee ku salaysan takoor, waxaad wici kartaa Xafiiska Macluumaadka Macmiilka Metro ee uu lambarkiiisu yahay 206-553-3000. Sidoo kale waxaad xafiiska Metro kula soo xidhiidhi kartaa adigoo qoraal ku soo hagaajinaya cinwaanka hoos ku qoran.</p> <p>General Manager, King County Metro Transit 201 S. Jackson St. KSC-TR-0415, Seattle, WA 98104</p>  |
|--|--|

King County Metro Transit does not discriminate in the provision of service...


| | |
|---|--|
| <p><small>English-Russian-Vietnamese</small></p> <p>King County Metro Transit does not discriminate in the provision of service on the basis of race, color, and national origin. For more information on Metro’s nondiscrimination obligations, or to file a discrimination complaint, you may call Metro’s Customer Information Office at 206-553-3000. You may also contact Metro in writing at the address below.</p> <p>При предоставлении услуг King County Metro Transit не дискриминирует на основании расы, цвета кожи и страны происхождения. Чтобы получить дополнительную информацию о недискриминационных обязательствах Metro или подать жалобу о дискриминации, вы можете позвонить в Информационный офис Metro по телефону (206) 553-3000. Вы также можете написать в Metro по нижеуказанному адресу.</p> <p>Metro Transit Hạt King không đối xử phân biệt trong vấn đề cung cấp dịch vụ dựa trên chủng tộc, màu da, và nguồn gốc quốc gia. Để biết thêm thông tin về trách nhiệm không đối xử phân biệt của Metro, hoặc để nộp đơn khiếu nại về tình trạng đối xử phân biệt, quý vị có thể gọi Customer Information Office (Phòng Thông Tin Cho Khách Hàng) của Metro ở số (206) 553-3000. Quý vị cũng có thể liên lạc với Metro qua thư từ ở địa chỉ bên dưới.</p> | <p><small>Tigrinya-Spanish-Chinese</small></p> <p>ናይ ኪንግ ካውንቲ ሚትሮ ን ስድስት ብሎጎታት ግለት፡ ሕብረ ቅርብት፡ ከምሆ ውን ምብቅል ናይ ኣገልግሎት ኣድልዎ ኣይገብርን እዩ። ንዝያዳ ሓበሬታ ብዛዕባ ናይ ሚትሮ ዘይምድላው ሓጻናት ወይ ድማ ናይ ኣድልዎ ኣቡቲታ ከተቐርቡ እንተደለኹም ኣብ ቁ. ተለፎን (206) 553-3000 ደዊልኩም ተወከሱ። ከምሆ ውን ብዮሖና ኣብዚ ዝሰጠኩ ኣድራሻ ንሚትሮ ከትራንስፖርት ንክልሉ ኣኹም።</p> <p>Metro Transit del Condado de King no discrimina en la prestación de servicios en base a raza, color y origen nacional. Para mayor información acerca de las obligaciones de no discriminación de Metro, o para presentar una denuncia de discriminación, puede llamar a la Oficina de Información al Cliente de Metro al 206-553-3000. Usted también puede ponerse en contacto con Metro por escrito, a la dirección a continuación.</p> <p>景都 Metro Transit 在提供服務時，不以種族、膚色和原國籍為由實行歧視。如欲瞭解 Metro 的不歧視義務詳情，或欲提交歧視投訴，您可以致電 Metro 的客戶服務處，電話號碼 (206) 553-3000。您也可以按以下地址致函聯絡 Metro。</p> <p>General Manager, King County Metro Transit 201 S. Jackson St. KSC-TR-0415, Seattle, WA 98104</p>  |
|---|--|

Translated brochure about Metro services.




Front and back panels of Metro’s Snow Guide, showing our Metro uses its “Interpreter” symbol and translated summaries. (2013-2014 version will include summaries in all of King County’s Tier 2 languages.)

WINTER 2011 - 2012



Metro Transit Snow Guide

- *How to Prepare*
- *How to Stay Informed*
- *Metro’s Emergency Service Network*



This brochure has information about riding Metro when it snows. For assistance in your language, please call Metro Customer Information at 206-553-3000, request an interpreter, and wait for assistance.

本冊子包含有關下雪時乘坐 Metro 的資訊。如需[中文]協助，請致電 Metro 客戶服務問詢處，電話 206-553-3000，請求提供翻譯，然後等候翻譯員幫助您。


이 팸플릿에는 눈이 올 시, 메트로 승차에 대한 안내가 포함되어 있습니다. 한국어로 도움이 필요하실 경우, 메트로 고객 안내부에 206-553-3000 번으로 전화하셔서 통역관을 요청하신 다음 통역관의 도움을 받으실 때까지 기다려 주시기 바랍니다.

Xaashidan waxa ku jyaal macluumaad la xidhiidha raacitaanka Metro markuu barafku da'ayo. Taageerada ah [Soomaali], fadlan ka Macluumaadka Macmiilka Metro lambarka 206-553-3000, codso turjumaan, oo sug turjumaanka si uu kuu gargaaro.

Este folleto contiene información acerca de cómo viajar en Metro cuando nieva. Para ayuda en español, por favor llame a Información al Cliente de Metro al 206-553-3000, solicite un intérprete, y espere para que le ayude un intérprete.



Tập sách này chứa đựng thông tin về việc đi Metro khi trời tuyết. Để được trợ giúp bằng [tiếng Việt], xin gọi Ban Thông Tin Khách Hàng Metro số 206-553-3000, yêu cầu một thông dịch viên, và chờ thông dịch viên giúp quý vị.

Naglalaman ang polyeto na ito ng impormasyon ukol sa pagsakay sa Metro kapag magkaniyebe. Para sa tulong sa Tagalog, pakitawagan ang Impormasyon ukol sa Metro para sa Kustomer sa 206-553-3000, humiling ng tagapagsalin, at maghintay ng tagapagsalin na tutulong sa inyo.




Interpreter
206-553-3000

Intérpretes Turjubaan Переводчик
Перекладач 통역사 የቃል አስተርጓሚ
翻譯員 Thông Dịch Viên ਇਟਰਪਰੈਟਰ

11/11:100k:M&SI



**King County
METRO**
We'll Get You There

Questionnaire about proposed service translated into Spanish.

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <h1>RAPIDRIDE</h1> | |
| <hr/> | | |
| <p>F Line RapidRide Survey Tell us what you think about the routing options. Please return the survey or complete it online (www.kingcounty.gov/haveasay) by Feb. 17, 2012.</p> | <p>Encuesta sobre la Línea F de RapidRide Díganos lo que piensa acerca de las opciones en la ruta. Por favor devuelva la encuesta o llénela en línea (www.kingcounty.gov/haveasay) antes del 17 de febrero de 2012.</p> | |
| <p>1. The West Valley Highway to SW Grady Way alternative (option A on the map inset) would travel along West Valley Highway and SW Grady Way with no stops between the Tukwila Sounder Station and the intersection of SW Grady Way and Oakesdale Avenue SW.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I like the West Valley Highway to SW Grady Way alternative</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I have concerns, but could accept this alternative</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I do not like the West Valley Highway to SW Grady Way alternative</p> | <p>1. La alternativa de West Valley Highway hacia SW Grady Way (Opción A en el mapa inserto) recorrería a lo largo de West Valley Highway y SW Grady Way, sin paradas, entre Tukwila Sounder Station y la intersección de SW Grady Way y Oakesdale Avenue SW.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Me gusta la alternativa de West Valley Highway hacia SW Grady Way</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Tengo preocupaciones, pero podría aceptar esta alternativa</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No me gusta la alternativa de West Valley Highway hacia SW Grady Way</p> | |
| <p>2. The Strander Boulevard to Oakesdale Avenue SW alternative (option B on the map inset) would travel along the future Strander Boulevard extension (scheduled for winter of 2014) connecting the Tukwila Sounder Station and Oakesdale Avenue SW. The locations of the stops along Strander Boulevard and Oakesdale Avenue SW have not been determined.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I like the Strander Boulevard to Oakesdale Avenue SW alternative</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I have concerns, but could accept this alternative</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I do not like the Strander Boulevard to Oakesdale Avenue SW alternative</p> | <p>2. La alternativa de Strander Boulevard hacia Oakesdale Avenue SW (opción B en el mapa inserto) recorrería a lo largo de la futura extensión de Strander Boulevard (programada para el invierno de 2014) conectando Tukwila Sounder Station y Oakesdale Avenue SW. No se ha determinado la ubicación de las paradas a lo largo de Strander Boulevard y Oakesdale Avenue SW.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Me gusta la alternativa de Strander Boulevard hacia Oakesdale Avenue SW</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Tengo preocupaciones, pero podría aceptar esta alternativa</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No me gusta la alternativa de Strander Boulevard hacia Oakesdale Avenue SW</p> | |
| <p>3. The Strander Boulevard to Lind Avenue SW alternative (option C on the map inset) would travel along the future Strander Boulevard extension (scheduled for winter of 2014) connecting to the Tukwila Sounder Station, then continuing along SW 27th Street and Lind Avenue SW. The locations of stops along Strander Boulevard, SW 27th Street, and Lind Avenue SW have not been determined.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I like the Strander Boulevard to Lind Avenue SW alternative</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I have concerns, but could accept this alternative</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> I do not like the Strander Boulevard to Lind Avenue SW alternative</p> | <p>3. La alternativa de Strander Boulevard hacia Lind Avenue SW (opción C en el mapa inserto) recorrería a lo largo de la futura extensión de Strander Boulevard (programada para invierno de 2014) conectando Tukwila Sounder Station, luego continuando a lo largo de SW 27th Street y Lind Avenue SW. No se ha determinado la ubicación de las paradas a lo largo de Strander Boulevard, SW 27th Street y Lind Avenue SW.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Me gusta la alternativa Strander Boulevard hacia Lind Avenue SW</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Tengo preocupaciones, pero podría aceptar esta alternativa</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No me gusta la alternativa Strander Boulevard hacia Lind Avenue SW</p> | |
| <p>Comments about the alternatives: _____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> | <p>Comentarios acerca de las alternativas: _____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> | |
| <hr/> | | |
| <p>Alternate Formats Available 206-684-1142 TTY Relay: 711</p> | | |

New bus signs using symbols to indicate destinations (ferry terminal and light rail stations) and customer information service.



Portions of Korean language rider survey.


RapidRide B Line

승객 기록 카드

본 설문은 Metro Transit 측에 본 노선에 대한 서비스 현황 및 개선 방법을 알리기 위한 목적으로 작성하는 것입니다.
작성한 설문지는 조사원에게 제출해 주십시오.

설문에 이미 참여하신 경우, 본 설문지를 조사원에게 반납해 주십시오.

도와 주셔서 대단히 감사합니다.



King County METRO
We'll Get You There

면담자: _____ 날짜: _____ 시간: _____

지시사항

RapidRide B Line에 대한 만족 또는 불만족 정도를 항목별로 해당하는 숫자에 동그라미로 표시하십시오. "5"는 "매우 만족", "4"는 "만족", "3"은 어느 쪽도 아닌 "보통"을 의미하며, "2"는 "불만족", "1"은 "매우 불만족"을 나타냅니다. 문항이 귀하에게 해당되지 않는 경우, "해당 없음(NA)"에 동그라미하십시오. 본 설문은 RapidRide B Line에 대한 평가이며, 다른 노선 또는 Metro Transit에 대한 일반적인 평가가 아니라는 점에 유의해 주십시오. 감사합니다!

| | 매우 만족 | | 보통 | | 매우 불만족 | | 해당없음 (NA) |
|---|-------|---|----|---|--------|--|-----------|
| 1. RapidRide B Line에서의 이동 시간 | | | | | | | |
| ▼ 버스 이동 시 소요 시간 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | NA |
| ▼ 버스 정류장 수 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | NA |
| 2. RapidRide B Line에서의 신변 안전 | | | | | | | |
| ▼ 버스 승차 중의 신변 안전 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | NA |
| ▼ 버스에서 다른 승객들의 행동 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | NA |
| ▼ 낮 시간에 버스를 기다리는 동안의 신변 안전 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | NA |
| ▼ 야간에 버스를 기다리는 동안의 신변 안전 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | NA |
| ▼ 승객 대기 공간에서 다른 사람들의 행동 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | NA |
| 3. 버스 이용 시 RapidRide B Line에 탑승한 대기실/버스 정류장 | | | | | | | |
| ▼ 앉아서 기다릴 수 있었음 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | NA |
| ▼ 대기실의 청결 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | NA |
| ▼ 조명 시설의 양 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | NA |
| ▼ 기상 변화로부터의 보호 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | NA |
| ▼ 노선 및 연결편에 대한 정보 이용 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | NA |
| ▼ 거주지 또는 출발지에서 버스 정류장의 이용 편의성 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | NA |
| ▼ 버스 접근 시 가시성(버스를 볼 수 있는) | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | NA |
| ▼ 실시간 전자 정보 표지판(일부 장소)에 제공된 정보 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | NA |
| 4. RapidRide B Line 버스에 대한 사항 | | | | | | | |
| ▼ 좌석 확보 가능성 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | NA |
| ▼ 버스 내 조명 시설의 양 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | NA |
| ▼ 버스 내부의 청결 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | NA |
| ▼ 버스에 냄새가 없음 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | NA |

면담자: _____ 날짜: _____ 시간: _____

| | 매우 만족 | 만족 | 보통 | 불만족 | 매우 불만족 | 해당없음 (NA) |
|-----------------------------|-------|----|----|-----|--------|-----------|
| ▼ 부드러운 승차감 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| ▼ 자전거용 렉 수용 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| ▼ 타고 내리기에 충분히 넓은 문과 통로 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| ▼ 서 있는 동안 잡을 수 있는 충분한 손잡이/봉 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| ▼ 타고 내릴 수 있는 문이 세 개 있음 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| ▼ 무료 Wi-Fi 이용성 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |

본 노선에서 환승하는(같이 타는) 경우, 아래 박스 안의 항목들을 평가해 주십시오. 환승을 하지 않는 경우, 박스 아래 6 번으로 가십시오.

| | 매우 만족 | 만족 | 보통 | 불만족 | 매우 불만족 | 해당없음 (NA) |
|------------------------------|-------|----|----|-----|--------|-----------|
| 5. RapidRide B Line과의 환승 용이성 | | | | | | |
| ▼ 환승 횟수 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| ▼ 저녁 밤 시간대의 버스 운행 횟수 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| ▼ 환승 연결을 위한 버스 시간 편성 방식 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| ▼ 환승 간 대기 시간 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| ▼ 환승 연결편 확보에 있어서 운전기사가 도움이 됨 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| ▼ 환승 시 버스가 정시에 도착 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| ▼ 대기실에서의 환승 정보 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |

이제 아래 6 번으로 가십시오.

RapidRide B Line 이용 시 아래 항목들을 평가해 주십시오.

| | 매우 만족 | 만족 | 보통 | 불만족 | 매우 불만족 | 해당없음 (NA) |
|--|-------|----|----|-----|--------|-----------|
| 6. RapidRide B Line에서 버스의 빈도 및 신뢰성 | | | | | | |
| ▼ 버스에 정시 탑승 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| ▼ 피크 시간(오전 6-9 시, 오후 3-6 시)동안 버스 운행 횟수 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| ▼ 낮 시간대(오전 9 시 - 오후 3 시)의 버스 운행 횟수 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| ▼ 저녁 밤 시간대의 버스 운행 횟수 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| ▼ 주말 버스 운행 횟수 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| ▼ 아침 시간대의 버스 운행 횟수 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 7. RapidRide B Line에 대한 전체적인 만족도 | | | | | | |
| ▼ RapidRide B Line에 대해 전반적으로 얼마나 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |

Front and back of a customer service card with interpreter information that is available for Metro bus operators to give to customers who do not speak English well.

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Metro Customer Services</p> <p>Customer Information: 206-553-3000 TTY Relay: 711 Toll free: 1-800-542-7876</p> <hr/> <p>King Street Center 201 S Jackson St, Seattle Monday-Friday, 8 am - 5 pm</p> <hr/> <p>Downtown Seattle Transit Tunnel Westlake Station mezzanine Monday-Friday, 9 am - 5:30 pm</p> <hr/> <p>Metro Online www.kingcounty.gov/metro</p> | | <p>  Interpreter 206-553-3000 </p> <p> Intérpretes Turjubaan Переводчик Перекладач 통역사 ຖ່າຍ ມີຕື່ງ 翻譯員 Thông Dịch Viên ਇੰਟਰਪਰੈਟਰ </p> <p>  </p> |
|--|--|--|

Appendix D

Subrecipients of Federal Funding

Subrecipients of Federal Funding

The following is a list of Metro projects that receive federal funding (bold) followed by subrecipients.

FTA - JOBS ACCESS/ REVERSE COMMUTE (JARC)

Neighborhood House
CASA Latina
YOUTH CARE
King County Work Training Program (KCWTP)
Puget Sound Educational Services District PSESD
Hero House
Cliffside Vocational
SKCAC Industries and Employment Services

FTA - TCSP Car Sharing

Zipcar, Inc.

FTA - JARC Car Sharing Earmark

Zipcar, Inc.

FTA - Manufacturing Industrial Complexes (MIC) Center & Wayfinding

Manufacturing Industrial Council d.b.a. Duwamish TMA (Transportation Mgmt Assoc)"

FTA - Urban Centers Access

FTA - Smart Growth TDM

Urban Mobility Group d.b.a. Commute Seattle (A collective part of Downtown Seattle Association)

FTA - Urban Centers Access

FTA - Smart Growth TDM

City of Bellevue

FTA - Partnership Support

Bellevue College

FTA - Urban Centers Access

City of Redmond

DOE – EECBG

Rainier Bio Gas, LLC

Appendix E
**NEPA Letters for Burien Transit Center and Kirkland
Transit Oriented Development Project**

cc Gary Kriedt



U.S. Department
of Transportation
**Federal Transit
Administration**

REGION X
Alaska, Idaho, Oregon,
Washington

915 Second Avenue
Federal Bldg. Suite 3142
Seattle, WA 98174-1002
206-220-7954
206-220-7959 (fax)

JUN 29 2004

Frank Tordillos
Grants Division Supervisor
King County Department of Transportation
201 South Jackson Street
MS KSC-TR-0814
Seattle, WA 98104-3856

RE: Burien Park & Ride
Documented Categorical Exclusion

Dear Mr. Tordillos:

FTA has received King County Metro's June 3, 2004 request a documented categorical exclusion (DCE) for the above referenced project. We have also reviewed supplemental materials submitted on June 7, 17 and 24th.

KCM proposes to reconfigure the existing Burien Park and Ride at 14900 4th Avenue SW to improve safety and circulation and to accommodate possible future transit oriented development. The project will mitigate traffic and safety concerns associated with the current traffic and bus circulation at the Park-and-Ride. The project will also include the acquisition of a 0.89 acre parcel bordering the northeast portion of the site, and will include a new signalized intersection and transit-only access point at SW 148th Street. This project will not add capacity to the Park-and-Ride.


This letter confirms that King County Metro has complied with the National Environmental Policy Act requirements for this project. Based on the information provided, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) concurs that the Project qualifies as a categorical exclusion as described in the Department of Transportation's Final Rule concerning Environmental Impact and Related Procedures, 23 CFR Section 771.117(d)(4) and (d)(10).

This categorical exclusion under 23 CFR Section 771.117(d)(4) and (d)(10) applies only to the Project as described in the above-referenced letter and supporting materials. Any changes to the proposed action from that described in the letter that would result in a significant environmental impact or the disclosure of any new information or circumstances relevant to environmental concerns and bearings on the proposed action or its impacts which would result in significant environmental impacts not disclosed in the DCE Worksheet will require re-evaluation of this project's categorical exclusion.

This confirmation of categorical exclusion does not provide FTA commitment that future Federal funds will be approved for this project. Any costs incurred under FTA pre-award authority must meet all Federal requirements prior to those costs being incurred in order to retain eligibility of those costs for future FTA grant assistance.

Please contact Jennifer Bowman at 206.220.7953 if you require additional information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R.F. Krochalis". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "R" and "K".

R.F. Krochalis
Regional Administrator



U.S. Department
of Transportation
**Federal Transit
Administration**

REGION X
Alaska, Idaho, Oregon,
Washington

915 Second Avenue
Federal Bldg. Suite 3142
Seattle, WA 98174-1002
206-220-7954
206-220-7959 (fax)

August 8, 2005

Gary Kreidt
Senior Environmental Planner
Design & Construction Section
Metro Transit Division
King County Department of Transportation
201 South Jackson, MS KSC-TR-0431
Seattle, Washington 98104-1900

RE: Project: Burien Transit Center
NEPA Environmental Re-evaluation

Dear Gary:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has received your letter, dated April 27, 2005 and subsequent "Documented Categorical Exclusion (DCE) Worksheet" dated June 23, 2005, requesting confirmation that the updated project design and noise impact information does not affect the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) approval issued for this project on June 29, 2004.

This letter confirms that King County has complied with the National Environmental Policy Act re-evaluation requirements for this project. Pursuant to 23 CFR Section 771.129(c) a re-evaluation was made necessary due to the design changes as reference in the "DCE Worksheet," after the FTA issued an environmental determination.


23 CFR section 771.129(c) states:

After approval of the EIS, FONSI, or CE designation, the applicant shall consult with the Administration prior to requesting any major approvals or grants to establish whether or not the approved environmental document or CE designation remains valid for the requested Administration action. These consultations will be documented when determined necessary by the Administration.

Based on the review of the information provided, FTA finds that the changes noted above are not considered substantial and will not result in significant environmental impacts that were not evaluated in the DCE issued on June 29, 2004.

Please contact me at (206) 220-4463 if you require additional information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Linda M. Gehrke".

Linda M. Gehrke
Acting Regional Administrator

Cc: Frank Tordillos, Grants Management
David Morrison, Grants Management



U.S. Department
of Transportation
**Federal Transit
Administration**

REGION X
Alaska, Idaho, Oregon,
Washington

915 Second Avenue
Federal Bldg. Suite 3142
Seattle, WA 98174-1002
206-220-7954
206-220-7959 (fax)

June 8, 2012

Kevin Desmond
General Manager
King County Metro
201 S Jackson St, MS KSC-TR-0415
Seattle, WA 98104-3856

RE: King County Metro South Kirkland Park and Ride Expansion (FTA Env't #452)
10610 NE 38th Place, Kirkland, WA
Documented Categorical Exclusion Confirmation (d)(9)

Dear Mr. Desmond:

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has received King County Metro *Categorical Exclusion and Documented Categorical Exclusion Worksheet* dated April 13, 2012 and supplemental information (Endangered Species Act Screening Checklist, April 2012 Draft Bellevue Land Use Staff Report, March 2012 Transportation Impact Analysis, March 2012 Air Quality Analysis, February 2012 Essential Fish Habitat Assessment, February 2012 Noise Analysis, Landscaping/Tree Retention Plan, Construction Phasing Plan, Short Plat Drawing, site plans, project maps, public notification information) regarding the South Kirkland Park and Ride Expansion project.

Based on this information FTA understands that King County Metro be involved in the construction of a three to four story parking garage on the existing South Kirkland Park and Ride site located at 10610 Northeast 38th Place in Kirkland, Washington. The project will increase the current park and ride capacity by about 240 to 367 parking stalls. King County Metro will also sell the southern portion of the park and ride site to a private developer.

Other project improvements include the following: construction of a new passenger loading area, a new layover area able to accommodate approximately four buses, a new traffic signal and crosswalk at the 108th Avenue Northeast and Northeast 38th Place intersection, sidewalks along 108th Avenue Northeast, a new stormwater vault, enhanced water quality treatment, and installation of fiber optic interconnect from the proposed 108th Avenue Northeast and Northeast 38th Place intersection to the existing Northup Way Signal.

As a condition of this approval, King County Metro must comply with the following:

- **Adopt and implement the enclosed King County Metro South Kirkland Park and Ride Inadvertent Discovery Plan for all activities involving ground disturbance;**
- **Revegetate the steep slope areas;**
- **Have a Stormwater Prevention Pollution Plan in place during construction to control potential sediment and construction-related contaminants in stormwater; and**
- **Provide adequate temporary parking during construction.**

Based on the information provided, FTA concurs that this project qualifies as a categorical exclusion as described in the Department of Transportation's Final Rule concerning Environmental Impact and Related Procedures, 23 CFR Section 771.117(d)(9).

This categorical exclusion under 23 CFR Section 771.117(d)(9) applies only to the project as described in the above-referenced letter and supporting materials. Any changes to the proposed action from that described in the letter that would result in a significant environmental impact or the disclosure of any new information or circumstances relevant to environmental concerns and bearings on the proposed action or its impacts which would result in significant environmental impacts not disclosed in the provided documentation will require re-evaluation of this project's categorical exclusion.

This confirmation of categorical exclusion does not provide FTA commitment that future Federal funds will be approved for this project. Any costs incurred under FTA pre-award authority must meet all Federal requirements prior to those costs being incurred in order to retain eligibility of those costs for future FTA grant assistance.

Please contact Erin Green at erin.green@dot.gov or (206)220-7963 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Linda Gehrke
Deputy Regional Administrator

Encl: King County Metro South Kirkland Park and Ride Inadvertent Discovery Plan

Cc: Gary Kriedt, King County Metro
David Morrison, King County Metro

Acting

Appendix F

Service Standards and Service Policies

King County Metro Service Guidelines

Introduction

Metro has developed service guidelines that it will use to design and modify transit services in an ever-changing environment. The guidelines will help Metro make sure that its decision-making is objective, transparent, and aligned with the regional goals for the public transportation system. These guidelines enable Metro to fulfill Strategy 6.1.1 in its *Strategic Plan for Public Transportation 2011-2021*, which calls for Metro to “Manage the transit system through service guidelines and performance measures.”

Metro will use the guidelines to make decisions about expanding, reducing and managing service, to evaluate service productivity, and to determine if service revisions are needed because of changes in rider demand or route performance. Guidelines are also intended to help Metro respond to changing financial conditions and to integrate its services with the regional transportation system.

The guidelines are designed to address productivity, social equity and geographic value. These factors are applied within the guidelines in a multi-step process to identify the level and type of service, along with additional guidelines to measure service quality, define service design objectives and to compare the performance of individual routes within the Metro service network to guide modifications to service following identified priorities. The guidelines work as a system to emphasize productivity, ensure social equity and provide geographic value in a balanced manner through the identification of measurable indicators associated with each factor and the definition of performance thresholds that vary by market served, service frequency and locations served. They are also intended to help Metro respond to changing financial conditions and to integrate its services with the regional transportation system.

A central piece of the service guidelines is the All-Day and Peak Network, which establishes target service levels for transit corridors throughout King County. Productivity, social equity and geographic value are prioritized in this three-step process:

- **Step one** establishes initial service levels for corridors based on how well they meet measurable indicators reflecting productivity, social equity, and geographic value. Indicators of high productivity (using measurable land use indicators closely correlated with transit productivity) make up 50 percent of the total score, while geographic value and social equity indicators each comprise 25 percent of the total score in this step.
 - **Productivity** indicators demonstrate market potential of corridors using land use factors of housing and employment density.
 - **Social Equity** indicators provide an evaluation of how well corridors serve concentrations of minority and low-income populations by comparing boardings in these areas along each corridor against the systemwide average of all corridor boardings within minority and low-income census tracts.
 - **Geographic Value** indicators establish how well corridors preserve connections and service throughout King County.

The cumulative score from this step indicates the initial appropriate frequency for service in the corridor.

- **Step two** makes adjustments to the assigned step-one service family based on current ridership, productivity, and night network completeness. Adjustments are only made to assign corridors to a higher service level; service frequencies are not adjusted downward in this step.
- **Step three** defines the peak overlay for the All-Day and Peak Network. This step evaluates whether or not peak service provides a significant ridership or travel time advantage over the local service.

The All-Day and Peak Network will be analyzed annually concurrent with Metro's reports on the application of the service guidelines. Using this network as a baseline and as resources allow, Metro will work to adjust service levels to better meet the public transportation needs of King County.

Other guidelines are grouped into the following categories:

- **Performance management**
These guidelines establish standards for productivity, passenger loads, and schedule reliability. Metro will use these guidelines to evaluate individual routes and recommend changes to achieve efficient and effective delivery of transit service as part of ongoing system management and in planning for growth or reduction.
- **Service restructures**
These guidelines define the circumstances that will prompt Metro to restructure multiple routes along a corridor or within an area.
- **Service Design**
These are qualitative and quantitative guidelines for designing specific transit routes and the overall transit network.
- **Use and implementation**
This section describes how Metro will use all guidelines, how they will be prioritized to make recommendations about adding, reducing or adjusting service, and how the performance of individual bus routes and the Metro system as a whole will be reported.

The service guidelines provide Metro with tools to ensure that decisions about Metro's service network are transparent, consistent, and clear. These guidelines will be reported on and reviewed annually to ensure that they are consistent with Metro's strategic plan and other policy goals.

All-day and peak network

Metro strives to provide high-quality transit service to a wide variety of travel markets and a diverse group of riders. Metro designs its services to meet a number of objectives:

- Support regional growth plans
- Respond to existing ridership demand
- Provide productive and efficient service
- Ensure social equity
- Provide geographic value through a network of connections and services throughout King County.

Metro is building a network of services to accomplish these objectives. The foundation of the All-Day and Peak Network is a set of two-way routes that operate all day and connect designated regional growth centers, manufacturing/industrial centers, and other areas of concentrated activity. All-day service is designed to meet a variety of travel needs and trip purposes throughout the day. Whether riders are traveling to work, appointments, shopping, or recreational activities, the availability of service throughout the day gives them the ability to travel when they need to. The All-Day and Peak Network also includes peak service that provides faster travel times, accommodates very high demand for travel to and from major employment centers, and serves park-and-ride lots in areas of lower population density.

A key step in developing the All-Day and Peak Network is to determine the service levels that meet the needs of King County's diverse communities. Metro determines these service levels through a three-step process:

First, service levels are set by scoring all corridors using six measures addressing land use, social equity, and geographic value. Corridors with higher scores are assigned higher levels of service. Second, service levels are adjusted based on existing ridership. Corridor service levels are increased when the service level suggested in step-one would not be adequate to accommodate existing riders, would be inconsistent with service levels set for RapidRide services, or would leave primary connections without night service. Third, peak service that enhances the all-day network is determined using travel time and ridership information.

These steps provide broad guidance for establishing a balance of all-day service levels and peak services and may change as conditions do. The target service levels may also be revised as areas of King County grow and change. Metro does not have sufficient resources to fully achieve the All-Day and Peak Network today. The service-level guidelines, used in combination with the guidelines established for managing the system, will help Metro make progress toward the All-Day and Peak Network.

Service levels are defined by corridor rather than by route to reflect the fact that there may be multiple ways to design routes to serve a given corridor, including serving a single corridor with more than one route. The desired service levels can be achieved through service by a single route or by multiple routes.

Metro evaluated 113 corridors where it provides all-day service today and 94 peak services provided today. The services in these corridors include those linking regional growth centers,

manufacturing/industrial centers, and transit activity centers; services to park-and-rides and major transit facilities; and services that are geographically distributed throughout King County. The same evaluation process could be used to set service levels for corridors that Metro does not currently serve.

All-day and peak network assessment process

| STEP-ONE: SET SERVICE LEVELS | |
|---|---|
| Factor | Purpose |
| Land Use | Support areas of higher employment and household density |
| Social Equity and Geographic Value | Serve historically disadvantaged communities |
| | Provide appropriate service levels throughout King County |

| STEP-TWO: ADJUST SERVICE LEVELS | |
|--|--|
| Factor | Purpose |
| Loads | Provide sufficient capacity for existing transit demand |
| Use | Improve effectiveness and financial stability of transit service |
| Service Span | Provide adequate levels of service throughout the day |

| STEP-THREE: IDENTIFY PEAK OVERLAY | |
|--|--|
| Factor | Purpose |
| Travel Time | Ensure that peak service provides a travel time advantage compared to other service alternatives |
| Ridership | Ensure that peak service is highly used |

| |
|--|
| OUTCOME: ALL-DAY AND PEAK NETWORK |
|--|

Step-One: Set service levels

Service levels are determined by the number of households and jobs in areas with access to a corridor, by the proportion of historically disadvantaged populations near the corridor, and by the geographic distribution of regional growth, manufacturing/industrial, and transit activity centers in King County. These factors give Metro a way to take into account the elements that make transit successful as well as the populations and areas that must be served to support social equity and deliver geographic value. Each corridor is scored on six factors, and the total score is used to set service levels in a corridor. Each corridor is intended to have the identified frequency during some or all of the time period listed.

Land use factors

The success of a transit service is directly related to how many people have access to the service and choose to use it. Areas where many people live and work close to bus stops have higher potential transit use than areas where few people live and work close by. Areas that

have interconnected streets have a higher potential for transit use than areas that have fewer streets or have barriers to movement, such as hills or lakes. The land-use factors Metro uses to determine service levels are the number of households and jobs located within a quarter-mile walking access of stops. The quarter-mile calculation considers street connectivity; only those areas that have an actual path to a bus stop are considered to have access to transit. This is an important distinction in areas that have a limited street grid or barriers to direct access, such as lakes or freeways. The use of land-use factors is consistent with Metro's *Strategic Plan for Public Transportation 2011-2021* because it addresses the need for transit to serve a growing population (Strategy 3.2.1) and encourages land uses that transit can serve efficiently and effectively (Strategy 3.3.1)

Social equity and geographic value factors

As it strives to develop an effective transit network that ensures social equity and provides geographic value, Metro considers how the network will serve historically disadvantaged populations, transit activity centers, regional growth centers, and manufacturing/industrial centers. As a way to achieve social equity, Metro identifies areas where low-income and minority populations are concentrated as warranting higher levels of service. Metro also identifies primary connections between centers as warranting a higher level of service, to achieve both social equity and geographic value. Primary connections are defined as the predominant transit connection between centers, based on a combination of ridership and travel time.

Centers represent activity nodes throughout King County that form the basis for a countywide transit network. The term "centers," as defined in the strategic plan, refers collectively to regional growth centers, manufacturing/industrial centers, and transit activity centers. Regional growth centers and manufacturing/industrial centers are designated in the region's *Vision 2040* plan. Metro identified transit activity centers beyond the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC)-designated centers to support geographic value in the distribution of its transit network throughout King County. Transit activity centers include major destinations and transit attractions such as large employment sites, significant healthcare institutions and major social service agencies. Transit activity centers represent activity nodes throughout King County that form the basis for an interconnected transit network throughout the urban growth area of King County.

Each transit activity center identified in Appendix I meets one or more of the following criteria:

- Is located in an area of mixed-use development that includes concentrated housing, employment, and commercial activity
- Includes a major regional hospital, medical center or institution of higher education located outside of a designated regional growth centers
- Is located outside other designated regional growth centers at a transit hub served by three or more all-day routes.

The size of these transit activity centers varies, but all transit activity centers represent concentrations of activity in comparison to the surrounding area.

The use of factors related to social equity and geographic value is consistent with the *Strategic Plan for Public Transportation 2011-2021*. The use of social equity factors guides transit service to provide travel opportunities for historically disadvantaged populations (Strategy 2.1.2). Factors concerning transit activity centers and geographic value guide service to areas of concentrated activity (Strategy 3.4.1) and ensure that services provide value in all areas of King County. Regional growth centers, manufacturing/industrial centers, and transit activity centers are listed in Appendix 1.

Revisions to Appendix 1 Centers in King County

The list of centers associated with the All-Day and Peak Network is adopted by the King County Council as part of Metro's service guidelines. However, the region's growth and travel needs are anticipated to change in the future. The following defines centers and guides additions to this list.

Regional Growth and Manufacturing/Industrial Centers

Additions to and deletions from the regional growth and manufacturing/industrial Centers lists should be based on changes approved by the PSRC and defined in *Vision 2040*, or subsequent regional plans.

Transit Activity Centers

Additional transit activity centers may be designated in future updates of the service guidelines. Additions to the list of transit activity centers will be nominated by the local jurisdictions and must meet one or more of the above criteria, plus the following additional criteria:

- Pathways through the transit activity center must be located on arterial roadways that are appropriately constructed for transit use.
- Identification of a transit activity center must result in a new primary connection between two or more regional or transit activity centers in the transit network, either on an existing corridor on the All-Day and Peak Network or as an expansion to the network to address an area of projected all-day transit demand. An expansion to the network indicates the existence of a new corridor for analysis.
- Analysis of a new corridor using step-one of the All-Day and Peak Network assessment process must result in an assignment of 30-minute service frequency or better.

| Factor | Measure | Threshold | Points |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------|
| Productivity (Land Use) | Households within ¼ mile of stops per corridor mile | >3,000 HH/Corridor Mi | 10 |
| | | >2,400 HH/Corridor Mi | 8 |
| | | >1,800 HH/Corridor Mi | 6 |
| | | >1,200 HH/Corridor Mi | 4 |
| | | >600 HH/Corridor Mi | 2 |
| | Jobs & student enrollment at universities & colleges within ¼ mile of stops per corridor mile | >10,250 Jobs & students/Corridor Mi | 10 |
| | | >5,500 Jobs & students/Corridor Mi | 8 |
| | | >3,000 Jobs & students/Corridor Mi | 6 |
| | | >1,400 Jobs & students/Corridor Mi | 4 |
| | | >500 Jobs & students/Corridor Mi | 2 |
| Social Equity | Percent of boardings in low-income census tracts ¹ | Above system average | 5 |
| | | Below system average | 0 |
| | Percent of boardings in minority census tracts ² | Above system average | 5 |
| | | Below system average | 0 |
| Geographic Value | Primary connection between regional growth, manufacturing/industrial centers | Yes | 5 |
| | | No | 0 |
| | Primary connection between transit activity centers | Yes | 5 |
| | | No | 0 |

Thresholds and points used to set service levels

Frequency based on total score

| Scoring Range | Peak Service Frequency (minutes) | Off-Peak Service Frequency (minutes) | Night Service Frequency (minutes) |
|---------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 25-40 | 15 | 15 | 30 |
| 19-24 | 15 | 30 | 30 |
| 10-18 | 30 | 30 | -- |
| 0-9 | 60 or less frequent (≥60) | 60 or less frequent | -- |

Step-Two: Adjust service levels

After setting service levels on the basis of the six factors in step-one, Metro adjusts the levels to ensure that the All-Day and Peak Network accommodates current ridership levels. Corridor service levels are increased if providing service at the levels established under step-one would not accommodate existing riders, would be inconsistent with policy-based service levels set for RapidRide services or would result in an incomplete network of night service³.

¹ Low-income tracts are those where a greater percentage of the population than the countywide average has low incomes, based on current American Community Survey data.

² Minority tracts are defined as tracts where a greater percentage of the population than the Countywide average is minority (all groups except White, non-Hispanic), based on current census data.

³ An incomplete network of night service is defined as a network in which night service is not provided on a primary connection between regional growth centers or on a corridor with frequent peak service. Provision of night service on such corridors is important to ensure system integrity and social equity during all times of day.

