



**King County
Metro Transit Division**

Department of Transportation
King Street Center, KSC-TR-0415
201 South Jackson Street
Seattle, WA 98104-3856

Memorandum

July 2007

TO: Interested parties

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David Hull".

FM: David Hull, Supervisor
Service Planning

RE: ***2006 Route Performance Report***

Attached are copies of the ***2006 Route Performance Report*** (Report). This reports on the performance of individual King County Metro routes.

The objective of measuring route performance is to identify individual services that may require modification, expansion or discontinuation based on their performance.

Route Performance Report for 2006. The Report consists of a list of routes grouped by subarea and time period, showing each route's performance on four measures plus a summary score.

Two measures used to evaluate each route were established by the 1997 Route Performance Guidelines. These guidelines were developed in response to the Six-Year Transit Development Plan for 1996 – 2001 policy that directed regular performance reports on each route. Additional route performance measures were adopted as part of the Six-Year Transit Development Plan for 2002 – 2007. One of these measures, passenger miles divided by seat miles was updated in 2004 to passenger miles divided by coach (platform) miles to better reflect performance in removing vehicle miles traveled on the roadways.

Two performance categories are highlighted in the Report for further action.

- Routes with “Strong” performance are to be considered for expansion.
- “Below minimum performance” routes are to be evaluated for changes to improve performance, or for discontinuation if performance does not improve after

changes are tried. Changes intended to improve performance or to delete routes that continue to have poor performance are subjected to a public process and only implemented if approved by the County Council.

Performance is evaluated based on comparison to other members of a group of routes, and routes are grouped by subarea and time period for similarity in operating conditions. Each of these subarea and time period groups will have some “strong” and some “below minimum” performance routes determined by thresholds based upon the average route performance in each group. These thresholds are updated every three years based upon the goal that the overall route network will improve performance continuously as a result of expanding high performance routes and deleting low performance routes. The performance thresholds used in this Report are based on fall 2006 route data, and they are shown in a table at the front of the Report route data tables.

The Report has an introductory section that contains explanations for the measures, the route groupings, and the thresholds. The introduction also contains tables summarizing performance by time period and year. New this year are tables summarizing performance for each subarea and a table indicating the number of routes by subarea, which fall into the above strong performance and below minimum performance categories. In addition, each set of tables include a short explanatory paragraph designed to point out trends in the performance measures.

In general, performance measures increased across all subareas and time periods. While there was a modest increase in service delivered from 2005 to 2006 (service growth was primarily in the South and East Subareas), rider use grew significantly more than would be expected by the growth in service alone. Therefore, not only are riders using the improved services, but riders are using existing services more intensively. Rider usage has also increased across all time periods, indicating that, in addition to increased usage among traditional peak commuters, other rider categories are increasing as well. Off peak commuters, shoppers and leisure users are among the groups of riders which appear to be using Metro more often.

Additional Information

Should you have any questions about the *Report on 2006 Route Performance*, please call David Hull, Service Planning Supervisor, at 263-4734, or Ted Day, Transit Planner III, at 684-1304.

2006
Route Performance Report

Prepared by
King County Metro Transit

Service Development Section:
Service Planning
Scheduling

July 2007

Table of Contents	Page i
Introduction	
Explanation of Measures and Route Groups	Page ii
A. Performance Measures: Discussion and Examples	
B. Route Definition and Performance Groups	
C. Production and Allocation Subareas	
2006 Performance Thresholds and Summary	Page x
A. Performance Thresholds	
B. 2006 Summary	
Abbreviations in the Route Performance Tables	Page xix
2006 Route Performance	
East Planning Subarea	Page 1
South Planning Subarea	Page 4
West Planning Subarea	Page 8

Explanation of Measures and Route Groups

A. Performance Measures: Discussion and Examples

➤ **Riders per revenue hour.** Routes with many ons and offs during each trip tend to do well on this measure. The high number of ons and offs is typical for routes operating in areas of dense population and employment, where many riders make short trips. The length of the trip and the density of the population and employment (thus number of stops) along it are correlated to performance on this measure. There are exceptions such as express trips that fill all seats and travel at mostly freeway speeds. This kind of trip achieves high ridership per revenue hour because the number of revenue hours per trip is quite small. (By contrast, if the non-revenue return trip was included, the route would drop by about half.) The range on this measure for the individual route variants at different times is high, with 98% of the variants ranging between 100 and 7 rides per revenue hour.

Example - An illustration of the impact of the travel time: Route 56 EX is a short route between Alki and Seattle, while Route 242 travels from Shoreline to Overlake. These two routes in the peak time period have the same number of trips (3,810 annually). They carry about the same number of riders annually (149,500 for Route 56 EX and 148,300 for Route 242). But Route 56 EX has a travel time that averages 29 minutes per trip, while Route 242 averages 67 minutes per trip. Since one of the factors in this measure is time spent in carrying riders, Route 56 EX scores much higher on this measure at 82.4 rides per revenue hour than does Route 242 at 35 rides per revenue hour.

The performance measure of riders per revenue hour is not the preferred productivity measure for transit planning as it fails to capture a route's impact on cost to the system. Instead, transit planners would use riders per platform hour. Platform hours capture the entire cost of a route including time buses are not serving customers.

Example – Routes 128 and 312 both serve approximately 420,000 annual riders during the peak period. By looking at riders per revenue hour one would conclude that Route 312 is more productive than Route 128 because Route 312 serves three more riders per revenue hour than does Route 128. However, Route 312 costs almost 25% more than does Route 128. Therefore, the measure of riders per platform hour reflects this fact as Route 128 serves 7.5 more riders per platform hour than does Route 312.

➤ **The ratio of fare revenue to operating expense** is the percentage cost recovery from fares paid by customers. There is a high correlation between the measure of riders per revenue hour and this ratio – the more riders who get on and off the coach during an hour of service, the more fare revenue is received to pay for that service. There are some exceptions, routes that are unusually high or low in fare revenue for the number of riders. Two of the reasons for these exceptions are: 1) operating expense is dependent on the number of platform hours and miles driven, rather than the number of revenue hours; and 2) some routes have a higher number of riders who have reduced fares or transfers.

Please note that the method for calculating fare revenue has been updated to reflect current conditions. The old calculation method was based on the 1992 Origin & Destination (O&D) survey. With the many changes in travel patterns and the route network, the method of fare calculation required updating. The new calculation method is based on the number of 1 zone peak, 2 zone peak, and off-peak riders on each route and the average 1 zone peak, 2 zone peak, and off-peak fare per rider for the system. In addition to using current information, this methodology has the advantage of being both simpler and more transparent than the old methodology.

The new method slightly changes the amount of fare revenue that is estimated to be generated by each subarea. Using the new methodology, there is about 7 percent less fare revenue in the South, about 2 percent less fare revenue in the East, and about 3 percent more fare revenue in the West than under the old methodology. The reason for this is that the relatively higher average fares in the East and South in 1992 reflected both a lower transfer rate and a higher percentage of 2-zone commuters in those subareas than exist today.

Example: The example of Route 13 and Route 255 illustrates the relationship between riders per hour and fare return to operating expense. While Route 255 carries 483,100 riders annually, while Route 13 carries 477,800; many more riders get on and off Route 13 each hour of operation (or hour of expense). Route 13 averages 55.2% of its operating expense covered by fares; while Route 255 with more riders, but fewer riders per hour of operation, averages only 23.5% fare recovery.

➤ **Passenger miles per revenue hour.** This measure is intended to value routes that provide trips of many miles. One rider may occupy a seat for the same number of miles on a long distance trip as do many riders each traveling only a mile or two. Performance on this measure has a substantial correlation to average length of the route in miles, the average speed of the vehicle (miles traveled per hour), and the route design and purpose. With the same number of riders, routes that travel faster will do better on this measure. There is a wide range of values for this measure across the individual route variants, with 98% of the route variants having between 24 and 750 passenger miles per revenue hour.

Example: Routes 190 and 191 travel about the same number of miles between Star Lake Park-and-Ride and downtown Seattle (20 and 22 miles), and they also have the about the same number of trips (3000 and 2800 annually) and riders (90,000 and 91,000). They both travel between 60,000 and 65,000 miles annually. In 2006, Route 190 averaged 590 passenger miles per revenue hour, while Route 191 averaged only 353 passenger miles per revenue hour. The difference is a result of the route design: Route 191 travels a long distance on Highway 99 before getting on I-5; Route 190 travels almost exclusively via the freeway; thus there is a large difference in speed, or the revenue miles per revenue hour. Route 190 carries many more riders per hour, as each trip takes less time. Also, as an all freeway route it makes no stops between Star Lake and Seattle, so all passengers travel the full length of the route, while Route 191 has intermediate stops, so some riders travel fewer miles than others.

➤ **Passenger miles divided by platform miles.** This is a replacement measure used in the 2004 Report and thereafter as a substitute for “Passenger miles divided by revenue seat miles,” the measure adopted in the Six-Year Plan Strategy M-3. The Plan states that the intent of this measure is to “assess the degree to which transit services contribute to the reduction of total vehicle miles traveled.”

The difficulties associated with using the initial formula of “passenger miles divided by revenue seat miles” are that the number of seats per coach varies, and revenue miles are not the total vehicle miles. The simpler formula of “passenger miles divided by platform miles” gives a score directly addressing the usefulness of transit in reducing total vehicle miles traveled, without the variability inherent in using seats as a multiplier and including all miles that the coach travels.

Example: Routes 48 N and 372 both cost about the same to operate (\$1.4 million per year), but due to the fact that Route 48 N is designed to cater to local trips and Route 372 is designed to provide more regional trips, Route 372 has a higher number of passenger miles per platform mile (13.56) than does Route 48 N (9.32). If you now take a look at the fare revenue generated by each route, you will notice that Route 48 N brings in about 47% more revenue than does Route 372. So the downside of this measure is that if the agency were to try to maximize this measure on each route, it would negatively impact the amount of revenue generated. Were the region ever to privatize transit service provision, one would expect that private operators would not emphasize this measure due to its negative impact on revenue.

➤ **“Route Effectiveness Sum” definition:** The Route Effectiveness Sum is intended to provide a way of comparing the routes in a specific group via a summary score for the four performance measures. It is calculated by adding four separate scores, one for each of the four performance measures for each route. These scores are a mathematical relationship of the standard deviation of a route’s performance from its group’s average performance for each measure. As the performance thresholds are held constant from 2005 to 2006, the 2005 average performances were used as the baseline from which to calculate the individual 2006 performance scores.

In years where the performance thresholds are calculated, the average for each group of routes will be 0, and the high and low scores are equal in distance from zero - one positive and one negative. The result is that within each group about half of the routes will have a positive “Route Effectiveness Sum” and have will have negative. However, for 2006, it is expected that there may be an imbalance in positive and negative scores depending on whether the routes in the group performed better or worse than in 2005.