Thresholds used to adjust service levels

| Factor | Measure | Threshold | Adjustment to warranted frequency | | |
|----------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | | Service level adjustment | Step 1 frequency (minutes) | Adjusted frequency (minutes) |
| Cost recovery | Estimated cost recovery by time of day - <i>if existing riders were served by step-one service levels</i> | >100% in any time period | Adjust two levels | 15 or 30 | <15 |
| | | | | ≥60 | 15 |
| | | Peak >50% Off-peak >50% Night >33% | Adjust one level | 15 | <15 |
| | | | | 30 | 15 |
| | | Night >16% | Add night service | ≥60 | 30 |
| Night >8% | -- | ≥60 | | | |
| Load | Estimated load factor ⁴ by time of day - <i>if existing riders were served by step-one service levels</i> | >1.5 | Adjust two levels | 15 or 30 | <15 |
| | | | | ≥60 | 15 |
| | | >0.75 | Adjust one level | 15 | <15 |
| | | | | 30 | 15 |
| | | ≥60 | 30 | | |
| Service span | Connection at night | Primary connection between regional growth centers | Add night service | -- | ≥60 |
| | | Frequent peak service | Add night service | -- | 30 |

Metro also adjusts service levels on existing and planned RapidRide corridors to ensure that identified service frequencies are consistent with policy-based service frequencies for the RapidRide program: more frequent than 15 minutes during peak periods, 15 minutes during off-peak periods, and 15 minutes at night. Where policy-based service frequencies are more frequent than service frequencies established in step-two, frequencies are improved to the minimum specified by policy.

The combined outcome of steps one and two is a set of corridors with all-day service levels that reflect factors concerning land use, social equity, geographic value, and ridership. These corridors are divided into families based on the frequency of service, as described in the Service Families section below. Corridors with the highest frequency would have the longest span of service.

Step-Three: Identify peak overlay

⁴ Load factor is calculated by dividing the maximum load along a route by the total number of seats on a bus, to get a ratio of riders to seats.

Peak service adds value to the network of all-day service by providing faster travel times and accommodating very high demand for travel to and from major employment centers. Peak service thresholds ensure that peak service is well-used and provides benefits above the network of all-day service. Service levels on peak routes are established separately from the all-day network because they have a specialized function within the transit network.

Thresholds for peak services

| Factor | Measure | Threshold |
|-------------|---|---|
| Travel Time | Travel time relative to alternative service | Travel time should be at least 20% faster than the alternative service |
| Ridership | Rides per Trip | Rides per trip should be 90% or greater compared to alternative service |

Metro considers travel time and ridership to determine where peak service is appropriate. Peak service in a corridor that also has all-day service should have higher ridership and faster travel times than the other service to justify its higher cost. If peak service does not meet the load and travel-time thresholds but serves an area that has no other service, Metro would consider preserving service or providing service in a new or different way, such as connecting an area to a different destination or providing alternatives to fixed-route transit service, consistent with Strategy 6.2.3.

Peak service generally has a minimum of eight trips per day on weekdays only. Peak service is provided for a limited span compared to all-day service. The exact span and number of trips are determined by demand on an individual route basis.

Evaluating new service

Metro has defined the current All-Day and Peak Network on the basis of appropriate levels of service for all-day and peak services within King County today. However, the service assessment processes described in the guidelines should also be used when Metro is considering and evaluating potential or proposed new services, including new service corridors. They should also be applied over time to determine appropriate levels of service, including the need for new services and service corridors as areas of King County change.

Service families

All-Day and Peak Network services are broken down by level of service into five families. Service families are primarily defined by the frequency and span of service they provide. The table below shows the typical characteristics of each family. Some services may fall outside the typical frequencies, depending on specific conditions.

Summary of typical service levels by family

| Service Family | Frequency ⁵ (minutes) | | | Days of service | Hours of service ⁶ |
|----------------------|--|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| | Peak ⁷ | Off-peak | Night | | |
| Very frequent | 15 or more frequent | 15 or more frequent | 30 or more frequent | 7 days | 16-20 hours |
| Frequent | 15 or more frequent | 30 | 30 | 7 days | 16-20 hours |
| Local | 30 | 30 - 60 | --* | 5-7 days | 12-16 hours |
| Hourly | 60 or less frequent | 60 or less frequent | -- | 5 days | 8-12 hours |
| Peak | 8 trips/day minimum | -- | -- | 5 days | Peak |
| | | | | | |
| Alternative Services | Determined by demand and community collaboration process | | | | |

*Night service on local corridors is determined by ridership and connections.

- **Very frequent** services provide the highest levels of all-day service. Very frequent corridors serve very large employment and transit activity centers and high-density residential areas.
- **Frequent** services provide high levels of all-day service. Frequent corridors generally serve major employment and transit activity centers and high-density residential areas.
- **Local** services provide a moderate level of all-day service. Local corridors generally serve regional growth centers and low- to medium-density residential areas.
- **Hourly** services provide all-day service no more frequently than every hour. Corridors generally connect low-density residential areas to regional growth centers.
- **Peak** services provide specialized service in the periods of highest demand for travel. Peak services generally provide service to a major employment center in the morning and away from a major employment center in the afternoon.
- **Alternative** service is any non-fixed route service directly provided or supported by Metro. Alternative services provide access to local destinations and fixed route transit service on corridors that cannot be cost-effectively served by fixed route transit at target service levels. The service type and frequency for Alternative services are determined through collaborative community engagement regarding community travel needs balanced against costs, which shall not exceed the estimated cost to deliver fixed route service at target service levels. Performance for Alternative services shall be determined individually for each service through a cost-effectiveness measure based on cost per rider.

⁵ Frequency is the number of minutes between consecutive trips in the same direction. A trip with four evenly spaced trips per hour would have an average headway of 15 minutes and a frequency of four trips per hour.

⁶ Hours of service, or span, is defined as the time between first trip and last trip leaving the terminal in the predominant direction of travel.

⁷ Time period definitions: Peak 5-9 a.m. and 3-7 p.m. weekdays; Off-peak 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. weekdays; 5 a.m. to 7 p.m. weekends; Night 7 p.m. to 5 a.m. all days.

Target Service Comparison The service guidelines compare the target service levels identified through the corridor analysis with existing levels of service. A corridor is determined to be either ‘below’, ‘at’ or ‘above’ its target service level. This process is called the target service comparison.

The target service comparison is a factor in both the investment and reduction priorities, as described in the ‘Use and Implementation’ section of the guidelines.

While the service families are based on frequency, Metro also classifies individual routes by their major destinations when comparing productivity. These classifications are based on the primary market served. Regional growth centers in the core of Seattle and the University District are significantly different from markets served in other areas of King County. Services are evaluated based on these two primary market types to ensure that comparisons reflect the service potential of each type of market.

- **Seattle core** routes are those that serve downtown Seattle, First Hill, Capitol Hill, South Lake Union, the University District, or Uptown. These routes serve regional growth centers with very high employment and residential density.
- **Non-Seattle core** routes are those that operate only in other areas of Seattle and King County. These routes provide all-day connections between regional growth or transit activity centers outside of Seattle or provide service in lower-density areas.

Performance management

Metro uses performance management to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the transit system. Performance management guidelines are applied to individual routes to identify high and low performance, areas where investment is needed, and areas where resources are not being used efficiently and effectively.

Productivity

Productivity measures identify routes where performance is strong or weak as candidates for addition, reduction, or restructuring. High and low performance thresholds differ for routes that serve the Seattle core areas⁸ and those that do not. Routes serving the Seattle core are expected to perform at a higher level because the potential market is much greater than for routes serving other areas of King County.

The measures for evaluating routes are rides per platform hour⁹ and passenger miles per platform mile¹⁰. Two measures are used to reflect the fact that services provide different values

⁸ Seattle core areas include the regional growth centers in downtown Seattle, First Hill/Capitol Hill, South Lake Union, Uptown, and the University District.

⁹ Rides per platform hour is a measure of the number of people who board a transit vehicle relative to the total number of hours that a vehicle operates (from leaving the base until it returns).

¹⁰ Passenger miles per platform mile is a measure of the total miles riders travel on a route relative to the total miles that a vehicle operates (from leaving the base until it returns).

to the system. Routes with high ridership relative to the amount of investment perform well on the rides-per-platform-hour-measure. Routes with full and even loading along the route perform well on the passenger-miles-per-platform-mile measure; an example is a route that fills up at a park-and-ride and is full until reaching its destination.

Low performance is defined as having productivity that ranks in the bottom 25 percent of routes within a category and time period. High performance is defined as having productivity levels in the top 25 percent of routes within a category and time period. Routes in the bottom 25 percent on both productivity measures are identified as the first candidates for potential reduction.

Thresholds for the top 25 percent and the bottom 25 percent are identified for the following time periods and destinations for each of two performance measures – rides/platform hour and passenger miles/platform mile.

| Time period | Route destination |
|-------------|-------------------|
| Peak | Seattle core |
| | Not Seattle core |
| Off-peak | Seattle core |
| | Not Seattle core |
| Night | Seattle core |
| | Not Seattle core |

Passenger loads

Passenger loads are measured to identify crowded services as candidates for increased investment. Overcrowding is a problem because buses may pass up riders waiting at stops, riders may choose not to ride if other transportation options are available, and overcrowded buses often run late because it takes longer for riders to board and get off at stops.

Passenger loads are averaged using observations from a complete period between service changes. Trips must have average loads higher than thresholds for an entire service change period to be identified as candidates for investment. Load factor is calculated by dividing the maximum load along a route by the total number of seats on a bus, to get a ratio of riders to seats.

- When a route operates every 10-minutes or more frequently, or on all RapidRide services, an individual trip should not exceed a load factor of 1.5.
- When a route operates less than every 10-minutes, or is not a RapidRide service, an individual trip should not exceed a load factor of 1.25.
- No trip on a route should have a standing load for 20 minutes or longer.

Other considerations: Vehicle availability

Action alternatives:

- Assign a larger vehicle
- Add or adjust the spacing of trips within a 20-minute period

Schedule reliability

Metro measures schedule reliability to identify routes that are candidates for remedial action due to poor service quality.

Schedule adherence is measured for all Metro services. Service should adhere to published schedules, within reasonable variance based on time of day and travel conditions. When measuring schedule adherence, Metro focuses on routes that are regularly running late. On-time is defined as a departure that is five minutes late or better at a scheduled time point.

| Time period | Lateness threshold (Excludes early trips) |
|-------------------------|--|
| Weekday average | > 20% |
| Weekday PM peak average | > 35% |
| Weekend average | > 20% |

Investment can include route design, schedule, or traffic operations improvements. Routes that operate with a headway less frequent than every 10-minutes that do not meet performance thresholds will be prioritized for schedule adjustment or investment. Routes that operate with a headway of every 10-minutes or more frequent that do not meet performance thresholds will be prioritized for traffic operations (speed and reliability) investments. It may not be possible to improve through-routed routes that do not meet performance thresholds because of the high cost and complication of separating routes.

Other considerations: External factors affecting reliability

Action alternatives:

- Adjust schedules
- Adjust routing
- Invest in speed and reliability improvements.

Service restructures

Service restructures are changes to multiple routes along a corridor or within an area, including serving new corridors, in a manner consistent with service design criteria found in this service guidelines document. Restructures may be prompted for a variety of reasons and in general are made to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of transit service or to reduce net operating costs when Metro's operating revenue is significantly reduced from historic levels.

- Under all circumstances, whether adding, reducing or maintaining service hours invested, service restructures shall have a goal to focus service frequency on the highest ridership and productivity segments of restructured services, to create convenient opportunities for transfer connections between services and to match service capacity to ridership demand to improve productivity and cost-effectiveness of service.

- In managing the transit system, service restructures shall have a goal of increasing ridership.
- Under service reduction conditions, service restructures shall have an added goal of resulting in an overall net reduction of service hours invested.
- Under service addition conditions, service restructures shall have added goals of increasing service levels and ridership.

When one or more key reasons trigger consideration of restructures, Metro specifically analyzes:

- Impacts on current and future travel patterns served by similarly aligned transit services;
- Passenger capacity of the candidate primary route(s) relative to projected consolidated ridership; and
- The cost of added service in the primary corridor to meet projected ridership demand relative to cost savings from reductions of other services.

Restructures will be designed to reflect the following:

- Service levels should accommodate projected loads at no more than 80 percent of established loading guidelines.
- When transfers are required as a result of restructures, the resulting service will be designed for convenient transfers and travel time penalties for transfers should be minimized.
- A maximum walk distance goal of 1/4 mile in corridors where service is not primarily oriented to freeway or limited-access roadways. Consideration for exceeding this goal may be given where the walking environment is pedestrian-supportive.

Based on these considerations, Metro recommends specific restructures that have compatibility of trips, capacity on the consolidated services to meet anticipated demand and that achieve measurable savings relative to the magnitude of necessary or desired change.

Following the implementation of restructures, Metro will regularly evaluate the resulting transit services and respond to on-time performance and passenger loads that exceed the performance management guidelines as part of the regular ongoing management of Metro's transit system.

Key reasons that will trigger consideration of restructures include:

Sound Transit or Metro service investments

- Extension or service enhancements to Link light rail, Sounder commuter rail, and Regional Express bus services.
- Expansion of Metro's RapidRide network, investment of partner or grant resources, or other significant introductions of new Metro service.

Corridors above or below All-Day and Peak Network frequency

- Locations where the transit network does not reflect current travel patterns and transit demand due to changes in travel patterns, demographics, or other factors.

Services compete for the same riders

- Locations where multiple transit services overlap or provide similar connections.

Mismatch between service and ridership

- Situations where a route serves multiple areas with varying demand characteristics or situations where ridership has increased or decreased significantly even though the underlying service has not changed.
- Opportunities to consolidate or otherwise reorganize service so that higher ridership demand can be served with improved service frequency and fewer route patterns.

Major transportation network changes

- Major projects such as SR 520 construction and tolling and the Alaskan Way Viaduct replacement; the opening of new transit centers, park-and-rides, or transit priority pathways; or the closure of facilities like the South Park Bridge.

Major development or land use changes

- Construction of a large-scale development, new institutions such as colleges or medical centers, or significant changes in the overall development of an area.

Service design

Metro uses service design guidelines to develop transit routes and the overall transit network. Guidelines reflect industry best practices for designing service. The use of service design guidelines can enhance transit operations and improve the rider experience. Some guidelines are qualitative considerations that service development should take into account. Other guidelines have quantitative standards for comparing and measuring specific factors.

1. Network connections

Routes should be designed in the context of the entire transportation system, which includes local and regional bus routes, light-rail lines, commuter rail lines and other modes. Metro strives to make transfers easy as it develops a network of services. Network design should consider locations where transfer opportunities could be provided, and where provision of convenient transfers could improve the efficiency of the transit network. Where many transfers are expected to occur between services of different frequencies, timed transfers should be maintained to reduce customer wait times.

2. Multiple purposes and destinations

Routes are more efficient when designed to serve multiple purposes and destinations rather than specialized travel demands. Routes that serve many rider groups rather than a single group appeal to more potential riders and are more likely to be successful. Specialized service should be considered when there is sizeable and demonstrated demand that cannot be adequately met by more generalized service.

3. Easy to understand, appropriate service

A simple transit network is easier for riders to understand and use than a complex network. Routes should have predictable and direct routings and should provide frequency and span appropriate to the market served. Routes should serve connection points where riders can connect to frequent services, opening up the widest possible range of travel options.

4. Route spacing and duplication

Routes should be designed to avoid competing for the same riders. Studies indicate that people are willing to walk one-quarter mile on average to access transit, so in general routes should be no closer than one-half mile. Services may overlap where urban and physical geography makes it necessary, where services in a common segment serve different destinations, or where routes converge to serve regional growth centers. Where services do overlap, they should be scheduled together, if possible, to provide effective service along the common routing.

Routes are defined as duplicative in the following circumstances:

- Two or more parallel routes operate less than one-half mile apart for at least one mile, excluding operations within a regional growth center or approaching a transit center where pathways are limited.
- A rider can choose between multiple modes or routes connecting the same origin and destination at the same time of day.
- Routes heading to a common destination are not spaced evenly (except for operations within regional growth centers).

5. Route directness

A route that operates directly between two locations is faster and more attractive to riders than one that takes a long, circuitous path. Circulators or looping routes do not have competitive travel times compared to walking or other modes of travel, so they tend to have low ridership and poor performance. Some small loops may be necessary to turn the bus around at the end of routes and to provide supplemental coverage, but such extensions should not diminish the overall cost-effectiveness of the route. Directness should be considered in relation to the market for the service.

Route deviations are places where a route travels away from its major path to serve a specific destination. For individual route deviations, the delay to riders on board the bus should be considered in relation to the ridership gained on a deviation. New deviations may be considered when the delay is less than 10 passenger-minutes per person boarding or exiting the bus along the deviation.

$$\frac{\text{Riders traveling through X Minutes of deviation}}{\text{Boardings and exitings along deviation}} \leq 10 \text{ minutes}$$

6. Bus stop spacing

Bus stops should be spaced to balance the benefit of increased access to a route against the delay that an additional stop would create for all other riders. While close stop-spacing

reduces walk time, it may increase total travel time and reduce reliability, since buses must slow down and stop more frequently.

| Service | Average stop spacing |
|--------------------|----------------------|
| RapidRide | ½ mile |
| All other services | ¼ mile |

Portions of routes that operate in areas where riders cannot access service, such as along freeways or limited-access roads, are excluded when calculating average stop spacing. Additional considerations for bus stop spacing include the pedestrian facilities, the geography of the area around a bus stop, passenger amenities, and major destinations.

7. Route length and neighborhood route segments

A bus route should be long enough to provide useful connections for riders and to be more attractive than other travel modes. A route that is too short will not attract many riders, since the travel time combined with the wait for the bus is not competitive compared to the time it would take to walk. Longer routes offer the opportunity to make more trips without a transfer, resulting in increased ridership and efficiency. However, longer routes may also have poor reliability because travel time can vary significantly from day to day over a long distance. Where many routes converge, such as in regional growth centers, they may be through-routed¹¹ to increase efficiency, reduce the number of buses providing overlapping service, and reduce the need for layover space in congested areas.

In some places, routes extend beyond regional growth centers and transit activity centers to serve lower density residential neighborhoods. Where routes operate beyond centers, ridership should be weighed against the time spent serving neighborhood segments, to ensure that the service level is appropriate to the level of demand. The percent of time spent serving a neighborhood segment should be considered in relation to the percent of riders boarding and exiting on that segment.

$$\frac{\text{Percent of time spent serving neighborhood segment}}{\text{Percent of riders boarding/exiting on neighborhood segment}} \leq 1.2^{12}$$

8. Operating paths and appropriate vehicles

Buses are large, heavy vehicles and cannot operate safely on all streets. Buses should be routed primarily on arterial streets and freeways, except where routing on local or collector streets is necessary to reach layover areas or needed to ensure that facilities and fleet used in all communities is equivalent in age and quality. Bus routes should also be designed to avoid places where traffic congestion and delay regularly occur, if it is possible to avoid such

¹¹ "Through-routing" means continuous routing of vehicles from one route to another such that a rider would not have to transfer from one route to reach a destination on the other.

¹² The value of the service extended into neighborhoods beyond major transit activity centers should be approximately equal to the investment made to warrant the service. A 1:1 ratio was determined to be too strict, thus this ratio was adjusted to 1.2.

areas while continuing to meet riders' needs. Bus routes should be routed, where possible, to avoid congested intersections or interchanges unless the alternative would be more time-consuming or would miss an important transfer point or destination. Services should operate with vehicles that are an appropriate size to permit safe operation while accommodating demand. Appropriate vehicles should be assigned to routes throughout the county to avoid concentrating older vehicles in one area, to the extent possible given different fleet sizes, technologies and maintenance requirements. All new vehicles will be equipped with automated stop announcement systems.

9. Route terminals

The location where a bus route ends and the buses wait before starting the next trip must be carefully selected. Priority should be given to maintaining existing layover spaces at route terminals to support continued and future service. People who live or work next to a route end may regard parked buses as undesirable, so new route terminals should be placed where parked buses have the least impact on adjoining properties, if possible. Routes that terminate at a destination can accommodate demand for travel in two directions, resulting in increased ridership and efficiency. Terminals should be located in areas where restroom facilities are available for operators, taking into account the times of day when the service operates and facilities would be needed. Off-street transit centers should be designed to incorporate layover space.

10. Fixed and variable routing

Bus routes should operate as fixed routes in order to provide a predictable and reliable service for a wide range of potential riders. However, in lower-density areas where demand is dispersed, demand-responsive service may be used to provide more effective service over a larger area than could be provided with fixed-route service. Demand-responsive service may be considered where fixed-route service is unlikely to be successful or where unique conditions exist that can be met more effectively through flexible service.

11. Bus Stop Amenities and Bus Shelters

Bus stop amenities should be installed based on ridership, in order to benefit the largest number of riders. Bus stop amenities include such things as bus shelters, seating, waste receptacles, lighting, and information signs, maps, and schedules. In addition to ridership, special consideration may be given to areas where:

- high numbers of transfers are expected;
- waiting times for riders may be longer;
- stops are close to facilities such as schools, medical centers, or senior centers; or
- the physical constraints of bus stop sites, preferences of adjacent property owners, and construction costs could require variance from standards.

Major infrastructure such as elevators and escalators will be provided where required by local, state, and federal regulations.

RapidRide Routes

| Level of amenity | Boardings |
|------------------|-----------|
| Station | 150+ |

| | |
|---------------|--------------|
| Enhanced stop | 50-149 |
| Standard stop | Less than 50 |

Other Routes

| Location | Boardings |
|-----------------|-----------|
| City of Seattle | 50 |
| Outside Seattle | 25 |

Use and implementation

Metro uses the following guidelines when adding or reducing service as well as in the ongoing development and management of transit service.

Guidelines for adding or reducing service

| Guideline | Measures |
|--------------------------|--|
| Productivity | Rides per platform hour |
| | Passenger miles per platform mile |
| Passenger loads | Load factor |
| Schedule reliability | On-time performance |
| | Headway adherence |
| | Lateness |
| All-Day and Peak Network | Current service relative to All-Day and Peak Network |

Adding Service

Metro invests in service by using guidelines in the following order:

1. Passenger Loads
2. Schedule Reliability
3. All-Day and Peak Network
4. Productivity

Passenger Loads and Schedule Reliability

Metro first uses the passenger load and schedule reliability guidelines to assess service quality. Routes that do not meet the standards are considered to have low quality service, which has a negative impact on riders and could discourage them from using transit. These routes are the highest priority candidates for investment. Routes that are through-routed but suffer from poor reliability may be candidates for investment, but because of the size and complexity of changes to through-routes, they would not be automatically given top priority.

All-Day and Peak Network

Metro next uses the All-Day and Peak Network guidelines and the target service comparison (as described on p. SG-8) to determine if corridors are below their target levels, meaning a corridor in which the all-day Service Family assignment (see SG-9) is a higher level of service than the corridor currently has. If a corridor is below the target service level it is an investment priority. Investments in corridors below their target service levels are prioritized primarily using the geographic value score. Investments are ordered for implementation on the basis of geographic value score, followed by the land use score, then the social equity score. Other constraints or considerations such as fleet availability or restructuring processes could be used to suggest order of implementation.

When planning improvements to corridors that are below their target service levels or that perform in the bottom 25 percent, Metro will consider the use of alternative services. These alternative services will be used to replace or to supplement the fixed route service in the corridor and cost-effectively maintain or enhance the access to transit for those who live in the corridor.

Also with growing resources, Metro could identify candidate alternative service areas based on feedback from communities about unmet travel needs. Alternative services could respond to travel needs not easily accommodated by fixed-route transit, or could be designed to make the fixed-route service more effective. This could involve adding service in corridors below their target service levels.

As development or transit use increase in corridors with alternative services, Metro will consider converting alternative service into fixed route service. Conversion of alternative service to fixed route service will be guided by alternative service performance thresholds and the cost effectiveness of the alternative service compared to that of fixed route.

Metro will measure the cost per rider for alternative service as one of the measures that can be compared to fixed route service. Other alternative service performance measures and

thresholds will be developed as Metro evaluates the demonstrations called for in the five-year plan. Appropriate measures will be used to evaluate each alternative service and will be included as part of the service guideline report.

Metro is open to forming partnerships with cities and private companies that would fully or partially fund transit service, and will make exceptions to the established priorities to make use of partner funding. Metro's partners are expected to contribute at least one-third of the cost of operating service. Partnerships will be considered according to the following priorities:

1. Service funded fully by Metro's partners would be given top priority over other service investments.
2. On corridors identified as below their target service levels in the All-Day and Peak Network, service that is between one-third and fully funded by Metro's partners would be given top priority among the set of investments identified in corridors below their target service levels. However, this service would not be automatically prioritized above investments to address service quality problems.

Productivity

The final guideline Metro uses to determine if additional service is needed is productivity. Routes with productivity in the top 25 percent perform well in relation to other routes; investment in these services would improve service where it is most efficient.

Reducing service

The service guidelines identify the steps for evaluation when Metro is reducing service. Routes that are in the bottom 25 percent in one or both productivity measures and operate on corridors that are above their target service levels have a higher potential for reduction than routes on corridors that are at or below their target service level. While the guidelines form the basis for identifying services for reduction, Metro also considers other factors such as system efficiencies, simplification, and potential changes to other service in an area. The use of these other factors means that some routes may not be reduced in the priority order stated below.

Metro also considers restructures when making large reductions, to identify areas where restructuring can lead to more efficient service. Reduction of service can range from reduction of a single trip to elimination of an entire route. While no route or area is exempt from change during large-scale system reductions, Metro will seek to maintain service at All-Day and Peak Network levels, and to avoid reducing service on corridors already identified as below their target service levels.

Service restructuring allows Metro to serve trip needs at a reduced cost by consolidating and focusing service in corridors such as those in the All-Day and Peak Network. Restructuring allows Metro to make reductions while minimizing impacts to riders. Metro strives to eliminate duplication, and match service to demand during large-scale reductions. As a result of service consolidation some routes may increase in frequency to accommodate projected loads, even while the result of the restructure is a reduction in service hours.

Metro serves some urbanized areas of east and south King County adjacent to or surrounded by rural land. Elimination of all service in these areas would result in significant reduction in the coverage that Metro provides. To ensure that Metro continues to address mobility needs, ensure social equity and provide geographic value to people throughout King County, connections to these areas would be preserved when making service reductions, regardless of productivity.

During service reductions Metro will consider the use of alternative services that can reduce costs on corridors with routes that are in the bottom 25 percent in one or both productivity measures. In this way, alternative services may help maintain public mobility in a cost-effective manner. These alternative services will be evaluated according to the measures and performance thresholds developed through the evaluation of the demonstrations called for in the five-year plan.

Priorities for reduction are listed below. Within all of the priorities, Metro ensures that social equity is a primary consideration in any reduction proposal, complying with all state and federal regulations.

1. Reduce service on routes that are below the 25 percent productivity threshold for a given time period. Routes that are below the 25 percent productivity threshold on both measures are considered for reduction before routes that are below the 25 percent productivity threshold for only one measure in the following order:
 - All-day routes that duplicate or overlap with other routes on corridors on the All-Day and Peak Network.
 - Peak routes failing one or both of the criteria.
 - All-day routes that operate on corridors that are above their target service levels, meaning corridors in which the all-day service family assignment (see SG-9) is a lower level of service than the corridor currently has.
 - All-day routes that operate on corridors which are at their target service levels. This worsens the deficiency between existing service and the All-Day and Peak Network service levels.
2. Restructure service to improve efficiency of service.
3. Reduce service on routes that are above the 25 percent productivity threshold for a given time period. Routes that are between the 25 and 50 percent productivity threshold on both measures are considered for reduction before routes that are above the 50 percent productivity threshold for either measure, in the following order:
 - All-day routes that duplicate or overlap with routes on the All-Day and Peak Network.
 - Peak routes that meet both peak criteria or are above the 25 percent threshold.
 - All-day routes on corridors that are above their target service levels.
 - All-day routes on corridors which are at their target service levels. This worsens the deficiency between existing service and the service levels determined through the All-Day and Peak Network analysis.
4. Reduce services on routes that are below the 25% productivity threshold for a given time period on corridors identified as below their target service levels. Routes that

are below the 25 percent productivity threshold on both measures are considered for reduction before routes that are below the 25 percent productivity threshold for only one measure. This worsens the deficiency between existing service and the All-Day and Peak Network service levels.

In many areas of the county, and especially in urbanized areas adjacent to or surrounded by rural land, Metro may provide service in different ways in the future, including with alternatives to fixed-route transit service (Strategy 6.2.3). These services could include fixed-route with deviations or other Dial-a-Ride Transit, or other alternative services that offer mobility similar to the fixed-route service provided. Services such as Community Access Transportation also provide alternatives to fixed-route service by allowing Metro to partner with local agencies or jurisdictions to provide service in a way that meets the needs of the community and is more efficient and cost-effective than fixed-route transit. This approach is consistent with the *Strategic Plan for Public Transportation 2011-2021* because it considers a variety of products and services appropriate to the market (Strategy 2.1.1).

Implementation

Metro revises service three times each year—in spring, summer, and fall. The summer service change coordinates with the summer schedule for the University of Washington, because service is adjusted each summer on routes serving the UW. In cases of emergency or time-critical construction projects, Metro may make changes at times other than the three regularly scheduled service changes. However, these situations are rare and are kept to a minimum because of the high level of disruption and difficulty they create. Metro will identify and discuss service changes that address performance-related issues in its annual route performance report.

Any proposed changes to routes are subject to approval by the Metropolitan King County Council except as follows (per King County code 28.94.020):

- Any single change or cumulative changes in a service schedule which affect the established weekly service hours for a route by 25 percent or less.
- Any change in route location which does not move the location of any route stop by more than one-half mile.
- Any changes in route numbers.

Adverse Effect of a Major Service Change

An adverse effect of a major service change is defined as a reduction of 25 percent or more of the transit trips serving a census tract, or 25 percent or more of the service hours on a route.

Disparate Impact Threshold

A disparate impact occurs when a major service change results in adverse effects that are significantly greater for minority populations than for non-minority populations. Metro's threshold for determining whether adverse effects are significantly greater for minority

compared with non-minority populations is ten percent. Should Metro find a disparate impact, Metro will consider modifying the proposed changes in order to avoid, minimize or mitigate the disparate impacts of the proposed changes.

Metro will measure disparate impacts by comparing changes in the number of trips serving minority or non-minority census tracts, or by comparing changes in the number of service hours on minority or non-minority routes. Metro defines a minority census tract as one in which the percentage of minority population is greater than that of the county as a whole. For regular fixed route service, Metro defines a minority route as one for which the percentage of inbound weekday boardings in minority census tracts is greater than the average percentage of inbound weekday boardings in minority census tracts for all Metro routes.

Disproportionate Burden Threshold

A disproportionate burden occurs when a major service change results in adverse effects that are significantly greater for low-income populations than for non-low-income populations. Metro's threshold for determining whether adverse effects are significantly greater for low-income compared with non-low-income populations is ten percent. Should Metro find a disproportionate burden, Metro will consider modifying the proposed changes in order to avoid, minimize or mitigate the disproportionate burden of the proposed changes.

Metro will measure disproportionate burden by comparing changes in the number of trips serving low-income or non-low-income census tracts, or by comparing changes in the number of service hours on low-income or non-low-income routes. Metro defines a low-income census tract as one in which the percentage of low-income population is greater than that of the county as a whole. For regular fixed route service, Metro defines a low-income route as one for which the percentage of inbound weekday boardings in low-income census tracts is greater than the average percentage of inbound weekday boardings in low-income census tracts for all Metro routes.

Public outreach

Metro conducts outreach to gather input from the public when considering major changes. Outreach ranges from relatively limited activities, such as posting rider alerts at bus stops, to more extensive outreach including mailed informational pieces and questionnaires, websites, media notices and public open houses.

For service changes that affect multiple routes or large areas, Metro may convene a community-based sounding board. Sounding board members attend public meetings, offer advice about public outreach, and provide feedback about what changes to bus service would be best for the local communities. Metro considers sounding board recommendations as it develops recommendations.

Proposed changes may require County Council approval, as described above. The Council holds a public hearing before making a final decision on changes.

Future guidelines

As the transit system changes over time, Metro may need to change some guidelines as well. Updates to the guidelines will be considered along with updates to Metro's *Strategic Plan for Public Transportation 2011-2021*.

As part of the required 2013 review and re-adoption of the strategic plan and service guidelines, the results of a collaborative process that addresses the factors, methodology and prioritization of adding service consistent with Strategy 6.1.1 will be included. Key goals include:

- A. More closely align factors used to serve and connect centers in the development of the All-Day and Peak Network and resulting service level designations, including consideration of existing public transit services, with jurisdictions' growth decisions, such as zoning, and transit-supportive design requirements, and actions, associated with but not limited to permitting, transit operating enhancements, parking controls and pedestrian facilities; and
- B. Create a category of additional service priority, complementary to existing priorities for adding service contained within the King County Metro Service Guidelines, so that priorities include service enhancements to and from, between and within *Vision 2040* Regionally Designated Centers, and other centers where plans call for transit-supportive densities and jurisdictions have invested in capital facilities, made operational changes that improve the transit operating environment and access to transit and implemented programs that incentivize transit use.

Appendix 1: Centers in King County

Regional Growth Centers

Auburn
Bellevue Downtown
Burien
Federal Way
First Hill/Capitol Hill
Kent
Northgate
Overlake
Redmond
Renton
SeaTac
Seattle CBD
South Lake Union
Totem Lake
Tukwila
University District
Uptown

Manufacturing/Industrial Centers

Ballard/Interbay
Duwamish
Kent
North Tukwila

Transit Activity Centers

Alaska Junction
Aurora Village Transit Center
Ballard (Ballard Ave NW/NW Market St)
Beacon Hill Station
Black Diamond
Bothell (UW Bothell/Cascadia Community College)
Carnation
Central District (23rd Ave E/E Jefferson St)
Children's Hospital
Columbia City Station
Covington (172nd Ave SE/SE 272nd St)
Crossroads (156th Ave NE/NE 8th St)
Crown Hill (15th Ave NW/NW 85th St)
Des Moines (Marine View Dr/S 223rd St)
Duvall

Eastgate (Bellevue College)
 Enumclaw
 Factoria (Factoria Blvd SE/SE Eastgate Wy)
 Fairwood (140th Ave SE/SE Petrovitsky Rd)
 Maple Valley (Four Corners, SR-169/Kent-Kangley Rd)
 Fremont (Fremont Ave N/N 34th St)
 Georgetown (13th Ave S/S Bailey St)
 Green River Community College
 Greenwood (Greenwood Ave N/N 85th St)
 Harborview Medical Center
 Highline Community College
 Issaquah Highlands
 Issaquah (Issaquah Transit Center)
 Juanita (98th Ave NE/NE 116th St)
 Kenmore (Kenmore Park and Ride)
 Kent East Hill (104th Ave SE/SE 240th St)
 Kirkland (Kirkland Transit Center)
 Kirkland (South Kirkland Park and Ride)
 Lake City
 Lake Forest Park
 Lake Washington Technical College
 Madison Park (42nd Ave E/E Madison St)
 Magnolia (34th Ave W/W McGraw St)
 Mercer Island
 Mount Baker Station
 Newcastle
 North Bend
 North City (15th Ave NE/NE 175th St)
 Oaktree (Aurora Ave N/N 105th St)
 Othello Station
 Rainier Beach Station
 Renton Highlands (NE Sunset Blvd/NE 12th St)
 Renton Technical College
 Roosevelt (12th Ave NE/NE 65th St)
 Sammamish (228th Ave NE/NE 8th St)
 Sand Point (Sand Point Way/NE 70th St)
 Shoreline (Shoreline Community College)
 Snoqualmie
 SODO (SODO Busway/Lander St)
 South Mercer Island
 South Park (14th Ave S/S Cloverdale St)
 South Seattle Community College
 Tukwila International Blvd Station

Twin Lakes (21st Ave SW/SW 336th St)
Valley Medical Center
Vashon
Wallingford (Wallingford Ave N/N 45th St)
Westwood Village
Woodinville (Woodinville Park and Ride)

Appendix 2: Corridors evaluated for All-Day and Peak Network

| Connections | | |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Between | And | Via |
| Admiral District | Southcenter | California Ave SW, Military Rd, TIBS |
| Alki | Seattle CBD | Admiral Way |
| Auburn | Pacific | Algona |
| Auburn | Burien | Kent, SeaTac |
| Auburn/GRCC | Federal Way | 15th St SW, Lea Hill Rd |
| Aurora Village | Seattle CBD | Aurora Ave N |
| Aurora Village | Northgate | Meridian Av N |
| Avondale | Kirkland | NE 85th St, NE Redmond Wy, Avondale Wy NE |
| Ballard | Seattle CBD | 15th Ave W |
| Ballard | University District | Green Lake, Greenwood |
| Ballard | Lake City | Holman Road, Northgate |
| Ballard | Seattle CBD | W Nickerson, Westlake Av N, 9th Ave |
| Ballard | University District | Wallingford (N 45th St) |
| Beacon Hill | Seattle CBD | Beacon Ave |
| Bellevue | Eastgate | Lake Hills Connector |
| Bellevue | Redmond | NE 8th St, 156th Ave NE |
| Bellevue | Renton | Newcastle, Factoria |
| Burien | Seattle CBD | 1st Ave S, South Park, Airport Wy |
| Burien | Seattle CBD | Delridge, Ambaum |
| Burien | Seattle CBD | Des Moines Mem Dr, South Park |
| Capitol Hill | Seattle CBD | 15th Ave E |
| Capitol Hill | Seattle CBD | Madison St |
| Capitol Hill | White Center | South Park, Georgetown, Beacon Hill, First Hill |
| Central District | Seattle CBD | E Jefferson St |
| Colman Park | Seattle CBD | Leschi, Yesler |
| Cowen Park | Seattle CBD | University Way, I-5 |
| Discovery Park | Seattle CBD | Gilman Ave W, 22nd Ave W, Thorndyke Av W |
| Eastgate | Bellevue | Newport Wy , S. Bellevue, Beaux Arts |
| Eastgate | Overlake | Phantom Lake |
| Eastgate | Bellevue | Somerset, Factoria, Woodridge |
| Enumclaw | Auburn | Auburn Wy S, SR 164 |
| Fairwood | Renton | S Puget Dr, Royal Hills |
| Federal Way | Kent | Military Road |
| Federal Way | SeaTac | SR-99 |
| Fremont | Broadview | 8th Av NW, 3rd Av NW |
| Fremont | Seattle CBD | Dexter Ave N |
| Fremont | University District | N 40th St |
| Green River CC | Kent | 132nd Ave SE |
| Greenwood | Seattle CBD | Greenwood Ave N |
| High Point | Seattle CBD | 35th Ave SW |
| Issaquah | North Bend | Fall City, Snoqualmie |
| Issaquah | Eastgate | Newport Way |
| Issaquah | Overlake | Sammamish, Bear Creek |
| Kenmore | Totem Lake | Finn Hill, Juanita |
| Kenmore | Kirkland | Juanita |
| Kenmore | Shoreline | Lake Forest Park, Aurora Village TC |
| Kenmore | University District | Lake Forest Park, Lake City |

| Connections | | |
|--------------------|---------------------|--|
| Between | And | Via |
| Kennydale | Renton | Edmonds Av NE |
| Kent | Renton | 84th Av S, Lind Av SW |
| Kent | Renton | Kent East Hill |
| Kent | Burien | Kent-DM Rd, S. 240th St, 1st Av S |
| Kent | Maple Valley | Kent-Kangley Road |
| Kent | Seattle CBD | Tukwila |
| Kirkland | Factoria | Overlake, Crossroads, Eastgate |
| Kirkland | Bellevue | South Kirkland |
| Lake City | University District | 35th Ave NE |
| Lake City | University District | Lake City, Sand Point |
| Lake City | Seattle CBD | NE 125th St, Northgate, I-5 |
| Laurelhurst | University District | NE 45th St |
| Madison Park | Seattle CBD | Madison St |
| Madrona | Seattle CBD | Union St |
| Magnolia | Seattle CBD | 34th Ave W, 28th Ave W |
| Mercer Island | S Mercer Island | Island Crest Way |
| Mirror Lake | Federal Way | S 312th St |
| Mount Baker | Seattle CBD | 31st Av S, S Jackson St |
| Mountlake Terrace | Northgate | 15th Ave NE, 5th Ave NE |
| Mt Baker | University District | 23rd Ave E |
| Northeast Tacoma | Federal Way | SW 356th St, 9th Ave S |
| Northgate | Seattle CBD | Green Lake, Wallingford |
| Northgate | University District | Roosevelt |
| Northgate | University District | Roosevelt Way NE, NE 75th St |
| Othello Station | Columbia City | Seward Park |
| Overlake | Bellevue | Bell-Red Road |
| Overlake | Bellevue | Sammamish Viewpoint, Northup Way |
| Queen Anne | Seattle CBD | Queen Anne Ave N |
| Queen Anne | Seattle CBD | Taylor Ave N |
| Rainier Beach | Seattle Center | Martin Luther King Jr Wy, E John St, Denny Way |
| Rainier Beach | Seattle CBD | Rainier Ave |
| Rainier Beach | Capitol Hill | Rainier Ave |
| Redmond | Eastgate | 148th Ave, Crossroads, Bellevue College |
| Redmond | Fall City | Duvall, Carnation |
| Redmond | Totem Lake | Willows Road |
| Renton | Enumclaw | Maple Valley, Black Diamond |
| Renton | Seattle CBD | Martin Luther King Jr Wy, I-5 |
| Renton | Renton Highlands | NE 4th St, Union Ave NE |
| Renton | Burien | S 154th St |
| Renton | Seattle CBD | Skyway, S. Beacon Hill |
| Renton | Rainier Beach | West Hill, Rainier View |
| Renton Highlands | Renton | NE 7th St, Edmonds Av NE |
| Richmond Beach | Northgate | Richmond Bch Rd, 15th Ave NE |
| Sand Point | University District | NE 55th St |
| Shoreline | University District | Jackson Park, 15th Av NE |
| Shoreline CC | Greenwood | Greenwood Av N |
| Shoreline CC | Northgate | N 130th St, Meridian Av N |
| Shoreline CC | Lake City | N 155th St, Jackson Park |
| Totem Lake | Seattle CBD | Kirkland, SR-520 |

| Connections | | |
|---------------------|-------------|------------------------------------|
| Between | And | Via |
| Tukwila | Des Moines | McMicken Heights, Sea-Tac |
| Tukwila | Seattle CBD | Pacific Hwy S, 4th Ave S |
| Tukwila | Fairwood | S 180th St, Carr Road |
| Twin Lakes | Federal Way | S 320th St |
| Twin Lakes | Federal Way | SW Campus Dr, 1st Ave S |
| University District | Seattle CBD | Broadway |
| University District | Seattle CBD | Eastlake, Fairview |
| University District | Seattle CBD | Lakeview |
| University District | Bellevue | SR-520 |
| UW Bothell | Redmond | Woodinville, Cottage Lake |
| UW Bothell/CCC | Kirkland | 132nd Ave NE, Lake Washington Tech |
| Vashon | Tahlequah | Valley Center |
| Wedgwood | Cowen Park | View Ridge, NE 65th St |
| West Seattle | Seattle CBD | Fauntleroy, Alaska Junction |
| White Center | Seattle CBD | 16th Ave SW, SSCC |
| White Center | Seattle CBD | Highland Park, 4th Ave S |
| Woodinville | Kirkland | Kingsgate |