Few routes have strong performances in one or more measures and below minimum performance in one or more measures. An extremely high or low score on one or two of the four measures may be enough to weight the overall Route Effectiveness Sum to a high or low number even though the route performs adequately on the other measures.

Use of the “Route Effectiveness Sum.” The Route Effectiveness Sum cannot be compared across groups. Standard deviations and averages depend upon the other scores and the number of items within a specified group, and the Route Effectiveness Sum represents only the position of a route within its subarea and time period group. The Route Effectiveness Sum is a mathematical construct that indicates how extreme a route’s performance is within a group of other routes. It can be used only to rank the overall performance of one route within a group of routes. By contrast, the numbers reported for the four performance measures represent a consistent physical measurement across all of the subareas and time periods. For instance, carrying 33 rides per revenue hour is the same number whatever the time period or subarea.

Example by analogy: *Question: which route did better on all four measures, the route variant with a Route Effectiveness Sum of 4.4. or the one that got only 1.9?*

This cannot be answered without knowing whether the route variants were in the same group. In this example from the 2005 Route Performance tables, the answer is the variant with a Route Effectiveness Sum of 1.9 actually performed better on every one of the four measures – more riders per revenue hour, per revenue mile, etc. The Route Effectiveness Sum of the better performing route was lower because it was in the South peak group. That is a higher performance group on average than the East night group where the score of 4.4 was achieved.

The only way to compare the numerical scores across time periods and/or subareas with the Route Effectiveness Sum would be to include all of the routes from every time period and subarea in one group, and then calculate a new set of Route Effectiveness scores based on the new group's averages and standard deviations on the measures.

B. Route Definition and Performance Groups

Routes are divided into groups by subarea and by time of day. Planning Subareas were defined when the *Long Range Policy Framework for Public Transportation* was adopted by the King County Council in 1993. All cross-subarea routes are kept whole for the purpose of performance evaluation, rather than dividing 50/50 those all day routes that travel between subareas as currently done for the purpose of allocating hours among subareas. For usefulness in comparing current and past route performance on routes crossing subarea boundaries, routes are reported in the same subarea as in prior years.

Route performance within each subarea is evaluated separately for three time periods that have different ridership characteristics. The three time periods are the peak period, offpeak (including weekend days), and night (all seven days). Time periods reflect the increasingly broad span of peak-period service levels, with the “peak” time period 4 hours in both morning and evening on weekdays (excluding holidays).

➤ **Routes are defined by route number, part of route and type of route.** Some route numbers include multiple variations, or “route variants” that are evaluated separately for performance. Route parts (north and south, or east and west) can be considered for the purposes of performance evaluation as totally separate routes, and are always listed separately in the report. Route types (e.g. express or shuttle routing) are a variation on the basic route or route part. Route variants that could be considered separately for specific improvements are kept separate on the performance evaluation.

Route type variants needed operationally. An example is trolley routes that have a shuttle (SH) variant traveling back to the base south of downtown Seattle at night. By having this trip back to the base on the schedule, it provides service to a few riders. The performance level of these operational variants is generally very low, but they are of service to a few people at very little or no system cost. When these comprise an extremely small part of the total route service in a time period, they are consolidated into the larger route variant. Otherwise they continue to be shown separately in the tables.

Route type variants with less than five trips in a time period. Those route variants generally have been combined with the same one in an adjacent time period to more accurately reflect overall performance. For instance, Route 272 is a commuter service from the Eastgate area to the University of Washington, and a few trips that occur in the offpeak time period are instead included as part of the peak period. However, express variants of less than five trips that do not have express trips in an adjacent time period are shown separately, rather than being combined with a different route type.

Routes excluded from performance evaluation. They are listed by origin subarea after the tables for the three time periods for that subarea. No thresholds were

calculated for these “exception” routes, although the average performance for regular routes in the same subarea during the same time period is listed under them as a reference point. The cost recovery performance measure for this Report is calculated using fully allocated costs, while the policy goal for custom and school routes is to generate enough revenue to cover 100% of marginal operating costs. The fare revenue for all of these types of routes is available upon request, whether paid by individuals or a partner institution. In addition to custom and school routes, other routes funded partially by partner entities and DART (demand responsive) routes are excluded from evaluation. A new small group of exception variants have been added this year to account for variants which are not able to be deleted as they are trips which are traveling between a route terminal and bus base. So it does not make sense to compare these route variants to ones which could be eliminated for poor performance.

C. Production and Allocation Subareas

Three planning Subareas were defined in the Long Range Policy Framework for Public Transportation when it was adopted by King County in 1993. Routes originally were assigned to one of the three subareas according to where the majority of morning boardings occurred – the “production” subarea. For purposes of allocating new hours of service between subareas, some routes were later assigned to a different subarea, or are shared by two subareas.

The table at the top of the next page lists those routes that have different production and allocation subareas. For usefulness in comparing current and past route performance, this report on route performance includes these routes in the “Production Subarea” listed below.

Route	Production Subarea	New Subarea	Route	Production Subarea	New Subarea
<i>East Production Subarea Routes</i>			<i>South continued</i>		
240	EAST	EAST-SOUTH	131	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST
255	EAST	EAST-WEST	131 TB	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST
271	EAST	EAST-WEST	132	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST
280	EAST	SOUTH-WEST	132 TB	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST
342	EAST	WEST	150	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST
935	EAST	EAST-WEST	150 TB	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST
DART					
			174	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST
			194	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST
			194 TB	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST
<i>South Production Subarea Routes</i>			<i>West Production Subarea Routes</i>		
101	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST	23	WEST	SOUTH-WEST
101 TB	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST	39	WEST	SOUTH-WEST
106	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST	126	WEST	SOUTH-WEST
107	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST	128	WEST	SOUTH-WEST
113	SOUTH	WEST	128 TB	WEST	SOUTH-WEST
120	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST	331	WEST	EAST-WEST
121	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST	982 CUST	WEST	EAST
121 TB	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST			
125	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST			
125 NT	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST			
125 TB	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST			

Performance Thresholds and Summary 2006

A. Performance Thresholds

Performance thresholds for evaluation of routes are set for three years to allow comparison of route performance from year to year. The performance thresholds for 2005 - 2007 are based on subarea performance by time period in 2005. Data used to develop these thresholds was the annualized Fall 2005 information on regular service routes - excludes paratransit, special service, the downtown Seattle Ride-Free Area, and the routes in group excluded from performance evaluation such as custom bus services.

Performance Thresholds: 2005 - 2007 (Revised using Fall 2005 Route Data)						
Subarea	Performance Thresholds*	Guide-Time	Rides/Rev. Hr.	Fare Rev. / Op. Exp.	Psgr.Miles / Rev. Hr.	Pass. Miles / Plat. Miles
EAST	Strong	Peak	39.8	23%	421	12.4
		OffPeak	30.2	18%	159	8.7
		Night	29.7	12%	186	7.2
	Minimum	Peak	12.9	6%	44	2.4
		OffPeak	10.3	3%	38	2.1
		Night	8.3	3%	37	2.2
SOUTH	Strong	Peak	44.3	25%	503	14.5
		OffPeak	49.2	24%	358	17.6
		Night	35.0	14%	287	11.2
	Minimum	Peak	24.7	12%	113	5.3
		OffPeak	22.1	9%	61	3.4
		Night	19.8	7%	63	3.0
WEST	Strong	Peak	72.1	37%	298	14.5
		OffPeak	72.9	32%	207	15.9
		Night	44.6	18%	150	9.2
	Minimum	Peak	33.9	15%	89	6.5
		OffPeak	30.7	13%	87	6.5
		Night	20.4	7%	53	3.4

Strong performance is defined as one standard deviation above the mean;
Below minimum performance is one standard deviation below the mean.

B. Route Performance for 2006

The purpose of route evaluation is to improve performance. Thresholds are updated periodically so that there will always be room for improvement. When thresholds are updated, as they were in 2005, some routes may move into the below minimum performance without a reduction in any measure as the below minimum performance bar was raised. However since the performance thresholds were held constant between the 2005 report and the 2006 report, it is valid to compare routes between the years. The best measure for comparing routes from year to year is the Route Effectiveness Summary. Any route which experienced an increase in Route Effectiveness from 2005 to 2006 can be concluded to be improving in performance. Instead, performance of King County Metro Routes is summarized for 2006 in the table below. Included in the summary is the percent change in each measure from 2005.

Note: These performance reports do not include rides within the downtown Seattle Ride Free Area and routes operated by Metro for Sound Transit. Routes that are not subject to performance evaluation are not included, although separately noted in the table summarizing 2006 routes. These totals can only be used to examine the subset of Metro service that is subject to annual performance evaluation, and will not match system totals found elsewhere.

SYSTEM-WIDE PERFORMANCE MEASURES

2006	Service Delivered in 2006 (Change from 2005)				
	Annual Revenue Hours	Annual Revenue Miles	Annual Trips	Annual Platform Miles	Annual Platform Hours
Peaks	1,006,970 (+0.5%)	15,616,917 (+1.2%)	1,393,842 (0%)	22,484,043 (+0.6%)	1,555,445 (+0.6%)
OffPeak	861,888 (+2.0%)	12,480,089 (+2.3%)	1,332,877 (+1.1%)	13,272,709 (+2.2%)	1,236,143 (+2.0%)
Night	318,527 (-1.1%)	5,060,035 (-1.9%)	561,809 (-3.1%)	5,918,347 (-2.6%)	500,075 (-1.7%)
Total	2,187,385 (+0.8%)	33,157,041 (+1.1%)	3,288,528 (-0.1%)	41,675,098 (+0.6%)	3,291,663 (+0.8%)
Except. Routes	79,806	1,314,252	178,446	1,589,608	115,093

2006	Rider Use in 2006 (Change from 2005)			Performance Measures			
	Annual Rides	Annual Passenger Miles	Annual Fare Revenue	Rides / Rev. Hr.	Fare Rev / Op. Exp	Psgr. Miles / RevHr	Psgr. Miles/ PlatMi
Peaks	48,447,736 (+6.8%)	255,862,974 (+3.2%)	\$45,829,896 (+13.0%)	48.11 (+6.2%)	25.7% (+11.6%)	254 (+2.4%)	11.4 (+2.5%)
OffPeak	42,225,601 (+6.1%)	176,948,169 (+7.8%)	\$30,309,114 (+14.0%)	48.99 (+4.0%)	22.9% (+9.0%)	205 (+5.7%)	13.3 (+5.8%)
Night	10,971,793 (+5.7%)	51,084,653 (+6.7%)	\$7,899,691 (+13.3%)	34.45 (+7.0%)	14.3% (+19.0%)	160 (+7.4%)	8.6 (+9.2%)
Total	101,645,130 (+6.4%)	483,896,169 (+5.2%)	\$84,038,701 (+13.4%)	46.47 (+5.6%)	22.9% (+9.2%)	221 (+4.2%)	11.6 (+4.6%)
Except. Routes	1,673,714	7,283,067	n.a.	20.97	n.a.	91	4.5