TABLE 1: Summary table of Metro strategic plan elements

| OBJECTIVE | STRATEGIES | MEASURES |
|--|---|---|
| Goal 1: Safety. Support safe communities. | | |
| <p>Keep people safe and secure.</p> <p>Outcome: Metro’s services and facilities are safe and secure.</p> | <p>Promote safety and security in public transportation operations and facilities.</p> <p>Plan for and execute regional emergency-response and homeland security efforts.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preventable accidents • Operator and passenger incidents and assaults • Customer satisfaction regarding safety and security • Effectiveness of emergency responses |
| Goal 2: Human Potential. Provide equitable opportunities for people from all areas of King County to access the public transportation system. | | |
| <p>Provide public transportation products and services that add value throughout King County and that facilitate access to jobs, education and other destinations.</p> <p>Outcome: More people throughout King County have access to public transportation products and services.</p> | <p>Design and offer a variety of public transportation products and services appropriate to different markets and mobility needs.</p> <p>Provide travel opportunities for historically disadvantaged populations, such as low-income people, students, youth, seniors, people of color, people with disabilities, and others with limited transportation options.</p> <p>Provide products and services that are designed to provide geographic value in all parts of King County.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Population with ¼-mile walk access to a transit stop or 2-mile drive to a park-and-ride • % low-income population within ¼-mile walk access to transit • % minority population within ¼-mile walk access to transit • Accessible bus stops • Transit mode share by market • Student and reduced-fare permits and usage • Access applicants who undertake fixed-route travel training • Access boardings • Access registrants • Requested Access trips compared to those provided • Number of trips provided by the Jobs Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) and Community Access Transportation (CAT) programs • Title VI compliance • % population at 15 dwelling units per acre within ¼ mile walk access of frequent service |

| OBJECTIVE | STRATEGIES | MEASURES |
|--|--|--|
| <p>Goal 3: Economic Growth and Built Environment. Encourage vibrant, economically thriving and sustainable communities.</p> | | |
| <p>Support a strong, diverse, sustainable economy.</p> <p>Outcome: Public transportation products and services are available throughout King County and are well-utilized in centers and areas of concentrated economic activity.</p> | <p>Through investments and partnerships with regional organizations, local jurisdictions and the private sector, provide alternatives to driving alone that connect people to jobs, education and other destinations essential to King County’s economic vitality.</p> <p>Partner with employers to make public transportation products and services more affordable and convenient for employees.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transit rides per capita • Effectiveness of partnerships • Park-and-ride utilization • Peak mode share at Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) sites • Employer-sponsored passes and usage • % population at 15 dwelling units per acre within ¼-mile walk access of frequent service • All public transportation ridership in King County (rail, bus, paratransit, rideshare) • Centers ridership • Bike rack use |
| <p>Address the growing need for transportation services and facilities throughout the county.</p> <p>Outcome: More people have access to and regularly use public transportation products and services in King County.</p> | <p>Expand services to accommodate the region’s growing population and serve new transit markets when financially feasible.</p> <p>Coordinate and develop services and facilities with other providers to create an integrated and efficient regional transportation system.</p> <p>Work with transit partners, WSDOT and others to manage park-and-ride capacity needs.</p> | |
| <p>Support compact, healthy communities.</p> <p>Outcome: More people regularly use public transportation products and services along corridors with compact development.</p> | <p>Encourage land uses, policies, and development that lead to communities that transit can serve efficiently and effectively.</p> <p>Support bicycle and pedestrian access to jobs, services, and the transit system.</p> | |
| <p>Support economic development by using existing transportation infrastructure efficiently and effectively.</p> <p>Outcome: Regional investments in major highway capacity projects and parking requirements are complemented by high transit service levels in congested corridors and centers.</p> | <p>Serve centers and other areas of concentrated activity, consistent with <i>Transportation 2040</i>.</p> | |

| OBJECTIVE | STRATEGIES | MEASURES |
|---|---|--|
| Goal 4: Environmental Sustainability. Safeguard and enhance King County’s natural resources and environment. | | |
| <p>Help reduce greenhouse-gas emissions in the region.</p> <p>Outcome: People drive single-occupant vehicles less.</p> | <p>Increase the proportion of travel in King County that is provided by public transportation products and services.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Per capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT) • Transit mode share • Public transportation energy use per passenger mile |
| <p>Minimize Metro’s environmental footprint.</p> <p>Outcome: Metro’s environmental footprint is reduced (normalized against service growth).</p> | <p>Operate vehicles and adopt technology that has the least impact on the environment and maximizes long-term sustainability.</p> <p>Incorporate sustainable design, construction, operating and maintenance practices.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average miles per gallon of the Metro bus fleet • Energy use at Metro facilities |
| Goal 5: Service Excellence. Establish a culture of customer service and deliver services that are responsive to community needs. | | |
| <p>Improve satisfaction with Metro’s products and services and the way they are delivered.</p> <p>Outcome: People are more satisfied with Metro’s products and services.</p> | <p>Provide service that is easy to understand and use.</p> <p>Emphasize customer service in transit operations and workforce training.</p> <p>Improve transit speed and reliability.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conformance with King County policy on communications accessibility and translation to other languages • Customer satisfaction • Customer complaints • On-time performance by time of day |
| <p>Improve public awareness of Metro products and services.</p> <p>Outcome: People understand how to use Metro’s products and services and use them more often.</p> | <p>Use available tools, new technologies, and new methods to improve communication with customers.</p> <p>Promote Metro’s products and services to existing and potential customers.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Load factor • Utilization of Metro web tools • One Regional Card for All (ORCA) usage |

| OBJECTIVE | STRATEGIES | MEASURES |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Goal 6: Financial Stewardship. Exercise sound financial management and build Metro’s long term sustainability.</p> | | |
| <p>Emphasize planning and delivery of productive service.</p> <p>Outcome: Service productivity improves.</p> | <p>Manage the transit system through service guidelines and performance measures.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boardings per platform hour • Passenger miles per platform mile • Access boardings • Commuter van boardings • Cost per boarding • Cost per hour • Service hours operated • Asset condition assessment • Base capacity level of service • Fare revenues • Farebox recovery • Fare parity with other providers in the region |
| <p>Control costs.</p> <p>Outcome: Metro’s costs grow at or below the rate of inflation.</p> | <p>Continually explore and implement cost efficiencies.</p> <p>Provide and maintain capital assets to support efficient and effective service delivery.</p> <p>Develop and implement alternative public transportation services and delivery strategies.</p> | |
| <p>Seek to establish a sustainable funding structure to support short- and long-term public transportation needs.</p> <p>Outcome: Adequate funding to support King County’s short- and long-term public transportation needs.</p> | <p>Secure long-term stable funding.</p> <p>Establish fare structures and fare levels that are simple to understand, aligned with other service providers, and meet revenue targets established by Metro’s fund management policies.</p> <p>Establish fund management policies that ensure stability through a variety of economic conditions.</p> | |
| <p>Goal 7: Public Engagement and Transparency. Promote robust public engagement that informs, involves, and empowers people and communities.</p> | | |
| <p>Empower people to play an active role in shaping Metro’s products and services.</p> <p>Outcome: The public plays a role and is engaged in the development of public transportation.</p> | <p>Engage the public in the planning process and improve customer outreach.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public participation rates • Customer satisfaction regarding their role in Metro’s planning process • Customer satisfaction regarding Metro’s communications and reporting |
| <p>Increase customer and public access to understandable, accurate and transparent information.</p> <p>Outcome: Metro provides information that people use to access and comment on the planning process and reports.</p> | <p>Communicate service change concepts, the decision-making process, and public transportation information in language that is accessible and easy to understand.</p> <p>Explore innovative ways to report to and inform the public.</p> | |

| OBJECTIVE | STRATEGIES | MEASURES |
|---|--|--|
| Goal 8: Quality Workforce. Develop and empower Metro’s most valuable asset, its employees. | | |
| <p>Attract and recruit quality employees.</p> <p>Outcome: Metro is satisfied with the quality of its workforce.</p> | <p>Market Metro as an employer of choice and cultivate a diverse and highly skilled applicant pool.</p> <p>Promote equity, social justice and transparency in hiring and recruiting activities.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demographics of Metro employees • Employee job satisfaction • Promotion rate • Probationary pass rate • Training opportunities provided • Trainings completed • Employee performance |
| <p>Empower and retain efficient, effective, and productive employees.</p> <p>Outcome: Metro employees are satisfied with their jobs and feel their work contributes to an improved quality of life in King County.</p> | <p>Build leadership and promote professional skills.</p> <p>Recognize employees for outstanding performance, excellent customer service, innovation and strategic thinking.</p> <p>Provide training opportunities that enable employees to reach their full potential.</p> | |

Appendix G-1
June 2012 Service Reinvestments: Title VI Analysis

June 2012 Service Reinvestments

Title VI Analysis
December 30, 2011

June 2012 Service Change Overview

In June, Metro is planning approximately 40,000 annual service hours in reductions or eliminations of low performing routes. Service hours obtained through these actions would be reinvested according to the priorities identified in the Service Guidelines adopted with Metro's Strategic Plan. These guidelines include: (1) relieve standing loads, (2) improve on-time performance, and (3) increase service levels on underserved corridors. These changes would implement newly adopted policy direction, taking the first step towards fulfilling Council's mandate established with the adoption of the temporary Congestion Reduction Charge to reinvest a minimum of 100,000 service hours from poorly performing bus routes during the 2012-2013 biennium with the objective of improving the overall cost effectiveness of the Metro Transit system.

The proposed June 2012 service change would reduce service on or eliminate low performing bus routes throughout King County. Metro measures the performance of routes using two measures: rides per platform hour and passenger miles per platform mile. The Service Guidelines define "low performance" as those routes that rank in the bottom 25 percent of routes according to or based on one or both performance measures, separated by market and time of day (peak, off-peak, and night). Routes that serve the greater downtown Seattle area or the University District are compared only against one another. Routes that do not serve those markets are also compared only against one another.

Routes that are poor performers according to one or both of the performance measures are candidates for reduction. Reductions are achieved through a combination of full route deletions, elimination of service during a specified time period, or a reduction in service frequency. Using service hours from reduced or eliminated routes, Metro will reinvest most of these resources in increased service on overloaded routes, routes with schedule reliability issues, and in Route 180, a route in an underserved corridor consistent with Metro's Service Guidelines. An extension of Route 177 is also proposed to provide trips that originate at the South Federal Way Park-and-Ride to replace the Route 196. All together, reinvestments would use about 34,000 of the 40,000 annual service hours from reduced or eliminated routes. The remaining 6,000 annual service hours would offset the higher than projected service hours required to maintain the system after the October 2011 service change.

Service Guidelines Overview

A central component of the service guidelines is the All-Day and Peak Network, which establishes target service levels for transit corridors throughout King County. Productivity, social equity and geographic value are prioritized in this three-step process:

- **Step one** establishes initial service levels for corridors based on how well they meet measurable indicators reflecting productivity, social equity, and geographic value. Indicators of high productivity (using measureable land use indicators closely correlated

with transit productivity) make up 50 percent of the total score, while geographic value and social equity indicators each comprise 25 percent of the total score in this step.

- **Productivity** indicators demonstrate market potential of corridors using land use factors of housing and employment density.
- **Social Equity** indicators provide an evaluation of how well corridors serve concentrations of minority and low-income populations by comparing boardings in these areas along each corridor against the systemwide average of all corridor boardings within minority and low-income census tracts.
- **Geographic Value** indicators establish how well corridors preserve connections and service throughout King County.

The cumulative score from this step indicates the initial appropriate frequency for service in the corridor.

- **Step two** makes adjustments to the assigned step-one service family based on current ridership, productivity, and night network completeness. Adjustments are only made to assign corridors to a higher service level; service frequencies are not adjusted downward in this step.
- **Step three** defines the peak overlay for the All-Day and Peak Network. This step evaluates whether or not peak service provides a significant ridership or travel time advantage over the local service.

Service reinvestments planned for June 2012 were identified by using the guidelines for productivity and the All-Day and Peak Network. While no route or area is exempt from change during large-scale system reductions, Metro seeks to maintain service at All-Day and Peak Network levels, and to avoid reducing service on corridors already identified as under-served. Priorities for reduction are listed below.

1. Reduce low-productivity services (below 25 percent of the performance threshold) in the following order:
 - All-day routes that duplicate or overlap with routes on corridors of the All-Day and Peak Network¹.
 - Peak routes failing one or both of the criteria (ridership and travel time advantage).
 - All-day routes that operate on over-served corridors, meaning corridors in which the target service level is a lower level than what the corridor currently has.

¹ The All-Day and Peak network includes 113 all-day corridors, as specified in Appendix 2 of the Service Guidelines. Some corridors with existing all-day service duplicate or overlap corridors included in the All-Day and Peak Network and were therefore excluded from the All-Day and Peak network.

June 2012 Service Reinvestments
Title VI Analysis

- All-day routes that operate on corridors in which the target service level is the same as what the corridor currently has. This worsens the deficiency between existing service and the All-Day and Peak Network service levels.
- 2. Restructure service to improve efficiency of service.
- 3. Reduce lower-productivity services (predominantly between 25 and 50 percent of the performance threshold):
 - All-day routes that duplicate or overlap with routes on the All-Day and Peak Network.
 - Peak routes that meet both peak criteria or are above the 25 percent threshold (ridership and travel time advantage).
 - All-day routes on over-served corridors, meaning corridors in which the target service level is a lower level than what the corridor currently has.
 - All-day routes that operate on corridors in which the target service level is the same as what the corridor currently has. This worsens the deficiency between existing service and the All-Day and Peak Network service levels.
- 4. Reduce low-productivity services in areas identified as under-served. This worsens the deficiency between existing service and the All-Day and Peak Network service levels.

All of the reductions planned for June 2012 were from the Priority 1 category above (low productivity services). Service hours obtained through reductions to low-productivity service will be reinvested according to the following priorities:

1. Passenger loads
2. Schedule reliability
3. All-Day and Peak Network
4. Productivity

Service improvements planned for June 2012 fall into the first three priority categories, above.

Title VI Analysis

I. Threshold 1: Is this a Major Service Change?

Planned reinvestments for June 2012 would affect 49 existing routes. The service change will discontinue 11 routes, reduce service on 5 routes and invest additional resources in 32 routes. This project meets all criteria for major service change by Metro and FTA definitions.

II. Threshold 2: Are Minority or Low-Income Routes Affected?

Characteristics of Affected Routes

The June 2012 includes changes to 49 existing routes². Of the affected routes:

² One route - Route 309 - was unclassified, because it had not yet been implemented in Fall 2010, the most recent service change for which route classification information was available as of the publication of this report.

June 2012 Service Reinvestments
 Title VI Analysis

- 18 are minority AND low-income routes
- 10 are minority routes only
- 10 are low-income routes only
- 10 are neither minority OR low-income routes

III. Threshold 3: Is there a Disproportionate Impact on Minority or Low-Income Routes?

The determination as to whether the proposed reductions would have a disproportionate impact was made by calculating the percentage of service hours invested in low-income and minority routes before and after the June 2012 service change. If the proportion of service hours invested in either low income or minority routes increases or stays the same following the June 2012 service change, then the proposed reductions would not have a disproportionate impact.

Results of the analysis are summarized below. This analysis indicates that the proposed reductions will not have a disproportionate impact on minority or low-income routes.

| Baseline System Data (October 2011) | |
|--|-----------|
| System Annual Hours | 3,522,545 |
| Existing Hours on Minority Routes | 1,807,800 |
| Percent of System | 51.3% |
| Existing Hours on Low-Income Routes | 1,805,631 |
| Percent of System | 51.3% |

| System After June 2012 Reinvestments | |
|---|-----------|
| System Annual Hours | 3,516,345 |
| Hours on Minority Routes | 1,805,100 |
| Percent of System | 51.3% |
| Hours on Low-Income Routes | 1,811,575 |
| Percent of System | 51.5% |

June 2012 Service Reinvestments
Title VI Analysis

The following tables summarize the change in service hours by service change category and Title VI category.

Service on Low-Income vs. Non Low-Income Routes

| | Low Income Routes | Non-Low Income Routes | Total |
|--|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| Annual Service Hours – October 2011 | 1,805,631 | 1,716,914 | 3,522,545 |
| Percent of Total Hours – October 2011 | 51.3% | 48.7% | 100% |
| Proposed Changes – June 2012 | | | |
| Service Reductions | -19,000 | -22,544 | -41,544 |
| On-Time Performance Improvement | 7,500 | 7,500 | 15,000 |
| Standing Load Relief | 4,900 | 3,100 | 8,000 |
| Underserved Corridor | 11,000 | | 11,000 |
| Route Extension | 1,544 | | 1,544 |
| Total Hours Change | 5,944 | -11,944 | -6,000 |
| Percent Change | 0.3% | -0.7% | -0.2% |
| Est. 2012 June Hours | 1,811,575 | 1,704,970 | 3,516,545 |
| Percent of Total Hours | 51.5% | 48.5% | 100% |

Service on Minority vs. Non Minority Routes

| | Minority Routes | Non-Minority Routes | Total |
|--|------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| Annual Service Hours – October 2011 | 1,807,800 | 1,714,746 | 3,522,545 |
| Percent of Total Hours – October 2011 | 51.3% | 48.7% | 100% |
| Proposed Changes – June 2012 | | | |
| Service Reductions | -28,144 | -13,400 | -41,544 |
| On-Time Performance Improvement | 7,900 | 7,100 | 15,000 |
| Standing Load Relief | 5,000 | 3,000 | 8,000 |
| Underserved Corridor | 11,000 | | 11,000 |
| Route Extension | 1,544 | | 1,544 |
| Hours Change | -2,700 | -3,300 | -6,000 |
| Percent Change | -0.1% | -0.2% | -0.2% |
| Est. 2012 June Hours | 1,805,100 | 1,711,446 | 3,516,545 |
| Percent of Total Hours | 51.3% | 48.7% | 100% |

Appendix A: Routes and Estimated Hours of June 2012 Service Change By Low Income and Minority Category

Appendix A: Routes and Estimated Hours of June 2012 Service Change By Low Income and Minority Category

| Low Income Routes Impacted in Proposed June 2012 Changes | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| Route | Between | Proposed Change | Est. Hours |
| 25 | Laurelhurst and Seattle CBD | Service Reduction | -4,000 |
| 99 | International District and Waterfront | Service Reduction | -5,800 |
| 119 | Vashon Island | Service Reduction | -900 |
| 129 | Riverton Heights and Tukwila | Service Reduction | -1,400 |
| 139 | Burien and Highline Community Hospital | Service Reduction | -500 |
| 162 | Kent and Seattle CBD | Service Reduction | -2,200 |
| 175 | W Federal Way and Seattle CBD | Service Reduction | -3,600 |
| 600EX | South Base and Seattle CBD | Service Reduction | -600 |
| 177 | Federal Way and Seattle CBD | Route Extension | 1,544 |
| 180 | Burien and Auburn | Underserved corridor | 11,000 |
| 7 | Rainier Beach and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 1,200 |
| 8 | Rainier Beach and Queen Anne | On-time performance improvement | 1,600 |
| 24 | Magnolia and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 200 |
| 27 | Colman Park and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 300 |
| 43 | University District and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 100 |
| 48S | Mount Baker and University District | On-time performance improvement | 400 |
| 49 | University District and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 700 |
| 60 | Broadway and White Center | On-time performance improvement | 1,400 |
| 106 | Renton and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 300 |
| 120 | Burien and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 200 |
| 124 | SeaTac and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 100 |
| 166 | Des Moines and Kent | On-time performance improvement | 400 |
| 169 | Renton and Kent | On-time performance improvement | 600 |
| 1 | Queen Anne Hill and Seattle CBD | Standing load relief | 300 |
| 8 | Rainier Beach and Queen Anne | Standing load relief | 500 |
| 9EX | Rainier Beach and Capitol Hill | Standing load relief | 400 |
| 41 | Northgate and Seattle CBD | Standing load relief | 400 |
| 73 | Jackson Park and Seattle CBD | Standing load relief | 1,900 |
| 169 | Renton and Kent | Standing load relief | 500 |
| 372EX | U District and Woodinville | Standing load relief | 900 |

Appendix A: Routes and Estimated Hours of June 2012 Service Change By Low Income and Minority Category
 June 2012 Service Reinvestments
 Title VI Analysis

| Non-Low Income Routes Impacted in Proposed June 2012 Changes | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| Route | Between | Proposed Change | Est. Hours |
| 38 | Beacon Hill and Mount Baker | Service Reduction | -2,100 |
| 42 | Pioneer Square and Columbia City | Service Reduction | -2,100 |
| 79EX | Lake City and Seattle CBD | Service Reduction | -2,700 |
| 196 | S Federal Way and Seattle CBD | Service Reduction | -5,944 |
| 219 | Newcastle and Factoria | Service Reduction | -2,400 |
| 912 | Enumclaw and Covington | Service Reduction | -1,900 |
| 925 | Newcastle and Factoria | Service Reduction | -2,600 |
| 935 | Kenmore and Totem Lake | Service Reduction | -2,800 |
| 5 | Greenwood and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 500 |
| 16 | Northgate and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 3,100 |
| 21 | Arbor Heights and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 700 |
| 31 | Magnolia and U District | On-time performance improvement | 200 |
| 33 | Magnolia and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 100 |
| 39 | Rainier Beach and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 900 |
| 57 | Alaska Junction and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 300 |
| 128 | South Center and Admiral District | On-time performance improvement | 1,400 |
| 205EX | Mercer Island and U District | On-time performance improvement | 100 |
| 309EX | Kenmore and First Hill | On-time performance improvement | 200 |
| 36 | Othello station and Seattle CBD | Standing load relief | 300 |
| 44 | Ballard and University District | Standing load relief | 1,300 |
| 128 | South Center and Admiral District | Standing load relief | 1,000 |
| 218 | Issaquah Highlands P&R and Seattle CBD | Standing load relief | 500 |

June 2012 Service Reinvestments
Title VI Analysis

| Minority Routes Impacted in Proposed June 2012 Changes | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| Route | Between | Proposed Change | Est. Hours |
| 38 | Beacon Hill and Mount Baker | Service Reduction | -2100 |
| 42 | Pioneer Square and Columbia City | Service Reduction | -2100 |
| 99 | International District and Waterfront | Service Reduction | -5,800 |
| 129 | Riverton Heights and Tukwila | Service Reduction | -1,400 |
| 162 | Kent and Seattle CBD | Service Reduction | -2,200 |
| 175 | W Federal Way and Seattle CBD | Service Reduction | -3,600 |
| 196 | S Federal Way and Seattle CBD | Service Reduction | -5944 |
| 219 | Newcastle and Factoria | Service Reduction | -2400 |
| 925 | Newcastle and Factoria | Service Reduction | -2600 |
| 177 | Federal Way and Seattle CBD | Route Extension | 1,544 |
| 180 | Burien and Auburn | Underserved corridor | 11,000 |
| 7 | Rainier Beach and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 1,200 |
| 21 | Arbor Heights and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 700 |
| 27 | Colman Park and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 300 |
| 39 | Rainier Beach and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 900 |
| 48S | Mount Baker and University District | On-time performance improvement | 400 |
| 60 | Broadway and White Center | On-time performance improvement | 1,400 |
| 106 | Renton and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 300 |
| 120 | Burien and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 200 |
| 124 | SeaTac and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 100 |
| 128 | South Center and Admiral District | On-time performance improvement | 1,400 |
| 166 | Des Moines and Kent | On-time performance improvement | 400 |
| 169 | Renton and Kent | On-time performance improvement | 600 |
| 9EX | Rainier Beach and Capitol Hill | Standing load relief | 400 |
| 36 | Othello station and Seattle CBD | Standing load relief | 300 |
| 41 | Northgate and Seattle CBD | Standing load relief | 400 |
| 73 | Jackson Park and Seattle CBD | Standing load relief | 1,900 |
| 128 | South Center and Admiral District | Standing load relief | 1,000 |
| 169 | Renton and Kent | Standing load relief | 500 |
| 218 | Issaquah Highlands P&R and Seattle CBD | Standing load relief | 500 |

June 2012 Service Reinvestments
Title VI Analysis

| Non-Minority Routes Impacted in Proposed June 2012 Changes | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| Route | Between | Proposed Change | Est. Hours |
| 25 | Laurelhurst and Seattle CBD | Service Reduction | -4,000 |
| 79EX | Lake City and Seattle CBD | Service Reduction | -2,700 |
| 119 | Vashon Island | Service Reduction | -900 |
| 600EX | South Base and Seattle CBD | Service Reduction | -600 |
| 935 | Kenmore and Totem Lake | Service Reduction | -2,800 |
| 912 | Enumclaw and Covington | Service Reduction | -1,900 |
| 139 | Burien and Highline Community Hospital | Service Reduction | -500 |
| 5 | Greenwood and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 500 |
| 8 | Rainier Beach and Queen Anne | On-time performance improvement | 1,600 |
| 16 | Northgate and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 3,100 |
| 24 | Magnolia and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 200 |
| 31 | Magnolia and U District | On-time performance improvement | 200 |
| 33 | Magnolia and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 100 |
| 43 | University District and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 100 |
| 49 | University District and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 700 |
| 57 | Alaska Junction and Seattle CBD | On-time performance improvement | 300 |
| 205EX | Mercer Island and U District | On-time performance improvement | 100 |
| 309EX | Kenmore and First Hill | On-time performance improvement | 200 |
| 1 | Queen Anne Hill and Seattle CBD | Standing load relief | 300 |
| 8 | Rainier Beach and Queen Anne | Standing load relief | 500 |
| 44 | Ballard and University District | Standing load relief | 1,300 |
| 372EX | U District and Woodinville | Standing load relief | 900 |

Appendix G-2
Fall 2012 Service Change Title VI Evaluation
(includes RapidRide C and D)

Fall 2012 Service Change

Title VI Evaluation

Spring 2012



Introduction

King County Metro Transit (“Metro”) is proposing changes to existing bus routes serving the Cities of Burien, Des Moines, Kent, Normandy Park, SeaTac, Seattle, Shoreline and Tukwila. Metro is proposing these changes to integrate with new service provided on two new *RapidRide* lines: the C Line between Westwood Village and Downtown Seattle via Fauntleroy and Alaska Junction, and the D Line between Crown Hill and Downtown Seattle via Ballard, Interbay and Uptown/Seattle Center West. Both *RapidRide* lines will provide frequent service, all-day seven days-per-week. In response to this new service, Metro is proposing changes to bus routes that would increase, reduce or eliminate bus service in the service change area. Additional changes are proposed to routes serving Downtown Seattle in order to improve transit flow on the 3rd Avenue transit spine. The proposed changes would be implemented as part of the Fall 2012 service change. This document includes analysis of the impact of proposed changes on minority and low-income populations in the service change area, including the impact of administrative changes planned for the Fall 2012 service change, conducted pursuant to the Federal Transit Administration’s Circular FTA C 4702.1A (May 13, 2007).

Metro’s strategic plan aligns public transportation activities with the goals, objectives and strategies identified in the County’s Strategic Plan. The proposed changes reflect the significance of King County’s adopted values for the transit system – to emphasize productivity, to ensure social equity and to provide geographic value.

The service change proposal for Fall 2012 was developed using King County Metro’s Strategic Plan for Public Transportation 2011-2021 and associated service guidelines. In developing the proposal, Metro used all elements of the guidelines, including service allocation, performance management, service design and use and implementation. The changes proposed for Fall 2012 fit within Metro’s definition of a service restructure, defined as changes to multiple routes along a corridor or within an area, including serving new corridors. The service guidelines identify key reasons that trigger consideration of a restructure, including the following: Sound Transit or Metro investments, corridors above or below target service levels, services competing for the same riders, mismatches between service and ridership, major transportation network changes and major development or land use changes. Metro is proposing this restructure primarily in response to the expansion in service on the RapidRide C and D Lines; however, specific elements of the restructure also respond to the other identified triggers.

In addition to the service design criteria applicable to service in general, the service guidelines provide specific guidance related to service restructures including the following:

- Under all circumstances, whether adding, reducing or maintaining service hours invested, service restructures shall have a goal to focus service frequency on the highest ridership and productivity segments of restructured services, to create convenient opportunities for transfer connections between services and to match service capacity to ridership demand to improve productivity and cost-effectiveness of service.
- In managing the transit system, service restructures shall have a goal of increasing ridership.
- Under service reduction conditions service restructures shall have an added goal of resulting in an overall net reduction of service hours invested.

- Under service addition conditions, service restructures shall have added goals of increasing service levels and ridership.

When one or more key reasons trigger consideration of restructures, Metro specifically analyzes:

- Impacts on current and future travel patterns served by similarly aligned transit services;
- Passenger capacity of the candidate primary route(s) relative to projected consolidated ridership; and
- The cost of added service in the primary corridor to meet projected ridership demand relative to cost savings from reductions of other services.

Restructures are designed to reflect the following:

- Service levels that accommodate projected loads at no more than 80 percent of established loading guidelines.
- When transfers are required as a result of restructures, the resulting service is designed for convenient transfers and travel time penalties for transfers should be minimized.
- A maximum walk distance goal of ¼ mile in corridors where service is not primarily oriented to freeway or limited-access roadways. Consideration for exceeding this goal may be given where the walking environment is pedestrian-supportive.

Based on these considerations, Metro recommends specific restructures that have compatibility of trips, capacity on the consolidated services to meet anticipated demand and that achieve measurable savings relative to the magnitude of necessary or desired change.

As stated above, the majority of routing and service level changes proposed for Fall 2012 are in direct response to the start-up of service on the RapidRide C and D Lines. The RapidRide C and D Lines will provide high quality frequent transit service between Ballard, Uptown and West Seattle via downtown Seattle. To implement the C and D Lines without making other changes to integrate RapidRide into the network would have resulted in significant duplication of service and poor cost effectiveness, contrary to the aforementioned service restructure guidelines, as well as Metro's service design guidelines. In addition to the changes proposed to integrate RapidRide into the transit network, other proposed changes were designed to increase overall ridership and cost effectiveness by reinvesting hours from poorly performing services according to the priorities identified in the service guidelines. In this way, the proposed service restructure developed using Metro's service guidelines will result in changes that meet a substantial need that is in the public interest.

I. Service Change Area & Routes

Affected Areas

The majority of changes are proposed in areas surrounding the C and D lines, or served by routes that connect with the C and D lines. Proposed changes affect areas located in the following jurisdictions: Burien, Des Moines, Kent, Normandy Park, SeaTac, Seattle, Shoreline and Tukwila. The project area includes 154 census tracts with 708,600 residents (Source: U.S. Census, 2010).

Affected Routes

Metro provides over 1.1 million annual hours of bus service on routes with changes proposed as part of the Fall 2012 service change. These routes averaged over 39 million annual rides based on Spring 2011 ridership data, and include three of the busiest routes in the entire Metro system: Routes 5, 15 and 120. Ridership data by route is shown in Table 1 for affected routes, including routes identified in the Fall 2012 service change ordinance, as well as routes subject to administrative changes in Fall 2012

Table 1: Average daily ridership on affected routes, Spring 2011

| Route | Between | Average Daily Ridership | | |
|-------|--|-------------------------|----------|--------|
| | | Weekday | Saturday | Sunday |
| 1 | Queen Anne Hill and Seattle CBD | 3,700 | 2,140 | 2,500 |
| 2NEX | Queen Anne Hill and Seattle CBD | 800 | 0 | 0 |
| 3N | N Queen Anne Hill and Seattle CBD | 2,470 | 1,370 | 0 |
| 4N | E Queen Anne Hill and Seattle CBD | 2,820 | 1,790 | 1,360 |
| 5 | Shoreline, Northgate and Seattle CBD | 6,640 | 5,010 | 2,960 |
| 10 | Capitol Hill and Seattle CBD | 4,680 | 2,520 | 990 |
| 11 | Madison Park and Seattle CBD | 3,400 | 1,580 | 1,260 |
| 12 | Capitol Hill and Seattle CBD | 4,110 | 1,540 | 590 |
| 14N | Summit and Seattle CBD | 1,260 | 740 | 460 |
| 14S | Mount Baker and Seattle CBD | 2,660 | 1,560 | 920 |
| 15 | Blue Ridge and Seattle CBD via Ballard and Uptown | 6,760 | 3,970 | 2,950 |
| 17 | Loyal Heights and Seattle CBD via Ballard and South Lake Union | 2,450 | 1,670 | 1,020 |
| 17EX | Loyal Heights and Seattle CBD via Ballard | 550 | 0 | 0 |
| 18 | N Beach and Seattle CBD via Ballard and Uptown | 4,890 | 3,810 | 2,790 |
| 19 | West Magnolia and Seattle CBD | 250 | | |
| 21 | Arbor Heights and Seattle CBD via 35th Ave SE and 4th Ave S | 1,760 | 1,180 | 1,080 |
| 21EX | Arbor Heights and Seattle CBD | 950 | 0 | 0 |
| 22 | White Center and Seattle CBD via Alaska Junction and SODO | 1,430 | 890 | 440 |
| 23 | White Center and Seattle CBD | 1,820 | 1,230 | 930 |
| 24 | Magnolia and Seattle CBD | 2,150 | 1,330 | 1,070 |
| 26 | East Green Lake and Seattle CBD via Wallingford and Fremont | 3,350 | 2,280 | 1,630 |
| 27 | Colman Park and Seattle CBD | 1,390 | 950 | 570 |
| 28 | Broadview and Seattle CBD via Fremont | 3,820 | 2,660 | 1,830 |
| 30 | Sand Point and Uptown via U District and Fremont | 3,010 | 2,170 | 1,760 |
| 31 | Magnolia and U District via Fremont | 1,480 | 610 | |
| 33 | Magnolia and Seattle CBD | 1,750 | 630 | 410 |
| 34EX | Seward Park and Seattle CBD | 170 | 0 | 0 |
| 35 | Harbor Island and Seattle CBD | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| 36 | Othello Station and Seattle CBD via Beacon Hill and International District | 9,360 | 5,930 | 5,100 |
| 37EX | Alaska Junction and Seattle CBD via Alki | 280 | 0 | 0 |

| Route | Between | Average Daily Ridership | | |
|-------|--|-------------------------|----------|--------|
| | | Weekday | Saturday | Sunday |
| 39 | Rainier Beach and Seattle CBD via Seward Park and Beacon Hill | 1,340 | 590 | 400 |
| 45EX | Queen Anne and U District | 140 | 0 | 0 |
| 46 | Shilshole and University District via Ballard and Fremont | 250 | 0 | 0 |
| 51 | Alaska Junction and Admiral District | 340 | 160 | 100 |
| 53 | Alaska Junction and Alki | 110 | 0 | 0 |
| 54 | White Center and Seattle CBD via Fautleroy and Alaska Junction | 4,170 | 2,410 | 1,910 |
| 55 | Admiral District and Seattle CBD via Alaska Junction | 2,090 | 1,070 | 770 |
| 56 | Alki and Seattle CBD via Admiral Junction | 850 | 920 | 510 |
| 57 | Alaska Junction and Seattle CBD via Admiral | 260 | 0 | 0 |
| 60 | Broadway and White Center via Georgetown and Beacon Hill | 4,320 | 1,890 | 1,420 |
| 75 | Ballard and U District via Northgate | 6,270 | 3,180 | 2,360 |
| 81 | Owl: Seattle CBD and Loyal Heights via Ballard | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| 85 | Owl: Seattle CBD and White Center via West Seattle | 70 | 80 | 40 |
| 116EX | Fautleroy and Seattle CBD | 280 | 0 | 0 |
| 120 | Burien and Seattle CBD via White Center and Delridge | 7,040 | 4,690 | 3,320 |
| 121 | Des Moines and Seattle CBD via Burien | 1,000 | 0 | 0 |
| 123EX | Burien and Seattle CBD | 210 | 0 | 0 |
| 124 | SeaTac and Seattle CBD via SODO | 3,510 | 2,080 | 1,510 |
| 125 | Shorewood and Seattle CBD via SSCC | 2,320 | 910 | 730 |
| 128 | South Center and Admiral District via White Center | 3,700 | 2,320 | 1,080 |
| 131 | Midway/Des Moines and Seattle CBD | 1,160 | 1,130 | 770 |
| 132 | Midway/Des Moines and Seattle CBD | 2,040 | 1,230 | 800 |
| 133 | University District and Burien | 230 | 0 | 0 |
| 134 | Burien and Seattle CBD via Georgetown | 180 | 0 | 0 |
| 156 | Tukwila and SeaTac | 440 | 180 | 200 |
| 166 | Des Moines and Kent | 2,050 | 1,360 | 760 |
| 169 | Kent and Renton via Kent East Hill | 3,160 | 2,120 | 1,910 |

II. Threshold 1: Is this a Major Service Change? YES

For the purposes of complying with FTAC4702.1A, Chapter V.4, Metro defines any change in service as “major” if King County Council approval of the change is required pursuant to KCC28.94.020.