EAST SUBAREA PERFORMANCE MEASURES

2006	Service Delivered in 2006 (Change from 2005)				
	Annual Revenue Hours	Annual Revenue Miles	Annual Trips	Annual Platform Miles	Annual Platform Hours
Peaks	215,215 (+4.7%)	3,982,670 (+7.4%)	247,352 (7.5%)	6,139,105 (+8.4%)	351,964 (+7.1%)
OffPeak	125,125 (+0.7%)	2,162,472 (+0.4%)	154,749 (+0.8%)	2,263,145 (+0.0%)	179,744 (+0.3%)
Night	32,476 (+0.4%)	620,195 (+1.4%)	40,330 (+0.6%)	728,814 (+1.1%)	51,076 (+0.6%)
Total	372,816 (+2.9%)	6,765,336 (+4.5%)	442,431 (+4.4%)	9,131,064 (+5.6%)	582,784 (+4.3%)

2006	Rider Use in 2006 (Change from 2005)			Performance Measures			
	Annual Rides	Annual Passenger Miles	Annual Fare Revenue	Rides / Rev. Hr.	Fare Rev / Op. Exp	Psgr. Miles / RevHr	Psgr. Miles/ PlatMi
Peaks	6,257,454 (+7.2%)	51,566,681 (+5.2%)	\$6,617,950 (+9.0%)	29.08 (+2.4%)	16.2% (+2.0%)	240 (+0.5%)	8.4 (-2.9%)
OffPeak	3,000,163 (+5.3%)	17,282,730 (+7.7%)	\$2,162,000 (+15.6%)	23.98 (+4.6%)	11.7% (+15.2%)	138 (+6.9%)	7.6 (+7.6%)
Night	689,443 (+8.0%)	4,190,779 (+15.3%)	\$496,399 (+19.3%)	21.23 (+7.6%)	9.0% (+18.0%)	129 (+14.8%)	5.8 (+14%)
Total	9,947,060 (+6.7%)	73,040,190 (+6.3%)	\$9,276,249 (+11.0%)	26.68 (+3.6%)	14.3% (+6.4%)	196 (+3.3%)	8.0 (+0.7%)

Overall, system performance increased in the East Subarea. During the peak, most of the rise in usage is a direct response to the increases in service delivered. This is further reinforced by the fact that the performance measures during the peak rose modestly. During the off peak and night usage increased significantly, even though service delivered increased very little. Based on this, it appears that East Subarea riders are increasingly choosing to use the Metro system in the off peak and at night.

EAST SUBAREA -- NUMBER OF ROUTES ABOVE STRONG/BELOW MINIMUM PERFORMANCE THRESHOLDS

	2006	Number of Routes in 2006 (Change from 2005)				
		Rides / Rev. Hr.	Fare Rev / Op. Exp	Psgr. Miles / RevHr	Psgr. Miles/ PlatMi	Route Effectiveness
Peaks	Above Strong	9 (+1)	9 (0)	8 (-3)	9 (0)	6 (-1)
	Below Minimum	10 (+1)	7 (+3)	8 (+4)	9 (0)	10 (+1)
Off Peak	Above Strong	4 (0)	2 (+1)	4 (+2)	5 (+2)	5 (0)
	Below Minimum	5 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	2 (+2)	4 (0)
Night	Above Strong	2 (0)	2 (0)	2 (+1)	5 (+3)	2 (-1)
	Below Minimum	2 (0)	2 (0)	2 (+1)	3 (0)	2 (-1)

While the overall East Subarea performance measures increased, things looked quite different on a route-by-route basis. The number of routes moving into the above strong performance category were off-set by the number of routes moving into the below minimum performance category. When looking at the Peak period one notices that there were eight instances of route variant measures moving into the below minimum performance. This is mostly accounted for by two new route variants which were created in 2006. It is not uncommon for new routes to have below minimum performance results in their first year. New routes often take up to three years before reaching their mature performance levels. During the off peak and night periods, the route variants generally had improving performance, showing the continued growth of ridership in the off peak and night in the East Subarea.

SOUTH SUBAREA PERFORMANCE MEASURES

2006	Service Delivered in 2006 (Change from 2005)				
	Annual Revenue Hours	Annual Revenue Miles	Annual Trips	Annual Platform Miles	Annual Platform Hours
Peaks	266,375 (+0.2%)	5,063,726 (-0.1%)	318,394 (-1.7%)	7,492,325 (-1.7%)	415,637 (-0.8%)
OffPeak	195,328 (+9.8%)	3,540,741 (+8.8%)	259,723 (+3.7%)	3,813,588 (+9.5%)	275,911 (+8.4%)
Night	77,443 (+2.8%)	1,505,897 (+1.8%)	105,574 (+0.8%)	1,855,102 (+1.0%)	121,091 (+1.4%)
Total	539,146 (+2.8%)	10,110,364 (+3.1%)	685,691 (+0.7%)	13,161,016 (+1.7%)	812,639 (+2.5%)

2006	Rider Use in 2006 (Change from 2005)			Performance Measures			
	Annual Rides	Annual Passenger Miles	Annual Fare Revenue	Rides / Rev. Hr.	Fare Rev / Op. Exp	Psgr. Miles / RevHr	Psgr. Miles/ PlatMi
Peaks	10,793,085 (+7.4%)	93,136,400 (-0.3%)	\$10,980,297 (+6.4%)	40.52 (+7.2%)	21.9% (+9.1%)	350 (-0.5%)	12.4 (+1.4%)
OffPeak	8,477,488 (+12.3%)	62,006,910 (+11.8%)	\$6,105,136 (+10.3%)	43.4 (+2.3%)	20.1% (+1.7%)	317 (+1.9%)	16.3 (+2.1%)
Night	2,620,689 (+14.3%)	21,005,792 (+12.5%)	\$1,886,896 (+12.4%)	33.8 (+11.2%)	13.6% (+11.8%)	271 (+9.5%)	11.3 (+11.4%)
Total	21,891,262 (+10.1%)	176,149,103 (+5.1%)	\$18,972,329 (+8.2%)	40.6 (+6.0%)	20.1% (+6.9%)	327 (+1.2%)	13.4 (+3.4%)

Unlike in the East Subarea, where the major investment in new service took place in the peak period, the South Subarea had a significant increase in off peak service delivered. However, even with the slight reduction in service delivered in the peak, the number of peak rides and fare revenue increased. Off peak and night usage measures all grew by more than 10%. The off peak increases can be partly explained by the growth in service delivered. The night increase, however, is mostly pure growth as there was only a small increase in service delivered.

SOUTH SUBAREA -- NUMBER OF ROUTES ABOVE STRONG/BELOW MINIMUM PERFORMANCE THRESHOLDS

	2006	Number of Routes in 2006 (Change from 2005)				
		Rides / Rev. Hr.	Fare Rev / Op. Exp	Psgr. Miles / RevHr	Psgr. Miles/ PlatMi	Route Effectiveness
Peaks	Above Strong	14 (+3)	15 (+1)	10 (0)	14 (+3)	16 (+6)
	Below Minimum	6 (-4)	8 (-5)	4 (-3)	8 (-5)	6 (-3)
Off Peak	Above Strong	6 (+2)	5 (+1)	6 (+1)	7 (+1)	7 (+1)
	Below Minimum	5 (+1)	5 (0)	4 (0)	5 (0)	5 (0)
Night	Above Strong	7 (+3)	7 (+3)	5 (0)	6 (0)	9 (+5)
	Below Minimum	2 (-1)	2 (0)	2 (+1)	2 (0)	3 (-1)

On a route-by-route basis, there were 30 instances of South Subarea route performance measures which moved into the above strong performance category. Complementing that was the fact that 22 instances of below minimum performance measures moved out of the category. The peak and night periods showed the strongest improvement in route performance measures, while the off peak period had a very slight improvement (due to the increase in service delivered). However, as riders become aware of the large improvements in off peak service, it is expected that off peak performance measures will experience a similar shift as was seen this year in the peak and night periods.

WEST SUBAREA PERFORMANCE MEASURES

2006	Service Delivered in 2006 (Change from 2005)				
	Annual Revenue Hours	Annual Revenue Miles	Annual Trips	Annual Platform Miles	Annual Platform Hours
Peaks	525,380 (-0.5%)	6,570,522 (-0.7%)	828,096 (-0.7%)	8,852,612 (-1.7%)	787,844 (-0.7%)
OffPeak	541,435 (-0.3%)	6,776,876 (-0.3%)	918,405 (+0.5%)	7,195,976 (-0.5%)	780,489 (+0.3%)
Night	208,609 (-1.3%)	2,993,944 (-2.5%)	413,905 (-3.2%)	3,334,431 (-3.2%)	327,907 (-2.0%)
Total	1,275,423 (-0.6%)	16,281,341 (-0.9%)	2,160,406 (-0.7%)	19,383,019 (-1.5%)	1,896,241 (-0.5%)

2006	Rider Use in 2006 (Change from 2005)			Performance Measures			
	Annual Rides	Annual Passenger Miles	Annual Fare Revenue	Rides / Rev. Hr.	Fare Rev / Op. Exp	Psgr. Miles / RevHr	Psgr. Miles/ PlatMi
Peaks	31,397,197 (+6.7%)	111,159,893 (+5.6%)	\$28,231,649 (+17.2%)	59.8 (+7.3%)	32.3% (+16.8%)	212 (+6.1%)	12.6 (+7.4%)
OffPeak	30,747,950 (+4.6%)	97,658,901 (+5.4%)	\$22,041,978 (+14.9%)	56.8 (+4.9%)	26.4% (+12.3%)	180 (+5.7%)	13.6 (+6.0%)
Night	7,661,660 (+3.9%)	25,888,082 (+3.1%)	\$5,516,395 (+14.2%)	36.7 (+5.3%)	15.4% (+15.2%)	124 (+4.5%)	7.8 (+6.5%)
Total	69,806,807 (+5.5%)	234,706,876 (+5.2%)	\$55,790,023 (+16.0%)	54.7 (+6.0%)	27.0% (+14.9%)	184 (+5.8%)	12.1 (+6.8%)

The West Subarea was the one subarea which showed a decline in service delivered between 2005 and 2006. Most of this is due to the reclassification of several route variants into the exception category. This did not impact rider use or the performance measures in a negative way. In fact, all categories of rider use and performance measures showed strong increases. So even with the low levels of transit service investment in the West Subarea, usage continues to climb steadily. However, with the rising usage and slow growth in transit service investment, many West Subarea routes are reaching capacity and the quality of ride is decreasing.

WEST SUBAREA -- NUMBER OF ROUTES ABOVE STRONG/BELOW MINIMUM PERFORMANCE THRESHOLDS

	2006	Number of Routes in 2006 (Change from 2005)				
		Rides / Rev. Hr.	Fare Rev / Op. Exp	Psgr. Miles / RevHr	Psgr. Miles/ PlatMi	Route Effectiveness
Peaks	Above Strong	32 (+9)	33 (+14)	20 (+2)	24 (+9)	29 (+11)
	Below Minimum	11 (-10)	8 (-11)	10 (-3)	10 (-7)	12 (-9)
Off Peak	Above Strong	18 (+4)	23 (+9)	18 (+8)	13 (+4)	23 (+8)
	Below Minimum	10 (-2)	7 (-6)	12 (-2)	9 (-5)	9 (-6)
Night	Above Strong	16 (+3)	17 (+3)	13 (+4)	11 (+2)	18 (+7)
	Below Minimum	7 (-3)	5 (-6)	10 (+2)	7 (-2)	8 (-4)

Reflecting the strong growth in overall West Subarea performance is the fact that many routes also improved their performance measures. Almost 100 route level performance measures moved into the above strong performance category while another 75 route level performance measures improved out of the below minimum performance category. One conclusion that can clearly be reached is that there are fewer poorly performing routes in the West Subarea than last year. This means that there are fewer opportunities for Metro to fix service deficiencies in the West Subarea through reducing or eliminating poorly performing routes.

Abbreviations Used in the Route Performance Tables

Production Subarea: Although some routes are now characterized differently for the allocation of new hours of service, routes were originally assigned to subareas according to where the majority of morning boardings occurred – the “production” subarea. In the Route Performance Report, each route is reported in only one subarea, and the same subarea is used as in prior years.

Guide Time: time periods defined for route evaluation

Peak 5:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. weekdays

Offpeak 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. weekdays; 5:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. weekends

Night 7:00 p.m. to 5:00 a.m. all days

Part: (Route Part)

N north route segment

S south route segment

E east route segment

W west route segment

Type: (Route Type)

ALT alternate routing

EX express routing

NT special routing for late night or very early morning

SH shuttle routing

SHAL alternate shuttle routing

SHTB turnback routing on a shuttle trip

TB turnback routing

TEX turnback routing on an express trip

Exceptions:

CUST Custom bus routes are cost supported by private business or schools for regular commuters

DART Dial-A-Ride Routes provide flexible routing available by request

PART Partnership or Grant funded routes - routes partially supported by other organizations or grants

SCH Routes or special trips that serve public secondary or private schools - cost usually shared with the school district or private school

n.a. Not applicable. The marginal operating cost ratio is available on request for the exception routes.

2006 Annual Route Performance Report

EAST Planning Subarea

**Prepared by
King County Metro Transit
Service Development Section:
Service Planning Group
Scheduling Group**

July 2007

2006 Route Performance Report - East Subarea

Prod Subarea	Exceptions to Route Evaluation	Guide time	Route	Part	Key Type	Origin	Rides /Rev. Hour	Fare Rev. / Op.Exp Ratio	Pass. Miles / Rev. Hour	Pass. Miles/ Plat. Miles	"Route Effectiveness" Sum
2006 PEAK - EAST PRODUCTION SUBAREA											
EAST						<i>Meets or exceeds strong performance threshold (Fall 2005)</i>	39.8	23%	421	12.4	3.7
EAST						<i>Less than minimum performance threshold (Fall 2005)</i>	12.9	6%	44	2.4	-3.7
EAST		Peak	218			Issaquah	64.9	23%	1122	18.6	11.0
EAST		Peak	312	EX		U of W - Bothell	57.9	28%	573	16.5	7.8
EAST		Peak	212			Eastgate	55.3	23%	518	13.4	6.0
EAST		Peak	306	EX		Kenmore	50.4	29%	498	17.5	7.1
EAST		Peak	229			Overlake	43.9	27%	458	16.0	5.8
EAST		Peak	230	W TB		Kirkland	42.8	22%	64	3.1	0.4
EAST		Peak	253			Bear Creek P&R	41.9	26%	145	9.4	2.6
EAST		Peak	225			Overlake	40.4	27%	413	14.7	5.1
EAST		Peak	230	E		Redmond P&R	39.8	24%	154	8.5	2.0
EAST		Peak	255			Kingsgate	36.3	24%	326	12.9	3.5
EAST		Peak	230	W		Kingsgate P&R	36.2	23%	124	7.3	1.2
EAST		Peak	245			Kirkland	36.2	22%	147	8.8	1.5
EAST		Peak	271	TB		Bellevue TC	35.9	22%	225	10.1	2.2
EAST		Peak	271			Issaquah P&R	35.6	27%	247	12.5	3.4
EAST		Peak	240			Bellevue	33.4	22%	180	10.7	1.9
EAST		Peak	261			Overlake P&R	32.9	19%	269	9.3	1.7
EAST		Peak	268			E Lake Sammamish	32.7	17%	434	10.5	2.6
EAST		Peak	205	EX		Mercer Island	32.6	19%	194	6.6	0.7
EAST		Peak	214	TB		Issaquah	31.4	15%	399	9.0	1.8
EAST		Peak	252			Kingsgate P&R	31.2	18%	420	11.0	2.5
EAST		Peak	272			Eastgate P&R	28.2	14%	245	8.1	0.3
EAST		Peak	311			Woodinville P&R	27.6	14%	499	11.5	2.3
EAST		Peak	266			Bear Creek P&R	26.9	13%	262	6.9	0.0
EAST		Peak	216			Sammamish	25.2	15%	432	12.5	2.2
EAST		Peak	342			Bothell	25.2	10%	266	6.0	-0.7
EAST		Peak	202			Mercer Island	24.9	13%	159	4.7	-1.2
EAST		Peak	203			Mercer Island	24.7	12%	40	1.5	-2.6
EAST		Peak	942	EX		Eastgate P&R	24.0	12%	238	5.4	-0.8
EAST		Peak	257			Kingsgate P&R	23.7	13%	310	7.8	0.2
EAST		Peak	237			Woodinville	23.7	7%	246	4.4	-1.6
EAST		Peak	214			North Bend	22.5	10%	323	6.4	-0.5
EAST		Peak	210			Issaquah	22.4	12%	208	5.1	-1.1
EAST		Peak	265			Redmond P&R	22.2	11%	247	6.0	-0.8
EAST		Peak	233			Bellevue	22.0	14%	86	4.9	-1.7
EAST		Peak	277			Juanita	21.7	12%	177	5.3	-1.3
EAST		Peak	234			Northshore P&R	20.8	13%	122	6.1	-1.4
EAST		Peak	238			Bothell	20.6	13%	85	4.3	-2.0
EAST		Peak	222			Overlake	19.9	13%	83	5.0	-1.9
EAST		Peak	260			Juanita	19.6	12%	281	7.2	-0.5
EAST		Peak	232			Duvall	19.0	8%	137	3.7	-2.5
EAST		Peak	236			Woodinville	18.9	11%	80	3.9	-2.4
EAST		Peak	250			Redmond P&R	18.8	10%	199	5.3	-1.6
EAST		Peak	269			E Lake Sammamish	15.8	8%	143	5.7	-2.4
EAST		Peak	249			Redmond P&R	15.0	9%	60	3.0	-3.2

2006 Route Performance Report - East Subarea

Prod Subarea	Exceptions to Route Evaluation	Guide time	Route	Part	Key Type	Origin	Rides /Rev. Hour	Fare Rev. / Op.Exp Ratio	Pass. Miles / Rev. Hour	Pass. Miles/ Plat. Miles	"Route Effectiveness" Sum
EAST		Peak	254		SH	Redmond	13.3	7%	44	1.9	-4.0
EAST		Peak	209			North Bend	11.4	6%	115	3.4	-3.5
EAST		Peak	202		SH	Mercer Island	11.2	4%	28	0.6	-4.8
EAST		Peak	247			Overlake P&R	11.1	5%	77	2.2	-4.1
EAST		Peak	251			North Creek	10.3	7%	65	2.8	-3.9
EAST		Peak	921			Eastgate P&R	10.0	6%	33	1.6	-4.4
EAST		Peak	644			Kenmore	9.9	3%	100	2.5	-4.2
EAST		Peak	220			Redmond P&R	7.1	4%	29	1.5	-4.9
EAST		Peak	201			Mercer Island	4.3	2%	19	0.7	-5.5
EAST		Peak	929			North Bend	3.0	2%	39	1.1	-5.5
EAST		Peak	922			Carnation	0.8	0%	11	0.2	-6.2
EAST		average 2006 PEAK - EAST					26.2	14%	232	7.35	-0.1

2006 OFF-PEAK - EAST PRODUCTION SUBAREA											
EAST		<i>Meets or exceeds strong performance threshold (Fall 2005)</i>					30.2	18%	159	8.7	3.3
EAST		<i>Less than minimum performance threshold (Fall 2005)</i>					10.3	3%	38	2.1	-3.3
EAST		OffPeak	230	E		Redmond P&R	39.3	17%	160	8.9	4.9
EAST		OffPeak	253			Bear Creek P&R	37.5	18%	131	9.7	4.6
EAST		OffPeak	213			Mercer Island	31.5	21%	57	2.9	1.1
EAST		OffPeak	230	W		Kingsgate P&R	30.2	16%	112	7.8	2.7
EAST		OffPeak	255			Kingsgate	30.1	13%	301	14.7	7.5
EAST		OffPeak	271			Issaquah P&R	30.1	16%	224	12.9	6.0
EAST		OffPeak	240			Bellevue	29.9	15%	184	10.7	4.6
EAST		OffPeak	245			Kirkland	29.2	13%	138	7.9	2.7
EAST		OffPeak	234			Northshore P&R	19.9	10%	116	6.5	0.6
EAST		OffPeak	222			Overlake	18.6	9%	89	5.2	-0.5
EAST		OffPeak	238			Bothell	18.5	9%	94	4.8	-0.6
EAST		OffPeak	204			Mercer Island	16.4	8%	51	2.6	-2.3
EAST		OffPeak	236			Woodinville	16.1	8%	77	4.1	-1.5
EAST		OffPeak	233			Bellevue	15.7	8%	75	4.5	-1.4
EAST		OffPeak	203			Mercer Island	15.3	10%	31	1.6	-2.8
EAST		OffPeak	249			Redmond P&R	13.6	7%	81	4.8	-1.5
EAST		OffPeak	254		SH	Redmond	9.2	4%	40	2.0	-3.9
EAST		OffPeak	209			North Bend	8.8	4%	101	3.3	-2.6
EAST		OffPeak	251			North Creek	8.2	4%	51	2.4	-3.7
EAST		OffPeak	921			Eastgate P&R	8.1	4%	39	2.2	-4.0
EAST		OffPeak	220			Redmond P&R	7.6	3%	42	2.2	-4.1
EAST		average 2006 MIDDAY - EAST					20.2	10%	98	5.39	0.3