The September 2012 service change affects over 50 existing routes and will create five new routes, including the C and D Lines. Seventeen routes are proposed for discontinuation, service will be eliminated on 28 segments of current routes, and service level changes will affect 18 routes. This project meets all criteria for major service change by Metro and FTA definitions.

Appendix B lists the specific routes and route segments being affected by the Fall 2012 service change.

III. Threshold 2: Are Minority or Low-Income Tracts Affected? YES

Characteristics of Service Area

Metro classifies census tracts as minority tracts if the percentage of the population classified as minority within a tract is greater than the percentage for the County as a whole. Based on Census 2010 data, 35.2 percent of the countywide population is classified as minority. Similarly, Metro classifies census tracts as low-income tracts if the percentage of the population classified as low-income within a tract is greater than the percentage for the County as a whole. Based on the American Community Survey five-year average for 2005-2009, 9.7 percent of the countywide population is classified as low-income.

The September 2012 service change includes changes to routes serving 154 census tracts in King County. Of the affected census tracts:

- 56 are minority AND low-income tracts
- 19 are minority tracts only
- 25 are low-income tracts only
- 54 are neither minority OR low-income tracts

75 of 154 tracts are minority tracts; 81 of 154 tracts are low-income tracts.

IV. Threshold 3: Is there a Disproportionate Impact on Minority or Low-Income Tracts? NO

As summarized in Table 2, the proposed Fall 2012 service change will not have a disproportionate impact on minority and low-income populations. Four percent of the minority tracts affected by the service change will have a decrease in service of 25 percent or more, compared to 3.8 percent of the affected non-minority tracts. Of the low-income tracts affected, 2.5 percent will experience a 25 percent or greater service decrease, compared with 5.5 percent of non low-income tracts. A greater percentage of affected non-minority (8.9%) than minority (5.3%) tracts will see service increases of 25 percent or more. Similarly, a slightly greater percentage of non low-income tracts (8.2%) will see service increases of 25 percent or more than low-income tracts (6.2%). However, the average percentage change in service will be the same for minority and non-minority tracts (1.2%), while low-income tracts will see higher average growth in service (1.7%) than non low-income tracts (0.6%).

Table 2. Summary of Change by Census Tract Group

| Census Tract Group | # of tracts affected | # tracts with > 25% decrease | % affected tracts with > 25% decrease | # tracts with > 25% increase | % affected tracts with > 25% increase | Avg % change in service |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|--|---|--------------------------------|
| Minority | 75 | 3 | 4.0% | 4 | 5.3% | 1.2% |
| Non-minority | 79 | 3 | 3.8% | 7 | 8.9% | 1.2% |
| Low-income | 81 | 2 | 2.5% | 5 | 6.2% | 1.7% |
| Non low-income | 73 | 4 | 5.5% | 6 | 8.2% | 0.6% |

Service Reductions

The percentage change in weekly bus trips was calculated for each census tract within the project area. The number of bus trips was tabulated by identifying the census tracts served by each route or route variant before and after the proposed changes, then summing the number of bus trips provided on the routes serving each tract before and after the proposed changes. A route or route variant was considered to serve a tract if it serves or will serve at least one bus stop located within the tract.

The Fall 2012 service change will not result in more than a 25% decrease in bus service in the project area as a whole; the total annual service hours invested in the affected routes will increase by less than three percent. Most changes are being made through redeployment of existing resources. However, the changes result in a more than 25% decrease in bus service in six census tracts, and these tracts are analyzed further within this report.

Of the six tracts with more than a 25% decrease in service:

- 2 are minority AND low-income tracts
- 1 is a minority tract only
- 0 are low-income tracts only
- 3 are neither minority NOR low-income tracts

3 of 6 tracts are minority tracts; 2 of 6 are low-income tracts.

Table 3 below identifies the percentage change in the number of bus trips per week in each tract where there would be a reduction of 25% or more.

Table 3: Tracts with Significant (>25%) Service Reductions

| Tract | Area | Minority | Low Income | Bus Trips Before (Weekly) | Bus Trips After (Weekly) | Percent Difference |
|--------|----------------------------|----------|------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| All | Within entire project area | n/a | n/a | 3,967 (avg all tracts) | 3,902 (avg all tracts) | n/a |
| 268.01 | White Center | Yes | Yes | 2,772 | 1,880 | -32% |
| 265 | White Center | Yes | Yes | 4,072 | 2,503 | -39% |
| 113 | White Center/Highland Park | Yes | No | 3,977 | 2,867 | -28% |
| 121 | Arbor Heights | No | No | 639 | 290 | -55% |
| 98 | North Admiral/Genesee | No | No | 1,863 | 1,271 | -32% |
| 5 | Broadview | No | No | 554 | 80 | -86% |

As indicated in Table 3, all tracts where service will decrease by 25% or more will continue to be served by Metro Transit. These figures include a calculation of reduced bus trips even when the bus trips are operated on a street which is the boundary line for the census tract and where today's bus trips are within ¼ mile walk access of a small proportion of the census tract residents. Specific impacts and service alternatives for each of these tracts is described in detail below and in Appendix B.

White Center and Highland Park

Tract 268.01 - Minority and Low Income

Tract 265 - Minority and Low Income

Tract 113 - Minority

Figure 1 shows the routes serving White Center and Highland Park before and after the proposed changes. Currently, 12 peak or all-day routes operate within these census tracts and provide 4,370 weekly bus trips. At stops within the census tracts, 3,920 daily riders board Metro service on an average weekday, 15 percent of the total boardings on these routes. Within White Center and Highland Park, Metro will be eliminating all-day transit service on two street segments. The first is a 0.4-mile segment of SW Henderson Street between Delridge Way SW and 16th Avenue SW, where four bus stops attracted 69 boardings per day on Routes 23 in Spring 2011, three percent of the total boardings on Route 23. Alternative all-day service will be available on Delridge Way SW and 16th Avenue SW, within ¼-mile of affected stops on SW Henderson Street. The second is a 0.4-mile segment of 4th Avenue SW between SW 102nd Street and SW Roxbury Street, where five bus stops attracted 14 boardings per day in Spring 2011 on Routes 131 and 134, less than one percent of total boardings on the route. Alternative all-day service will be available on SW 102nd Street, 8th Avenue SW and SW Roxbury Street, within ¼ mile of affected stops on 4th Avenue SW.

White Center and Highland Park will continue to be served by Route 131, which will be improved to operate every 20-30 minutes during peak periods and every 30 minutes during off-peak time periods, seven days-per-week. In addition, Route 128 will continue to serve these areas and will have improved span and frequency during evening hours. Other routes that will continue to serve these areas with little or no change in the level of service include Routes 60, 113 and 120. Routes 60, 120 and 125 will be revised to connect to Westwood Village, a retail shopping center and a designated transit activity center that provides access to retail goods, food, and employment, and where connections to the C Line and other routes will be available. These revisions will offer low income, minority and transit dependent populations with improved access to these services.

Frequency reductions within White Center and Highland Park will occur along 16th Avenue SW, the western periphery of the identified tracts, where Routes 22, 23 54, 60, 120 and 125 operate today. The majority of the land area within the affected census tracts lies outside the ¼-mile walk area for these routes. The two routes that will operate within the interior portions of the affected tracts - Routes 128 and 131 - will receive frequency improvements in Fall 2012.

Although the total number of bus trips is decreasing, White Center and Highland Park will continue to have direct all-day service to and from the same major destinations as today, including the following: Downtown Seattle, Beacon Hill, First Hill, Capitol Hill, Georgetown, SODO, Admiral Junction, Alaska Junction, Morgan Junction, South Seattle Community College, South Park, Westwood Village, Tukwila, Burien and South Park. Two destinations with direct, all-day service to and from White Center and Highland Park today - Fauntleroy and Highline Community College - will be accessible on transit though a connection between two routes. In addition, Fauntleroy will be accessible by walking to a RapidRide C Line stop in the vicinity of Westwood Village.




Figure 1. Transit Service in White Center and Highland Park, Fall 2011 and Fall 2012 (Proposed)

Arbor Heights

Tract 121 - Neither Minority nor Low Income

Today, Arbor Heights is served by Routes 21 Local and 21 Express. Route 21 Local is being revised to terminate at Westwood Village and will no longer serve Arbor Heights. However, revised Route 22 will provide Arbor Heights with hourly service during peak and off-peak periods seven days-per-week. Route 21 Express will continue to serve Arbor Heights but will have two fewer bus trips per day. Figure 2 shows the routes serving Arbor Heights before and after the proposed changes.

Currently, two routes operate within Tract 121 and provide 640 weekly bus trips. At stops within Tract 121, 70 daily riders board Metro service on an average weekday, two percent of the total boardings on these routes. Within Tract 121, bus stops on 35th Avenue SW, 39th Avenue SW, Marine View Drive SW and SW 106th Street will continue to be served during the peak periods by Route 21 Express but will lose all off-peak and night service. The 13 bus stops along these segments attracted 20 boardings during off-peak and night periods per day in Spring 2011 on Route 21, two percent of the total boardings on the route during these time periods. On average 14 of the 20 daily riders boarding at these stops will have no alternative service within one-quarter mile of the affected stops. The closest alternative service will be Route 22 with stops between one-quarter and three-quarters of a mile away.

Although Arbor Heights will be losing direct, all-day service to Downtown Seattle and SODO, peak period service to Downtown Seattle will be maintained on Route 21 Express. In addition, all-day service to Downtown Seattle and SODO will be available via a connection between Routes 22 and Routes 21, 120 and/or the C Line at Westwood Village. New connections between Arbor Heights and the Morgan and Alaska Junctions will be provided by Route 22.




Figure 2. Transit Service in Arbor Heights, Fall 2011 and Fall 2012 (Proposed)

North Admiral/Genesee

Tract 98 - Neither Minority nor Low Income

Tract 98 is currently served by Routes 51, 55, 56 (local and express), 57, 85 and 128. Routes 51, 56 Local and 85 will be deleted, and Route 55 will be reduced to 10 peak period bus trips per weekday. New Route 50 will also serve this tract. Route 128 will continue to serve this area and will have improved span and frequency during evening hours. Route 57 will continue to serve this area and will have little or no change in service levels. Figure 3 shows the routes serving North Admiral/Genesee before and after the proposed changes.

Currently, seven peak or all-day routes operate within Tract 98. At stops within Tract 98, 1,070 daily riders board Metro service on an average weekday, 15 percent of the total boardings on these routes. Within Tract 98, all-day bus service will be eliminated on SW Hanford Street, 37th Avenue SW, SW Manning Street and 35th Avenue SW, where 11 bus stops attracted 19 boardings per day in Spring 2011 on Route 51, ten percent of the total boardings on the route. Two of the 11 stops on these street segments will have alternative service within one-quarter mile. Tract 98 will also lose off-peak and night service at four stops along SW Admiral Way that attracted 59 boardings per day in Spring 2011 on Route 56, nine percent of the total boardings on the route during these time periods. One of the four stops along this segment will have alternative service within one-quarter mile. SW Admiral Way forms the northern periphery of Tract 98, and the majority of the land area within Tracts 98 lies outside the ¼-mile walk area for routes operating on SW Admiral Way.

North Admiral/Genesee will continue to have peak period service to Downtown Seattle on Routes 55, 56 Express and 57 but will lose direct service to Downtown Seattle at other times of day. However, Downtown Seattle will be accessible during all times of day via a connection between Routes 128 and the C Line at Alaska Junction, or between Route 50 and Link Light Rail at SODO station. North Admiral/Genesee will continue to have direct all-day service to and from other major destinations, including the following: Alaska Junction, Morgan Junction, South Seattle Community College, White Center, Tukwila, and SODO.




Figure 3. Transit Service in North Admiral/Genesee, Fall 2011 and Fall 2012 (Proposed)

Broadview*Tract 5 - Neither Minority nor Low-Income*

Today, Routes 28 Local and 28 Express operate on 3rd Avenue NW, the eastern boundary of Tract 5, and on 8th Avenue NW between NW 125th and 132nd Streets. The majority of the land area within Tract 5 lies outside the ¼-mile walk area for these routes. Route 28 Express will continue to serve Broadview with no change in routing or the level of service. However, Route 28 Local will no longer operate north of NW 103rd Street and will no longer serve Broadview. Greenwood Avenue North, located approximately ¼ mile east of 3rd Avenue NW, will continue to be served by Route 5 Local. Service along this segment of Route 5 will have service improved from 30 minutes to 15 minutes during peak and off-peak hours, Monday through Saturday, representing an increase of 320 total weekly bus bus trips. Figure 4 shows the routes serving Broadview and surrounding areas before and after the proposed changes.

The 17 bus stops located within Tract 5 will continue to have peak period service to Downtown Seattle on Route 28 Express. However, no service will be provided to these stops at other times of day. At these stops, Route 28 attracted 58 daily boardings during off-peak and night periods in Spring 2011, three percent of the total boardings on the route during these time periods. With the exception of six stops located on 8th Avenue SW and NW 125th Street, stops within Tract 5 will have alternative service available within approximately ¼ mile, on Greenwood Avenue North, where Route 5 will provide all-day service to the same major destinations currently accessible on Route 28, including Fremont, South Lake Union and Downtown Seattle. At Route 5 stops on Greenwood Avenue North paralleling the Route 28 stops north of 103rd Street, there are currently 440 average weekday boardings and significantly higher residential and commercial development densities.




Figure 4. Transit Service in Broadview and surrounding areas, Fall 2011 and Fall 2012 (Proposed)

Service Additions

The Fall 2012 service change will not result in more than a 25% increase in bus service in the service area as a whole; the total annual service hours invested in the affected routes will increase by less than three percent. Most changes are being made through redeployment of existing resources. However, the changes result in a more than 25% increase in bus service in 11 census tracts, and these tracts were analyzed further.

Of the 11 tracts with more than a 25% increase in service:

- 4 are minority AND low-income tracts
- 0 are a minority tracts only
- 1 is a low-income tract only
- 6 are neither minority NOR low-income tracts

4 of 11 tracts are minority tracts; 5 of 11 are low-income tracts.

Table 3 below identifies the percentage change in the number of bus trips per week in each tract where there would be an increase of 25% or more.

Table 3: Tracts with Significant (>25%) Service Increases

| Tract | Neighborhoods | Minority | Low Income | Bus Trips Before (Weekly) | Bus Trips After (Weekly) | Percent Difference |
|--------|---|----------|------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| All | Within entire project area | n/a | n/a | 3,967 (avg all tracts) | 3,902 (avg all tracts) | n/a |
| 290.01 | Des Moines | No | No | 597 | 968 | 62% |
| 287 | Des Moines, Normandy Park | No | No | 597 | 968 | 62% |
| 286 | Des Moines, Normandy Park | No | No | 714 | 957 | 34% |
| 274 | Burien, Boulevard Park | Yes | Yes | 892 | 1,246 | 40% |
| 270 | Boulevard Park, Shorewood | Yes | Yes | 675 | 976 | 44% |
| 264 | Boulevard Park | Yes | Yes | 838 | 1,075 | 28% |
| 107.02 | Highpoint | Yes | Yes | 1,085 | 1,483 | 37% |
| 48 | Ballard/Fremont | No | No | 1,877 | 2,588 | 38% |
| 16 | Blue Ridge, Loyal Heights | No | No | 2,741 | 3,477 | 27% |
| 17.02 | Whittier Heights, Crown Hill, Greenwood | No | Yes | 3,081 | 4,646 | 51% |
| 14 | Crown Hill | No | No | 2,685 | 3,633 | 35% |

Specific impacts for each of these tracts is described in detail below and in Appendix B.

Des Moines and Normandy Park

Tract 290.01 - Neither Minority nor Low Income

Tract 287 - Neither Minority nor Low Income

Tract 286 -Neither Minority nor Low Income

Routes 131 and/or 132 currently serve these areas; however, these routes are being revised to terminate at Burien Transit Center and will no longer serve these areas. Routes 131 and 132,

which together provide two bus trips per hour during most times of day, will be replaced by Routes 156 and 166, which together will provide four bus trips per hour during most times of day. These areas will continue to be served by peak commuter Routes 121 and/or 122 with little or no change in the level of service.

Burien, Boulevard Park and Shorewood

Tract 274 - Minority and Low Income

Tract 270 - Minority and Low Income

Tract 264 - Minority and Low Income

These areas will continue to be served by the same routes as today. The overall amount of service is increasing as a result of frequency and/or span improvements on Routes 128, 131 and 132.

Highpoint

Tract 107.02 - Minority and Low Income

With the exception of Route 85, which is proposed for deletion, Highpoint would be served by the same routes as today. The overall amount of service is increasing as a result of frequency and/or span improvements on Routes 21 Local and 128.

Ballard/Fremont

Tract 48 - Neither Minority nor Low Income

The area located between Ballard and Fremont will continue to be served by Routes 28 Local, 28 Express and 44, which will have levels of service comparable to today. In addition, Route 18 is being revised to operate through this area and will provide 15-minute service for most of the day on weekdays and Saturdays. Route 46 will be deleted and will no longer serve the area.

Blue Ridge, Loyal Heights, Crown Hill, Whittier Heights and Greenwood

Tract 16 - Neither Minority nor Low Income

Tract 17.02 - Non-Minority and Low Income

Tract 14 - Neither Minority nor Low Income

These areas will continue to be served by the same routes as today, except that revised Route 18 will replace Route 75, and the D Line will replace Route 15. In addition, new Route 61 will serve the Loyal Heights neighborhood. All of these changes result in net increases in service.

VI. Alternatives

Metro considered transit alternatives for riders when developing route proposals. Service alternatives are identified in Section IV of this report for areas where service will be increased or reduced by 25% or more. A comprehensive listing of service alternatives for all changes is available in Appendix B.

VII. Mitigation

During the planning process, Metro conducted extensive public outreach in the affected communities. This outreach was designed to involve the community in decision-making and identify potential problems with ideas and plans for changing service.

Outreach was conducted in two phases. Metro asked for feedback on an initial set of service concepts during the first phase, which extended from late October 2011 through January 2012. Staff reviewed and incorporated public feedback, then returned to the public in February 2012 with a proposal. Metro staff once again reviewed and incorporated public feedback, which is reflected in further changes made to the proposal after the second round of outreach. Outreach included open houses, meetings with community groups, media outreach, email notifications, posters at bus stops, targeted mailings to community organizations and various forms of online communications and social media. The outreach effort also included elements specifically designed to solicit input from community members with limited English proficiency (LEP), including translated written information, designated phones for LEP feedback and staff presentations. King County Metro Transit produced and has available a Public Engagement Report that provides detail about this comprehensive outreach effort. The summary of that report is attached in Appendix C.

Metro made several modifications to route plans in direct response to public input on a variety of topics including routing ideas, concerns about transfers and concerns about service span. The extensive outreach allowed Metro to identify community issues and concerns and make changes where possible to mitigate any negative impacts. Examples of changes Metro made in response to public outreach include:

- Maintaining the portion of Route 2 between Queen Anne and Downtown Seattle, and maintaining Route 2 service on Spring and Seneca Streets, rather than shifting service to Madison Street
- Maintaining the portion of Route 4 between Judkins Park and Downtown Seattle
- Maintaining night service to the Summit neighborhood, currently served by Route 14
- Maintaining express service on 15th Avenue NW in Ballard (Route 15 Express)
- Maintaining Route 16 routing on Meridian Avenue North between NE 92nd Street and NE Northgate Way
- Maintaining peak service between Nickerson Street and Downtown Seattle (Revused Routes 2 Express and 17 Local)
- Maintaining all-day service to the Arbor Heights, Shorewood and Gatewood neighborhoods (Revised Route 22)
- Maintaining all-day service to the Viewmont neighborhood in Magnolia (Route 24)
- Maintaining all-day service between East Green Lake, Wallingford and Downtown Seattle (Route 26 Local)
- Maintaining all-day service to Colman Park and Yesler Way between 3rd and 12th Avenues (Route 27)
- Providing an east-west connection between North Delridge and Alaska Junction (new Route 50)
- Maintaining direct service between Downtown Seattle and 16th Avenue SW all-day on weekdays and Saturdays (Route 125)

- Maintaining all-day service on S 216th Street in Des Moines (Revised Route 156)

Metro also plans extensive outreach surrounding the implementation of changes. Metro routinely provides travel training to social service agency clients, people with disabilities and seniors. Metro will offer training for customers in affected areas and will also provide new information to customers who have worked with travel training staff in the past. Prior to implementation, Metro will work with community groups, local cities, and social service agencies to inform riders of the upcoming changes, with a special emphasis on riders with limited English proficiency. Metro has an established network of contacts in the affected communities from outreach already conducted in these areas. Around the time of service changes, Metro will have designated “street teams” of Metro staff at key locations affected by the service changes where many riders board or transfer. Street teams will provide information, assistance, and directions on how to access transit after bus routes change.


VIII. Substantial Need

The proposals for service change for Fall 2012 were developed using King County Metro’s Strategic Plan for Public Transportation 2011-2021 and associated service guidelines, adopted by King County in August 2011. The proposal further implements Ordinance 17169 in which the King County Council directed the King County Executive to use this plan and guidelines to reinvest existing service resources per the established priorities of service quality and increasing service in currently underserved corridors. The intent of the proposals is to increase overall rider use of the Metro Transit system and to serve the interests of the community by using local transit taxes and resources more cost effectively.

Metro has determined that none of the proposals under consideration would have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority and low-income riders. Significant reductions in service are limited to six out of 154 census tracts in the project area. Of the tracts with significant reductions, all-day bus service will be maintained within five of the six, and in the Broadview neighborhood, frequent all-day service will be available on Greenwood Avenue North, located approximately ¼-mile from eastern census tract boundary (3rd Avenue NW). Peak express service to Downtown Seattle will be maintained in the five tracts where it is available today. Service will increase significantly in 11 census tracts, four of which are designated minority tracts, and five of which are designated low-income.


APPENDIX A: AFFECTED AREAS AND IMPACTS

Northwest Section of Project Area



APPENDIX A: AFFECTED AREAS AND IMPACTS

Southwest Section of Project Area



APPENDIX B: SERVICE CHANGES AND ALTERNATIVES

| Service Change | Route | Segment/Area | Time of Day | Spring 2011 Weekday Rides/Day (Route Total) | Spring 2011 Weekday Rides/Day Impacted by Change | Impacts Minority Census Tracts | Impacts Low-Income Census Tracts | Alternative or replacement service within 1/4 mile |
|---------------------------|--------------|------------------------|--------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| Route elimination | 15 | Entire route | All times | 5,570 | 5,570 | No | Yes | D Line, 15EX, 18 |
| Route elimination | 23 | Entire route | All times | 1,820 | 1,820 | Yes | Yes | 131 |
| Route elimination | 34EX | Entire route | All times | 170 | 170 | Yes | Yes | 7, 7EX, 50, 106 |
| Route elimination | 35 | Entire route | All times | 20 | 20 | Yes | Yes | None |
| Route elimination | 39 | Entire route | All times | 1,340 | 1,340 | Yes | Yes | 7, 7EX, 50, Link |
| Route elimination | 45EX | Entire route | All times | 140 | 140 | Yes | Yes | 13, 31, 32 |
| Route elimination | 46 | Entire route | All times | 250 | 250 | Yes | Yes | 31, 32, 44 |
| Route elimination | 51 | Entire route | All times | 340 | 340 | No | No | 50, 55, 56EX, 57, 128 |
| Route elimination | 53 | Entire route | All times | 110 | 110 | No | Yes | 37, 773, 775, Water Taxi |
| Route elimination | 54 | Entire route | All times | 3,670 | 3,670 | Yes | Yes | C Line, 120 |
| Route elimination | 54EX | Entire route | All times | 500 | 500 | No | Yes | 116 |
| Route elimination | 56 | Entire route | All times | 850 | 850 | Yes | Yes | 50, 56EX, Link |
| Route elimination | 81 | Entire route | All times | 50 | 50 | Yes | Yes | D Line |
| Route elimination | 85 | Entire route | All times | 70 | 70 | Yes | Yes | C Line, 120 |
| Route elimination | 133 | Entire route | All times | 230 | 230 | Yes | Yes | 113, 120, 121, 122, 123, 70, 71, 72, 73 |
| Route elimination | 134 | Entire route | All times | 180 | 180 | Yes | Yes | 60, 106, 124, 131, 132 |
| Route segment elimination | 2NEX | W Raye St | All times | 800 | 70 | No | No | N/A |
| Route segment elimination | 3N | North Queen Anne | All times | 2,470 | 150 | No | No | 4N, 13, 2EX |
| Route segment elimination | 5 | Greenwood to Northgate | All times | 6,640 | 510 | Yes | Yes | 18 |
| Route segment elimination | 10 | 1st Avenue | All times | 4,680 | 690 | No | Yes | Many |
| Route segment elimination | 11 | 2nd Avenue | All times | 3,400 | 140 | No | Yes | Many |

| Service Change | Route | Segment/Area | Time of Day | Spring 2011 Weekday Rides/Day (Route Total) | Spring 2011 Weekday Rides/Day Impacted by Change | Impacts Minority Census Tracts | Impacts Low-Income Census Tracts | Alternative or replacement service within 1/4 mile |
|---------------------------|--------------|--|--------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| Route segment elimination | 12 | 1st Avenue | All times | 4,110 | 690 | No | Yes | Many |
| Route segment elimination | 14N | 3rd Avenue | All times | 1,260 | 490 | No | Yes | Many |
| Route segment elimination | 17 | Sunset Hill, Loyal Heights | All times | 2,450 | 310 | No | No | 61, 17EX, 44, 48 |
| Route segment elimination | 18 | North Beach | All times | 4,890 | 190 | No | No | 61, 18 EX |
| Route segment elimination | 18 | 15th Ave W, Uptown | All times | 4,890 | 2,220 | No | Yes | D Line, 32, 1, 2, 13 |
| Route segment elimination | 21 | Arbor Heights | All times | 1,760 | 170 | No | No | 21EX, 22 |
| Route segment elimination | 22 | 15th Ave SW/SW 107th St to 26th Ave SW/SW Roxbury St | All times | 1,430 | 270 | Yes | Yes | 21, 22, 120 |
| Route segment elimination | 22 | Alaska Junction to Downtown Seattle | All times | 1,430 | 1,130 | Yes | Yes | C Line, 50 |
| Route segment elimination | 28 | NW 103rd Street to Broadview | All times | 3,820 | 340 | Yes | Yes | 5, 28EX |
| Route segment elimination | 30 | University District to Uptown | All times | 3,010 | 1,800 | Yes | Yes | 31, 32, 18 |
| Route segment elimination | 57 | SODO | All times | 260 | 50 | Yes | Yes | 21, 50 |
| Route segment elimination | 57 | SW Spokane St | All times | 260 | 12 | Yes | Yes | 21, 50 |
| Route segment elimination | 75 | Ballard to Northgate | All times | 6,270 | 2,480 | Yes | Yes | 18 |
| Route segment elimination | 120 | Delridge Way SW between SW Roxbury St and SW Barton Pl | All times | 7,040 | 700 | Yes | Yes | 60, 120, 125 |
| Route segment elimination | 124 | E Marginal Way S/Ellis Ave S & 4th Ave S/S Holgate St | All times | 3,510 | 1,386 | Yes | Yes | 131, 132 |
| Route segment elimination | 125 | Shorewood, White Center | All times | 2,320 | 630 | Yes | Yes | 22, 113 |
| Route segment elimination | 131 | Highline CC to Burien TC | All times | 1,160 | 330 | Yes | Yes | 166 |

| Service Change | Route | Segment/Area | Time of Day | Spring 2011 Weekday Rides/Day (Route Total) | Spring 2011 Weekday Rides/Day Impacted by Change | Impacts Minority Census Tracts | Impacts Low-Income Census Tracts | Alternative or replacement service within 1/4 mile |
|---------------------------|--------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| Route segment elimination | 131 | South Park | All times | 1,160 | 260 | Yes | Yes | 60, 132 |
| Route segment elimination | 131 | Georgetown | All times | 1,160 | 120 | Yes | Yes | 60, 106, 124 |
| Route segment elimination | 131 | S Industrial Way, Airport Way S, 6th Ave S | All times | 1,160 | 180 | Yes | Yes | 124 |
| Route segment elimination | 132 | 1st Avenue S | All times | 2,040 | 270 | Yes | Yes | 131, 132 |
| Route segment elimination | 132 | Highline CC to Burien TC | All times | 2,040 | 560 | Yes | Yes | 156, 166 |
| Route segment elimination | 166 | Marine View Dr S/S 216th St & Highline CC | All times | 2,040 | 240 | Yes | Yes | 156 |
| Span adjustment (+) | 128 | Restructured route | Evenings (Mon-Sun) | 3,700 | N/A | Yes | Yes | N/A |
| Span adjustment (-) | 17 | Restructured route | Off-peak, Night | 3,700 | 1,140 | No | Yes | 18, 31, 32, 61, 44, 48 |
| Span adjustment (-) | 27 | Entire route | Weekends | 3,700 | 950 | Yes | Yes | 4S, 14S |
| Span adjustment (-) | 55 | Entire route | Off-peak, Night (Mon-Sun) | 3,700 | 870 | No | Yes | C Line, 50, 128, 775 |
| Span adjustment (-) | 125 | Restructured route | Weekday and Saturday evenings; Sunday | 3,700 | 70 | Yes | Yes | 22, 128 |
| Headway adjustment (+) | 1 | Entire route | Peak | 3,700 | 1,660 | No | Yes | N/A |
| Headway adjustment (+) | 4N | East Queen Anne | All times | 2,820 | 150 | No | No | N/A |
| Headway adjustment (+) | 5 | Greenwood to Shoreline CC | All times | 6,640 | 1,020 | Yes | Yes | N/A |
| Headway adjustment (+) | 17EX | Entire route | All times | 550 | 550 | No | Yes | N/A |
| Headway adjustment (+) | 18 | Restructured route | All times | 550 | 1,530 | Yes | Yes | N/A |

| Service Change | Route | Segment/Area | Time of Day | Spring 2011 Weekday Rides/Day (Route Total) | Spring 2011 Weekday Rides/Day Impacted by Change | Impacts Minority Census Tracts | Impacts Low-Income Census Tracts | Alternative or replacement service within 1/4 mile |
|------------------------|-------|--------------------|---|---|--|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Headway adjustment (+) | 21 | Restructured route | Weekday Peak, Off-Peak, Saturday Off-peak | 550 | 1,170 | Yes | Yes | N/A |
| Headway adjustment (+) | 21EX | Entire route | All times | 950 | 950 | Yes | Yes | N/A |
| Headway adjustment (+) | 33 | Entire route | Weekday Off-peak | 1,750 | 440 | No | Yes | N/A |
| Headway adjustment (+) | 116EX | Entire route | Peak | 280 | 280 | Yes | Yes | N/A |
| Headway adjustment (+) | 123EX | Entire route | Peak | 210 | 210 | Yes | Yes | N/A |
| Headway adjustment (+) | 128 | Restructured route | Weekend Evenings | 3,700 | 1,580 | Yes | Yes | N/A |
| Headway adjustment (+) | 131 | Restructured route | Peak, Off-Peak (Mon-Sun) | 3,700 | 350 | Yes | Yes | N/A |
| Headway adjustment (+) | 132 | Restructured route | Peak, Off-Peak (Mon-Sun) | 3,700 | 1,060 | Yes | Yes | N/A |
| Headway adjustment (-) | 1 | Entire route | Weekday Off-peak | 3,700 | 1,610 | No | Yes | N/A |
| Headway adjustment (-) | 14S | Mount Baker | Evening | 2,660 | 20 | Yes | No | Restructured 14S |
| Headway adjustment (-) | 15EX | Entire route | All times | 1,190 | 1,190 | No | Yes | N/A |
| Headway adjustment (-) | 17 | Restructured route | Peak | 1,190 | 1,180 | No | Yes | N/A |
| Headway adjustment (-) | 22 | Restructured route | Peak, Off-Peak (Mon-Sun) | 1,190 | 600 | Yes | Yes | N/A |
| Headway adjustment (-) | 27 | Entire route | Weekends | 1,390 | 950 | Yes | Yes | N/A |
| Headway adjustment (-) | 37EX | Entire route | Peak | 280 | 280 | Yes | Yes | N/A |
| Headway adjustment (-) | 55 | Entire route | Peak | 2,090 | 1,220 | No | Yes | N/A |
| Headway adjustment (-) | 57 | Entire route | Peak | 260 | 260 | Yes | Yes | N/A |

| Service Change | Route | Segment/Area | Time of Day | Spring 2011 Weekday Rides/Day (Route Total) | Spring 2011 Weekday Rides/Day Impacted by Change | Impacts Minority Census Tracts | Impacts Low-Income Census Tracts | Alternative or replacement service within 1/4 mile |
|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| Headway adjustment (-) | 121 | Burien TC to Downtown Seattle | Peak | 1,000 | 680 | Yes | Yes | N/A |
| Headway adjustment (-) | 125 | Restructured route | Weekday Peak and Evening; Saturday | 1,000 | 2,320 | Yes | Yes | N/A |
| Route extension | 2NEX | Restructured route | All times | 800 | N/A | No | No | N/A |
| Route extension | 60 | Restructured route | All times | 4,320 | N/A | Yes | Yes | N/A |
| Route extension | 156 | Restructured route | All times | 440 | N/A | Yes | Yes | N/A |
| Route extension | 166 | Restructured route | All times | 2,050 | N/A | Yes | Yes | N/A |

Notes:

1. Ridership categories are not additive; some routes are listed more than once
2. Segment ridership is the maximum number of boardings or alightings by direction, except for mid-route segments, where riders is the total boardings and alightings in both directions.
3. Affected ridership for frequency and span adjustments is estimated using APC data for affected time periods, but is not exact.

APPENDIX C: PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT REPORTS – Executive Summary

SEPTEMBER 2012 SERVICE CHANGES PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT REPORT

Executive Summary

Metro Transit is proposing to change bus service on approximately 50 routes in September 2012 to complement the start of RapidRide C and D line service and offset slower boarding times in downtown Seattle due to the elimination of the Ride Free Area. These changes are intended to create a more efficient system through the application of Metro Transit's newly adopted service guidelines and the goals laid out in the Strategic Plan for Public Transportation, 2011-2021.

In preparation for these changes, KCDOT Communications (Communications) and Transit conducted a four-month, two-phase community engagement process to gather feedback. The project area for this effort extended from Shoreline to Des Moines and touched almost every neighborhood in the City of Seattle. Nearly 10,000 people took the time to share their ideas and concerns about this service planning effort, representing 8 percent of the average daily ridership on the affected routes.

Following is a summary of the engagement efforts for the two phases.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT FOR PHASE 1

The first phase of engagement was conducted from late October 2011 and continued through January, 2012. During this period staff heard from nearly 5,000 people--1,200+ people at the open houses, presentations and information tables, and an additional 3,600+ community members via the online survey, phone line, 'Have a Say' email account, and meeting feedback forms. Staff also measured 32,502 total visits to the project website, 14,728 of which were from separate individuals (unique visits).

Following the first phase of community engagement, Metro identified several common concerns, ideas and suggestions from riders for revising the first round of service change concepts. More than 50 percent of the initial concepts were updated in preparation for the second phase of engagement.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT FOR PHASE 2

The second phase of engagement was February 1-29, 2012. During this period staff again heard from nearly 5,000 people--1,500+ people at the open houses, presentations and information tables, and an additional 3,300+ community members via the online survey, phone line, and 'Have a Say' email account. Staff also measured 12,553 total visits to the project website, 7,765 of which were from separate individuals (unique visits).

SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

Following are some key findings from the two phases of community engagement:

- Survey respondents indicated concern about transit access being further away;
- Respondents expressed concern about having to transfer more than they do currently;
- Respondents in Ballard and Fremont indicated support for a direct connection between the two neighborhoods;
- Respondents in South Park and the Delridge neighborhoods indicated support for improved connectivity to regional shopping centers such as Westwood Village; and
- The sum total of respondents indicated support for improved east-west connectivity, such as proposals for increased frequency of service between Interbay and the University District and a direct connection between West Seattle and the Rainier Valley.

SEPTEMBER 2012 SERVICE CHANGES PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT REPORT

Community Engagement Plan & Activities

The Strategic Plan for Public Transportation establishes the following goals for Metro Transit's outreach and engagement:

- Build capacity to engage all communities in a manner that promotes and fosters trust.
- Empower people to play an active role in shaping Metro's products and services.
- Involve the public early in any planning process and offer opportunities for ongoing involvement.
- Support community-based solutions to problems.
- Be responsive and accountable to the public.
- Explore innovative ways to report to and inform the public.
- Increase customer and public access to understandable, accurate and transparent information.



Community engagement plans for both phases of the September 2012 service planning effort utilized a set of strategies and tools designed to achieve these goals. The intention was to strengthen the relationship with the community by being transparent about the decision-making process, keeping people informed of their opportunities to engage, and reflecting back what we heard on a regular basis using communication tools such as the 'Have a Say' blog and Facebook page.

'HAVE A SAY'

Communications used the 'Have a Say' graphic identity to establish a framework for the engagement efforts, from the website to meeting materials, to bus posters. This overall identity helps to build public awareness about opportunities to engage in Metro Transit's ongoing planning efforts. Via this new online engagement portal, community members weigh in on projects and track their progress through the decision-making process. At the open houses, the public can engage in conversation and dialogue about their own views while deepening their understanding of other's views at the 'Have a Say' stations.



Communications also built in multiple feedback loops for the engagement process in order to be responsive and accountable to community needs. The surveys for Phases 1 and 2 provided space for people to give feedback on the engagement process. More than 1,200 people took the time to share their thoughts and ideas. Many of these ideas helped shape the outreach efforts for Phase 2, such as creating neighborhood packets of proposed changes, adding a Tweet-up to the meeting schedule, posting notices at bus shelters, and sending out Transit Alerts to remind people of open houses.

NOTIFICATIONS

Due to financial constraints, Communications was unable to send out mailings to every affected household. However, we recognize the importance of reaching people that don't have readily available access to computers. In lieu of a direct mailing, Communications devised a notification process that

One survey respondent said, "Good job, I was contacted in several different ways. The bus placards are particularly effective for awareness, but the email contacts got me to fill out the forms once I was aware."

Another person commented, "The multiple efforts to keep the community informed and involved is much appreciated. Thank you."


SEPTEMBER 2012 SERVICE CHANGES PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT REPORT

reached people where they interact directly with Metro and leveraged the communication channels and relationships that already exist in the community. The goal was to reach a representative sample of the bus riding population on the affected routes.

Direct notification was designed to reach bus riders where they interface with Metro—at bus stops, transit centers, etc. This consisted of posting information on the bus or at bus shelters, Rider Alerts, sharing information with the bus drivers, street teaming, targeted mailings to key community locations, and Transit Alerts to subscribers of affected routes.

Communications leveraged formal and informal networks of communication by reaching out to people’s trusted sources of information. Staff sent notifications to more than 500 community partners and employers in the affected area, encouraging them to spread the word about the project via their own internal communication channels. Staff also mailed materials to nearly 200 organizations to share with their residents and visitors. These points of contact generated a few dozen requests for presentations to under-represented groups. The media strategy also included targeted releases to neighborhood blogs and ethnic media outlets that focused on the changes being proposed in their community.

When asked how they heard about the proposed changes for September 2012, survey respondents indicated that there were a variety of ways they found out about the process. The following chart illustrates the results from that question.



ONLINE ENGAGEMENT

Communications also employed an innovative approach to the online engagement, soliciting feedback via new channels such as the ‘Have a Say’ blog and Facebook page, and the kcmetrobus Twitter account. During the two phases of outreach, nearly 5,500 people filled out the online survey and another 2,000 shared their comments via email or phone. The website analytics also show that nearly 20,000 people visited the website during this four-month timeframe.

SEPTEMBER 2012 SERVICE CHANGES PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT REPORT

FACE-TO-FACE ENGAGEMENT

The efforts to engage people “on the ground” were also varied and broad-reaching. In addition to the open houses, staff hosted information tables, and partnered with community organizations to arrange special meetings for under-represented populations such as the Seattle Housing Authority Resident Action Council, Catholic Community Services foster grandparent program, Yesler Terrace’s Vietnamese elder group, and retirement homes in Greenlake and First Hill.

One person commented in the survey, *“I appreciate being able to provide input from the online surveys. With a young family and both parents working, it’s difficult for us to attend the public meetings, but appreciate that you host them.”*

Measuring the success of the engagement is critical, especially when introducing new and innovative methods. To that end, staff continually monitored the extent and quality of the outreach efforts for both phases using a number of tools such as web analytics, survey analytics, number of people reached via the face-to-face meetings, and feedback loops that gauged people’s overall satisfaction with the engagement process.

SEPTEMBER 2012 SERVICE CHANGES PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT REPORT

Equity & Social Justice

Given the diversity of Metro Transit's bus riding population, our community engagement must ensure all voices are reflected in the decision-making process. For both phases of outreach, staff targeted under-represented populations by partnering with organizations serving them and making information available in a variety of forms and languages.

Survey analytics for the second phase of engagement show that approximately 23 percent of respondents to the demographic questions would be classified as low income with an annual household income of \$35,000 or less. Nine percent of respondents said they had a disability and of those, 66 percent said they were mobility impaired. Seventeen percent indicated they were a minority and 2 percent indicated English was not the primary language spoken at home.

According to census data, Spanish and Vietnamese are the primary languages spoken by 10 percent or more of the population in the project area. As the two languages spoken by the largest number of people, special materials were prepared and phone lines were set up in these two languages.

More than one percent of the visitors to the project website viewed the content in a language other than English.

| Web content translations | |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| Language | # of visits |
| Chinese | 75 |
| Spanish | 34 |
| Japanese | 33 |
| Korean | 14 |
| Russian | 10 |

ADDITIONAL OUTREACH ACTIVITIES FOR PHASES 1 AND 2

- Translating materials and distributing them to organizations via mail and making them available at open houses and information tables. Materials were translated into Spanish, Vietnamese, Somali, Arabic, and Cambodian.
- Hosting information tables at locations that serve under-represented populations such as food banks and human services organizations
- Posting information at key community locations serving under-represented populations
- Providing large print materials and surveys at open houses
- Providing dedicated Spanish and Vietnamese phone lines
- Arranging for interpreters (including deaf and deaf/blind) upon request
- Presentations to the National Federation of the Blind's Seattle Chapter, Catholic Community Services, the Yesler Terrace Vietnamese Group, and the Seattle Housing Authority Resident Action Council, King County Mobility Coalition
- Presentations to retirement facilities such as Horizon House, Exeter House, Tate Mason House, Hearthstone House, and the Hilltop House
- Reaching out to community partners such as the White Center CDA, VA Hospital, DisAbility Rights Commission, and the NW Kidney Center via phone and in person
- Having Accessible Services Staff available at open houses to answer questions and provide support for people with special needs

SEPTEMBER 2012 SERVICE CHANGES PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT REPORT

Community Feedback Summary

COMMUNITY FEEDBACK FOR PHASE 1

The first phase of engagement began in October, 2011 and continued through January, 2012. During this period staff heard from nearly 5,000 people--1,200+ people at the open houses, presentations and information tables, and an additional 3,600+ community members via the online survey, phone line, 'Have a Say' email account, and meeting feedback forms. Staff also measured 32,502 total visits to the project website, 14,728 of which were from separate individuals (unique visits).

Following the first phase of community engagement, Metro identified several common concerns, ideas and suggestions from riders for revising the first round of service change concepts. More than 50 percent of the initial concepts were updated in preparation for the second phase of engagement.

COMMUNITY FEEDBACK FOR PHASE 2

The second phase of engagement was February 1-29, 2012. During this period staff again heard from nearly 5,000--1,500+ people at the open houses, presentations and information tables, and an additional 3,300+ community members via the online survey, phone line, and 'Have a Say' email account. Staff also measured 12,553 total visits to the project website, 7,765 of which were from separate individuals (unique visits). The following summarizes that feedback.



Who filled out the survey for Phase 2?

The survey asked a series of questions that can be categorized into five areas; route level feedback on the proposed changes, general feedback on the proposed changes, personal transit use, demographics, and feedback on the engagement process. A separate survey track was also offered for respondents who officially represent a business or organization.

Of the 2,409 people that completed the survey, 73 percent indicated they ride the bus three or more days a week. Survey respondents said their top three reasons for using the bus were to get to/from work, for shopping/errands, and for fun/recreational/social activities. When asked about the one change they would make to their current transit service, the majority of survey respondents said they would make buses come more often.

In a series of questions aimed to measure people's perceptions about the proposed changes, 63 percent of respondents expected their transit trips to take more time door-to-door and 48 percent expected they would have to transfer more. About 75 percent of all respondents indicated they travel 0-3 blocks to access transit now and nearly 50 percent of respondents indicated that transit service would be farther away with the proposed changes.

Survey feedback on Phase 2 route proposals

Due to space considerations, the survey provided structured questions for 16 of the 57 service change proposals. Staff selected these questions based on service change concepts that generated the most feedback in the first phase of outreach. Additional feedback was collected in the survey's open-ended comment box, as well as the 'Have a say' email and phone line, details of which can be found in the following section. Following is a summary of feedback by geographic area.

SEPTEMBER 2012 SERVICE CHANGES PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT REPORT

North and Northwest Seattle

A majority of respondents indicated they liked or could accept a connection between Northgate, Ballard, Fremont, South Lake Union and Downtown (proposed Route 18), improved frequency of bus service between Interbay and Laurelhurst (Route 31 and new Route 32), and improved frequency of service on Queen Anne Avenue N, north of Galer Street (Route 13 and proposed Route 3). When asked about the proposal to replace Route 2 (north part) through Queen Anne with additional trips on Route 13 and an extension of Route 1, respondents were more evenly split between those that liked or could accept it and those that could not accept it.

West Seattle, White Center, and South King County

In West Seattle, a majority of respondents indicated they liked or could accept proposals to extend Route 60 to Westwood Village, provide east-west bus service between West Seattle and the Rainier Valley (new Route 50), and provide service between Alki and Georgetown (new Route 20). Responses were more evenly split between those that liked or could accept them and those that could not accept them for proposals to revise Route 125 to operate only on weekdays, reduce the number of peak trips for Route 37, and replace mid-day and evening service to Arbor Heights and Gatewood neighborhoods with an hourly shuttle.

Central Seattle

In Seattle's Central Area, a majority of respondents indicated they liked or could accept the proposals to improve frequency of service along Madison Street in First Hill (proposed routes 2 and 12), revise Route 2 (south part) to travel to First Avenue via Madison and Marion Streets, and Revise Route 27 to serve Seneca Street.



Southeast Seattle

In Southeast Seattle, the majority of respondents indicated they liked or could accept the proposals to provide east-west bus service from the Rainier Valley to West Seattle (new Route 50) and replace service on Routes 4 (north and south parts) with additional trips on Routes 3 (north and south parts). When asked about deleting service on Route 14 (south part) between 31st Ave S/S McClellan Street and Mount Rainier Drive S, the majority of respondents said they could not accept it.

Open-ended feedback on Phase 2 route proposals

In addition to the structured survey questions, people provided feedback via the survey's open-ended comment box, email, or phone. Comments were reviewed and tallied by route. The following table provides the sum total of structured and open-ended responses received by route, plus a breakdown of those that indicated they liked or could accept the proposal versus those that could not accept the proposal, and the percent of respondents in favor. Of the route proposals, routes 3, 20, 32, 50, and 60 were the most supported, while routes 16, 17, 30, 33, 45, 46, and 131 received nominal support.

SEPTEMBER 2012 SERVICE CHANGES PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT REPORT

| Community Feedback Results – By Route | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|------|---------|------------|
| Route | Total | Like | Dislike | % in Favor |
| 1 | 22 | 8 | 14 | 36 |
| 2 (north) | 883 | 398 | 485 | 45 |
| 2 (south) | 830 | 346 | 484 | 42 |
| 3 (north) | 707 | 620 | 87 | 88 |
| 3 (south) | 5 | 4 | 1 | 80 |
| 4 (north) | 498 | 296 | 202 | 59 |
| 4 (south) | 505 | 290 | 215 | 57 |
| 5 | 26 | 8 | 18 | 31 |
| 10 | 11 | 2 | 9 | 18 |
| 11 | 14 | 2 | 12 | 14 |
| 12 | 18 | 5 | 13 | 28 |
| 13 | 11 | 7 | 4 | 64 |
| 14 (north) | 153 | 3 | 150 | 2 |
| 14 (south) | 383 | 136 | 247 | 36 |
| 15 Express | 18 | 9 | 9 | 50 |
| 16 | 132 | 10 | 122 | 8 |
| 17 | 195 | 2 | 193 | 1 |
| 18 | 1093 | 801 | 292 | 73 |
| 20 | 472 | 406 | 66 | 86 |
| 21 | 15 | 5 | 10 | 33 |
| 21 Express | 7 | 1 | 6 | 14 |
| 22 | 292 | 170 | 122 | 58 |
| 23 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 20 |
| 24 | 141 | 24 | 117 | 17 |
| 27 | 399 | 245 | 154 | 61 |
| 28 | 25 | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| 30 | 16 | 0 | 16 | 0 |
| 32 | 737 | 664 | 73 | 90 |
| 33 | 42 | 5 | 37 | 12 |

| Community Feedback Results – By Route | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|------|---------|------------|
| Route | Total | Like | Dislike | % in Favor |
| 34 Express | 35 | 5 | 30 | 14 |
| 35 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 37 | 278 | 142 | 136 | 51 |
| 39 | 37 | 7 | 30 | 19 |
| 45 | 14 | 0 | 14 | 0 |
| 46 | 37 | 0 | 37 | 0 |
| 50 | 571 | 502 | 69 | 88 |
| 51 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| 53 | 11 | 0 | 11 | 0 |
| 55 | 18 | 8 | 10 | 44 |
| 56 | 14 | 1 | 13 | 7 |
| 56 Express | 4 | 1 | 3 | 25 |
| 57 | 15 | 3 | 12 | 20 |
| 60 | 398 | 372 | 26 | 93 |
| 75 | 24 | 15 | 9 | 63 |
| 81 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 85 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 116 Express | 1 | 1 | 0 | 100 |
| 120 | 16 | 11 | 5 | 69 |
| 123 Express | 12 | 0 | 12 | 0 |
| 124 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 25 |
| 125 | 513 | 215 | 298 | 42 |
| 128 | 11 | 7 | 4 | 64 |
| 131 | 36 | 3 | 33 | 8 |
| 132 | 43 | 7 | 36 | 16 |
| 133 | 37 | 0 | 37 | 0 |
| 134 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 60 |
| 156 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 166 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

Appendix G-3
Fall 2013 Service Change: Title VI Service Equity
Analysis

Fall 2013 Service Change

Title VI Service Equity Analysis

Spring 2013



Introduction

King County Metro Transit (“Metro”) is proposing changes that are consistent with the policy direction and priorities adopted on July 11, 2011 in King County Metro’s Strategic Plan for Public Transportation 2011-2021 and the Five-Year Implementation Plan for Alternatives to Traditional Transit Delivery. Metro’s Strategic Plan aligns public transportation activities with the goals, objectives and strategies identified in King County’s Strategic Plan. The proposed changes reflect the significance of King County’s adopted values for the transit system – to emphasize productivity, ensure social equity and provide geographic value.

The proposed changes will affect service in the cities of Bellevue, Burien, Carnation, Duvall, Issaquah, Mercer Island, North Bend, Redmond, Renton, Sammamish, SeaTac, Seattle, Shoreline, Snoqualmie, Tukwila, and Woodinville, as well as portions of unincorporated King County. These changes include implementation of the remaining two planned RapidRide lines, improvement of commuter services in the I-90 corridor, and the start of the first alternative-service demonstration project in the Snoqualmie Valley. Metro is focused on delivering a variety of public transportation services appropriate to different markets and mobility needs as outlined briefly here:

- **RapidRide E Line** - Metro will implement RapidRide E Line along Aurora Avenue North in Shoreline and Seattle. This RapidRide Line will replace Route 358, one of the busiest routes in the entire Metro system. RapidRide provides high quality, frequent service with enhanced route facilities, real time information signs and proof of payment fare collection system.
- **RapidRide F Line** - Metro will implement RapidRide F Line between Burien, Sea Tac, Tukwila, and Renton. RapidRide provides high quality, frequent service with enhanced route facilities, real time information signs and proof of payment fare collection system. Minor changes are proposed around the F Line that will minimize route duplication and improve overall system effectiveness. The resources needed to extend the F Line from its original terminus in downtown Renton to serve Boeing’s 737 manufacturing plant and “The Landing” development in North Renton will be secured through award of a State Regional Mobility Grant and through reinvestment of other Renton area service that duplicates F Line service.
- **I-90 Corridor** - I-90 commuter services have seen significant ridership growth in the past few years. The proposed changes in this corridor are intended to address overcrowding within existing resources by better matching the available capacity to the market demand. The changes will also attract new riders by providing faster and more direct trips for some commuters.
- **Alternative Service Delivery** - The first alternative-service demonstration project in the Snoqualmie Valley includes changes to the fixed route transit network and the establishment of a new alternative public transportation service, the Snoqualmie Intra-Valley Shuttle. Metro utilized the community collaboration planning process for alternative service delivery and identified a committed local funding partner and local service provider that can operate intra-valley service at a lower cost. Changes to fixed routes will also move service to areas with higher population and employment concentration. This combination of changes is intended to increase productivity and reduce costs, while improving mobility in areas that are difficult to serve in a cost effective way with traditional transit services.

This document includes analysis of the cumulative and project-specific impacts of these proposed changes on minority and low-income populations, conducted pursuant to the Federal Transit Administration's Circular FTA C 4702.1B, (October 1, 2012).

I. Service Change Area & Routes

Affected Areas

The four project areas include a total of 71 census tracts with about 356,000 residents (Source: U.S. Census, 2010). More detailed information about the affected project areas is provided below:

RapidRide E Line - The project area includes 21 census tracts with 102,212 residents and affects routes in the jurisdictions of Seattle and Shoreline.

RapidRide F Line - The project area includes eight census tracts with 36,540 residents and affects routes in the jurisdictions of Burien, Renton, SeaTac, and Tukwila.

I-90 Corridor - The project area includes 28 census tracts with 141,872 residents and affects routes in the jurisdictions of Bellevue, Issaquah, North Bend, Redmond, Sammamish, Seattle, and Snoqualmie.

Alternative Service Delivery - The project area includes 21 census tracts with 115,373 residents and affects routes in the jurisdictions of Carnation, Duvall, Issaquah, North Bend, Redmond, Snoqualmie, and Woodinville, as well as portions of unincorporated King County.

Affected Routes

Metro provides more than 167,000 annual service hours on routes with proposed changes for Fall 2013. Cumulatively, these routes averaged more than 5.7 million annual rides based on Spring 2012 ridership data. Annual service hour and ridership data is shown in Table 1 for affected routes identified in the Fall 2013 service change ordinance.

Table 1: Annual service hours and average daily ridership on affected routes, Spring 2012

| Route | Between | Approximate annual service hours | Weekday | Saturday | Sunday |
|-------------------------|---|----------------------------------|---------|----------|--------|
| | | Average Daily Ridership | | | |
| RapidRide E Line | | | | | |
| 358 | Shoreline-Seattle | 70,000 | 10,410 | 8,250 | 5,750 |
| RapidRide F Line | | | | | |
| 110 | Tukwila-Renton | 13,000 | 170 | 0 | 0 |
| 140 | Burien-SeaTac-Tukwila-Renton | 36,000 | 3,450 | 2,520 | 1,960 |
| I-90 Corridor | | | | | |
| 211 | Issaquah Highlands-Eastgate-South Bellevue-North Mercer Island-First Hill | 6,500 | 330 | 0 | 0 |
| 215 | North Bend-Snoqualmie-Issaquah-Eastgate-Seattle | 6,000 | 580 | 0 | 0 |

| Route | Between | Approximate annual service hours | Weekday | Saturday | Sunday |
|-------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------|--------|
| | | | Average Daily Ridership | | |
| 216 | Sammamish-North Issaquah-Eastgate-Mercer Island-Seattle | 6,000 | 620 | 0 | 0 |
| 218 | Issaquah Highlands-Eastgate - Seattle | 11,000 | 1,780 | 0 | 0 |
| Alternative Service Delivery | | | | | |
| 209 | North Bend-Snoqualmie-Fall City-Preston-Issaquah | 9,500 | 260 | 210 | 0 |
| 224 | Redmond-Duvall-Carnation-Fall City | 5,000 | 120 | 0 | 0 |
| 311 | Duvall-Woodinville-Seattle | 13,000 | 980 | 0 | 0 |

II. Threshold 1: Is this a Major Service Change? YES

For the purposes of complying with FTA C 4702.1B, Chapter IV, Metro defines any change in service as “major” if King County Council approval of the change is required pursuant to KCC 28.94.020.

The four projects included in the September 2013 service change affect a total of ten existing routes, create four new routes, and establish the Snoqualmie Intra-Valley Shuttle. The following list provides a more detailed breakdown of the service changes by project:

RapidRide E Line – Discontinue one route and establish a new route.

RapidRide F Line – Discontinue two routes and establish a new route

I-90 Corridor - Eliminate three route segments, extend one route to serve a new area, establish one new route, and change service frequency on one route.

Alternative Service Delivery – Establish a new route, establish a new alternative public transportation service, replace service on two route segments with the new alternative service, and change span of service on one route.

The service change meets all criteria for a major service change by Metro and FTA definitions. Appendix B lists the specific routes and route segments being affected by the Fall 2013 service change.

III. Threshold 2: Are Minority or Low-Income Tracts Affected? YES

Classifying minority and low income census tracts

Metro classifies census tracts as minority tracts if the percentage of the population that is minority within a tract is greater than the percentage for King County as a whole. Based on Census 2010 data, 35.2 percent of the countywide population is classified as minority. Similarly, Metro classifies census tracts as low-income tracts if the percentage of the population classified as low-income (living at or below the poverty threshold) within a tract is greater than the

percentage for King County as a whole. Based on the American Community Survey five-year average for 2006-2010, 10.5 percent of the countywide population is classified as low-income.

The September 2013 service change includes changes to routes serving a total of 71 census tracts in King County, the characteristics of which are broken out by project in Table 2 below. Note that the sum of tracts affected by each project (78) exceeds 71 due to overlap between projects in downtown Seattle and in East King County.

Table 2. Summary of Census Tract Minority and Low Income Classifications

| Project | Census Tract Classification | | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|
| | Total Census Tracts in Project Area | Minority & Low-income | Minority ONLY | Low-income ONLY | Neither Minority nor Low-income |
| RapidRide E Line | 21 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 8 |
| RapidRide F Line | 8 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| I-90 Corridor | 28 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 13 |
| Alternative Service Delivery | 21 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 14 |

IV. Threshold 3: Is there a Disparate Impact on Minority or Low-Income Tracts? NO

The ‘Service Level’ metric used in this analysis is the number of bus trips serving a census tract. As summarized in Table 3 below, the four projects included in the proposed Fall 2013 service change will not have a disparate cumulative impact on minority and low-income populations using this metric. This is also true at the project level, as outlined in more detail later in this section.

None of the minority tracts affected by the projects in this service change will have a decrease of 25 percent or more in the number of bus trips, compared to seven percent of the affected non-minority tracts. Of the low-income tracts affected, none will experience a 25 percent or greater decrease in the number of bus trips, compared with seven percent of non low-income tracts.

A greater percentage of affected non-minority (24%) than minority (8%) tracts will see increases of 25 percent or more in the number of bus trips. Similarly, a greater percentage of non low-income tracts (28%), than low-income tracts (4%) will see an increase of 25 percent or more in the number of bus trips. However, the average percentage change in the number of bus trips will be about the same for minority and non-minority tracts (8% and 9% respectively), while non low-income tracts will see higher average growth in the number of bus trips (11%) than low-income tracts (5%).

Table 3. Cumulative Summary of Service Level Change by Census Tract

| Census Tract Group | # of tracts affected | # tracts with >25% decrease | % affected tracts with >25% decrease | # tracts with >25% increase | % affected tracts with >25% increase | Average % change in # of bus trips |
|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Minority | 25 | 0 | 0% | 2 | 8% | 8% |
| Non-Minority | 46 | 3 | 7% | 11 | 24% | 9% |
| Low-income | 28 | 0 | 0% | 1 | 4% | 5% |
| Non-low-income | 43 | 3 | 7% | 12 | 28% | 11% |

RapidRide E Line

As detailed in Table 4 below, none of the tracts affected by the RapidRide E Line project will have a decrease of 25 percent or more in the number of bus trips. The average percentage change in service will be slightly more in the minority tracts (7%) than non-minority tracts (5%). Conversely, non-low income tracts will see higher average growth in service (7%) than low income tracts (4%).

Table 4. RapidRide E Line Summary of Service Level Change by Census Tract

| Census Tract Group | # of tracts affected | # tracts with >25% decrease | % affected tracts with >25% decrease | # tracts with >25% increase | % affected tracts with >25% increase | Average % change in # of bus trips |
|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Minority | 7 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 7% |
| Non-Minority | 14 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 5% |
| Low-income | 10 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 4% |
| Non-low-income | 11 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 7% |

RapidRide F Line

As detailed in Table 5 below, none of the tracts affected by the RapidRide F Line project will have a decrease of 25 percent or more in the number of bus trips. A greater percentage of affected non-minority (50%) than minority (0%) tracts will see increases of 25 percent or more in the number of bus trips. Similarly, a greater percentage of non low-income tracts (50%) than low-income tracts (0%) will see increases of 25 percent or more in the number of bus trips. Non-minority (25%) and non low-income (23%) tracts will also see higher average growth in the number of bus trips than minority (10%) and low-income tracts (10%).

Table 5. RapidRide F Line Summary of Service Level Change by Census Tract

| Census Tract Group | # of tracts affected | # tracts with >25% decrease | % affected tracts with >25% decrease | # tracts with >25% increase | % affected tracts with >25% increase | Average % change in # of bus trips |
|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Minority | 6 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 10% |
| Non-Minority | 2 | 0 | 0% | 1 | 50% | 25% |
| Low-income | 6 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 10% |
| Non-low-income | 2 | 0 | 0% | 1 | 50% | 23% |

I-90 Corridor

As detailed in Table 6 below, none of the tracts affected by the I-90 Corridor project will have a decrease of 25 percent or more in the number of bus trips. A greater percentage of affected non-minority (17%) than minority (10%) tracts will see increases of 25 percent or more in the number of bus trips. Similarly, a greater percentage of non low-income tracts (25%) than low-income tracts (0%) will see increases of 25 percent or more in the number of bus trips. Non-minority (9%) and non low-income (5%) tracts will also see higher average growth in the number of bus trips than minority (5%) and low-income tracts (0%).

Table 6. I-90 Corridor Summary of Service Level Change by Census Tract

| Census Tract Group | # of tracts affected | # tracts with >25% decrease | % affected tracts with >25% decrease | # tracts with >25% increase | % affected tracts with >25% increase | Average % change in # of bus trips |
|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Minority | 10 | 0 | 0% | 1 | 10% | 5% |
| Non-Minority | 18 | 0 | 0% | 3 | 17% | 9% |
| Low-income | 12 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% | 0% |
| Non-low-income | 16 | 0 | 0% | 4 | 25% | 13% |

Alternative Service Delivery

As detailed in Table 7 below, none of the minority tracts affected by the Alternative Service Delivery project will have a decrease of 25 percent or more in the number of bus trips, compared to nineteen percent of the affected non-minority tracts. Of the low-income tracts affected, none will experience a 25 percent or greater decrease in the number of bus trips, compared with seventeen percent of non low-income tracts.

A greater percentage of affected non-minority (38%) than minority (20%) tracts will see increases of 25 percent or more in the number of bus trips, while low-income and non low-income tracts will see the same increase (33%) in the number of bus trips. The average percentage change in the number of bus trips will be higher for minority tracts (9%) than non-minority tracts. Similarly, the average percentage change in the number of bus trips will be higher for low-income tracts (15%) than for non low-income tracts (4%).

Table 7. Alternative Service Delivery Summary of Service Level Change by Census Tract

| Census Tract Group | # of tracts affected | # tracts with >25% decrease | % affected tracts with >25% decrease | # tracts with >25% increase | % affected tracts with >25% increase | Average % change in # of bus trips |
|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Minority | 5 | 0 | 0% | 1 | 20% | 9% |
| Non-Minority | 16 | 3 | 19% | 6 | 38% | 5% |
| Low-income | 3 | 0 | 0% | 1 | 33% | 15% |
| Non-low-income | 18 | 3 | 17% | 6 | 33% | 4% |

Service Reductions

The percentage change in weekly bus trips was calculated for each census tract within the four project areas. The number of bus trips was tabulated by identifying the census tracts served by each route or route variant before and after the proposed changes, then summing the number of bus trips provided on the routes serving each tract before and after the proposed changes. A route or route variant was considered to serve a tract if it serves or will serve at least one bus stop located within the tract.

This analysis found that RapidRide E Line, RapidRide F Line, and the I-90 Corridor projects will not result in more than a 25% decrease in bus service in any of the affected census tracts. For the Alternative Service Delivery project, the analysis found that the proposed changes will not result in more than a 25% decrease in bus service in the project area as a whole. However, the changes will result in a more than 25% decrease in bus service in three census tracts located within the

Alternative Service Delivery project area, which are analyzed further within this report. Of the three tracts with more than a 25% decrease in service, zero are minority and/or low-income. Table 8 below identifies the percentage change in the number of bus trips per week in each tract where there would be a reduction of 25% or more.

Table 8: Alternative Service Delivery Tracts with Significant (>25%) Service Level Reductions

| Tract | Area | Minority | Low-Income | Bus Trips Before (weekly) | Bus Trips After (weekly) | % Difference |
|--------|-------------------------------------|----------|------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| 323.11 | Cottage Lake | No | No | 221 | 161 | -27% |
| 323.27 | Trilogy | No | No | 35 | 0 | -100% |
| 328 | SR-202 (Unincorporated King County) | No | No | 163 | 120 | -26% |

The figures referenced in Table 8 include a calculation of reduced bus trips even when the bus trips are operated on a street which is the boundary line for the census tract and where bus trips are within ¼ mile walk access of a small proportion of the census tract residents today. Specific impacts and service alternatives for each of these tracts is described in detail below and in Appendix B.

Cottage Lake

Tract 323.11 – Neither Minority nor Low Income

Cottage Lake is currently served by peak routes 232 and 311, and all-day route 931, which provide a total of 221 weekly bus trips. Within the Cottage Lake area, Metro will be eliminating a segment of Route 311 on NE Woodinville-Duvall Road.

At stops within Tract 323.11, 18 daily riders board Metro routes 232 and 311 on an average weekday, two percent of the total boardings on these routes. Stop level data are not available for DART routes, including Route 931, Of the total 18 rides in this tract, five occur on Route 311, which will no longer serve this tract.

Alternative service on NE Woodinville-Duvall Road will be available on routes 232 and 931. Although the total number of bus trips is decreasing, Cottage Lake will continue to have peak service to and from many of the same major destinations as today, including Redmond, Bellevue and Woodinville. No changes are being proposed to all-day Route 931. Service to downtown Seattle will be accessible on transit though a connection between two routes, either at Woodinville Park-and-Ride or Redmond Transit Center.

Trilogy 323.27

Tract 323.27 - Neither Minority nor Low Income

The Trilogy community is currently served by Route 224 with stops on NE Novelty Hill Road near Trilogy Parkway NE. Novelty Hill Road NE forms the southern boundary of tract 323.27. Because Route 224 will be extended into Redmond Ridge East at Trilogy Parkway NE, these stops will no longer be served. However, Metro is planning to locate a new pair of stops on Trilogy Parkway NE, just south of NE Novelty Hill Road. Although riders in Trilogy may have to walk further to access Route 224, there will be a significant

improvement in service frequency on this route, making it a more attractive transportation option. Five daily riders board Route 224 in this tract.

SR-202 (Unincorporated King County)

Tract 328 - Neither Minority nor Low Income

Transit service along State Route 202 will be restructured as part of the Snoqualmie Valley Alternative Services Demonstration Project. Tract 328 is currently served by Route 209, which will continue to serve the pair of stops on SR-202 it currently serves, but will be reduced to peak-only service. Alternative all-day service will be provided by the Snoqualmie Intra-Valley Shuttle, which will operate weekdays from about 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., every 90-minutes. The pair of stops in Tract 328 attract less than one boarding, on average, each weekday.

Service Additions

The Fall 2013 service change will not result in more than a 25% increase in bus service throughout the collective project areas. However, the changes will result in a more than 25% increase in bus service in 13 census tracts located within three of the four separate project areas.

Table 9 below identifies the percentage change in the number of bus trips per week in each tract where there will be an increase of 25% or more. Specific impacts for each tract are described in detail below and in Appendix B.

Table 9: Tracts with Significant (>25%) Service Increases

| Tract | Area | Minority | Low-Income | Bus Trips Before (weekly) | Bus Trips After (weekly) | % Difference |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|----------|------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| RapidRide F Line | | | | | | |
| 253.01 | NE Renton | No | No | 2,073 | 2,963 | 43% |
| I-90 Corridor | | | | | | |
| 322.07 | Sammamish | No | No | 279 | 349 | 25% |
| 322.11 | Sammamish | No | No | 173 | 218 | 26% |
| 322.12 | Sammamish | No | No | 202 | 277 | 37% |
| 322.14 | Sammamish | Yes | No | 139 | 184 | 32% |
| 323.18 | Sammamish | No | No | 110 | 155 | 41% |
| Alternative Service Delivery | | | | | | |
| 323.29 | Redmond Ridge | Yes | No | 65 | 95 | 46% |
| 324.01 | Duvall | No | No | 175 | 245 | 40% |
| 324.02 | Duvall | No | No | 65 | 100 | 54% |
| 325 | Carnation | No | No | 65 | 100 | 54% |
| 326.02 | Snoqualmie Ridge | No | No | 213 | 303 | 42% |
| 327.03 | Snoqualmie | No | Yes | 213 | 303 | 42% |
| 327.04 | North Bend | No | No | 213 | 303 | 42% |

RapidRide F Line - Northeast Renton

Tract 253.01 - Neither Minority nor Low Income

The frequency of service is improving to Northeast Renton due to the replacement of peak Route 110 with the RapidRide F Line extension to “The Landing” mixed-use

development. The F Line will provide 10-20 minute service frequency, seven days a week for at least 14 hours per day. Northeast Renton will continue to be served by routes 240 and 342 with no change in the level of service.

I-90 Corridor - Sammamish

Tract 322.07 - Neither Minority nor Low Income

Tract 322.11 - Neither Minority nor Low Income

Tract 322.12 -Neither Minority nor Low Income

Tract 322.14 – Minority and Non Low Income

Tract 323.18 -Neither Minority nor Low Income

In addition to Route 216, which currently provides six morning and afternoon trips from Sammamish to downtown Seattle, a new peak route will be created that has five morning and nine afternoon trips. Sammamish will continue to be served by routes 269 and 927 with no change in the level of service.

Alternative Service Delivery - Remond Ridge, Duvall, Carnation

Tract 323.29 – Minority and Non Low Income

Tract 324.01 - Neither Minority nor Low Income

Tract 324.02 - Neither Minority nor Low Income

Tract 325 - Neither Minority nor Low Income

Transit service in the Redmond Ridge, Duvall and Carnation areas will be restructured as part of the Snoqualmie Valley Alternative Services Demonstration Project. The frequency of service is improving to the Redmond Ridge and Duvall areas due to a 46% increase in the number of trips on the shortened Route 224. Additionally, the frequency of service to Duvall and Carnation will be improved by replacing the eliminated segment of Route 224 with the Snoqualmie Intra-Valley Shuttle, which will operate weekdays from about 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. every 90-minutes.

Alternative Service Delivery - Snoqualmie, Snoqualmie Ridge, and North Bend

Tract 326.02- Neither Minority nor Low Income

Tract 327.03 – Non-Minority and Low Income

Tract 327.04 - Neither Minority nor Low Income

Transit service in the North Bend, Snoqualmie and Snoqualmie Ridge areas will be restructured as part of the Snoqualmie Valley Alternative Services Demonstration Project. The number of trips to Snoqualmie and North Bend will increase due to the addition of the Snoqualmie Intra-Valley Shuttle, which will operate weekdays from about 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. every 90 minutes. Transit service to the Snoqualmie Ridge is increasing due to the addition of Route 208, which will provide reverse peak direction, mid-day, and Saturday service to an area that is currently served by one peak route with five morning and five afternoon trips.

VI. Alternatives

Metro considered transit alternatives for riders when developing the four separate project proposals. Service alternatives are identified in Section IV of this report for areas where service

will be deleted or reduced by 25% or more. A comprehensive listing of service alternatives for all changes is available in Appendix B.

VII. Mitigation

During the planning process, Metro conducted public outreach for RapidRide F Line, the I-90 Corridor and Alternative Service Delivery projects. The RapidRide E Line project did not warrant a separate engagement effort since it will not include any service changes beyond the replacement of an existing route with the new RapidRide service. Outreach for the other three projects was designed to involve the community in the decision-making process and solicit feedback on service planning concepts and proposals.

All three engagement efforts included outreach on affected bus routes and at high-use bus stops and transit facilities, open houses, meetings with community groups and social service agencies, media releases, electronic notifications, posters at bus stops, targeted mailings to stakeholders and various forms of online communications and social media. The outreach effort also included elements specifically designed to solicit input from community members with limited English proficiency (LEP), including translated written information, designated phone lines for LEP feedback, interpreters at open houses, and outreach to ethnic media outlets. King County Metro Transit produced Public Engagement Reports that provide details about these comprehensive community engagement efforts. (Executive summaries of these reports are attached in Appendices C-E)

Metro made several modifications to route concepts in direct response to public input on a variety of topics including routing ideas, concerns about coverage loss, and maintaining adequate capacity. The respective engagement efforts helped Metro to identify community issues and concerns, and make changes where possible to mitigate any adverse affects. Examples of changes Metro made in response to community feedback include:

RapidRide F Line

- Postponing any changes to routes 105 and 908 as part of the F Line integration in Renton

I-90 Corridor

- Maintaining service to Mercer Island Park-and-Ride on Route 216
- Restoring the afternoon connection between Eastgate and Sammamish Park-and-Ride on Route 216
- Adding more service to Sammamish in the afternoon to address potential crowding issues

Alternative Service Delivery

- Retaining peak service on Route 209 and streamlining the routing between Snoqualmie and Fall City
- Improving the frequency of service between Duvall and Redmond on Route 224

Metro also plans extensive outreach surrounding the implementation of changes utilizing an established network of contacts in the affected communities. Prior to implementation, Metro will work with riders, community groups, local cities, and social service agencies to inform the broader community of the upcoming changes, with a special emphasis on riders that are transit dependent or have limited English proficiency.


Metro routinely provides travel training to social service agency clients, people with disabilities and seniors. Metro will offer training for customers in affected areas and will also provide new information to customers who have worked with travel training staff in the past. Additionally, around the time of service changes, Metro will have designated “street teams” of Metro staff at key locations affected by the service changes where many riders board or transfer. Street teams will provide information, assistance, and directions on how to access transit after bus routes change.

VIII. Substantial Need

The four projects included in the Fall 2013 service change were developed using Metro’s Strategic Plan for Public Transportation 2011-2021, as well as the Five-year Implementation Plan for Alternatives to Traditional Transit Delivery. The common goals of the four projects are to increase overall rider use of the Metro Transit system, better match service levels to demand and serve the interests of the community by using local transit funding and resources more cost effectively.

Metro has determined that the four projects, both cumulatively and separately, will not have a disparate impact on minority and low-income riders. Significant reductions in the number of bus trips are limited to three out of 21 census tracts in the Alternative Service Delivery project area. Of the tracts with significant reductions, all-day bus service will be maintained within two of the three, and in the Trilogy neighborhood, more frequent all-day service will be available on Trilogy Parkway NE, located approximately 70 feet from the current bus stop located within the census tract boundary on NE Novelty Hill Rd. The number of bus trips will increase significantly in 13 census tracts in the RapidRide F Line, I-90 Corridor and Alternative Service Delivery project areas, two of which are designated minority tracts, and one of which is designated low-income.

APPENDIX A: AFFECTED AREAS AND IMPACTS



| LEGEND | | Title VI Status in Project Area Census Tracts | 2010 Census Tracts Percent Change | |
|--------|----------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------|
| — | Current Metro Routes | Low-income only | > 25% Decrease | 10% - 25% Increase |
| | | Minority & Low Income | 10% - 25% Decrease | >25% Increase |
| | | Minority Only | Other tracts in project area | |

The information included on this map has been compiled by King County staff from a variety of sources and is subject to change without notice. King County makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, as to accuracy, completeness, timeliness, or rights to the use of such information. This document is not intended for use as a survey product. King County shall not be liable for any general, special, indirect, incidental, or consequential damages including, but not limited to, lost revenues or lost profits resulting from the use or misuse of the information contained on this map. Any sale of this map or information on this map is prohibited except by written permission of King County.