2006 Route Performance Report - East Subarea

Prod Subarea	Exceptions to Route Evaluation	Guide time	Route	Part	Key Type	Origin	Rides /Rev. Hour	Fare Rev. / Op.Exp Ratio	Pass. Miles / Rev. Hour	Pass. Miles/ Plat. Miles	"Route Effectiveness" Sum
2006 NIGHT - EAST PRODUCTION SUBAREA											
EAST	<i>Meets or exceeds strong performance threshold (Fall 2005)</i>						29.7	12%	186	7.2	3.5
EAST	<i>Less than minimum performance threshold (Fall 2005)</i>						8.3	3%	37	2.2	-3.5
EAST		Night	253			Bear Creek P&R	49.0	22%	159	7.8	7.9
EAST		Night	230	E		Redmond P&R	37.0	16%	155	7.2	5.2
EAST		Night	230	W		Kingsgate P&R	23.7	10%	104	5.6	1.4
EAST		Night	271			Issaquah P&R	23.1	10%	173	8.0	3.2
EAST		Night	255			Kingsgate	20.2	8%	206	8.7	3.2
EAST		Night	240			Bellevue	19.4	8%	129	6.0	1.0
EAST		Night	245			Kirkland	18.2	8%	80	3.7	-0.9
EAST		Night	280			Bellevue TC	16.0	6%	275	7.6	2.8
EAST		Night	222			Overlake	11.4	5%	58	3.0	-2.6
EAST		Night	236			Woodinville	10.1	4%	55	2.1	-3.4
EAST		Night	254	SH		Redmond	7.6	3%	35	1.1	-4.6
EAST		Night	238			Bothell	6.7	3%	37	1.5	-4.5
EAST	average 2006 NIGHT - EAST						19.0	7%	111	4.69	0.7

2006 EAST PRODUCTION SUBAREA EXCEPTION ROUTES - NOT EVALUATED											
EAST	PART	Peak	200			Issaquah	13.3	n.a.	31	1.3	
EAST	SCL	Peak	206			Newport Hills	86.0	n.a.	324	12.8	
EAST	SCL	Peak	207			Newport Hills	75.6	n.a.	259	10.6	
EAST	SCL	Peak	208			Newport Hills	68.6	n.a.	278	11.5	
EAST	SCL	Peak	219			Newcastle	10.1	n.a.	28	1.0	
EAST	PART	Peak	291	DART		Redmond	11.4	n.a.	41	3.3	
EAST	PART	Peak	630	EX		Kingsgate	25.8	n.a.	129	3.7	
EAST	SCL	Peak	885			Bellevue	40.5	n.a.	89	3.8	
EAST	SCL	Peak	886			Clyde Hill	36.0	n.a.	37	3.2	
EAST	SCL	Peak	888			Eastgate	35.3	n.a.	170	7.3	
EAST	SCL	Peak	889			Bellevue	60.6	n.a.	209	9.5	
EAST	SCL	Peak	890			Eastgate	38.6	n.a.	193	7.2	
EAST	SCL	Peak	891			Mercer Island	76.6	n.a.	314	10.3	
EAST	SCL	Peak	892			Mercer Island	102.7	n.a.	318	9.8	
EAST	DART	Peak	926	DART		Crossroads	9.9	n.a.	32	2.1	
EAST	DART	Peak	927	DART		E Lake Sammamish	6.9	n.a.	44	2.6	
EAST	DART	Peak	935	DART		Juanita	8.1	n.a.	44	2.5	
EAST	SCL	Peak	986	CUST		Kirkland	53.6	n.a.	179	5.2	
EAST	SCL	Peak	989	CUST		Eastgate	53.7	n.a.	666	16.8	
EAST	SCL	Peak	997	CUST		Bellevue	29.4	n.a.	110	3.8	
EAST	regular route average: 2006 East Peak						26.2		232	7.35	

EAST	PART	OffPeak	200			Issaquah	13.4	n.a.	36	2.3	
EAST	DART	OffPeak	926	DART		Crossroads	9.2	n.a.	28	1.9	
EAST	DART	OffPeak	927	DART		E Lake Sammamish	5.7	n.a.	37	2.0	
EAST	DART	OffPeak	935	DART		Juanita	6.6	n.a.	35	1.9	
EAST	regular route average: 2006 East OffPeak						20.2		98.4	5.4	

2006 Annual Route Performance Report

SOUTH Planning Subarea

**Prepared by
King County Metro Transit
Service Development Section:
Service Planning Group
Scheduling Group**

July 2007

2006 Route Performance Report - South Subarea

Prod Subarea	Exceptions to Route Evaluation	Guide time	Route	Part	Key Type	Origin	Rides /Rev. Hour	Fare Rev. / Op.Exp Ratio	Pass. Miles / Rev. Hour	Pass. Miles/ Plat. Miles	"Route Effectiveness" Sum
2006 PEAK - SOUTH PRODUCTION SUBAREA											
SOUTH	<i>Meets or exceeds strong performance threshold (Fall 2005)</i>						44.3	25%	503	14.5	3.1
SOUTH	<i>Less than minimum performance threshold (Fall 2005)</i>						24.7	12%	113	5.3	-3.1
SOUTH		Peak	105			Renton Highlands	74.7	41%	174	10.92	7.1
SOUTH		Peak	164			Kent	66.7	36%	284	13.05	6.5
SOUTH		Peak	168			Timberlane	64.7	30%	231	8.74	4.2
SOUTH		Peak	169			Kent P&R,TC	60.3	33%	267	14.13	5.6
SOUTH		Peak	120			Burien	58.6	32%	323	16.02	5.9
SOUTH		Peak	174			Federal Way P&R,TC	57.4	34%	392	19.38	7.1
SOUTH		Peak	119		SH	Vashon	53.4	25%	204	6.69	1.6
SOUTH		Peak	106			Renton	51.9	32%	301	16.40	5.2
SOUTH		Peak	122			Highline CC	51.6	31%	456	17.23	6.0
SOUTH		Peak	118		TB	Vashon	50.4	21%	192	6.62	0.7
SOUTH		Peak	941		EX	Star Lake P&R	48.7	22%	735	15.21	5.4
SOUTH		Peak	143		EX	Black Diamond	48.3	28%	789	22.83	8.2
SOUTH		Peak	121			Highline CC	45.0	24%	431	13.73	3.3
SOUTH		Peak	101			Fairwood	44.6	31%	497	19.66	6.0
SOUTH		Peak	125		TB	White Center	43.9	26%	240	11.69	2.1
SOUTH		Peak	131		TB	Burien	43.6	23%	270	10.43	1.5
SOUTH		Peak	101		TB	Renton CBD	43.6	28%	457	19.66	5.3
SOUTH		Peak	118			Vashon	42.6	18%	139	4.50	-1.4
SOUTH		Peak	180			Auburn	42.3	25%	198	9.00	0.9
SOUTH		Peak	113			Shorewood	41.9	18%	303	9.64	0.5
SOUTH		Peak	107			Renton	41.0	26%	135	7.54	0.4
SOUTH		Peak	132		TB	Burien	41.0	25%	250	11.31	1.7
SOUTH		Peak	150		TB	Kent	39.9	26%	425	18.93	4.3
SOUTH		Peak	116		EX	Fauntleroy	39.5	18%	284	11.27	0.5
SOUTH		Peak	131			Highline CC	39.4	25%	214	11.73	1.3
SOUTH		Peak	125			Shorewood	39.4	22%	230	9.39	0.5
SOUTH		Peak	181			Green River CC	39.1	22%	194	8.82	0.2
SOUTH		Peak	111			Renton	38.8	24%	515	15.06	3.4
SOUTH		Peak	166			Kent P&R,TC	38.3	23%	178	9.17	0.2
SOUTH		Peak	187			Federal Way	37.3	24%	118	5.46	-0.9
SOUTH		Peak	158			Lk Meridi/E Kent P&R	37.0	18%	606	15.70	2.9
SOUTH		Peak	197			Federal Way	36.8	15%	754	14.90	3.1
SOUTH		Peak	177			Federal Way	36.6	17%	635	15.04	2.8
SOUTH		Peak	140			Burien	36.4	20%	149	7.68	-0.9
SOUTH		Peak	132			Highline CC	36.4	22%	217	9.63	0.2
SOUTH		Peak	139			Gregory Heights	36.0	21%	71	4.52	-1.9
SOUTH		Peak	170			McMicken Heights	34.5	23%	280	9.25	0.5
SOUTH		Peak	194		TB	SeaTac	34.3	22%	344	13.17	1.5
SOUTH		Peak	153			Kent	34.1	21%	116	5.98	-1.5
SOUTH		Peak	190			Star Lake P&R	33.9	16%	590	11.85	1.4
SOUTH		Peak	114			Renton	33.8	21%	394	11.54	1.0
SOUTH		Peak	148			Fairwood	33.5	19%	120	6.56	-1.7
SOUTH		Peak	194			Federal Way	33.3	19%	489	16.85	2.4
SOUTH		Peak	121		TB	Burien	32.4	19%	242	9.06	-0.6

2006 Route Performance Report - South Subarea

Prod Subarea	Exceptions to Route Evaluation	Guide time	Route	Part	Key Type	Origin	Rides /Rev. Hour	Fare Rev. / Op.Exp Ratio	Pass. Miles / Rev. Hour	Pass. Miles/ Plat. Miles	"Route Effectiveness" Sum	
SOUTH		Peak	183			Kent	32.4	17%	139	5.54	-2.3	
SOUTH		Peak	133			Burien TC	31.8	16%	338	9.98	-0.5	
SOUTH		Peak	162			Kent	31.6	14%	555	11.39	0.6	
SOUTH		Peak	191			Star Lake P&R	30.6	15%	353	8.34	-1.1	
SOUTH		Peak	123		EX	Burien	30.5	23%	280	13.18	0.9	
SOUTH		Peak	192			Federal Way	29.4	15%	468	9.63	-0.4	
SOUTH		Peak	167			Auburn P&R	29.1	15%	419	11.08	-0.2	
SOUTH		Peak	152			Enumclaw	29.0	14%	532	11.24	0.1	
SOUTH		Peak	134			Burien TC	28.9	15%	181	8.12	-2.2	
SOUTH		Peak	159			Kent P&R,TC	28.0	14%	436	11.21	-0.4	
SOUTH		Peak	154			Auburn	27.7	10%	229	5.17	-3.4	
SOUTH		Peak	161			Kent	27.7	16%	356	10.13	-0.8	
SOUTH		Peak	179			Federal Way	26.7	12%	590	10.56	-0.3	
SOUTH		Peak	196			Federal Way S P&R	26.3	11%	444	8.45	-1.7	
SOUTH		Peak	182			Federal Way	26.2	11%	95	3.21	-4.5	
SOUTH		Peak	155			Fairwood	25.6	14%	92	4.63	-4.0	
SOUTH		Peak	118		EX	Vashon	24.4	14%	191	9.64	-2.4	
SOUTH		Peak	119		EX	Vashon	24.3	18%	252	14.36	-0.4	
SOUTH		Peak	915			Enumclaw	22.7	9%	132	2.80	-5.2	
SOUTH		Peak	175			Federal Way P&R,TC	22.1	11%	342	8.16	-2.6	
SOUTH		Peak	173			Federal Way P&R,TC	17.4	7%	229	4.51	-5.2	
SOUTH		Peak	149			Black Diamond	8.0	3%	47	1.26	-8.3	
SOUTH		average 2006 PEAK - SOUTH						34.5	19%	308	9.89	58.3

2006 OFFPEAK - SOUTH PRODUCTION SUBAREA											
SOUTH	<i>Meets or exceeds strong performance threshold (Fall 2005)</i>						49.2	24%	358	17.6	3.5
SOUTH	<i>Less than minimum performance threshold (Fall 2005)</i>						22.1	9%	61	3.4	-3.5
SOUTH		OffPeak	164			Kent	79.1	37%	371	19.82	8.5
SOUTH		OffPeak	105			Renton Highlands	72.1	31%	205	12.79	5.1
SOUTH		OffPeak	174			Federal Way P&R,TC	63.1	29%	469	26.24	7.8
SOUTH		OffPeak	120			Burien	62.1	27%	341	19.22	5.5
SOUTH		OffPeak	169			Kent P&R,TC	57.1	28%	284	16.44	4.6
SOUTH		OffPeak	168			Timberlane	55.8	22%	230	10.30	2.4
SOUTH		OffPeak	140			Burien	47.4	21%	233	13.15	2.0
SOUTH		OffPeak	106			Renton	45.9	24%	277	18.47	3.3
SOUTH		OffPeak	101		TB	Renton CBD	43.8	20%	471	25.67	5.0
SOUTH		OffPeak	194			Federal Way	43.1	18%	733	27.64	6.7
SOUTH		OffPeak	180			Auburn	42.6	20%	210	9.70	0.9
SOUTH		OffPeak	180		TB	Auburn	42.1	19%	201	11.35	0.9
SOUTH		OffPeak	181			Green River CC	40.2	19%	216	11.97	1.0
SOUTH		OffPeak	107			Renton	39.0	20%	143	8.14	0.0
SOUTH		OffPeak	132		TB	Burien	38.9	19%	271	12.14	1.2
SOUTH		OffPeak	187			Federal Way	37.6	22%	138	7.23	0.0
SOUTH		OffPeak	125			Shorewood	37.4	18%	227	11.09	0.5
SOUTH		OffPeak	166			Kent P&R,TC	36.4	18%	188	10.53	0.1

2006 Route Performance Report - South Subarea

Prod Subarea	Exceptions to Route Evaluation	Guide time	Route	Part	Key Type	Origin	Rides /Rev. Hour	Fare Rev. / Op.Exp Ratio	Pass. Miles / Rev. Hour	Pass. Miles/ Plat. Miles	"Route Effectiveness" Sum	
SOUTH		OffPeak	132			Highline CC	35.6	19%	242	12.42	0.8	
SOUTH		OffPeak	194		TB	SeaTac	34.7	15%	393	16.13	1.8	
SOUTH		OffPeak	131			Highline CC	34.4	18%	227	12.17	0.5	
SOUTH		OffPeak	139			Gregory Heights	33.1	15%	67	4.29	-2.3	
SOUTH		OffPeak	150		TB	Kent	32.2	15%	382	19.49	2.0	
SOUTH		OffPeak	148			Fairwood	32.0	16%	136	7.77	-1.2	
SOUTH		OffPeak	183			Kent	29.4	13%	174	9.53	-1.3	
SOUTH		OffPeak	915			Enumclaw	27.3	10%	177	5.39	-2.4	
SOUTH		OffPeak	182			Federal Way	26.6	10%	111	4.56	-3.1	
SOUTH		OffPeak	155			Fairwood	25.2	12%	102	6.24	-2.8	
SOUTH		OffPeak	118		TB	Vashon	12.4	4%	44	1.36	-5.8	
SOUTH		OffPeak	119		SH	Vashon	11.9	4%	48	1.44	-5.8	
SOUTH		OffPeak	149			Black Diamond	9.2	4%	91	2.79	-5.7	
SOUTH		OffPeak	118			Vashon	7.9	3%	29	0.96	-6.5	
SOUTH		OffPeak	912			Covington	5.3	2%	51	1.40	-6.6	
SOUTH		average 2006 OFFPEAK - SOUTH						35.6	17%	209	10.52	0.5

2006 NIGHT - SOUTH PRODUCTION SUBAREA												
SOUTH	<i>Meets or exceeds strong performance threshold (Fall 2005)</i>						35.0	14%	287	11.2	3.4	
SOUTH	<i>Less than minimum performance threshold (Fall 2005)</i>						19.8	7%	63	3.0	-3.4	
SOUTH		Night	120			Burien	50.2	19%	317	14.40	8.3	
SOUTH		Night	169			Kent P&R,TC	48.4	19%	211	9.27	5.9	
SOUTH		Night	174			Federal Way P&R,TC	43.6	18%	440	18.25	9.1	
SOUTH		Night	140			Burien	41.7	16%	218	10.18	4.5	
SOUTH		Night	105			Renton Highlands	36.2	14%	76	3.71	0.2	
SOUTH		Night	168			Timberlane	35.4	13%	153	5.55	0.9	
SOUTH		Night	164			Kent	35.2	16%	149	7.08	2.2	
SOUTH		Night	181			Green River CC	34.6	12%	143	4.58	0.4	
SOUTH		Night	106			Renton	34.5	16%	231	12.47	4.1	
SOUTH		Night	194			Federal Way	31.8	12%	549	16.50	6.4	
SOUTH		Night	101		TB	Renton CBD	31.2	12%	321	13.93	3.8	
SOUTH		Night	166			Kent P&R,TC	29.8	12%	120	4.84	-0.3	
SOUTH		Night	125		NT	Shorewood	29.7	18%	215	10.51	3.4	
SOUTH		Night	150		TB	Kent	28.3	12%	378	16.18	4.3	
SOUTH		Night	180		TB	Auburn	28.1	11%	135	5.25	-0.8	
SOUTH		Night	187			Federal Way	25.6	11%	84	3.27	-1.9	
SOUTH		Night	125			Shorewood	23.1	8%	160	4.69	-2.1	
SOUTH		Night	148			Fairwood	22.3	8%	96	4.90	-2.6	
SOUTH		Night	131			Highline CC	21.3	9%	156	6.24	-1.7	
SOUTH		Night	132			Highline CC	20.1	9%	173	7.52	-1.4	
SOUTH		Night	139			Gregory Heights	20.0	8%	42	2.21	-4.1	
SOUTH		Night	125		TB	White Center	17.4	7%	95	4.84	-3.8	
SOUTH		Night	107			Renton	16.6	7%	57	2.57	-4.8	
SOUTH		average 2006 NIGHT - SOUTH						27.4	11%	175	7.1	1.3

2006 SOUTH PRODUCTION SUBAREA EXCEPTION ROUTES - NOT EVALUATED

2006 Route Performance Report - South Subarea

Prod Subarea	Exceptions to Route Evaluation	Guide time	Route	Part	Key Type	Origin	Rides /Rev. Hour	Fare Rev. / Op.Exp Ratio	Pass. Miles / Rev. Hour	Pass. Miles/ Plat. Miles	"Route Effectiveness" Sum
SOUTH	PART	Peak	110			Renton	19.4	n.a.	38	1.54	
SOUTH	DART	Peak	901		DART	Dash Point	28.6	n.a.	50	3.94	
SOUTH	DART	Peak	903		DART	South Campus	28.9	n.a.	102	5.21	
SOUTH	DART	Peak	908		DART	Renton Highlands	12.4	n.a.	23	1.62	
SOUTH	DART	Peak	909		DART	Renton	12.2	n.a.	30	2.02	
SOUTH	DART	Peak	917		DART	Algona	18.4	n.a.	62	3.25	
SOUTH	DART	Peak	918		DART	Kent	34.8	n.a.	58	3.86	
SOUTH	CUST	Peak	952		CUST	Auburn P&R	21.4	n.a.	559	10.22	
SOUTH	regular route average: 2006 SOUTH PEAK						34.5		308	9.9	
SOUTH	DART	OffPeak	901		DART	Dash Point	25.0	n.a.	43	3.26	
SOUTH	DART	OffPeak	903		DART	South Campus	26.0	n.a.	91	4.56	
SOUTH	DART	OffPeak	908		DART	Renton Highlands	10.5	n.a.	19	1.37	
SOUTH	DART	OffPeak	909		DART	Renton	11.0	n.a.	27	1.81	
SOUTH	PART	OffPeak	914		DART	Kent	16.8	n.a.	73	5.47	
SOUTH	PART	OffPeak	916		DART	Kent	15.4	n.a.	76	5.96	
SOUTH	DART	OffPeak	917		DART	Algona	18.0	n.a.	53	2.68	
SOUTH	DART	OffPeak	919		DART	Auburn	16.7	n.a.	40	2.54	
SOUTH	regular route average: 2006 SOUTH OFFPEAK						35.6		209	10.5	
SOUTH	DART	Night	901		DART	Dash Point	25.1	n.a.	44	3.01	
SOUTH	DART	Night	903		DART	South Campus	26.0	n.a.	92	4.54	
SOUTH	regular route average: 2006 SOUTH NIGHT						27.4		175	7.1	