APPENDIX B: SERVICE CHANGES AND ALTERNATIVES

| Service Change | Route | Segment/Area | Time of Day | Spring 2012 Weekday Rides/Day (Route Total) | Spring 2012 Weekday Rides/Day Impacted by Change | Impacts Minority Census Tracts | Impacts Low-Income Census Tracts | Alternative or replacement service within 1/4 mile |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|---|------------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| RapidRide E Line | | | | | | | | |
| Route elimination | 358X | Entire route | All times | 10,140 | 10,140 | Yes | Yes | E Line |
| New route | E Line | Shoreline-Seattle | N/A | N/A | N/A | Yes | Yes | Replaces service on Route 358 |
| RapidRide F Line | | | | | | | | |
| Route elimination | 110 | Entire route | Peak | 170 | 170 | Yes | Yes | F Line |
| Route elimination | 140 | Entire route | All times | 3,450 | 3,450 | Yes | Yes | F Line |
| New route | F Line | Burien to Renton via SeaTac and Tukwila | N/A | N/A | N/A | Yes | Yes | Replaces service on routes 110 and 140 |
| I-90 Corridor | | | | | | | | |
| Route segment elimination | 211 | South Bellevue Park-and-Ride deviation | Peak | 330 | 28 | No | No | 550 and 2, 3, 4, 12 |
| Route segment elimination | 215 | Issaquah Transit Center deviation | Peak | 480 | 105 | No | No | 214, 554 |
| Route segment elimination | 216 | North Issaquah | Peak | 620 | 13 | No | No | 200, 269, 927 |
| Route extension | 216 | Extend to serve Issaquah Highlands | Peak | 620 | N/A | No | No | N/A |
| Headway adjustment (-) | 218 | Entire route | Peak | 1,780 | 1,780 | No | No | 216, New 219 |
| New route | 219 | Sammamish-Issaquah Highlands-Seattle | N/A | N/A | N/A | No | No | Supplements service on routes 216 and 218 |
| Alternative Service Delivery | | | | | | | | |
| New route | 208 | North Bend-Snoqualmie-Issaquah | N/A | N/A | N/A | Yes | No | Extends service to Snoqualmie Ridge |
| Span adjustment (-); | 209 | Fall City-Preston | Mid-day, Off-Peak Direction, Night | 259 | 16 | Yes | No | No off-peak service |

| Service Change | Route | Segment/Area | Time of Day | Spring 2012 Weekday Rides/Day (Route Total) | Spring 2012 Weekday Rides/Day Impacted by Change | Impacts Minority Census Tracts | Impacts Low-Income Census Tracts | Alternative or replacement service within 1/4 mile |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Alternative Service Delivery | | | | | | | | |
| Alternative service replacement | 209 | Fall City-Snoqualmie | Mid-day, Off-Peak Direction, Night | 259 | 25 | No | No | Snoqualmie Intra-Valley Shuttle |
| Alternative service replacement | 224 | Duvall to Fall City | All times | 123 | 39 | No | No | Snoqualmie Intra-Valley Shuttle |
| Route segment elimination | 311 | Woodinville to Duvall | All times | 980 | 65 | Yes | No | 232, 931 |
| New alternative service | Snoqualmie Intra-Valley Shuttle | Duvall-Carnation-Fall City-Snoqualmie-North Bend | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | No | Replaces service on routes 209 and 224 |

Notes:

1. Segment ridership is the maximum number of boardings or alightings by direction, except for mid-route segments, where riders is the total boardings and alightings in both directions.
2. Affected ridership for frequency and span adjustments is estimated using APC data for affected time periods, but is not exact.

**APPENDIX C: I-90 CORRIDOR PROJECT
PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT REPORT**



Public Engagement Report

I-90 Corridor Project Executive Summary

Prepared by King County Department of Transportation Communications
March 2013



Executive Summary

Metro Transit, with the intention of easing crowding and improving service quality, presented potential schedule and route changes to seven peak I-90 commuter routes--210, 211, 212, 214, 215, 216, and 218. These routes serve three major park-and-rides on the Eastside: the Eastgate Park-and-Ride, the Issaquah Transit Center, and the Issaquah Highlands Park-and-Ride and provide peak-only service via I-90 starting east of I-405. Outreach began in January 2013 and concluded in February 2013.

Metro engaged affected riders to collect feedback on the proposals both in-person and online. Communications received more than 700 responses to the survey and conducted public outreach on buses, at transit centers and park-and-rides, and at a public meeting. Here is a brief summary of community feedback:

- As expected, riders that would benefit from the proposed changes expressed general support, while riders that would need to connect to another route, walk further to get to their bus stop, or take a more crowded bus did not express support.
- Riders of Route 212 who board at the Eastgate lower platforms do not wish to walk out to the freeway station due to concerns about weather protection, getting a seat on the bus and fears of ice on the sidewalk in the winter.
- Those riders who begin their commute east of Issaquah are significantly in favor of eliminating the stop at Issaquah Transit Center along Route 215.
- Mercer Island riders don't like the proposed changes to eliminate the Mercer Island Park-and-Ride along Route 216 as this route is an alternative when Route 550 is overcrowded during peak periods.



Communications and Metro staff used the feedback received to make adjustments to the original service change proposal.

[Click here for a full copy of the Public Engagement Report](http://www.kingcounty.gov/transportation/kcdot/MetroTransit/Jobs~/media/transportation/kcdot/MetroTransit/HaveASay/I-90Corridor/I-90_PublicEngagementReport.ashx) as detailed below, or type http://www.kingcounty.gov/transportation/kcdot/MetroTransit/Jobs~/media/transportation/kcdot/MetroTransit/HaveASay/I-90Corridor/I-90_PublicEngagementReport.ashx into your web browser:

1. Executive Summary
2. Community Engagement Plan & Activities
3. Equity & Social Justice
4. Community Feedback Summary

APPENDICES

- Appendix A – Survey Results by Boarding Location
- Appendix B – Emails and Phone Calls Received
- Appendix C – Website and Social Media Analytics
- Appendix D – Meeting Materials and Handouts

**APPENDIX D: SNOQUALMIE VALLEY ALTERNATIVE
SERVICE DELIVERY DEMONSTRATION PROJECT
PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT REPORT**



Public Engagement Report Executive Summary

Snoqualmie Valley Alternative Service Delivery Demonstration Project

Prepared by King County Department of Transportation Communications
March 2013



Executive Summary

In accordance with the five-year Alternative Services Delivery Implementation Plan, Metro Transit will be developing and demonstrating alternative transportation services delivery products in the Snoqualmie Valley that will provide service to more people and improve mobility at a lower operating cost. In preparation for this service, KCDOT Communications (Communications) and Transit conducted a community engagement process from October 2012 - March 2013 to identify how the community was using current fixed-route bus service, what alternative transportation was already available, and what connections to the public transit network riders needed to maintain. Communications also gathered feedback on proposed alternatives after all the above information was identified. The project area for this effort extended from Duvall in the lower Valley and North Bend in the upper Snoqualmie Valley. More than 400 people took time to share ideas and concerns during this time period.

Using the Service Guidelines, Metro identified routes 209, 224, and 311 as having productivity in the lowest 25%, and therefore analyzed these routes for possible elimination, restructuring, or other remediation to fund alternative services.

Summary of community feedback

Phase 1

Respondents were asked about their current riding habits and knowledge and use of alternative transportation services. The following were some key findings:

- The majority of respondents on each route indicated they ride the bus three or more days per week.
- The most common reason for using the bus was to get to or from work.
- With the exception of Route 311 riders who were somewhat familiar with alternative transportation services such as VanPool or Access, most respondents stated they were not very familiar with alternative transportation services.

Phase 2

Respondents were asked for feedback on Metro's proposal to revise certain fixed route services to the Valley and instead use those funds to promote right size alternative transportation services. The following were some key findings:

- The majority of respondents indicate they would use public transportation more if the proposed changes are implemented.
- Concerns were expressed about what alternatives were available if a rider were to miss the last bus trip home.

Metro has also arranged to continue engagement by riding buses in April to speak with riders in detail about the proposals.

[Click here for a full copy of the Public Engagement Report](http://www.kingcounty.gov/transportation/kcdot/MetroTransit/Jobs/~media/transportation/kcdot/MetroTransit/AlternativeService/ASD_SV_PublicEngagementReport.aspx) as detailed below, or enter http://www.kingcounty.gov/transportation/kcdot/MetroTransit/Jobs/~media/transportation/kcdot/MetroTransit/AlternativeService/ASD_SV_PublicEngagementReport.aspx into your web browser:

1. Executive Summary
2. Community Engagement Plan & Activities
3. Equity & Social Justice
4. Community Feedback Summary

APPENDICES

- Appendix A – Survey Results for Phase 1 by Route
- Appendix B – Survey Results for Phase 2
- Appendix C – Website and Social Media Analytics for Phases 1 and 2
- Appendix D – Outreach Materials for Phases 1 and 2
- Appendix E – Emails and Phone Calls Received for Phases 1 and 2

**APPENDIX E: RENTON RESTRUCTURE PROJECT
PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT REPORT**



Renton Transit Restructure

Public Engagement Report
Executive Summary

Prepared by King County Department of Transportation Communications

March 2013

Executive Summary

The new RapidRide F Line is scheduled to begin service between Burien and Renton in June 2014. Metro Transit is recommending changes to routes 110, 155, and 909 to complement the new F Line service and allow transit service in the area to serve more people cost-effectively. As a result of these changes and of funding from a Regional Mobility Grant, Metro will also extend the F Line to The Landing in Renton. In preparation for these changes, we reached out to affected riders to collect their feedback on the proposals during two phases of outreach.



Metro's engagement process was designed so as to hear from a representative sample of those possibly affected by the changes under consideration. Metro staff reached out to the public using a variety of notification systems inviting people to participate via several engagement methods. The following is a list of those notification systems:

- GovDelivery transit alert sent to all affected route subscribers
- Notifications to Renton neighborhood associations, chamber of commerce, Employee Transportation Coordinators at Renton area employers, organizations serving low-income and LEP populations
- Postings at affected bus shelters at the Renton Transit Center and high-use stops or stops that would be highly impacted
- Personal phone calls/emails/meetings with the City of Renton
- Personal phone calls/emails to organizations serving low-income and LEP populations
- Bus boardings on affected routes
- Media release, Facebook posts, and @KCMetroBus tweets

Engagement methods for Phase I (November-December 2012)

Open houses

Metro hosted two open houses—one at the Renton Technical College on November 28 and the other at Renton High School on November 30. Metro also held a multilingual open house at the Renton Housing Authority in the Highlands. About 30 people attended the open houses.

Information table

Metro staffed an information table during lunch at the Renton Senior Center and talked to approximately 40 people.

Transit center/park-and-ride outreach

To inform riders about the proposals, Metro handed out information fliers and spoke to riders at the Tukwila Sounder Station during the morning peak commute period and at the Renton Transit Center during midday.

Riding the bus

To inform riders about the proposals, Metro boarded the buses of the affected routes and handed out project information fliers to approximately 200 people.

Stakeholder outreach

Metro coordinated with Metro's Employee Transportation Coordinators and the city of Renton's commute trip reduction staff to send out information about the proposals to the affected commute trip reduction sites in Renton. Metro also personally contacted the Boeing, PACCAR, and Kenworth employment sites. A presentation was also made to the South County Mobility Coalition – a group representing organizations serving transit-dependent populations and concerned about mobility in the southern part of the county.

Outreach to populations with limited English proficiency

Project materials were translated into five different languages and interpreters were made available at the open houses. The project survey for individuals and businesses was fully translated into Spanish. Metro also coordinated with the Renton Housing Authority to host a multi-lingual open house.

Engagement methods for Phase II (February 2013)

Metro made changes to engagement methods for Phase 2 due to the amount of community response received during Phase 1. More time was invested to engage riders on the bus and at busy bus stops than at open houses or information tables. These methods ensured Metro would reach more people without compromising the quality of the interaction.

Transit center/park-and-ride outreach

To engage affected riders we handed out information fliers and gathered feedback at the Tukwila Sounder Station during the morning peak commute period.

Riding the bus

To speak face-to-face with riders about the proposals, Metro boarded Route 155 in Fairwood and handed out about 50 surveys that asked riders for opinions about the proposed change. Metro also rode Route 110 and passed out surveys to riders getting on and off the bus at stops that would be affected by the change.

Stakeholder outreach

Metro coordinated with our own employee transportation coordinators and the City of Renton's commute trip reduction staff members to send out information about our proposals to the affected commute trip reduction sites in Renton. The Boeing, PACCAR, and Kenworth employment sites were also personally contacted and a presentation was made to the South County Mobility Coalition – a group representing organizations serving transit-dependent populations.

Outreach to populations with limited English proficiency

We translated project materials into five different languages and sent special notifications to community organizations that serve people with limited English proficiency.

Feedback – Phase I

Nearly 100 people filled out the online survey. As expected, riders who would benefit from the change expressed general support, while riders who would need to connect to another route, walk further to get to their bus stop, or take a different bus did not express support. The following is a breakdown of the survey results by route:

Route 105

Concept: extend route further east in the Renton Highlands to cover a portion of Route 908

- Many liked the change, but there was some concern about losing service at the Renton Housing Authority site at NE 16th Street and Kirkland Avenue NE.

Route 110

Concept: discontinue and replace with the F Line

- Many respondents were concerned about the timing of connections with Sounder and walking further for those who work at Boeing and PACCAR/Kenworth.

Route 155

Concept: Convert to DART

- Concern was expressed about how to use DART and about the loss of interline between Route 155 and 156, which provides a connection to the airport.

Route 908

Concept: discontinue and replace with portions of routes 105 and 909.

- There was concern about losing coverage and frequency to the Renton Highlands.

Route 909

Concept: revise to serve portion of Route 908 and extend to Renton Technical College

- Riders liked the better connection to the Renton Highlands.

Feedback – Phase II

About 85 people filled out the online survey. Many of the concepts shared during Phase 1 were scaled back for Phase 2. The following is a breakdown of the survey results by route:

Route 110

Proposed change: discontinue and replace with the F Line

- Of the 53 survey respondents, 66% stated that their travel needs would be met or might be met, but they would need additional help to understand how.
- Most of the respondents who expressed concern are worried about the timing of connections with Sounder and about walking further for those who work at Boeing and PACCAR/Kenworth.

Route 155

Proposed change: convert to DART

- Of the 70 survey respondents, 67% said their travel needs would be met or might be met, but they would need additional help to understand how.
- Most of the respondents who expressed concern are worried about how to use DART, the reliability of DART, and about the loss of interline between Route 155 and 156, which provides a connection to the airport.

Route 909

Proposed change: revise to extend to Renton Technical College

- Of the six survey respondents, 83% said their travel needs would be met or might be met, but they would need additional help to understand how.

We also received 44 comments submitted via phone or email. The themes include:

- Concern about longer walks and longer waits.
- Concern about reliability of DART and questions about how it works.

Web, blog and social media analytics

In addition to reaching out to people on the bus and in meetings, we implemented a robust online engagement effort using the project website, Metro Matters blog and 'Have a Say' Facebook page. The following is a quick summary of how many people we reached using these online tools:

- 900+ people have visited the project website
- 460+ people have viewed the four Metro Matters blog posts published about this project
- 625+ people have viewed the seven 'Have a Say' Facebook posts about the project.

[Click here for a full copy of the Public Engagement Report](http://www.kingcounty.gov/transportation/kcdot/MetroTransit/Jobs/~//media/transportation/kcdot/MetroTransit/HaveASay/Renton/Renton_PublicEngagementReport.ashx) as detailed below, or type http://www.kingcounty.gov/transportation/kcdot/MetroTransit/Jobs/~//media/transportation/kcdot/MetroTransit/HaveASay/Renton/Renton_PublicEngagementReport.ashx into your web browser:

1. Executive Summary
2. Community Engagement Plan & Activities
3. Equity & Social Justice
4. Community Feedback Summary

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Survey results by phase

Appendix B – Emails and phone calls received

Appendix C – Website and social media analytics

Appendix D – Notifications, posters, fliers, meeting materials, and handouts by phase

Appendix E – Blog posts and comments

Appendix G-4
RapidRide A Line: Title VI Environmental Justice
Analysis, December 2010


RapidRide A Line

Title VI/Environmental Justice Analysis

December 2010

Introduction

King County Metro introduced the A Line RapidRide Bus Rapid Transit service in October 2010 to connect the south King County cities of Tukwila, SeaTac, Des Moines, Kent, and Federal Way. This document summarizes the analysis of the impact of proposed changes on minority and low-income populations in the A Line corridor, and the process leading up to the implementation of the A Line. Elements related to a restructuring of Route 174 service prior to and leading up to the A Line implementation were included in the Title VI reporting documentation for the Transit Connections service changes.



I. Service Change Area & Routes

Affected Areas

The implementation of the A Line involved replacement of existing service provided by Route 174 along the International Blvd/Pacific Highway South corridor in South King County. The affected areas include portions of five cities, including (north to south) Tukwila, SeaTac, Des Moines, Kent, and Federal Way. Routes with connections to the A Line corridor serve many additional areas of South King County, Seattle, and Pierce County. For this analysis, only the areas within 1 mile of affected route were considered to be part of the service change area. The affected area includes 29 census tracts with 154,801 residents (Source: U.S. Census, 2000). Appendix A contains a map of the affected tracts.

Affected Routes

As of Spring 2010, Metro provided about 59,800 annual hours of bus service on three routes that served portions of the International Blvd/Pacific Highway South corridor between Tukwila and Federal Way. While Route 174 was the primary route serving the entire corridor, routes 166 and 175 also provided overlapping service in some areas and continue to do so at present. The bus routes in the service area averaged 8,440 riders per weekday based on Spring 2010 ridership data. Ridership data by route is shown in Table 1 for affected routes.

Table 1: Average daily ridership on routes serving A Line corridor, Spring 2010

| Route | Areas Served | Average Daily Ridership | | |
|-------|--|-------------------------|----------|--------|
| | | Weekday | Saturday | Sunday |
| 166 | Des Moines - Highline Community College - Kent | 2,100 | 1,190 | 660 |
| 174 | Federal Way - Kent - Des Moines - SeaTac - Tukwila | 6,130 | 4,180 | 3,750 |
| 175 | North Federal Way - Midway - Downtown Seattle | 210 | | |

II. Threshold 1: Is this a Major Service Change?

This project meets criteria for major service change by Metro and FTA definitions.

Implementation of the A Line included an investment of approximately 30,500 new annualized service hours in the affected corridor, increasing service by more than 25% in the corridor. Implementation of the A Line improved service frequencies during most hours of each day. On weekdays, service frequency improved from every 20-30 minutes to every 10-15 minutes during peak hours (7-9 a.m. and 2-6 p.m.), and from every 30 minutes to every 15 minutes at all other times between 4:15 a.m. and 10 p.m. On weekends, service frequency improved from every 30 minutes to every 15 minutes between 4:45 a.m. and 10 p.m. Service frequency between 10 p.m. and 1:30 a.m. remained at every 30 minutes. The A Line also added two early morning trips between 1:30 a.m. and 4:15 a.m. to serve commuters to and from Sea-Tac Airport.

In addition to service increases, twenty-six stops have been upgraded to RapidRide stations, most of which received larger passenger shelters, pedestrian scaled lighting, additional benches, bike parking, real-time passenger information signs and off-board fare payment. Twenty-three other stops along the corridor have been enhanced, most with new passenger shelters, benches and additional lighting. A new proof of payment system is in use that allows riders who have paid to board through any of three doors on new, BRT-style buses.

III. Threshold 2: Are Minority or Low-Income Tracts Affected?

Characteristics of Service Area

The A Line serves 29 census tracts in southwest King County. Of the affected census tracts:

- 17 (59%) are minority AND low-income tracts
- 3 (10%) are minority tracts only
- 0 (0%) are low-income tracts only
- 9 (31%) are neither minority OR low-income tracts

IV. Threshold 3: Is there a Disproportionate Impact on Minority or Low-Income Tracts?

Service Increases

Implementation of the A Line will result in more than a 25% increase in bus service along the corridor it serves. Thus, all the census tracts in the service area (listed in Section III) will see a positive impact from service. Based on the characteristics of the service area, implementation of the A Line will have a positive impact on minority and low-income areas.

Stop Changes

Eleven stops were removed as part of the implementation of the A Line to increase stop spacing from approximately 1/3 mile to 0.45 miles. Stops were selected for removal based on multiple factors, including the existing stop level ridership and distance between stops in the same direction.

VI. Alternatives

Former route 174 riders now need to take the A Line for travel in the affected corridor. Since the A Line is more frequent, there is not a need to identify other alternatives for riders. Travel times in the A Line corridor are also expected to decrease by up to 30% from the travel times experienced on Route 174, providing a benefit to riders in the corridor. There are some riders who formerly boarded Route 174 at stops that are not served by RapidRide. These riders now have to travel to a different stop to use the A Line. Most riders who boarded Route 174 previously will continue to board the A Line at their current stop.


There will be no fare difference between the A Line and regular Metro service. Therefore riders who have used Route 174 in the past will not see a financial impact due to this change.

VII. Mitigation

Metro solicited preliminary public feedback on the A Line in 2007, and conducted more substantial outreach in 2008 and 2009. During the first round of outreach in 2007, Metro held three open houses in SeaTac, Des Moines, and Federal Way to get feedback from the community on the A Line proposal. Metro also mailed a survey to addresses along the proposed A Line corridor that included questions about demographics, stop spacing changes, and features proposed for RapidRide. Frequency of service and trip length (time) were cited as the most important elements of RapidRide among people responding to the survey. Late evening service was also cited as a relatively important element of RapidRide. Metro used information from these outreach activities to revise stop spacing plans, and focus elements of the RapidRide program to meet the needs of people in the A Line corridor.

During the more substantial outreach effort in 2008 and 2009, Metro solicited feedback about the A Line in the area as part of the Transit Connections project to restructure routes in Southwest King County. Outreach include two separate mailings in multiple languages to meet the needs of populations with limited English proficiency, a community Sounding Board made up of residents and employees in the affected area, multiple open houses, and presentations to public groups. The A Line was included in all outreach about the Transit Connections project, including maps of the proposed routing and stops, and information about elements of the A Line. More information is available about the Transit Connections project and outreach in separate Title VI documentation of that project.

Appendix A: Project Area



Appendix G-5
RapidRide B Line Restructure: Title VI Analysis,
Spring 2011

Bellevue Redmond Connections

RapidRide B Line Restructure

Final Title VI Analysis

Spring 2011

I. Service Change Area & Routes

Affected Areas

The majority of route changes are proposed in areas surrounding the B Line in Bellevue and Redmond. However, many routes serve multiple jurisdictions and thus changes affect routes serving the cities of Duvall, Issaquah, Kenmore, Kirkland, Newcastle, Renton, and Seattle. For this analysis, only the areas directly adjacent to the affected portions of routes were considered to be part of the service change area. The affected area includes 45 census tracts with 219,909 residents (Source: U.S. Census, 2010). Appendix A contains maps of the affected tracts.

Affected Routes

Metro provides about 389,000 annual hours of bus service on affected routes within the service change area. The bus routes in the service area averaged 27,920 riders per weekday based on Fall 2010 ridership data. Ridership data by route is shown in Table 1 for affected routes.

Table 1: Average daily ridership on routes serving affected areas, Fall 2010

| Route | Areas Served | Average Daily Ridership | | |
|-------|--|-------------------------|----------|--------|
| | | Weekday | Saturday | Sunday |
| 212 | Eastgate - Downtown Seattle | 1,260 | | |
| 221 | Education Hill - Redmond - Overlake - Lake Hills - Eastgate | 1,210 | 580 | 380 |
| 222 | Eastgate - Factoria - Beaux Arts - Downtown Bellevue | 740 | 370 | 140 |
| 225 | Overlake - Phantom Lake - Eastgate - Downtown Seattle | 250 | | |
| 229 | Overlake - Lake Hills - Eastgate - Downtown Seattle | 310 | | |
| 230 | Kingsgate - Kirkland - Bellevue - Crossroads - Overlake - Redmond | 3,420 | 1,570 | 1,110 |
| 233 | Bear Creek - Overlake - Bellevue | 870 | 270 | |
| 234 | Kenmore - Juanita - Kirkland - Bellevue | 1,080 | 430 | 310 |
| 240 | Clyde Hill - Bellevue - Factoria - Newport Hills - Newcastle - Renton | 2,390 | 1,650 | 720 |
| 245 | Kirkland - Houghton - Overlake - Crossroads - Bellevue College - Eastgate - Factoria | 2,820 | 980 | 790 |
| 246 | Factoria - Somerset - Eastgate - Woodridge - Bellevue | 310 | | |
| 247 | Overlake - Eastgate - Renton - Kent Boeing | 60 | | |
| 249 | Overlake - Kirkland - Bellevue | 550 | 200 | |
| 250 | Redmond - Sammamish Viewpoint - Overlake - Downtown Seattle | 240 | | |
| 253 | Bear Creek - Redmond - Overlake - Crossroads - Bellevue | 2,950 | 1,900 | 1,190 |
| 255 | Brickyard P&R - Totem Lake - Kirkland - Downtown Seattle | 3,370 | 1,680 | 1,200 |
| 256 | Overlake - Kirkland - Downtown Seattle | 220 | | |
| 261 | Overlake - Crossroads - Bellevue - Downtown Seattle | 310 | | |
| 265 | Redmond - Houghton - Downtown Seattle | 280 | | |
| 266 | Redmond - Overlake - Downtown Seattle | 240 | | |
| 271 | Issaquah - Eastgate - Bellevue College - Bellevue - Medina - University District | 4,570 | 1,510 | 740 |
| 272 | University District - Crossroads - Lake Hills - Eastgate | 330 | | |
| 926 | Crossroads - Phantom Lake - Bellevue College - Eastgate | 140 | | |

II. Threshold 1: Is this a Major Service Change?

The Bellevue Redmond Connections project affects 23 existing routes. The project will create three new routes, discontinue 12 routes, and modify routing and service levels on numerous others. This project meets all criteria for major service change by Metro and FTA definitions.

III. Threshold 2: Are Minority or Low-Income Tracts Affected?

Characteristics of Service Area

The Bellevue Redmond Connections project includes changes to routes serving 45 census tracts in the central Eastside area. Of the affected census tracts:

- 4 (9%) are minority AND low-income tracts
- 16 (36%) are minority tracts only
- 0 (0%) are low-income tracts only
- 25 (55%) are neither minority OR low-income tracts

IV. Threshold 3: Is there a Disproportionate Impact on Minority or Low-Income Tracts?

Service Increases

The Bellevue Redmond Connections project will not result in more than a 25% increase in bus service in the project area as a whole. However, the changes would result in significant increases in service in some areas. Seven census tracts would see a service increase of 25% or more.

Of the 7 tracts with increases in service:

- 1 (14%) is a minority AND low-income tract
- 3 (43%) are minority tracts only
- 1 (14%) is a low-income tract only
- 3 (43%) are neither minority OR low-income tracts

Table 2: Tracts with service increase (25% or greater)

| Tract | Neighborhoods | Description of Major Changes |
|-------|------------------------|--|
| 22605 | Willows/Rose Hill | Frequency Increase (B Line) |
| 22606 | Grass Lawn | Frequency Increase (B Line, Route 245) |
| 22801 | Overlake | Frequency Increase (B Line, Route 245) |
| 22902 | West Lake Sammamish | Frequency Increase (Route 249) |
| 23202 | Crossroads | Frequency Increase (B Line, Route 245) Route revised to serve tract (Route 221) |
| 23603 | Crossroads | Frequency Increase (B Line) Route revised to serve tract (Route 245) |
| 23900 | Beaux Arts, Enatai | Route revised to serve tract (249) |

Service Reductions

The Bellevue Redmond Connections project will not result in more than a 25% decrease in bus service in the project area as a whole. Changes are being made through investments funded by Transit Now and the redeployment of existing resources. However, the changes would result in some areas having no bus service or significantly less service than currently available. One census tract would see a service reduction of 25% or more. The one tract with reductions is a minority tract only.



Table 3: Tracts with service reduction (25% or greater)

| Tract | Neighborhood | Description of Major Changes |
|-------|--------------|------------------------------|
| 32313 | Bear Creek | Frequency Decrease |

VI. Alternatives

Metro considered transit alternatives for riders when developing route proposals. Most areas with route changes continue to have transit service, though in some areas riders may be using a different route or have a connection to a new location.

Travel times in the B Line corridor are expected to decrease through a combination of changes. These changes include transit signal priority, stop consolidation, new bus configurations, and potentially different fare policies. Travel times for other trips may change slightly due to the consolidation of routes and reduction of Metro peak-only services. Some sample trips are displayed below to indicate the range of impacts proposed.



Many riders will continue make trips solely on Metro service, and thus will not experience a difference in cost of travel. For riders who choose to use Sound Transit service instead of or in combination with Metro service, fares for most trips will be equal to or less than trips on Metro service alone. For riders transferring between Metro and Sound Transit, an ORCA card will be required to avoid having to pay separately for each portion of the trip.

VII. Mitigation

Metro conducted extensive outreach to the public in the affected communities. This outreach was designed to involve the community in decision-making and identify potential problems with ideas and plans for changing service. Outreach was conducted between September 2010 and March 2011.

Outreach included a community Sounding Board, open houses and information tables in affected areas, an informational postcard mailing to affected areas, a project website, and an online questionnaire. The Sounding Board was composed of community members and bus riders who helped identify community and jurisdictional concerns, reviewed proposals and provided feedback, helped develop alternative proposals, and provided feedback on outreach and communications.

In response to feedback received during the outreach process, Metro made the following changes to its service proposals:


- Maintained peak commuter service from West Lake Sammamish Parkway and NE 24th Street to Downtown Seattle (Route 250)
- Modified Route 245 to serve 140th Avenue SE and SE Main Street in order to serve and Sammamish High School and multi-family housing complexes
- Eliminated existing deviation of Route 221 to serve Overlake Transit Center and revised route to serve Crossroads and Phantom Lake
- Maintained existing routing of Route 240 through Factoria and South Bellevue, rather than deviating to serve Eastgate and Bellevue College
- Revised Route 249 to serve hotels on NE 29th Place in Bellevue
- Maintained or improved existing services instead of pursuing new service concepts for peak service across the SR-520 floating bridge
- Maintained peak commuter service from NE 70th Street to Downtown Seattle (Route 265)

As indicated above, only one Census tract (32313 - Bear Creek) would experience a decrease in service greater than 25 percent. However, Metro and Sound Transit would continue to provide a high level of service to this tract and would maintain time-competitive service options to key destinations, including Downtown Seattle, Downtown Redmond, Overlake, Downtown Bellevue and Kirkland. Although the direct connection to Downtown Bellevue will be available only during peak periods, convenient connections between the B Line and routes serving the neighborhood will be available at Redmond Transit Center during the mid-day, evening and weekends.

VIII. Substantial Need

Implementation of the B Line is a significant investment of new resources. Service restructures are being proposed to support high levels of service on the B Line trunk service, improve connections between the B Line and other routes, improve service frequency and span in the area, and enhance network efficiency by reducing duplication among transit services. These objectives present a substantial need for considering the restructures outlined in the Bellevue Redmond Connections project.

Appendix A: Project Area



STUDY AREA CENSUS TRACT DESIGNATIONS

Appendix G-6
Ride Free Area Closure: Title VI Evaluation

Ride Free Area Closure – Title VI Evaluation

Prepared by:
Service Development Section
Metro Transit Division
King County Department of Transportation

September, 2012



Introduction

The downtown Seattle Ride Free Area (RFA) was initiated at the request of the City of Seattle in July 1973 to enhance employee, visitor and resident circulation within the downtown core and to improve retail activity. The city agreed to pay King County Metro's operating deficit for the free service: \$64,000. This amount was equivalent to the annual revenue from the Dime Shuttle once operated downtown by Seattle Transit, which became part of Metro.

Subsequent RFA agreements were based on the annual number of trips in the RFA. The amount increased annually in proportion to the increase in total ridership in Seattle. The city's payments for the RFA grew from \$64,000 in 1974 to \$364,000 in 1982. From 1977 to 1982, the city's payments also covered a reduced-fare shuttle to the Kingdome. After 1982, the shuttle payments were handled separately. In January 1978, the RFA boundary was extended to Battery Street. The City of Seattle agreed to pay for this extension from 1978 to 1982.

In 1982, the Seattle City Council convened a task force to review the RFA, recommend if it should continue, and examine its financial status. The task force determined that the RFA should continue and that the compensation from the city should compensate Metro for the net fare revenue loss resulting from the operation of the RFA. Net fare revenue loss was equal to the total estimated fare revenue loss from RFA operations less the operating cost savings to Metro resulting from increased travel speeds through downtown. After this review, the city's contributions increased from \$100,000 to \$150,000 from 1984 to 1989. The increases were based on estimates of Metro's revenue losses and changes in operating costs resulting from operating the RFA.

For the past 14 years, the city's payment has been adjusted only for inflation; it has not been re-calculated based on estimated fare revenue loss to Metro since 1998. The city paid King County Metro \$401,500 for RFA operation in 2011.

2009 King County performance audit

The King County Auditor's Office conducted a Transit Performance Audit in 2009 that included a major focus on ways that Metro could reduce costs and increase revenues in light of dramatic reductions in sales tax revenue. One recommendation directed Metro to update the formula used to assess the City of Seattle's payment for the RFA.

"Transit should update and fully document the formula used to assess the City of Seattle's payment for the Downtown Seattle Ride Free Area to reflect current ridership and operating conditions including trips that are attracted by virtue of free fares. Transit and the council should then consider revising the agreement with the City of Seattle." (A13)

Updated RFA Lost Revenue and Operating Savings Estimates

In 2010, Metro undertook a number of efforts to respond to these audit recommendations. Metro conducted in-person interviews and used ridership data to estimate the number of boardings in the RFA and lost revenue from RFA operations. This work, summarized in Ride Free Area Ridership and Revenue Estimates, estimated there were 8.4 million boardings in the RFA in 2010. Approximately 2.8 million of the 8.4 million annual boardings were made by people who had not already paid for their trip with a transfer or a pass. Of these 2.8 million boardings, 40 percent of the riders said they would be willing to pay for their trip in the downtown area. The remaining 60 percent said they would not use the bus if they had to pay. Metro also conducted analysis to update the estimated operating cost savings from RFA operations.

Based on this work, Metro estimated that it could potentially gain \$2.2 million per year in additional revenue if the RFA were eliminated, including the loss of fare revenue, fare evasion and net of additional operational costs.

Congestion reduction charge ordinance

On August 16, 2011, the King County Council approved Ordinance 17169, enacting the congestion reduction charge, an annual \$20 vehicle license fee to preserve transit service in King County. The ordinance also directed Metro to take additional steps to improve efficiency. This funding helped to prevent a 17 percent reduction in transit service that would have led to a loss of 9 million passenger trips annually.

When the County Council approved this charge, it also requested that Metro discontinue the Ride Free Area by October 2012 if the county was unable to negotiate an agreement with the City of Seattle using a new methodology that accurately offset the cost of service and acknowledged the minimal benefit to the county in providing these services.

The City of Seattle has indicated that it is not in a position to negotiate a new agreement with a higher annual payment to Metro. As a result, Metro is proceeding with the elimination of the RFA scheduled for September 29, 2012.

Title VI Evaluation Requirements and Approach

The elimination of the downtown Seattle Ride Free Area results from the expiration of an agreement between the City of Seattle and King County Metro. This is not a fare change that requires adoption of an ordinance by the King County Council. Nonetheless, Metro is providing this Title VI evaluation of the impacts of RFA elimination on minority and low-income populations in downtown Seattle in keeping with the spirit of the Federal Transit Administration's Circular FTA C 4702.1A (May 13, 2007). The relevant section of this circular follows.

Chapter V.4. REQUIREMENT TO EVALUATE SERVICE AND FARE CHANGES. In order to comply with 49 CFR Section 21.5(b)(2), 49 CFR Section 21.5(b)(7) and Appendix C to 49 CFR part 21, recipients to which this chapter applies shall evaluate significant system-wide service and fare changes and proposed improvements at the planning and

programming stages to determine whether those changes have a discriminatory impact.
.....

- a. Option A: Recipients are encouraged to evaluate the impacts of proposed service and fare changes according to the following procedure:
- (1) Assess the effects of the proposed fare or service change on minority and low-income populations.
 - (a) ...
 - (b) ...
 - (c) Fare changes. For proposed changes that would increase or decrease fares on certain transit modes or by fare payment type or payment media, the recipient should analyze any available information generated from ridership surveys indicating whether minority and low-income riders are more likely to use the mode of service, payment type, or payment media that would be subject to the fare increase.
 - (2) Assess the alternatives available for people affected by the fare increase or major service change.
 - (a) ...
 - (b) Fare changes. For proposed fare changes, the recipient should analyze what, if any, alternative transit modes, fare payment types, or fare payment media are available for people affected by the fare change. This analysis should compare the fares paid under the change with fares that would be paid through available alternatives.
 - (3) Describe the actions the agency proposes to minimize, mitigate, or offset any adverse effects of proposed fare and service changes on minority and low-income populations.
 - (4) Determine which, if any of the proposals under consideration would have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority and low-income riders. Recipients can implement a fare increase or major service reduction that would have disproportionately high and adverse effects provided that the recipient demonstrates that the action meets a substantial need that is in the public interest and that alternatives would have more severe adverse effects than the preferred alternative.
- b. Option B: Locally Developed Evaluation Procedure. Recipients have the option of modifying the above option or developing their own procedures to evaluate significant system-wide service and fare changes and proposed improvements at the planning and programming stages to determine whether those changes have a discriminatory impact. This locally developed alternative shall include a description of the

methodology used to determine the impact of the service and fare change, a determination as to whether the proposed change would have discriminatory impacts, and a description of what, if any, action was taken by the agency in response to the analysis conducted.

Metro has developed the following threshold approach for identifying whether a Title VI evaluation needs to be conducted pursuant to V.4.b above.

Threshold 1: Is this a “significant systemwide ... fare change.”

As noted above this is not a systemwide fare change, nonetheless it is a significant change for those impacted.

Threshold 2: Are minority or low-income census tracts affected?

According to the 2010 Census, 35.2 percent of households in King County are minority. Using the county average as a guide, five of the seven census tracts located wholly or partially in the downtown Seattle RFA are non-minority, while 2 are minority. (See Figure 1) Data from the 2005-2009 American Community Surveys indicate that 9.65 percent of households in King County are living in poverty. All of the seven census tracts located partially or wholly in the RFA have a greater than average percentage of households living in poverty. (Figure 2)

Threshold 3: Is there a disproportionate impact on low-income or minority census tracts?

Since all the Census Tracts in the RFA are low-income, elimination of the downtown Seattle Ride Free Area will have a disproportionate impact on low-income census tracts. Note that this change will also impact many others coming to downtown Seattle from throughout the region for work, shopping and recreational purposes.

Mitigating Impacts on Low-Income Riders

Among those who will be most affected by the elimination of the Ride Free Area and change to pay-on-entry are people with little or no income who use the free bus service to access essential services downtown.

Metro is committed to continuing to help people who depend on public transportation for mobility. Metro also complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act and the “fair and just” principle of the King County Strategic Plan, which seeks to eliminate inequities and social injustices based on race, income, and neighborhood.

The following are strategies that Metro pursued and continues to pursue to assist those affected by the upcoming changes:

- Use Metro’s existing transportation assistance programs.

- Reach out to human services and health agencies to assist them in increasing awareness of elimination of RFA and the availability of reduced fare tickets.
- Work with the City of Seattle to determine what mitigation solutions might be put in place to assist people who cannot afford transit in downtown Seattle.

Metro's existing transportation assistance programs

Reduced Regional Fare Permit

The Regional Reduced Fare Permit (RRFP) program entitles senior riders (age 65 or older), riders with a disability, and Medicare card holders to reduced fares on public transportation throughout the Puget Sound region. Permit holders are entitled to a 75-cent fare on all Metro's regular transit services throughout the county and at all times of day. The discount provided by this reduced fare ranges from 67 percent during off-peak hours to 75 percent for a 2-zone peak trip. RRFP riders may also purchase monthly passes at a reduced rate of \$27 and load value onto an "electronic purse" on an ORCA RRFP card.

RRFP applicants must complete an application form and pay \$3 to purchase the permit. Seniors may apply by mail; people with disabilities must apply in person and have their disability certified by a health care professional.

King County Human Services Ticket Program

King County's Human Services Ticket Program sells tickets at an 80 percent discount to human services agencies throughout the county. Participating agencies distribute these tickets to their clients for travel to shelters, medical appointments, job training, food banks and other essential services. This program was established in 1993 when Seattle Housing and Resource Effort (SHARE) established a homeless shelter at the Aloha Inn, outside of walking distance from the downtown RFA.

The Department of Housing/Human Services at the City of Seattle and the Department of Community/Human Services at King County determine the eligibility and the allocations for each agency. Social service agencies purchase tickets directly from Metro throughout the year, paying 20 percent of the cost of the tickets up to their annual allocation. Participating human services agencies are listed in Exhibit A.

King County Code (Section 28.94.245) establishes a limit to the annual amount of Metro subsidy for the Human Services Ticket Program (\$1.875 million in 2011 and 2012). This limit has been adjusted over the years in response to increased demand as well as fare increases. Metro provided over 1.1 million rides through this program in 2011. With 94 percent of the approved allocation was used in 2011, leaving \$106,000 of subsidy available for program growth. An additional subsidy of up to \$200,000 per year may be made available from tickets donated by King County residents renewing their automobile tabs and donating their incentive bus tickets through the CRC program.

Working with human services and health agencies

In November 2011, the King County Executive's Office and Metro convened a subcommittee of representatives from key social and health service agencies to seek their advice about mitigation strategies. These agencies assist low-income people who use the RFA to travel to services in and around downtown Seattle.

This group includes Seattle King County Coalition on Homelessness, Plymouth Housing Group, Downtown Emergency Service Center, Evergreen Treatment, Pioneer Square Clinic, Real Change, Compass Center, International District Housing Alliance, Catholic Community Services of Western Washington, and Millionaire Club. The committee also includes representatives from the City of Seattle and Seattle City Council.

Throughout the process, County staff continued to work with the service agencies and the City of Seattle staff to develop options to mitigate the impacts of the elimination of the RFA to low- and no-income riders. In March 2012, the subcommittee met again with City of Seattle representatives to focus on transportation assistance.

Evaluating mitigation options

Working with the human service agencies and the City of Seattle, Metro evaluated several options to address impacts to no- and low-income residents that may result from elimination of the RFA. This evaluation included:

- Study of travel behavior in the RFA.
- Review of human service ticket programs at transit agencies nationwide.
- Review of downtown Seattle circulator options and a donated van program, both of which would provide transportation options for those who cannot afford to pay a fare.

Travel behaviors in the Ride Free Area

In December 2011, Metro commissioned a survey by Gilmore Research to study bus travel by low-income residents and human service agency (HSA) clients in the Ride Free Area. More than 1,100 interviews were completed at service agencies and residential facilities in downtown Seattle.

The study had the following objectives:

1. Provide a better understanding of mobility needs, capabilities, and resources of these clients.
2. Allow the development of an estimate of RFA ridership by HSA clients residing in the RFA and of clients traveling to HSAs from outside the RFA.

This study provided valuable information on travel behaviors of low-income residents and human services clientele in the RFA. Key findings include:

- 56 percent of respondents at service providers live within the RFA.
- Almost 40 percent of HSA clients have a bus pass, and those who live inside the RFA are just as likely to have a bus pass as those who do not.

- A greater proportion of those who live inside the RFA report having a difficult time walking than those who live outside it.
- The average number of daily trips per resident taken entirely within the RFA is 2.63.
- On the day they took the survey, two out of three HSA clients reported taking a trip in the RFA to visit a service agency, on average taking 2.02 trips to service agencies each day.

Unfortunately, the results of this study seem to have overstated the number of daily trips taken solely within the RFA by human service agency clients. When compared to the 2010 report on RFA ridership and revenue estimates (which included actual bus zone boarding counts), the December 2011 survey suggests that the number of boardings by HSA clients is equal to the total number of RFA boardings by all riders on all days. Given the RFA's historical use by more than just HSA clients, the results of estimated ridership from the survey are not considered reliable.

Mitigation Options

(A) Increase subsidy to Human Services Ticket Program

Metro examined what a number of transit agencies around the nation do to assist low-income individuals or nonprofit organizations. These transit agencies were Metro Transit in Minneapolis, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (MUNI), TriMet of Portland, Los Angeles Metro Transit Authority, Kitsap Transit and Honolulu BUS.

These transit agencies typically offer one of three types of discounts:

- Discounted passes or tickets distributed directly to social service and non-profit agencies.
- Discounted passes or tickets distributed to individuals based on income-eligibility.
- Fare subsidy coupons distributed to individuals based on income-eligibility.

Discounts to nonprofit and social service agencies ranged from 5 to 50 percent of the cost of a pass or ticket. Individuals whose eligibility is based on income typically received a 50 percent discount on passes.

Compared to the programs evaluated, King County Metro provides the largest discount to nonprofit agencies with its Human Services Ticket program, which offers an 80 percent discount to human services agencies, which in turn provide these tickets to their low-income clients. Expanding this program is one option to mitigate impacts on low-income residents and clients of human service agencies resulting from eliminating the RFA. This option was viewed somewhat favorably by agencies currently participating in this program during outreach meetings with these agencies. Those agencies not currently participating in the human services ticket program did not view this option as favorably: they did not want to spend limited funds for the 20 percent of the value of the tickets and devote limited staff resources to administering the program.

(B) Provide donated vehicles

A donated-vehicle program would provide vehicles to human services agencies and housing facilities to provide transportation to their clients. Vans retired from Metro's Vanpool or Vanshare fleet would be provided. A new vehicle, similar to those operated by the Community Access Transportation (CAT) and dial-a-ride transportation (DART) programs might also be provided. Human service agencies or housing facilities would operate these vans to transport their clients.

Metro could pay for the van maintenance costs, typically \$2,000 per year per van. Subsidies for operating costs would be on a case-by-case basis. With the donation of these vans, Metro forfeits \$6,000 worth of salvage value for each Vanpool or Vanshare vehicle. For a new vehicle, similar to those used by the CAT program, the purchase price would range from \$60,000 to \$65,000. Human service agencies in and around downtown Seattle showed limited support for implementing such a program.

(C) Downtown circulator

Metro developed two proposals to provide information on costs and benefits for discussion purposes to help the City of Seattle develop a downtown circulator. These options are:

- Third Avenue Metro circulator, operating via Third Avenue between South Jackson Street and Battery Street, using current Metro bus stops to pick up and drop off passengers in this corridor
- Downtown circulator, as evaluated, would operate on a fixed route in a clockwise direction between Yesler Way and Battery Street on First Avenue, and travel east onto Battery Street and back onto Second Avenue for a short segment. From Second Avenue, the circulator would travel east via Virginia Street to Boren Avenue, serving the Urban Rest Stop and eventually Harborview Medical Center at Jefferson Street. The circulator would loop back into the downtown core via Yesler Way.

Cost estimates for the Third Avenue Metro circulator are based on three or four 40 foot coaches, depending on the frequency desired. The annual operating cost per coach would be approximately \$230,000. The Third Avenue Metro circulator would also require the purchase of additional 40-foot coaches at the cost of \$600,000 each. With three coaches, service could be provided every 20 minutes.

The downtown circulator cost estimates include two or three 10- to 15-passenger vehicles operated by an outside contractor. Annual operating cost per vehicle would be \$150,000-\$180,000. Depending on the vehicle chosen, capital costs would range from \$60,000 to \$65,000 per vehicle. With three vehicles, service could be provided every 20 minutes.

Mitigation Strategy

The City of Seattle and King County Metro decided to move forward with the implementation of a free downtown Seattle circulator as the strategy for mitigating the impacts of the RFA closure based on a number of factors, including community feedback through a public engagement process and specific comments from downtown Seattle human service agencies, low-income consumer populations, as well as cost considerations. In addition to the free circulator, the county is considering legislation that would expand the current limit on the total amount of discounts available for the sale and distribution of transit tickets to human service agencies.

Free Downtown Circulator

Through a partnership with the City of Seattle and Solid Ground (a non-profit personal transit corporation), Metro is contributing to a free downtown circulator service pilot project. This circulator will provide free rides for low income persons living in downtown Seattle, as well as those who access health and human services in the downtown Seattle area. The free circulator map is shown in Figure 3. Metro is providing two custom vehicles; one 23-passenger vehicle, and one 19-passenger vehicle. Service will operate Monday through Friday, from approximately 7:00 am to 4:00 pm. Vehicles are scheduled to provide service every 25-30 minutes. The City of Seattle is funding the operating and vehicle maintenance expenses of the service up to a maximum of \$400,000 annually. The term of the pilot project is October 1, 2012 to December 31, 2013.

Distribution of Additional Bus Tickets to Human Service Agencies

Legislation is currently under consideration by the King County Council which would add \$250,000 to the limit on the total amount of discounts available for the sale and distribution of transit tickets to human service agencies. The current limit is \$1.875 million per year. This legislation, if passed would increase the total amount to \$2.125 million per year.

Figure 1: RFA Minority/Non-minority Census Tracts




Figure 2: RFA Low-income Census Tracts




Figure 3:





Appendix G-7
Report on Rates of Fare for the Transit Program
2011 Report

Report on Rates of Fare for the Transit Program

2011 Report

August 2012

**Research and Management Information
Transit Division**



Table of Contents

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| Background | 2 |
| Section 28.94.035: ADA Paratransit Program | 2 |
| Section 28.94.045: Community Transportation Program | 3 |
| Section 4.150.230: Visitor Passes | 7 |
| Section 4.150.136: Vanpool Fares | 8 |
| Section 4.150.090: Limited Service Fares | 8 |
| Section 4.150.070: Customized Bus Service Fares | 9 |
| Section 4.150.050: Animal Fares | 10 |
| Section 4.150.450: Public School District Agreements | 10 |
| Section 4.150.410: Governmental Agency Ticket and/or Pass Agreements | 11 |
| Section 4.150.110: Peace Officer Fares | 11 |
| Section 28.94.225: Ride Free Services Agreements | 11 |
| Section 4.150.530: Leasing of Transit Vehicles | 12 |
| Section 4.150.350: Interagency Trip Agreements | 12 |
| Section 4.150.610: Waiving or Discounting Fare or Pass Prices | 13 |
| Section 4.150.210: Provision of Tickets to Human Services Agencies | 15 |
| | |
| Appendix A: 2011 Special Event Descriptions | |
| Appendix B: 2011 Custom Bus Routes | |
| Appendix C: Estimated Benefits and Lost Revenue from Special Rates of Fare Programs in 2011 | |
| Appendix D: Summary Table of 2011 Special Rates of Fare Programs | |
| Appendix E: Human Services Agencies Participating in 2011 | |

REPORT ON RATES OF FARE FOR THE TRANSIT PROGRAM

Background

In addition to establishing fares for regularly-scheduled public transportation service, the King County Code provides the authority to modify regular rates of fare and to establish fares and fees for other transportation services. Section 28.94.265 of the code also provides that the Department of Transportation Director submit to the King County Council an annual report of all the services and fares authorized by K.C.C. 28.94.035, 4.150.230, 4.150.130, 4.150.090, 4.150.070, 4.150.050, 4.150.450, 4.150.410, 4.150.110, 28.94.225, 4.150.530, 4.150.350, 4.150.610 and 4.150.210.

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide a brief description and summary information on the modified rates of fare and special transportation services programs offered in 2011, in compliance with section 28.94.265 of the code. Each section begins with the relevant sections of the King County Code and then follows with a program summary.

Paratransit Programs

**Section 28.94.035: ADA Paratransit Program and
Section 28.94.045: King County Metro Community Transportation Program and Services**

ADA Paratransit Program

28.94.035 ADA paratransit program.

A. As required in 49 C.F.R. pt. 37, subpart F, the county shall provide paratransit or other special services, referred to in this section, K.C.C. 28.94.045 and K.C.C. 28.94.245* as "ADA paratransit services," to individuals eligible under the federal Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, referred to in this section, K.C.C. 28.94.045 and K.C.C. 28.94.245* as "ADA". The county may supplement the ADA paratransit services with other service described in K.C.C. 28.94.045.

B. ADA paratransit services shall be provided during the same hours and days as regular, fixed, non-commuter bus service, within corridors that extend three-fourths of a mile on either side of the regular, fixed, non-commuter bus routes, as the routes may be amended from time to time.

C. ADA paratransit services shall be provided on a curb-to-curb basis.

D. ADA paratransit services shall be provided on an advance reservations basis, on the day before the occurrence of the ride requested.

E. ADA paratransit services may include requiring riders to transfer from one paratransit vehicle to another as part of the trip requested by the rider.

F. Subscription service shall not be provided as part of the ADA paratransit services.

G. ADA paratransit services may include feeder service to and from an accessible bus zone for individuals who are able to use the fixed route system.

H. In furtherance of the ADA paratransit program, the director may:

1. Organize and manage the provision of ADA paratransit services, including but not limited to call-taking, scheduling, dispatching, operations and vehicle maintenance, and, subject to applicable contracting and procurement requirements, enter into agreements with public and private agencies and entities for the provision of one or more of the services;
2. Develop and implement procedures in accordance with 49 C.F.R. pt. 37, subpart F, for the certification of ADA paratransit eligibility and the suspension of ADA paratransit service to eligible individuals with a documented pattern or practice of missing scheduled rides. The suspensions shall not be processed according to the procedures dealing with suspensions related to violations of rules of conduct on transit property and facilities as set forth elsewhere in K.C.C. chapter 28.96;
3. Develop and implement procedures for ADA paratransit service, and establish eligibility, administrative and operations procedures and referral services for the services;
4. Encourage the participation of, and enter into agreements with, public and private agencies and entities to coordinate their transportation resources as provided in this section;
5. Enter into agreements with other transit agencies to establish procedures for allocating paratransit trips and the cost of paratransit services to ADA-eligible riders seeking to transfer between transportation systems or cross jurisdictional boundaries and allocate the costs of providing paratransit services where the paratransit services of the other agencies overlap the county's ADA paratransit services; and
6. Submit plans, reports and information to the Federal Transit Administration as may be required under applicable federal regulations. (Ord. 13441 § 2, 1999).

Community Transportation Program

28.94.045 King County metro community transportation program and services.

A. The King County metro community transportation program is hereby established to supplement available public and private transportation services operating in King County

that are targeted to individuals with special transportation needs. Individuals with special transportation needs shall include those individuals who, because of physical or mental disability, income status, or age are unable to transport themselves or to purchase appropriate transportation. Services provided under this section may be implemented and updated by the director as provided in this chapter and within annual appropriations.

B. King County metro community transportation program paratransit services may be provided daily between the hours of six a.m. and ten p.m. unless otherwise specified in this section, and may include:

1. For individuals who meet the eligibility criteria for ADA paratransit services, services provided in the area of the county within corridors that extend three-quarter miles on either side of regular, fixed, non-commuter bus routes, as the routes may be amended from time to time. The area shall expand and contract during the same days and hours as the regular, fixed, non-commuter bus routes; provided further that the easternmost paratransit service corridor shall extend one and one-half miles to the east of the easternmost regular, fixed, non-commuter bus route; and provided further that when such paratransit service corridors as specified herein result in areas within the King County Urban Growth Boundary being surrounded on all sides by paratransit service corridors, such areas shall be included in the service area for King County metro community transportation program paratransit services.

2. For individuals who meet the eligibility criteria for ADA paratransit services, services provided with door-to-door driver assistance when such assistance is determined to be essential, using criteria established by the director. The director or designee shall determine the days and hours and the conditions under which these services can be provided safely and when they will be provided outside the established King County metro community transportation service hours and service area in response to the special transportation needs of individual riders;

3. For individuals who meet the eligibility criteria for ADA paratransit services, services provided with hand-to-hand driver assistance when such assistance is determined to be essential, using criteria established by the director, and when such individuals are sponsored by an agency or other organization that enters into a contract with the county for the assistance. The director or designee shall determine the days and hours and conditions under which these services can be provided safely and when they will be provided outside the established King County metro community transportation service hours and service area in response to the special transportation needs of individual riders;

4. For individuals who meet the eligibility criteria for ADA paratransit services, an advance reservation period that may be extended up to seven days in advance of the occurrence of the ride requested. However, any extension of the reservation period shall not adversely affect the system capacity for scheduling ADA paratransit program rides requested;

5. For individuals who meet the eligibility criteria for ADA paratransit services, subscription service arranged for individuals who establish a recurrent pattern of travel that, under criteria established by the director, provides for the efficient operation of the services. However, the arrangements shall not adversely affect the system capacity for scheduling ADA paratransit program rides requested; and

6. For individuals who have a valid regional reduced fare permit, are at least eighteen years of age and have an annual income at or below seventy percent of the median income for the state of Washington, as determined from time to time by the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services and adjusted for family size, and who live too far from regular, fixed, non-commuter bus routes or general public dial-a-ride service, transportation services to and from the bus routes or dial-a-ride service may be provided. The director or designee shall determine the days and hours and conditions under which these services can be provided safely and when they will be provided outside the established King County metro community transportation service hours and service area in response to the special transportation needs of individual riders. The services shall not be provided if the individual can make other public or private transportation arrangements.

C. King County metro community transportation program paratransit services may be provided to public and private agencies who share in the cost of service delivery and whose participants:

1. Meet the eligibility criteria for ADA paratransit services;
2. Have a valid regional reduced fare permit, are at least eighteen years of age and have an annual income at or below seventy percent of the median income for the state of Washington, as determined from time to time by the Washington State Department of Social and Health Services and adjusted for family size;
3. Are deemed eligible as participants to attend programs at or with agencies that participate in the county's community partnership services under D of this section; or
4. Have special transportation needs and are participants, customers or clients at programs, agencies or other entities that enter into contracts with the county to coordinate or share their transportation resources with the county and its service providers for the purpose of maximizing the provision of transportation services and the use of all available county and non-county resources. The director or designee shall determine when such paratransit services may be provided outside the established King County metro community transportation program service area in response to the special transportation needs of individual riders. Insofar as practicable, the county shall secure commitments from the public and private agencies so that by the 2004 their share of the costs of providing the services is not less than twenty-five percent. Cost participation by agencies may include direct or in-kind cost contributions.

D. Community partnership services, including but not limited to operating, capital and technical support and resources, to support volunteer and other transportation services may be provided and updated by the director as provided in this chapter. The individuals identified in C of this section are eligible for the services. The services shall be allocated, subject to applicable contracting and procurement requirements, to public or private non-profit entities and municipalities within King County that provide or sponsor social services to eligible individuals and to other entities whose participation enhances the county's transportation and transportation-related human and community services goals and objectives. Planning for community partnership services shall include those agencies in King County are responsible for establishing service goals for eligible populations. This may include, but is not limited to, the King County department of human services, the Area Agency on Aging and the Seattle-King County public health department.

E. Services to assist individuals in using the most cost-effective, appropriate and available transportation resource or resources may be made available to individuals eligible under C of this section, and may include:

1. Bus travel training and orientation services; and
2. Information and referral services.

F. The executive shall initiate an effort to increase the availability of accessible vehicles in the local taxicab industry that do not charge rates greater than for nonaccessible vehicles. The goal of such an effort must be to achieve at least ten percent accessibility in the taxicabs licensed by the county by the year 2001.

G. In furtherance of the King County metro community transportation program, the director may:

1. Organize and manage the provision of King County metro community transportation program paratransit services, including but not limited to call-taking, scheduling, dispatching, operations and vehicle maintenance, and, subject to applicable contracting and procurement requirements, enter into agreements with public and private agencies and entities for the provision of one or more of the services;
2. Develop and implement procedures, and establish eligibility, administrative and operations procedures and referral services, for the King County metro community transportation program;
3. Encourage the participation and enter into agreements with public and private agencies and entities to coordinate their transportation resources as provided in this section; and
4. Enter into agreements with other transit agencies to establish procedures for allocating King County metro community transportation program paratransit trips and

the cost of King County metro community transportation program paratransit services for riders seeking to transfer between transportation systems or cross jurisdictional boundaries and to allocate the costs of providing paratransit services where the paratransit services of the other agencies overlap the county's paratransit services. (Ord. 13441 § 3, 1999).

Statistical Summary

At the end of 2011:

- The ADA paratransit program had 30,663 eligible persons registered. ADA registrants took 1,221,392 passenger rides on Access Transportation, for a 0.6 percent decrease from 2010 rides.
- The Taxi Scrip program had 24,298 eligible persons registered. Taxi Scrip program participants took 32,352 taxi rides—a 0.5 percent decrease from the number of 2010 rides.
- Community Access Transportation agencies provided 303,428 rides to persons participating in their programs, compared with 250,369 rides provided in 2010—an increase of 21.2 percent.
- Paratransit service revenue from cash fares was \$388,495 in 2011, compared with \$221,927 in 2010. Pass sales revenue is no longer listed, as it is combined with other One Regional Card for All (ORCA) pass sales and the revenue is credited to the Metro Transit Division. Service costs including direct operating cost, program management cost, ADA eligibility and registration cost, community partnership program cost and administrative cost were \$56,723,758 in 2011, compared with \$54,309,766 in 2010, an increase of 4.4 percent.

Section 4.150.230: Visitor Passes

4.150.230 Visitor passes.

The director is authorized to issue and sell visitor passes entitling the holders thereof to public transportation services as specified by the passes, provided such issuance is not expected to require the addition of regularly scheduled service. The director shall establish the rates of fare, the number of visitor passes and the extent of services available under said passes based on the estimated average visitor usage and the administrative costs of issuing the passes. Said passes may be valid for a period not to exceed seven consecutive days. The director is further authorized to issue and sell said passes to travel, convention and special event groups for quantities over one hundred at a rate that is not less than seventy percent of the established visitor rate. Visitor pass privileges shall commence and terminate on the date(s) for which the passes are valid. (Ord. 12643 § 7, 1997. Formerly K.C.C. 28.94.180).

This section authorizes the Department of Transportation Director to sell visitor passes. No visitor passes were sold in 2011.

Section 4.150.136: Vanpool Fares**4.150.130 Vanpool fares.**

The director is authorized to establish rates of fare for vanpools, provided that the rates of fare are established at a level reasonably estimated to recover the operating and capital costs of, and at least twenty-five percent of the cost of administering, the vanpool program. (Ord. 12643 § 8, 1997. Formerly K.C.C. 28.94.185).

This section sets the parameters by which the Department of Transportation Director may establish rates of fare for vanpools. King County Metro Transit's Vanpool Program began at the City of Seattle in 1979 with 21 vans. The City of Seattle transferred operation of the vanpool program to the Municipality of Metropolitan Seattle (Metro) in 1984, and the Metro vanpool responsibilities became part of the King County Metro Transit Division in 1996.

King County Metro Transit administers the largest publicly-owned vanpool program in the nation. The program provides vans, staff support, maintenance, fuel and insurance to groups of five to fifteen people who commute together. Riders pay a monthly fare based on the round-trip mileage of the commute, the number of people in the vanpool and the van size. At the end of 2011, there were 1,087 vanpool vans in operation.

In 2001, King County Metro Transit initiated Vanshare, a new commuter van product, to its vanpool program. Vanshare maximizes the use of the public transportation system by connecting commuters to/from transit, rail, ferry service and park-and-ride lots. At the end of 2011, there were 141 Vanshare groups operating, for a total of 1,228 commuter vans in operation.

Pursuant to code, vanpool fares are to be established at a level such that the program is reasonably estimated to recover program operating and capital costs and at least 25 percent of the cost of administering the program. In 2011, vanpool revenues were \$9,467,977, consisting of \$9,311,152 in fare revenue and \$156,825 in other operating revenue. Operating costs were \$5,648,000, administrative costs were \$4,436,000 (25 percent of which needs to be recovered through fares) and capital costs were \$2,749,000. This was consistent with the multi-year Vanpool financial plan, which is structured to provide for the long-term stability of the program while complying with the code provisions regarding vanpool fares. Vanpools operating in 2011 provided 2,829,663 passenger trips. Vanshares operating in 2011 provided 288,343 passenger trips.

Section 4.150.090: Limited Service Fares**4.150.090 Limited service fares.**

The director is authorized to establish rates of fare for limited service to special or seasonal activities or events, provided such rates of fare and any contributions are established at a level reasonably estimated to recover at least twenty-five percent of the marginal cost for the service hours provided. In addition, the rates of fare for limited service shall be established at a level at least equal to the rates of fare for equivalent regularly scheduled service. If, however, the limited service is not equivalent to any

regular service, then the rates of fare shall be no less than one-half of the one-zone, off-peak full fare set forth in this chapter. Such limited services shall be on an individual fare-paying basis and be scheduled according to such routes, schedules and dates as are determined by the director. (Ord. 12643 § 9, 1997. Formerly K.C.C. 28.94.190).

This section authorizes the Department of Transportation Director to establish rates of fare for limited service to special or seasonal activities or events.

King County Metro Transit provided limited service for special and/or seasonal events, which attracted 231,604 riders in 2011. Marginal costs of \$1,020,538 were partially offset by \$825,732 in operating revenue, for a net cost of \$194,806. (See Appendix A for a listing of special event service during 2011.)

Section IV.D of the 2010/2011 Transit Program Financial Policies establishes a policy of full recovery of all direct and indirect costs for special services provided for other public or private organizations. This section also authorizes the Department of Transportation Director to waive this policy where it may interfere with the ability to sponsor or participate in services that are vital to the primary goal of King County's public transportation program, subject to confirmation by the King County Council as soon as possible after the action taken by the Department of Transportation Director for all expenditures in excess of \$30,000 annually.

Special services subject to this financial policy were provided for four types of events—seven Husky games, six Seahawks games, 14 Sounders games, and Seafair. There was ridership of 171,654 on these services, which incurred \$714,196 in costs and generated revenue of \$714,196 for a recovery rate of almost 100 percent. There were no events for which expenditures in excess of \$30,000 were waived.

Section 4.150.070: Customized Bus Service Fares

4.150.070 Customized bus service fares.

The director is authorized to establish rates of fare for customized bus service, provided such rates of fare are established at a level reasonably estimated to recover at least eighty percent of the marginal cost for the service hours provided. Such customized services shall be on an individual fare-paying basis and be regularly scheduled according to such routes, schedules and dates as are determined by the director. There shall be no zone fares charged on customized bus service. Passes held by senior citizens, persons with disabilities, and employees, and other special passes or permits may be honored on customized bus service insofar as consistent with overall cost recovery requirements set forth above. Transfers may be issued on customized bus service. (Ord. 12643 § 10, 1997. Formerly K.C.C. 28.94.195).

This section authorizes the Department of Transportation Director to establish rates of fare for customized bus service. The provision of custom bus service began in 1979. Riders pay a premium fare for customized express service. The service is oriented toward commuters and students who commute between the same geographic area and schools or employment centers.

There were 12 custom bus routes in operation during 2011. One of these routes provided service to Boeing employment sites, nine provided service to private schools and one provided short-term service to the Pacific Northwest Ballet Summer School. These routes generated 192,334 passenger trips and \$896,420 in revenue (passes, cash, tickets and direct payments) with costs of \$1,485,380, for an overall cost recovery of 60 percent. The route providing service to Boeing recovered 29 percent of marginal costs, and routes serving schools recovered 111 percent. Metro reviews all routes and works with those that fall below revenue requirements to identify and take appropriate remedial action to improve cost recovery. Custom bus routes, areas served, destinations and the employers/schools served are listed in Appendix B.

Section 4.150.050: Animal Fares

4.150.050 Animal fares.

The following procedure and rate of fare shall be used for animals riding on coaches. For small animals that do not occupy space other than the lap of the person accompanying the animal and for assistive animals, there shall be no fare charged. For all other animals, a fare equivalent to the fare paid by the individual accompanying the animal shall be charged and a transfer issued upon request except that no zone fare shall be charged. Animals riding on coaches shall be leashed or otherwise restrained and shall not pose a problem of health, injury to property or persons, or disturbance to other passengers. (Ord. 12643 § 11, 1997. Formerly K.C.C. 28.94.200).

This section sets the procedure and fare for animals riding on coaches. Data are not available regarding the number of fares or amount of revenue collected for animals riding coaches.

Section 4.150.450: Public School District Agreements

4.150.450 Agreements - public school districts (effective until July 1, 2012).

The executive is authorized to execute agreements with public school districts to supply students with passes in connection with special school programs, but the price for passes under the agreements shall be established at a rate of thirty-six dollars for each month in which these passes are valid, and the passes shall be valued at the youth fare established in K.C.C. 4.150.010 for rides on regularly scheduled county public transportation service on buses, trolleys, transit vans, dial-a-ride vehicles and streetcars. (Ord. 17130 § 5, 2011; Ord. 14096 § 4, 2001; Ord. 13480 § 5, 1999; Ord. 12643 § 12, 1997. Formerly K.C.C. 28.94.210).

This section authorizes the King County Executive to enter into agreements to sell Metro bus passes to public school districts for their students. King County Metro Transit had agreements with the Seattle School District, the Highline School District, the Bellevue School District, the Lake Washington School District and the Mercer Island School District to supply students with passes during the 2011/2012 school year. Each participating school district purchased passes on ORCA cards and distributed them to students to travel to and from schools using regular transit routes.

For the 2011/2012 school year, King County Metro Transit received \$2,535,916 from the sale of 17,515 student passes.

Section 4.150.410: Governmental Agency Ticket and/or Pass Agreements

4.150.410 Governmental agency ticket and/or pass agreements.

The executive is authorized to execute agreements with local, state and federal governmental entities to provide tickets and/or passes to their employees or others traveling to their facilities at rates other than those set forth in this chapter; provided, that usage by such employees and others is not expected to require the addition of regularly scheduled public transportation services; provided further, that such agreements are not estimated to reduce the revenue which would otherwise be received for such travel. Such agreements shall be subject to approval by the council to the extent such approval is required by the charter, ordinance and/or applicable state law. (Ord. 12643 § 13, 1997. Formerly K.C.C. 28.94.215).

This section authorizes the King County Executive to enter into agreements with local, state and federal governmental entities to provide tickets and/or passes to their employees or others traveling to their facilities.

King County Metro Transit has an ongoing agreement with the King County Superior Court to provide a ticket to prospective jurors as part of their juror summons to assist them in taking transit on their first day of jury service. The Metro Transit Division estimates that the full value of the trips taken by jurors using the jury summons ticket for travel to the Kent Regional Justice Center and Seattle Superior Court locations was \$16,612 in 2011. Pursuant to the agreement, King County Superior Court provided King County Metro Transit reimbursement in that amount.

Section 4.150.110: Peace Officer Fares

4.150.110 Peace officers fares.

Notwithstanding any other provision in this chapter, general authority Washington peace officers employed by a general authority Washington law enforcement agency with officers in King County may ride regularly scheduled public transportation services without payment of fare provided such officers are in uniform or display their police badge(s) to the transit operator. (Ord. 12643 § 14, 1997. Formerly K.C.C. 28.94.220).

This section authorizes Washington peace officers to ride regularly-scheduled public transportation services without payment of fare. Data are not available regarding this subsection.

Section 28.94.225: Ride Free Services Agreements

28.94.225 Ride free services agreements.

The executive is authorized to execute agreements to provide ride free services within geographic areas. Any such agreements shall be subject to approval by the council. (Ord. 17130 § 12, 2011; Ord. 12643 § 15, 1997).

This section authorizes the King County Executive to enter into agreements to provide ride free services within geographic areas. The downtown Seattle Ride Free Area has been in effect since September 1973. The City of Seattle has entered into agreements with King County Metro Transit and contributed funds for operation of the Ride Free Area (RFA).

The revenue lost by King County Metro Transit by operating the Ride Free Area is offset by increased efficiency of operations due to faster loading and alighting and payments made by the City of Seattle. King County Metro Transit received \$401,500 from the City of Seattle for operation of the Ride Free Area in 2011.

In 2011, there were about 8.8 million unlinked trips entirely within the RFA. Of these, an estimated 4.3 million were by riders with a pass, and another 1.6 million were taken by cash payers who were transferring to or from Metro revenue service. Thus, 2.9 million unlinked trips were "free." Of those, about 600,000 were within two hours of a previous trip entirely in the RFA and would not generate a fare.

Section 4.150.530: Leasing of Transit Vehicles

4.150.530 Leasing of transit vehicles.

For the lease of a transit vehicle of the county for charter operation by others, the minimum rental shall be the marginal cost per service hour of such vehicle's operation as established from time to time by the director plus ten percent thereof. (Ord. 12643 § 16, 1997. Formerly K.C.C. 28.94.230).

This section sets the policy regarding the lease or rental of County-owned transit vehicles for charter operation by others.

King County Metro Transit did not lease coaches during 2011.

Section 4.150.350: Interagency Trip Agreements

4.150.350 Interagency trip agreements.

The executive is authorized to execute agreements with other transit agencies to establish a system of fare payment for passengers transferring between transportation systems. The agreements shall be subject to approval by the council to the extent the approval is required by the charter, ordinance or applicable state law, or any combination thereof. The agreements shall provide that the county's share of the fares collected for trips involving transfers between transit agencies shall be the estimated revenue collected for the trips multiplied by the ratio of the revenue that would have been generated by application of the county's appropriate fares or prorated per trip pass prices due under other provisions of this chapter for the county portions of these interagency trips divided by the sum of the revenue that would have been generated by the application of each agency's appropriate fares or prorated per trip pass prices for all segments of such interagency trips. (Ord. 15669 § 2, 2007: 13480 § 6, 1999: Ord. 12643 § 17, 1997. Formerly K.C.C. 28.94.235).

This section authorizes the King County Executive to enter into agreements with other transit agencies for regional fare payment and revenue apportionment.

King County Metro Transit participated with six other transit agencies and the Washington State Ferry System in the ORCA program for regional fare payment, as authorized by Ordinance 14598, adopted on April 29, 2003, authorizing Metro's participation in the ORCA Interlocal Agreement.

Through the end 2011, over 1 million ORCA cards were in distribution, including 877,362 Adult, 115,019 Regional Reduced Fare Permits and 76,555 Youth cards. In December 2011, 300,229 ORCA cards were in use. With implementation of ORCA card for the UPass program in the fall of 2011, average weekday boardings on Metro with ORCA approached 60 percent by year's end.

Section 4.150.610: Waiving or Discounting Fare or Pass Prices

4.150.610 Waiving or discounting fare or pass prices.

For the purpose of attracting new ridership, relieving congestion, developing market strategies, testing prices or experimental service, and implementing other special transit programs or promotions, the director may waive or discount the fare or pass prices otherwise established in this chapter whenever such waiver or discount is not expected to require the addition of regularly scheduled public transportation services and, in the judgment of the director, the value of the program or promotion and the benefit to the public exceeds the expected loss of revenue. The loss in revenue of all such programs, promotions and fare discounts shall, in the aggregate, be no greater than \$350,000 annually. (Ord. 12643 § 18, 1997. Formerly K.C.C. 28.94.240).

This section authorizes the Department of Transportation Director to waive or discount fares. King County Metro Transit's marketing activities that utilize free ride tickets include transportation outreach events at key employment sites throughout the region, direct mail residential promotions and other special events. These events promote ridership by providing citizens with information about transit, vanpool and ridematch services; explaining HOV incentives including pass subsidies and carpool parking discounts offered by employers at work sites; selling passes; and providing personalized trip planning/ridematch services.

Programs and promotional activities supported by King County Metro Transit in 2011 included employer site promotions and other programs and promotional activities. The total revenue loss to King County Metro Transit for waiving or discounting fare or pass prices in 2011 is estimated at \$86,077. Program costs were also incurred, including an estimated \$9,130 for printing tickets. In 2011, these promotional activities allowed an estimated 35,786 trips to be taken by individuals who do not usually ride the bus. (See Appendix C for a detailed derivation of these estimates and Appendix D for a Summary Table of 2011 Special Rates of Fare Programs).

Employer Site Promotions

King County Metro Transit distributed free ride tickets at employer transportation fairs and also distributed free ride tickets for other promotional activities including customer relations and community outreach.

From January through December 2011, an estimated 21,826 pairs of tickets were distributed at employer site promotions, with an estimated 30 percent—or 13,096 tickets—redeemed. Individuals who usually do not ride the bus took an estimated 6,875 trips by utilizing free ride tickets distributed at employment site events and promotions during 2011. King County Metro Transit's total revenue loss for tickets distributed at employment site promotions in 2011 is estimated at \$14,805.

Other Programs and Promotional Activities

Adopt-A-Stop Program: The Adopt-A-Stop program encourages volunteers to “adopt” one or more non-sheltered bus zones to assist in disposing of litter and cleaning minor graffiti from the zones. For this service, volunteers are offered 60 free pairs of tickets per quarter. In 2011, 341 volunteers adopted 420 stops. 47,976 pairs of tickets were allocated to the program, at an estimated revenue loss to King County Metro Transit of \$32,542. The Adopt-A-Stop program is no longer accepting new members. Gradually eliminating the program was a 2010-2011 budget reduction.

Customer Service Office, Service Supervisors and Service Changes: Free ride tickets were distributed to riders who have had a negative experience on our transit service and to aid riders in need (e.g. lost wallet, took wrong bus, route change impacts, etc.). In 2011, 5,152 pairs of free ride tickets were distributed with an estimated revenue loss to King County Metro Transit of \$11,754.

Marketing/Community Outreach: A total of 22,886 pairs of free ride tickets were distributed during marketing and community outreach events. Use of these tickets and passes resulted in an estimated revenue loss to King County Metro Transit of \$25,270 and an estimated 11,754 rides by new customers.

In 2011, free ride tickets were used in the In Motion programs in Georgetown, South Park, Squire Park, Swedish Hospital, West Seattle and White Center. The tickets are a method to increase awareness of existing service and to understand service restructuring (especially with the introduction of RapidRide B Line service in east King County) and they allow non-riders to take test rides. Tickets were again included in the Chinook Book, a healthy/environmental coupon book and directory, to encourage readers to consider bus travel for non-commute trips.

Miscellaneous Programs/Use: A total of 1,400 pairs of free ride tickets were used for Rideshare programs, promotions, and for miscellaneous use. Use of these tickets and passes resulted in an estimated revenue loss to King County Metro Transit of \$950 and an estimated 441 rides by new customers.

Bikes on State Route 520 Deadhead Service: Beginning in 2008, deadheading coaches began providing free bike service on the State Route 520 bridge for customers commuting just between Montlake and Evergreen Point. This demonstration was extended through the end of 2009 and, subsequently, through 2011. This is a low-cost way to support bicycle commuting while waiting for the construction of a new State Route 520 bridge.

Revenue loss for this program was estimated at \$9,016 during 2011. This was based on an estimate of 20 free trips per day derived from summer 2007 data from Metro's automated passenger counting (APC) system; APC data indicated that forty-two percent of the weekday trips were taken during peak hours. All trips were assumed to be taken by adult riders. It was also assumed that the average number of free bicycle trips per day remained constant throughout the year and that 50 percent of the riders making these trips have passes.

Section 4.150.210: Provisions of Tickets to Human Services Agencies

4.150.210 Provisions of tickets to human services agencies.

The director is authorized to establish a program for the sale and distribution of tickets to human service agencies at twenty percent of their cash value for the purpose of meeting the transportation needs of low income and homeless populations. The total amount of the eighty percent discount provided under the program shall not exceed one million eight hundred seventy-five thousand dollars for any one year. The allocation of discount tickets under the program shall be made by the director in conjunction with local jurisdictions and the county's department or departments responsible for human services programs. The local jurisdictions and the county department or departments shall determine the number of tickets from their respective allocations which shall be sold to the human service agencies eligible under the program. Tickets sold under the program are valid on all public transportation and paratransit service. (Ord. 16702 § 9, 2009; Ord. 16299 § 6, 2008; Ord. 15959 § 3, 2007; Ord. 14096 § 5, 2001; Ord. 13640 § 1, 1999; Ord. 12643 § 19, 1997. Formerly K.C.C. 28.94.245).