2006 Annual Route Performance Report

WEST (or NORTH) Planning Subarea

**Prepared by
King County Metro Transit
Service Development Section:
Service Planning Group
Scheduling Group**

July 2007

2006 Route Performance Report - West Subarea

Prod Subarea	Exceptions to Route Evaluation	Guide time	Route	Part	Key Type	Origin	Rides /Rev. Hour	Fare Rev. / Op.Exp Ratio	Pass. Miles / Rev. Hour	Pass. Miles/ Plat. Miles	"Route Effectiveness" Sum
2006 PEAK - WEST PRODUCTION SUBAREA											
WEST			<i>Meets or exceeds strong performance threshold (Fall 2005)</i>				72.1	37%	298	14.5	3.0
WEST			<i>Less than minimum performance threshold (Fall 2005)</i>				33.9	15%	89	6.5	-3.0
WEST		Peak	1			Kinnear	101.4	57%	121	11.7	4.9
WEST		Peak	15			Blue Ridge	99.7	52%	249	14.0	6.1
WEST		Peak	3	N		North Queen Anne	97.5	59%	101	10.7	4.4
WEST		Peak	2	N		West Queen Anne	96.5	56%	123	13.2	4.9
WEST		Peak	68			Northgate TC	96.2	57%	191	12.2	5.4
WEST		Peak	4	N		East Queen Anne	95.4	59%	106	11.0	4.4
WEST		Peak	13			Seattle Pacific U.	89.6	55%	117	12.6	4.3
WEST		Peak	15		TB	Ballard	89.5	53%	262	14.8	6.1
WEST		Peak	18		TB	Crown Hill	89.4	45%	221	15.3	5.1
WEST		Peak	48	N	TB	Ravenna	88.5	18%	123	2.1	-1.7
WEST		Peak	15		EX	Blue Ridge	86.7	38%	409	16.9	6.5
WEST		Peak	18			North Beach	85.4	49%	232	12.8	4.7
WEST		Peak	12		TB	First Hill	82.4	44%	72	9.7	1.8
WEST		Peak	56		EX	Alki	82.4	32%	407	16.1	5.5
WEST		Peak	2	S		Madrona	81.8	48%	111	11.4	2.9
WEST		Peak	48	S		Rainier Beach	81.5	48%	224	14.1	4.7
WEST		Peak	12			Interlaken Park	80.9	48%	97	11.3	2.7
WEST		Peak	372		TEX	Kenmore	80.5	33%	337	10.3	3.3
WEST		Peak	8		TB	Capitol Hill	80.0	38%	99	6.4	0.5
WEST		Peak	5		EX	Greenwood	79.3	38%	343	16.2	5.3
WEST		Peak	28		TB	Whittier Heights	78.4	37%	232	9.6	2.5
WEST		Peak	4	S		Judkins Park	77.8	43%	106	11.1	2.1
WEST		Peak	11			Madison Park	77.1	46%	135	10.4	2.4
WEST		Peak	3	S		Madrona	77.1	42%	92	10.1	1.6
WEST		Peak	49			U. District	76.4	36%	171	19.9	4.3
WEST		Peak	10			Capitol Hill	76.3	43%	101	11.2	2.0
WEST		Peak	14	N		Summit	76.3	39%	88	10.8	1.4
WEST		Peak	18		EX	North Beach	75.9	33%	369	14.7	4.6
WEST		Peak	24		TB	Central Magnolia	75.4	38%	259	13.6	3.6
WEST		Peak	2	N	EX	West Queen Anne	73.7	29%	157	7.4	0.2
WEST		Peak	48	S	ALT	Columbia City	73.4	47%	162	11.3	2.8
WEST		Peak	65			Lake City	72.2	39%	188	11.2	2.3
WEST		Peak	48	N		Loyal Heights	71.8	38%	157	9.3	1.4
WEST		Peak	24			Central Magnolia	71.1	42%	209	11.8	2.8
WEST		Peak	3	S	TB	First Hill	70.7	34%	78	9.7	0.3
WEST		Peak	26			East Green Lake	70.1	38%	164	10.1	1.6
WEST		Peak	41		TB	Northgate P&R	68.9	28%	486	17.1	5.5
WEST		Peak	48	N	EX	Loyal Heights	68.5	32%	218	10.8	1.6
WEST		Peak	54		EX	Fauntleroy	68.0	25%	397	12.9	3.2
WEST		Peak	44			Ballard	67.8	32%	132	12.9	1.3
WEST		Peak	36		TB	Beacon Hill	66.7	38%	171	14.6	2.6
WEST		Peak	8			Mount Baker	66.4	40%	124	9.2	1.0
WEST		Peak	4	N	NT	East Queen Anne	64.0	38%	76	7.0	-0.4
WEST		Peak	26		EX	East Green Lake	63.8	31%	269	13.9	2.5

2006 Route Performance Report - West Subarea

Prod Subarea	Exceptions to Route Evaluation	Guide time	Route	Part	Key Type	Origin	Rides /Rev. Hour	Fare Rev. / Op.Exp Ratio	Pass. Miles / Rev. Hour	Pass. Miles/ Plat. Miles	"Route Effectiveness" Sum
WEST		Peak	17		EX	Loyal Heights	62.7	28%	349	14.9	3.2
WEST		Peak	55			Admiral District	62.4	31%	283	14.8	2.8
WEST		Peak	67			North Seattle	62.4	32%	177	11.1	1.0
WEST		Peak	358		EX	Aurora Village	62.0	39%	357	22.7	6.2
WEST		Peak	72		EX	Lake City	61.6	37%	265	20.3	4.6
WEST		Peak	7		EX	Rainier Beach	61.0	28%	254	11.5	1.4
WEST		Peak	5			Shoreline CC	60.9	32%	244	11.8	1.7
WEST		Peak	9		EX	Rainier Ave	60.9	30%	199	10.2	0.7
WEST		Peak	73		TEX	Roosevelt	60.7	33%	248	16.7	3.1
WEST		Peak	43			U. District	60.3	30%	137	14.9	1.3
WEST		Peak	56			Alki	60.2	32%	173	9.0	0.3
WEST		Peak	5		ALT	Northgate TC	59.6	34%	216	12.9	1.9
WEST		Peak	27			Colman Park	59.5	35%	104	7.9	-0.4
WEST		Peak	21		EX	Arbor Heights	59.1	26%	394	15.2	3.4
WEST		Peak	28			Broadview	58.7	31%	179	9.4	0.3
WEST		Peak	75			Northgate	58.5	35%	206	13.3	1.9
WEST		Peak	28		EX	Broadview	58.2	28%	348	14.4	2.9
WEST		Peak	74			Sand Point	58.1	32%	176	11.2	0.8
WEST		Peak	71		EX	Wedgwood	57.9	35%	253	18.4	3.6
WEST		Peak	7		TB	Rainier Beach	57.7	27%	177	16.7	1.7
WEST		Peak	14 S			Mount Baker	57.3	34%	113	11.2	0.3
WEST		Peak	31			Magnolia	57.0	30%	183	9.0	0.1
WEST		Peak	73		EX	Jackson Park	57.0	34%	258	17.7	3.3
WEST		Peak	19			West Magnolia	57.0	30%	198	10.3	0.5
WEST		Peak	42		EX	Rainier View	56.5	31%	264	15.1	2.5
WEST		Peak	33			Discovery Park	56.5	30%	214	10.7	0.7
WEST		Peak	54			Fauntleroy	55.9	28%	279	14.2	2.1
WEST		Peak	60			White Center	55.7	36%	165	12.5	1.2
WEST		Peak	128			Admiral District	54.9	34%	224	11.8	1.4
WEST		Peak	41			Lake City	54.8	31%	383	22.4	5.3
WEST		Peak	42		TB	Rainier Beach	54.8	29%	163	9.6	-0.2
WEST		Peak	36			Rainier Beach	53.3	30%	189	12.7	0.9
WEST		Peak	99			International Dist.	53.1		59	6.2	-4.7
WEST		Peak	7			Rainier Beach	52.5	25%	170	15.3	0.8
WEST		Peak	75		TB	Lake City	52.4	28%	154	7.8	-1.0
WEST		Peak	373		EX	Aurora Village TC	52.3	24%	272	11.5	0.8
WEST		Peak	23			White Center	52.2	31%	234	13.3	1.5
WEST		Peak	70			U. District	52.1	30%	110	12.4	0.0
WEST		Peak	17			Loyal Heights	50.8	31%	186	11.0	0.3
WEST		Peak	42			Rainier View	49.6	32%	211	13.7	1.3
WEST		Peak	21			Arbor Heights	49.5	28%	216	11.2	0.3
WEST		Peak	32		EX	Rainier Beach	49.3	27%	242	12.8	0.9
WEST		Peak	303		EX	Shoreline	49.2	23%	441	13.3	2.6
WEST		Peak	66		EX	Northgate	48.9	32%	183	15.6	1.5
WEST		Peak	301		EX	Shoreline	48.4	30%	544	18.1	5.3
WEST		Peak	76			Wedgwood	47.9	19%	289	10.3	0.0
WEST		Peak	372		EX	Woodinville P&R	47.7	26%	296	13.6	1.5
WEST		Peak	77		EX	North City	47.2	23%	370	13.7	1.8

2006 Route Performance Report - West Subarea

Prod Subarea	Exceptions to Route Evaluation	Guide time	Route	Part	Key Type	Origin	Rides /Rev. Hour	Fare Rev. / Op.Exp Ratio	Pass. Miles / Rev. Hour	Pass. Miles/ Plat. Miles	"Route Effectiveness" Sum	
WEST		Peak	57			W. Seattle Junction	47.2	26%	221	10.4	-0.1	
WEST		Peak	45		EX	Queen Anne	46.8	17%	145	5.8	-2.8	
WEST		Peak	38			SODO	46.6	30%	70	5.0	-2.6	
WEST		Peak	346			Aurora Village	45.8	28%	168	9.6	-0.7	
WEST		Peak	16			Northgate TC	45.5	29%	155	11.5	-0.2	
WEST		Peak	355		EX	Shoreline CC	45.2	20%	313	11.2	0.4	
WEST		Peak	64		EX	Lake City	44.1	22%	245	11.0	-0.2	
WEST		Peak	74		EX	Sand Point	42.4	18%	251	9.7	-0.9	
WEST		Peak	22			White Center	41.4	25%	168	10.2	-1.0	
WEST		Peak	316			Shoreline	40.8	21%	253	10.0	-0.7	
WEST		Peak	34		EX	Rainier Beach	40.3	19%	190	8.2	-2.0	
WEST		Peak	348			Richmond Beach	37.7	27%	119	7.7	-2.1	
WEST		Peak	345			Shoreline	37.5	30%	137	10.3	-1.1	
WEST		Peak	330			Lake City	37.1	16%	87	4.0	-4.4	
WEST		Peak	347			Mountlake Terrace	37.1	26%	133	8.6	-1.9	
WEST		Peak	39			Rainier Beach	36.2	21%	141	8.1	-2.5	
WEST		Peak	304			Shoreline	35.4	18%	400	12.6	0.8	
WEST		Peak	242			North Seattle	35.0	19%	397	11.5	0.6	
WEST		Peak	46			Shilshole	34.4	14%	103	3.9	-4.6	
WEST		Peak	217			Seattle CBD	33.9	17%	336	8.6	-1.0	
WEST		Peak	308			Lake Forest Park	33.3	18%	349	12.0	0.0	
WEST		Peak	331			Kenmore	30.0	18%	119	7.0	-3.6	
WEST		Peak	79		EX	Lake City	29.7	14%	165	6.9	-3.5	
WEST		Peak	25			Laurelhurst	29.3	20%	89	6.5	-3.8	
WEST		Peak	256			Seattle CBD	29.2	21%	239	11.2	-1.1	
WEST		Peak	35			Seattle CBD	28.7	18%	130	7.5	-3.4	
WEST		Peak	37		EX	Admiral District	27.5	13%	200	7.7	-3.2	
WEST		Peak	243			Jackson Park	26.4	15%	209	5.2	-3.6	
WEST		Peak	51			West Seattle	25.3	14%	42	2.4	-6.0	
WEST		Peak	301			Shoreline	16.5	9%	145	6.6	-4.9	
WEST		Peak	126			Rainier Beach	9.1	6%	39	1.8	-7.8	
WEST		average 2006 PEAK - WEST						53.0	26%	194	10.5	0.0