This section authorizes the human services ticket program. During 2011, the program had the following terms:

King County Metro Transit subsidized 80 percent of the face value of tickets.

The total subsidy was not to exceed \$1,875,000.

The City of Seattle and King County were responsible for determining the eligibility of, and directing their respective ticket allocations to, human service providers serving low income and homeless populations.

After receiving authorization from a local jurisdiction or King County, human service providers may purchase their authorized allotment of tickets from King County Metro Transit by paying 20 percent of the ticket face value.

The tickets are valid on all public transportation and paratransit service.

The program is administered by the City of Seattle's Human Services Department and King County's Department of Community and Human Services. In 2011, the City distributed subsidized tickets to 68 social service providers. King County and the remaining jurisdictions pooled their allocations for distribution to 80 social service agencies.

A total face value of \$2,211,243 worth of tickets was made available through this program in 2011. This represents a King County Metro Transit subsidy of \$1,768,994 and a cost to the social service agencies of \$442,249. In total, 79,165 ticketbooks were distributed, representing about 995,962 individual rides. (See Appendix E for a list of human service agencies receiving tickets through this program.)

Appendix A
Report on Rates of Fare for the Transit Program - 2011 Report
2011 Special Event Service

| EVENT | DATE(S) | | TOTAL PSGRS | CASH FARE | AVG FARE | Sponsor Payments | Marketing Credit | Total Op. Revenue | Total Op. Expense |
|---|---------|--------|----------------|--------------|-------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | Start | End | | | | | | | |
| Husky Service - Local | Sep-11 | Nov-11 | 26,055 | REG | \$2.00 | | | \$52,110 | \$86,543 |
| Husky Service - Park and Ride | Sep-11 | Nov-11 | 133,862 | \$2.50 | \$0.00 | \$506,706 | | \$528,651 | \$528,651 |
| Seahawks | Sep-11 | Dec-11 | 13,983 | \$5.00 | \$5.00 | \$13,281 | \$14,682 | \$97,878 | \$97,878 |
| Sounders | Apr-11 | Oct-11 | 8,763 | \$2.25 | \$2.25 | \$33,191 | \$9,337 | \$62,245 | \$62,245 |
| Folklife | May-11 | May-11 | 4,315 | REG | \$1.13 | | | \$4,876 | \$18,721 |
| Bumbershoot | Sep-11 | Sep-11 | 2,262 | REG | \$1.13 | | | \$2,556 | \$18,721 |
| SR-520 Shuttle | Jun-11 | Nov-11 | 310 | REG | \$1.13 | | | \$350 | \$28,529 |
| Wheels to Water | Mar-11 | Dec-11 | 2,001 | n/a | \$0.00 | \$22,903 | | \$22,903 | \$26,200 |
| Seafair - Torchlight | Jul-11 | Jul-11 | 2,980 | REG | \$1.13 | | | \$3,367 | \$28,374 |
| Seafair - Hydro Shuttle | Jul-11 | Jul-11 | 15,037 | n/a | n/a | \$20,422 | \$5,000 | \$25,422 | \$25,422 |
| KC Request | Jan-11 | Dec-11 | 2,216 | n/a | \$0.00 | | | \$0 | \$4,740 |
| 4th of July Standbys | Jul-11 | Jul-11 | 540 | REG | \$1.13 | | | \$610 | \$6,225 |
| Bite of Seattle | Aug-11 | Aug-11 | 123 | REG | \$1.13 | | | \$139 | \$7,657 |
| Fremont Parade Standbys | Jun-11 | Jun-11 | 2,386 | REG | \$1.13 | | | \$2,696 | \$7,395 |
| I-405 Closure Standbys | Apr-11 | Apr-11 | 19 | REG | \$1.13 | | | \$21 | \$4,706 |
| Mercer Street Standbys | May-11 | Jun-11 | 4,448 | REG | \$1.13 | | | \$5,026 | \$14,039 |
| New Year's Standby | Dec-11 | Dec-11 | 502 | REG | \$1.13 | | | \$567 | \$5,675 |
| Post-Game Standbys (M's, Seahawks, Sounders) | Mar-11 | Dec-11 | 3,375 | REG | \$1.13 | | | \$3,814 | \$15,328 |
| Film/Photo Shoots | Jan-11 | Aug-11 | n/a | n/a | n/a | \$4,747 | | \$4,747 | \$4,175 |
| Other Paid Specials | Jan-11 | Oct-11 | n/a | n/a | \$0.00 | \$3,945 | | \$3,945 | \$4,445 |
| Other Shuttles/Standbys | Jan-11 | Aug-11 | 3,369 | REG | \$1.13 | | | \$3,807 | \$24,869 |
| TOTAL, ALL SPECIAL SERVICE | Jan-11 | Dec-11 | 231,604 | | | \$605,195 | \$29,019 | \$825,732 | \$1,020,538 |

*excludes services with no passengers

**excludes services with no revenue

^ no ridership data collected

REG=Regular Fares.

Appendix B
Report on Rates of Fare for the Transit Program - 2011 Report
2011 Custom Bus Routes

| Route | Pass Price | Cash Fare | % of Cost Recovery | Communities Served | Destination | Employer/School | Base |
|-------|-------------|---------------|--------------------|---|-------------|--------------------|---------|
| 952 | \$126/\$144 | \$3.50/\$4.00 | 29% | Auburn/Kent/Renton | Everett | Boeing | South |
| 981 | \$171 | \$4.75 | 121% | Mercer Island/Eastgate/Bellevue | Bellevue | Lakeside | East |
| 982 | \$171 | \$4.75 | 109% | Bear Creek/Redmond/Yarrow/Evergreen Point | N. Seattle | Lakeside/Univ Prep | East |
| 983 | \$171 | \$4.75 | 102% | Issaquah/South Bellevue/Mercer Island | N. Seattle | Lakeside/Univ Prep | East |
| 984 | \$171 | \$4.75 | 106% | Madrona/Madison Park/Capitol Hill | Seattle | Lakeside | Central |
| 985 | \$90 | \$2.50 | 111% | University District (Summer Only) | Queen Anne | Pacific NW Ballet | Central |
| 986 | \$171 | \$4.75 | 112% | Kirkland/Evergreen Point/ Montlake | N. Seattle | Lakeside/Univ Prep | East |
| 987 | \$171 | \$4.75 | 115% | Rainier Beach/Mt. Baker/Leschi | N. Seattle | Lakeside/Univ Prep | Central |
| 988 | \$171 | \$4.75 | 113% | Madrona/Madison Park/Capitol Hill | N. Seattle | Lakeside/Univ Prep | Central |
| 989 | \$171 | \$4.75 | 97% | Eastgate/Bellevue/Mercer Island | N. Seattle | Lakeside/Univ Prep | East |
| 994 | \$171 | \$4.75 | 116% | Queen Anne/Magnolia/Ballard | N. Seattle | Lakeside/Univ Prep | Central |
| 995 | \$171 | \$4.75 | 120% | Laurelhurst/Viewridge/Wedgwood | N. Seattle | Lakeside/Evergreen | Central |

Appendix C**Report on Rates of Fare for the Transit Program - 2011 Report
Estimated Benefits and Lost Revenue**

Percentage of customers responding either "1 to 4 Rides", or "Zero Rides" to the 1997 survey question: "in the last 30 days, how many one-way rides have you personally taken on a Metro bus, not counting rides entirely within the downtown Seattle Ride Free Area?"

___ 5 or More Rides

___ 1 - 4 Rides

___ Zero Rides

Zero to 4 rides = 52.5%

I. BENEFITS -- INCENTIVES TO RIDE THE BUS**Free Ride Tickets -- Employer Site Promotions:**

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Total tickets distributed, 2011 (2 tickets / customer) | 43,652 |
| x Redemption rate (based on 1997 farebox counts) | 0.30 |
| <u>x Percent "Usually Don't Ride"</u> | <u>0.525</u> |
| Estimated trips by new customers | 6,875 |

Free Ride Tickets -- Other Programs and Promotions:

| | |
|--|--------------|
| Total tickets distributed, 2011 (2 tickets / customer) | 127,530 |
| x Redemption rate (based on 1997 farebox counts) | 0.30 |
| <u>x Percent "Usually Don't Ride"</u> | <u>0.525</u> |
| Estimated trips by new customers | 20,086 |

Free Ride Tickets -- InMotion:

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| Total tickets distributed, 2011 | 27,500 |
| Tickets Redeemed | 16,871 |
| <u>x Percent "Usually Don't Ride"</u> | <u>0.525</u> |
| Estimated trips by new customers | 8,857 |

| | |
|---|---------------|
| TOTAL ESTIMATED NEW CUSTOMER TRIPS | 35,818 |
|---|---------------|

II. REVENUE LOSS**Free Ride Tickets -- Employer Site Promotions:**

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Total tickets distributed, 2011 | 43,652 |
| x Redemption rate (based on 1997 farebox counts) | 0.30 |
| x Percent "Usually Do Ride" | 0.475 |
| x Average lost revenue: Peak cash fare ¹ | <u>(\$2.38)</u> |
| Estimated Revenue Loss: Tickets | \$ (14,805) |

Free Ride Tickets -- Other Programs and Promotions:

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Total tickets distributed, 2010 | 127,530 |
| x Redemption rate (based on 1997 farebox counts) | 0.30 |
| x Percent "Usually Do Ride" | 0.475 |
| x Average lost revenue: Peak cash fare ¹ | <u>(\$2.38)</u> |
| Estimated Revenue Loss: Tickets | \$ (43,252) |

Free Ride Tickets -- InMotion:

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Total tickets distributed, 2011 | 27,500 |
| Tickets Redeemed | 16,871 |
| x Percent "Usually Do Ride" | 0.475 |
| x Average lost revenue: Peak cash fare ² | <u>(\$2.38)</u> |
| Estimated Revenue Loss: Tickets | \$ (19,073) |

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|
| TOTAL ESTIMATED REVENUE LOSS | \$ (77,130) |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|

¹ (\$2.25 x 61.9% + \$2.50 x 31.1% + \$3.00 x 7%) =

\$2.38

Appendix D
Report on Rates of Fare for the Transit Program - 2011 Report
Summary of Trips and Revenue Loss from 2011 Special Rates of Fare Programs

| Program | Estimated New Customer Trips | Estimated Costs | |
|---|---------------------------------|---------------------|----------------|
| | | Revenue Gain (Loss) | Printing |
| Employer Site Promotions | 6,875 | (\$14,805) | \$2,008 |
| Other Special Rates of Fare Programs and Promotions | | | |
| Adopt-A-Stop | 15,112 | (\$32,542) | \$4,414 |
| Customer Service Office, Service Supervisors & Service Changes | 1,623 | (\$3,495) | \$474 |
| Marketing/Community Outreach | 11,734 | (\$25,270) | \$2,106 |
| Other Programs and Miscellaneous Use | 441 | (\$950) | \$129 |
| Totals: | 35,786 | (\$77,061) | \$9,130 |

The cost of printing a ticket = \$0.0460

Appendix E: 2011 Participating Social Service Agencies Report on Rates of Fare for the Transit Program - 2011 Report

CITY OF SEATTLE AGENCIES

BALLARD ECUMENICAL MINISTRY
 BREAD OF LIFE MISSION
 CASA LATINA
 CATHOLIC COMMUNITY SERVICES OF KING COUNTY
 CENTER FOR CAREER ALTERNATIVES
 CHIEF SEATTLE CLUB
 CHILDRENS HOME SOCIETY OF WA
 CHURCH COUNCIL OF GREATER SEATTLE
 CHURCH OF MARY MAGDALENE
 COMPASS HOUSING ALLIANCE
 CONSEJO
 COUNTRY DOCTOR - FREE TEEN CLINIC
 DESC
 DIOCESE OF OLYMPIA-REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT OFFICE
 EL CENTRO DE LA RAZA
 EVERGREEN TREATMENT SERVICES
 FAMILY WORKS
 FARESTART
 FIRST AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH
 FIRST PLACE
 GETHSEMANE COMMUNITY SERVICES
 GOODWILL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION
 HARBORVIEW MEDICAL CENTER/PIONEER SQUARE CLINIC
 HARDER HOUSE
 HSD/EMERGENCY RESERVES/SEVERE WEATHER
 INTERNATIONAL DISTRICT HOUSING ALLIANCE
 JEWISH FAMILY SERVICES
 JUBILEE WOMEN'S CENTER
 LAMBERT HOUSE
 MILLIONAIRE CLUB CHARITY
 NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE
 NEW BEGINNINGS
 NEW HORIZONS MINISTRIES
 NORTH HELPLINE
 OPERATION NIGHTWATCH - SEATTLE
 PARENT CHILD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
 PEACE FOR THE STREETS BY KIDS FROM THE STREETS
 PIKE MARKET MEDICAL CLINIC
 PIONEER HUMAN SERVICES - SPRUCE STREET INN
 PLYMOUTH HOUSING GROUP
 PROVIDENCE HOSPITALITY HOUSE
 PROVIDENCE REGINA HOUSE
 PUGET SOUND HEALTH CARE SYSTEM
 QUEEN ANNE HELP LINE
 RECOVERY CAFÉ
 SALVATION ARMY
 SALVATION ARMY ADULT REHABILITATION CENTER
 SEATTLE CONSERVATION CORPS
 SEATTLE FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH SHELTER MINISTRY
 SEATTLE MENNONITE CHURCH
 SEATTLE MUNICIPAL COURT
 SEATTLE URBAN ACADEMY
 SHALOM ZONE NONPROFIT ASSOC./RISING OUT OF THE SHADOWS (ROOTS)
 SHARE (SEATTLE HOUSING AND RESOURCE EFFORT)
 SOJOURNER PLACE
 SOUTH SEATTLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE - WOMEN'S CENTER
 ST. JOHN THE EVANGELIST CONFERENCE OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL SOCIETY
 TEEN FEED
 TINY DIAMOND EARRINGS MENTORING PROGRAM
 UNION GOSPEL MISSION
 UNITED INDIANS OF ALL TRIBES FOUNDATION
 UNIVERSITY CHURCHES EMERGENCY FUND
 VIETNAMESE FRIENDSHIP ASSOCIATION
 VIRGINIA MILLER HOUSE
 WELLSRING FAMILY SERVICES
 WEST SEATTLE HELPLINE
 WOODLAND PARK PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH
 YEAR UP

KING COUNTY AGENCIES

ASIAN COUNSELING AND REFERRAL SERVICE
 ATLANTIC STREET CENTER
 BELLEVUE COLLEGE/CAREER EDUCATION OPTIONS
 CATHOLIC COMMUNITY SERVICES
 CENTER FOR CAREER ALTERNATIVES
 CENTER FOR HUMAN SERVICES
 CHILD CARE RESOURCES
 CITY OF KENT - HOUSING AND HUMAN SERVICES
 CITY OF KENT CORRECTIONS - CITY JAIL
 CITY OF SEATAC - EMERGENCY SERVICES
 COMPASS CENTER - RENTON VETERAN CENTER
 DOMESTIC ABUSE WOMEN'S NETWORK
 EASTSIDE ACADEMY - RECOVERY/COUNSELING/EDUCATION
 EASTSIDE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PROGRAM
 EASTSIDE INTERFAITH SOCIAL CONCERNS COUNCIL
 ECCELSIA COMMUNITY CHURCH
 EMPOWERING YOUTH AND FAMILIES OUTREACH
 FEDERAL WAY COMMUNITY CAREGIVING NETWORK
 FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH OF BELLEVUE/OUTREACH
 FRIENDS OF YOUTH
 GRACE LUTHERAN CHURCH
 HEALTHPOINT - MEDICAL/DENTAL/HOMELESS OUTREACH
 HEROES FOR THE HOMELESS
 HIGHLINE SCHOOL DISTRICT/SCHOOL AND PROG. BASED
 HOPELINK
 ISSAQUAH CHURCH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES
 JESUS CHRIST SALT AND LIGHT
 KC DAJD - COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS DIVISION
 KC DCHS WORK TRAINING PROGRAM
 KC DCHS/VETERANS PROGRAM
 KC DEPT OF PUBLIC HEALTH - JAIL HEALTH SERVICES
 KC DEPT. OF JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION - DRUG COURT
 KC JOBS INITIATIVE
 KENT SCHOOL DISTRICT/REFUGEE TRANSITION CENTER
 KENT YOUTH AND FAMILY SERVICES
 KING COUNTY RESERVED
 KITH
 LIFELONG AIDS ALLIANCE
 MAPLE VALLEY FOOD BANK AND EMERGENCY SERVICES
 MT. SI SENIOR CENTER
 MULTI-SERVICE CENTER
 NEIGHBORHOOD HOUSE
 NEW BEGINNINGS
 NEW CONNECTIONS
 NEW TRADITIONS - WOMEN'S OUTPATIENT TREATMENT
 PERINATAL TREATMENT SERVICES
 PREGNANCY AID OF KENT
 PUGET SOUND OIC DBA PUGET SOUND TRAINING CENTER
 RECOVERY CENTERS OF KING COUNTY
 REFUGEE WOMEN'S ALLIANCE
 SEATTLE DRUG AND NARCOTIC CENTER (SEADRUNAR)
 SEATTLE EDUCATION ACCESS - COLLEGE SUCCESS PROGRAM
 SEATTLE HOUSING AND RESOURCE EFFORT (SHARE)
 SEATTLE INDIAN HEALTH BOARD
 SENIOR SERVICES
 SHORELINE COMMUNITY COLLEGE - CEO PROGRAM
 SOLID GROUND
 SOPHIA WAY - EASTSIDE WINTER RESPONSE SHELTER
 SOUTHWEST YOUTH AND FAMILY SERVICES
 ST. LUKE'S PARISH - HELPING HANDS
 ST. MARY'S THE FOOD BANK
 ST. STEPHEN HOUSING ASSOCIATION
 ST. VINCENT DE PAUL COUNCIL SEATTLE-KING COUNTY
 ST. VINCENT DE PAUL HOLY FAMILY-HELPING HANDS
 ST. VINCENT DE PAUL SOUTH KING COUNTY
 STANDUP FOR KIDS
 TEEN FEED (FORMALLY: UNIVERSITY STREET MINISTRY)
 THERAPEUTIC HEALTH SERVICES/CENTRAL YFSC
 TREEHOUSE
 TZU CHI FOUNDATION
 VALLEY CITIES COUNSELING AND CONSULTATION
 VASHON YOUTH AND FAMILY SERVICES
 WASHINGTON STATE DOC - SEATTLE DAY REPORTING
 WASHINGTON WOMEN'S EMPLOYMENT & EDUCATION
 WELCOME HOME SOCIETY
 WORLD RELIEF SEATTLE
 YMCA OF GREATER SEATTLE
 YOUTHCARE
 YWCA OF SEATTLE-KC-SNOHOMISH COUNTY
 YWCA OF SEATTLE-KC-SNOHOMISH COUNTY - HOMELESS

Appendix H
Social Service Agencies Receiving Human Service
Tickets in 2012

Social Service Agencies Receiving Human Service Tickets In 2012

KING COUNTY AGENCIES

Api Chaya
Asian Counseling and Referral Service
Atlantic Street Center
Bellevue College/**Career Education Options**
Catholic Community Services
Catholic Community Services -HEN
Center for Human Services
Child Care Resources
City of Auburn
City of Kent - **Housing And Human Services**
City of Kent Corrections - **City Jail**
City of Seatac
City of Tukwila
Compass Housing Alliance Renton/Counseling/Education
DCHS - Employment & Education Resources
Defender Association
Domestic Abuse Women's Network
Eastside Academy - **Recovery/Counseling/Education**
Eastside Interfaith Social Concerns Council
Eastside Interfaith Social Concerns Council - **Eastside Winter Shelter**
Empowering Youth and Families Outreach
Federal Way Community Caregiving Network
First Congregational Church of Bellevue/**Outreach**
Friends of Youth
Grace Lutheran Church - Shelter
Heroes For The Homeless
Highline School District/**School And Prog. Based**
Hopelink
International Rescue Committee
Issaquah Church and Community Services
Jesus Christ Salt and Light
KC Career Connections / Jobs Initiatives
KC DAID - Community Corrections Division
KC DCHS Work Training Program
KC DCHS/**Veterans Program**
KC Dept of Public Health - **Jail Health Services**
KC Dept. of Judicial Administration - **Drug Court**
Kent School District/**Refugee Transition Center**
Kent Youth and Family Services
Kith
Life Wire
Lifelong Aids Alliance
Lutheran Community Services Northwest
Maple Valley Food Bank and Emergency Services
Multi-Service Center
Navos

Neighborhood House
New Beginnings
New Connections
New Traditions
Perinatal Treatment Services
Pregnancy Aid of Kent
Puget Sound OIC **Db** **Puget Sound Training Center**
Recovery Centers of King County
Refugee Women's Alliance
Seattle Drug and Narcotic Center (**Seadrunar**)
Seattle Education Access
Seattle Housing and Resource Effort (**Share**)
Seattle Indian Health Board
Senior Services
Shoreline Community College - **CEO Program**
Solid Ground
Somali Community Services Coalition
Sophia Way
Sound Mental Health
South Seattle Community College
Southwest Youth and Family Services
St. Luke's Parish - **Helping Hands**
St. Mary's Food Bank
St. Stephen Housing Association
St. Vincent De Paul - Holy Family / Helping Hands
St. Vincent De Paul Council Seattle-King County
St. Vincent De Paul South King County
Standup For Kids
Teen Feed (**Formally: University Street Ministry**)
The Auburn Food Bank
The Salvation Army
Therapeutic Health Services/**Central YFSC**
Tzu Chi Foundation
Vashon Youth and Family Services
Washington State Doc - **Seattle Day Reporting**
Washington Women's Employment & Education (WWEE)
Way Back Inn
Welcome Home Society
World Relief Seattle
YMCA of Greater Seattle
Youthcare
YWCA of Seattle-KC-Snohomish County

CITY OF SEATTLE AGENCIES

Alliance of People With Disabilities
 Asian Counseling And Referral Service
 Atlantic Street Center
 Ballard Ecumenical Ministry
 Bread of Life Mission
 Casa Latina
 Catholic Community Services
 Children's Home Society Of Washington
 Church of Mary Magdalene - **Mary's Place**
 Compass Housing Alliance
 Compass Housing Alliance - **Homestep (Formerly Church Council)**
 Consejo Counseling and Referral Services
 Country Doctor Free Teen Clinic
 Denise Louie Educational Center
 Diocese of Olympia - **Refugee Resettlement Office**
 Downtown Emergency Service Center (**DESC**)
 Ed Thomas House Medical Respite
 El Centro De La Raza
 Elizabeth Gregory Home
 Evergreen Treatment Services (**The Reach Project**)
 Family Works
 Farestart
 First African Methodist Episcopal Church (**FAME**)
 First AME Child Development Center
 First Place
 Food Bank at St Mary's
 Gethsemane Community Services
 Goodwill Development Association
 Harborview Medical Center/**Pioneer Square Clinic**
 Harder House
 Heroes for the Homeless
 Hsd/Emergency Reserve/Severe Weather
 International District Housing Authority
 Jewish Family Services
 Jubilee Women's Center
 Mayor's Office for Senior Citizens (Seattle HSD Ads)
 Millionaire Club Charity
 Mount Baker Housing Association
 Navos Pact Program
 Neighborcare Health
 Neighborhood House
 New Beginnings
 New Horizon's Ministries
 Operation Nightwatch
 Parent Child Assistance Program
 Peace For The Streets By Kids From The Streets

People's Institute Baptist Church - Work It Out Seattle
Pike Market Medical Clinic/**Neighborcare Health**
Pike Market Senior Center/**Downtown Food Bank**
Pioneer Square Human Services-**Spruce Street Inn**
Plymouth Housing Group
Powerful Voices
Providence Regina House
Puget Sound Health Care System
Queen Anne Helpline
Raja for Africa
Recovery Café
Resident Action Council of Seattle Housing Authority
Saint Andrew's Church - **Jubilee Dinner Program**
Salvation Army Adult Rehabilitation Center
Seattle Conservation Corps
Seattle Education Access
Seattle First Presbyterian Church
Seattle Housing and Resource Effort (**Share**)
Seattle Mennonite Church
Seattle Municipal Court
Seattle Tilth
Seattle Union Gospel Mission
Seattle Urban Academy
Shalom Zone Nonprofit Association/**Rising Out Of The Shadows (Roots)**
Sojourner Place
Solid Ground
Sound Mental Health
St. Francis House
St. John the Evangelist Conference of the Society of St. Vincent De Paul
Street Youth Ministries
Teen Feed
Tiny Diamond Earrings Mentoring Program
University Churches Emergency Fund
Vietnamese Friendship Association
Virginia Miller House
Wapi Community Services
Wellspring Family Services
West Seattle Helpline
Woodland Park Presbyterian Church
Year Up
Youth In Focus
YWCA of Seattle-King County-Snohomish County

Appendix I

Documentation of Council Action

Documentation of Council Action

This appendix contains the King County Council minutes approving ordinances and motions related to Metro's Strategic Plan and Service Guidelines. The minutes documenting approval of the Title VT Program are also included. The minutes contain the title of the ordinance, ordinance number and the date the ordinance was passed. Only the portion of the minutes referring to the relevant ordinance are shown so reviewers do not have to search through the minutes of the entire Council meeting to find the relevant ordinances.

Because the ordinances are quite long, they are not included in this appendix. Rather, a link to the ordinance is provided just below the ordinance number. Click on the link to view the ordinance. (If the link is not active, copy the link and paste it into a browser.)

Approval Related to Service Changes

Metropolitan King County Council Meeting Minutes May 24, 2010

23. 2010-0277 AN ORDINANCE for the October 2010 and February 2011 public transportation service improvements for King County.

Sponsors: Mr. Phillips

The enacted number is 16844.

<http://mkcclegisearch.kingcounty.gov/View.ashx?M=F&ID=940981&GUID=98D53200-8E60-491E-BE98-05F10FEF100F>

On 5/24/2010, a public hearing was held and closed.

A motion was made by Councilmember Phillips that this Ordinance be Passed.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 9- Ms. Lambert, Mr. von Reichbauer, Mr. Gossett, Ms. Patterson, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Dunn, Ms. Drago, Mr. Ferguson, and Ms. Hague

Metropolitan King County Council Meeting Minutes July 6, 2010

26. AN ORDINANCE for October 2010 public transportation service improvements for King County.

Sponsors: Ms. Patterson

The enacted number is 16877.

<http://mkcclegisearch.kingcounty.gov/View.ashx?M=F&ID=960749&GUID=E03FBAE4-4379-4723-A713-6B1098FFABFC>

On 7/6/2010, a public hearing was held and closed.

A motion was made by Councilmember Phillips that this Ordinance be Passed.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 9- Ms. Lambert, Mr. von Reichbauer, Mr. Gossett, Ms. Patterson, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Dunn, Ms. Drago, Mr. Ferguson, and Ms. Hague

Metropolitan King County Council Meeting Minutes September 27, 2010

35. Proposed Substitute Ordinance No. 2010-0437.2

AN ORDINANCE relating to a corridor-implementation plan for State Route 520 and State Route 522;
implementing public transportation service improvements according to the plan; and repealing Ordinance 16843, Section 1, and Ordinance 16843, Section 2.

Sponsors: Mr. Ferguson and Mr. Phillips

On 09/27/2010, a public hearing was held and closed.

The enacted number is 16935.

<http://mkcclegisearch.kingcounty.gov/View.ashx?M=F&ID=1054101&GUID=970DB7C9-7640-4DA6-804D-BE937F973A24>

This matter passed on the Consent Agenda.

Metropolitan King County Council Meeting Minutes May 31, 2011

7. Proposed Substitute Ordinance No. 2011-0176.2

AN ORDINANCE for the October 2011 public transportation improvements for King County.

Sponsors: Mr. Phillips

On 05/31/2011, a public hearing was held and closed.

The enacted number is 17100.

<http://mkcclegisearch.kingcounty.gov/View.ashx?M=F&ID=1389412&GUID=5F4265A2-7226-4E62-9648-46761FD710C1>

*On 05/23/2011, the following person appeared to speak:
Deric Gruen*

Victor Obeso, Manager, Service Development, Department of Transportation, answered questions of the Council.

*The Chair recessed the meeting at 2:14 p.m.
The Chair reconvened the meeting at 2:23 p.m.*

*Ms. Hague moved Amendment 1. The motion carried by the following vote:
Votes: Yes: 8 - Mr. Dunn, Mr. Ferguson, Mr. Gossett, Ms. Hague, Mr. McDermott, Ms. Patterson, Mr. Phillips and Mr. von Reichbauer*

*No: 0
Excused: 1 - Ms. Lambert*

A motion was made by Councilmember Phillips that this Ordinance be Passed as Amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 8 – Mr

von Reichbauer, Ms. Patterson, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Ferguson,
Mr. McDermott, Ms. Hague, and Mr. Gossett

Excused: 1 - Ms. Lambert

Metropolitan King County Council Meeting Minutes January 30, 2012

9. Proposed Substitute Ordinance No. 2011-0495.2

AN ORDINANCE related to the public transportation and the June 2012 and Winter 2013 reduction or elimination of low performing fixed-route bus service and reinvestment of resources into priorities established within the King County Metro Transit Strategic Plan 2011-2021 and Service Guidelines as adopted by Ordinance 17143.

Sponsors: Mr. Phillips

On 1/30/2012, a public hearing was held and closed.

The enacted number is 17259.

<http://mkcclegisearch.kingcounty.gov/View.ashx?M=F&ID=1738770&GUID=F892FE71-F2F0-4E6C-8A0F-86DFCF719023>

On 01/30/2012, the following people spoke:

*Celso Tolman
Mar Murillo
Lynn Sereda
Judy Tobin
Khoe Vo (interpreter Hanh Lai)*

Mr. Ferguson moved Amendment 1.

Ms. Lambert moved Amendment 1c, to Amendment 1.

Jim Brewer, legal counsel, answered questions of the Council.

John Resha, council staff, answered questions of the Council, clarifying Amendment 1.

Paul Carlson, council staff, answered questions of the Council.

John Resha answered questions of the Council, clarifying Amendment 1c, and noting a technical correction; above 'EFFECT', to insert "Delete lines 95 through 97".

Ms. Patterson requested a roll call vote on Amendment 1c.

Voting on Ms. Lambert's motion to adopt Amendment 1c, the motion was carried by the following vote:

Votes: Yes: 5 - Mr. Dunn, Ms. Hague, Ms. Lambert, Ms. Patterson and Mr. Phillips

No: 4 - Mr. Ferguson, Mr. McDermott, Mr. von Reichbauer and Mr. Gossett

Mr. McDermott offered an oral amendment to Amendment 1, as amended, changing text on Amendment 1c. On line 14, after 'to', and before 'collectively' to insert "receive council approval on an outside contractor with professional public involvement"

experience to independently", and on line 16, after 'the', to insert "Executive".

Anne Noris, Clerk, made some clarification on Mr. McDermott's oral amendment to Amendment 1c.

Mr. Gossett accepted the oral amendment as friendly.

Ms. Patterson had a procedural question regarding the intent of the oral amendment to Amendment 1c.

Mr. McDermott withdrew his oral amendment to Amendment 1c. The Chair so ordered.

Kevin Desmond, General Manager, Transit Division, Department of Transportation, answered questions of the Council.

Joe Woods, Deputy Chief of Staff, Executive Office, answered questions of the Council.

Mr. Ferguson requested a roll call vote on Amendment 1, as amended. The motion to adopt Amendment 1, as amended, carried by the following vote:

Votes: Yes: 7 - Mr. Dunn, Mr. Gossett, Ms. Hague, Ms. Lambert, Ms. Patterson, Mr. Phillips and Mr. von Reichbauer

No: 2 - Mr. Ferguson and Mr. McDermott

The Clerk clarified that Amendment 2 was withdrawn by Mr. Phillips and Amendment 3 was withdrawn by Ms. Patterson.

Ms. Hague moved Title Amendment T1. The motion carried.

A motion was made by Councilmember Phillips that this Ordinance be Passed as Amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 9- Ms. Lambert, Mr. von Reichbauer, Ms. Patterson, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Ferguson, Mr. McDermott, Ms. Hague, and Mr. Gossett

Metropolitan King County Council Meeting Minutes May 7, 2012

7. Proposed Substitute Ordinance No. 2012-0141.2

AN ORDINANCE implementing September 2012 public transportation service changes for King County.

Sponsors: Mr. Phillips

On 5/7/2012, a public hearing was held and closed.

The enacted number is 17320.

<http://mkcclegisearch.kingcounty.gov/View.ashx?M=F&ID=1940481&GUID=8C352D49-2477-4711-ABBF-6A4803F66230>

On 05/07/2012, the following people spoke:

- 1. Sam Bellomio*
- 2. Alex Zlmerman*

Mr. Phillips moved Amendment 1.

Mr. Phillips' motion passed unanimously.

A motion was made by Councilmember Phillips that this Ordinance be Passed as Amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 8 - Mr. von Reichbauer, Ms. Patterson, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Ferguson, Mr. McDermott, Ms. Hague, and Mr. Gossett

Excused: 1 - Ms. Lambert

Metropolitan King County Council Meeting Minutes May 13, 2013

11. Proposed Substitute Ordinance No. 2013-0213.2

AN ORDINANCE implementing public transportation service changes and the Snoqualmie Valley alternative service demonstration program in September 2013, February 2014 and June 2014 scheduled service changes.

Sponsors: Mr. Phillips

On 5/13/2013, a public hearing was held and closed.

The enacted number is 17584.

<http://mkcclegisearch.kingcounty.gov/View.ashx?M=F&ID=2517757&GUID=D05FF495-3B0B-4DAE-AA41-740717A6DA7F>

This matter passed on the Consent Agenda.

Metropolitan King County Council Meeting Minutes August 15, 2011

11. Proposed Ordinance No. 2011-0288

AN ORDINANCE relating to public transportation and imposing a two-year congestion reduction charge of twenty dollars on vehicle registration renewals in King County in accordance with Chapter 373, Laws of Washington 2011.

[NOTE: Section 11 of the ordinance directs Metro a plan for the implementation of the elimination of the Ride Free Area.]

SECTION 11:

- A. *The executive is requested to discontinue the downtown Seattle ride free area by October 2012 and to develop and submit to council by May 2012 an implementation plan to guide the elimination of the ride free area. The plan should be filed in the form of a paper original and an electronic copy with the clerk of the council, who shall retain the original and provide an electronic copy to all councilmembers.*

B. *The implementation plan may include, but is not limited to the following elements to ensure a smooth transition:*

1. *Outreach and coordination with downtown Seattle human services agencies, including a description of a partner program or programs designed to help mitigate the increased cost of trips in downtown Seattle for disadvantaged populations;*
2. *Consideration of an increase in the number of trips or level of subsidy available through the human services ticket program;*
3. *Outreach with downtown businesses, including further promotion of the ORCA card system;*
4. *Coordination with the city of Seattle and affected transit agencies;*
5. *A customer information plan to help riders transition to the new fare collection procedures in downtown Seattle;*
6. *Descriptions of any transit route and facility modifications; and*
7. *Employee training.*

C. *In order for the city of Seattle to continue to benefit from the ride free area in downtown Seattle, the city must negotiate a new methodology that accurately off-sets the cost of service and that acknowledges the minimal benefit to the county in providing these services.]*

Sponsors: Mr. Phillips and Mr. Gossett

On 07/25/2011, a public hearing was held and closed.

The enacted number is 17169.

<http://mkcclegisearch.kingcounty.gov/View.ashx?M=F&ID=1531391&GUID=1CC2D425-FDFE-4A6A-8CF0-2F3FB7A0418B>

John Resha, council staff, summarized Amendment 2 and answered questions of the Council.

Sung Yang, Government Affairs Director, Executive Services, Office of the Executive, answered questions of the Council.

Ms. Patterson moved Amendment 2. The motion carried by the following vote:

Votes: Yes: 9 - Mr. Dunn, Mr. Ferguson, Mr. Gossett, Ms. Hague, Ms. Lambert, Mr.

McDermott, Ms. Patterson, Mr. Phillips and Mr. von Reichbauer

No: 0

Excused: 0

A motion was made by Councilmember Patterson that this Ordinance be Passed as Amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 7 - Ms. Lambert, Ms. Patterson, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Ferguson, Mr. McDermott, Ms. Hague, and Mr. Gossett

No: 2 - Mr. von Reichbauer, and Mr. Dunn

Approvals Related to Strategic Plan and Service Guidelines

Metropolitan King County Council Meeting Minutes July 11, 2011

13. Proposed Substitute Ordinance No. 2011-0114.2

AN ORDINANCE relating to public transportation; adopting the **Strategic Plan for Public Transportation 2011-2021 and Metro Transit Service Guidelines**; and repealing Ordinance 12060, Section 1, Ordinance 12060, Section 2; Ordinance 12060, Section 3, Ordinance 12060, Section 4; Ordinance 12060, Section 5, Exhibit A to Ordinance 12060, Exhibit B to Ordinance 12060, Exhibit C to Ordinance 12060, Exhibit D to Ordinance 12060, Ordinance 14464, Section 1, Ordinance 14464, Section 2, Ordinance 14464, Section 3, Ordinance 14464, Section 4, Ordinance 14464, Section 5, Ordinance 14464, Section 6, Attachment A to Ordinance 14464, Attachment B to Ordinance 14664, Attachment C to Ordinance 14464, Attachment D to Ordinance 14464, Ordinance 15047, Section 1, Ordinance 15047, Section 2, Attachment A to Ordinance 15047, Attachment B to Ordinance 15047, Attachment C to Ordinance 15047, Attachment D to Ordinance 15047, Ordinance 15962, Section 1, Ordinance 15962, Section 2, Attachment A to Ordinance 15962, Ordinance 15963, Section 1, Ordinance 15963, Section 2, Attachment A to Ordinance 15963, Ordinance 16708, Section 1, Ordinance 16708, Section 2, Ordinance 16708, Section 3, Attachment A to Ordinance 16708 and Attachment B to Ordinance 16708.
[play video](#)

Sponsors: Mr. Dunn and Mr. Phillips

On 7/11/2011, a public hearing was held and closed.

The enacted number is 17143.

**A motion was made by Councilmember Phillips that this Ordinance be Passed.
The motion carried by the following vote:**

Yes: 9- Ms. Lambert, Mr. von Reichbauer, Ms. Patterson, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Ferguson, Mr. McDermott, Ms. Hague, and Mr. Gossett

Regional Transit Committee Meeting Minutes July 17, 2013

A motion was made by Councilmember Bagshaw that this Motion be Recommended Do Pass. The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 12 - Ms. Patterson, Mr. McDermott, Mr. Butler, Ms. McGilton, Mr. Eggen, Ms. Palmer, Mr. Rasmussen, Ms. Bagshaw, Mr. Dembowski, Mr. Vance, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Osborne and Mr. Wright

Excused: 2.5 - Ms. Burbidge, Mr. Hill and Ms. Allen

Proposed Ordinance No. 2013-0230

AN ORDINANCE relating to public transportation; adopting updates to the Strategic Plan for Public Transportation 2011-2021 and King County Metro Service Guidelines; and amending Ordinance 17143, Section 4.

Sponsors: Mr. Dembowski

This matter was Recommended Do Pass Substitute

Yes: Ms. Patterson, Ms. McGilton, Mr. Eggen, Mr. Hill, Ms. Allen, Mr. Rasmussen, Ms. Bagshaw, Mr. Dembowski, Mr. Vance, Ockerlander, Mr. Osborne and Mr. Wright

Excused: Mr. McDermott, Ms. Burbidge, Mr. Butler, Ms. Palmer and Mr. Dunn