2006 Route Performance Report - West Subarea

Prod Subarea	Exceptions to Route Evaluation	Guide time	Route	Part	Key Type	Origin	Rides /Rev. Hour	Fare Rev. / Op.Exp Ratio	Pass. Miles / Rev. Hour	Pass. Miles/ Plat. Miles	"Route Effective-ness" Sum
2006 OFFPEAK - WEST PRODUCTION SUBAREA											
WEST	<i>Meets or exceeds strong performance threshold (Fall 2005)</i>						72.9	32%	207	15.9	3.3
WEST	<i>Less than minimum performance threshold (Fall 2005)</i>						30.7	13%	87	6.5	-3.3
WEST		OffPeak	4 N			East Queen Anne	104.5	46%	114	11.3	4.4
WEST		OffPeak	1			Kinnear	103.1	43%	126	11.6	4.3
WEST		OffPeak	2 N			West Queen Anne	100.0	44%	135	14.0	4.8
WEST		OffPeak	68			Northgate TC	93.5	43%	209	13.6	5.6
WEST		OffPeak	3 N			North Queen Anne	93.0	44%	96	10.1	3.0
WEST		OffPeak	13			Seattle Pacific U.	91.6	42%	130	13.5	4.1
WEST		OffPeak	3 S	TB		First Hill	90.5	44%	100	15.4	4.1
WEST		OffPeak	15			Blue Ridge	90.5	46%	225	16.0	6.6
WEST		OffPeak	11			Madison Park	89.5	44%	145	13.1	4.4
WEST		OffPeak	18	TB		Crown Hill	84.8	42%	205	14.2	5.1
WEST		OffPeak	15			Ballard	82.8	41%	197	9.9	3.9
WEST		OffPeak	10			Capitol Hill	81.5	37%	117	13.2	2.8
WEST		OffPeak	36	TB		Beacon Hill	80.7	36%	216	19.3	5.6
WEST		OffPeak	18			North Beach	77.8	42%	198	14.3	4.8
WEST		OffPeak	67			North Seattle	74.8	36%	215	18.5	5.2
WEST		OffPeak	4 S			Judkins Park	74.2	35%	109	12.2	1.9
WEST		OffPeak	3 S			Madrona	74.0	30%	97	10.9	0.9
WEST		OffPeak	2 S			Madrona	73.6	35%	111	11.5	1.8
WEST		OffPeak	12			Interlaken Park	72.6	32%	99	11.7	1.2
WEST		OffPeak	9	EX		Rainier Ave	72.4	33%	261	19.0	5.6
WEST		OffPeak	49			U. District	72.1	27%	158	18.1	3.1
WEST		OffPeak	48 S			Rainier Beach	72.1	37%	200	13.2	3.7
WEST		OffPeak	7	TB		Rainier Beach	71.9	27%	227	21.5	4.9
WEST		OffPeak	14 S			Mount Baker	69.4	34%	125	12.3	1.8
WEST		OffPeak	12	TB		First Hill	68.5	36%	74	11.9	1.1
WEST		OffPeak	48 N			Loyal Heights	66.9	33%	148	10.3	1.6
WEST		OffPeak	48 S	ALT		Columbia City	66.1	33%	146	10.6	1.6
WEST		OffPeak	14 N			Summit	65.9	23%	74	8.8	-1.0
WEST		OffPeak	44			Ballard	63.5	25%	119	12.0	0.5
WEST		OffPeak	26			East Green Lake	63.1	29%	133	9.4	0.6
WEST		OffPeak	65			Lake City	62.9	28%	165	11.9	1.6
WEST		OffPeak	358	EX		Aurora Village	62.7	30%	390	27.1	8.8
WEST		OffPeak	8	TB		Capitol Hill	62.3	28%	93	8.5	-0.4
WEST		OffPeak	7			Rainier Beach	58.9	23%	196	17.2	2.5
WEST		OffPeak	4 N	NT		East Queen Anne	58.8	30%	80	7.3	-0.9
WEST		OffPeak	5			Shoreline CC	58.6	30%	239	14.6	3.3
WEST		OffPeak	8			Mount Baker	57.9	27%	111	8.6	-0.4
WEST		OffPeak	73	EX		Jackson Park	57.4	30%	260	20.8	4.9
WEST		OffPeak	72	EX		Lake City	55.8	28%	254	20.9	4.6
WEST		OffPeak	60			White Center	55.7	30%	156	12.9	1.5
WEST		OffPeak	43			U. District	55.3	22%	139	14.6	0.7
WEST		OffPeak	128			Admiral District	54.9	27%	264	15.7	3.5
WEST		OffPeak	42	TB		Rainier Beach	54.5	21%	164	12.1	0.5

2006 Route Performance Report - West Subarea

Prod Subarea	Exceptions to Route Evaluation	Guide time	Route	Part	Key Type	Origin	Rides /Rev. Hour	Fare Rev. / Op.Exp Ratio	Pass. Miles / Rev. Hour	Pass. Miles/ Plat. Miles	"Route Effectiveness" Sum
WEST		OffPeak	73		TEX	Roosevelt	53.4	24%	214	14.7	2.1
WEST		OffPeak	75			Northgate	52.6	27%	213	15.3	2.5
WEST		OffPeak	48 S		TB	Mount Baker	52.6	26%	120	8.0	-0.8
WEST		OffPeak	36			Rainier Beach	52.6	26%	200	15.6	2.2
WEST		OffPeak	28			Broadview	51.2	26%	166	10.0	0.4
WEST		OffPeak	71		EX	Wedgwood	50.8	26%	232	20.0	3.6
WEST		OffPeak	54			Fauntleroy	49.5	23%	282	15.5	3.1
WEST		OffPeak	372		EX	Woodinville P&R	49.4	20%	319	17.3	3.8
WEST		OffPeak	42			Rainier View	48.5	24%	189	12.8	1.1
WEST		OffPeak	74			Sand Point	48.1	21%	160	10.8	-0.3
WEST		OffPeak	71			Wedgwood	46.5	23%	184	13.7	1.0
WEST		OffPeak	41			Lake City	46.3	21%	335	21.3	4.9
WEST		OffPeak	5		ALT	Northgate TC	45.3	22%	197	13.2	0.9
WEST		OffPeak	56			Alki	44.9	22%	196	12.1	0.6
WEST		OffPeak	42		NT	Rainier View	44.9	30%	185	12.9	1.4
WEST		OffPeak	346			Aurora Village	44.9	20%	181	10.5	-0.2
WEST		OffPeak	72			Lake City	44.7	23%	183	11.3	0.3
WEST		OffPeak	24			Central Magnolia	44.5	21%	140	8.2	-1.3
WEST		OffPeak	73			Jackson Park	44.1	21%	174	9.4	-0.4
WEST		OffPeak	16			Northgate TC	43.9	23%	147	11.4	-0.3
WEST		OffPeak	55			Admiral District	42.8	19%	209	11.7	0.3
WEST		OffPeak	27			Colman Park	41.8	18%	85	7.1	-2.8
WEST		OffPeak	70			U. District	39.6	17%	100	10.7	-2.0
WEST		OffPeak	345			Shoreline	39.1	25%	152	11.2	-0.3
WEST		OffPeak	74		TB	Sand Point	39.0	15%	113	6.2	-3.0
WEST		OffPeak	60		TB	Georgetown	39.0	19%	81	6.8	-3.0
WEST		OffPeak	21			Arbor Heights	38.7	19%	196	11.3	-0.1
WEST		OffPeak	23			White Center	38.7	19%	181	10.9	-0.5
WEST		OffPeak	348			Richmond Beach	38.2	19%	141	8.8	-1.6
WEST		OffPeak	31			Magnolia	38.1	17%	165	9.9	-1.2
WEST		OffPeak	66		EX	Northgate	37.7	19%	152	12.7	-0.7
WEST		OffPeak	17			Loyal Heights	35.3	20%	145	10.1	-1.3
WEST		OffPeak	347			Mountlake Terrace	35.3	17%	140	8.9	-2.0
WEST		OffPeak	128		TB	West Seattle	34.4	14%	131	6.7	-3.0
WEST		OffPeak	99			International Dist.	34.2		38	4.4	-6.4
WEST		OffPeak	22			White Center	32.0	16%	143	9.8	-1.9
WEST		OffPeak	38			SODO	30.3	16%	56	4.3	-4.7
WEST		OffPeak	39			Rainier Beach	29.1	14%	131	8.3	-2.8
WEST		OffPeak	331			Kenmore	29.0	16%	126	7.7	-2.9
WEST		OffPeak	28		SH	Broadview	27.5	11%	111	5.2	-4.2
WEST		OffPeak	33			Discovery Park	27.3	13%	107	6.9	-3.7
WEST		OffPeak	51			West Seattle	25.5	11%	45	2.5	-6.0
WEST		OffPeak	25			Laurelhurst	22.1	13%	74	6.1	-4.7
WEST		OffPeak	74		SH	Sand Point	14.8	5%	29	1.4	-7.6
WEST		OffPeak	53			Admiral District	13.6	7%	42	2.5	-7.0
WEST		OffPeak	37			Admiral District	6.3	2%	24	1.1	-8.4
WEST		average 2006 OFFPEAK - WEST					51.8	23%	147	11.2	0.0

2006 Route Performance Report - West Subarea

Prod Subarea	Exceptions to Route Evaluation	Guide time	Route	Part	Key Type	Origin	Rides /Rev. Hour	Fare Rev. / Op.Exp Ratio	Pass. Miles / Rev. Hour	Pass. Miles/ Plat. Miles	"Route Effectiveness" Sum
2006 NIGHT - WEST PRODUCTION SUBAREA											
WEST						<i>Meets or exceeds strong performance threshold (Fall 2005)</i>	44.6	18%	150	9.2	3.4
WEST						<i>Less than minimum performance threshold (Fall 2005)</i>	20.4	7%	53	3.4	-3.4
WEST		Night	13			Seattle Pacific U.	63.4	27%	79	7.3	5.3
WEST		Night	8		TB	Capitol Hill	58.9	23%	85	7.1	4.2
WEST		Night	10			Capitol Hill	58.1	22%	84	7.5	3.9
WEST		Night	2 N			West Queen Anne	56.4	25%	75	6.9	4.1
WEST		Night	49			U. District	53.1	21%	119	12.1	5.6
WEST		Night	44			Ballard	52.0	19%	99	8.1	3.5
WEST		Night	11			Madison Park	51.4	24%	87	6.7	3.7
WEST		Night	72			Lake City	50.2	23%	195	12.6	7.5
WEST		Night	358		EX	Aurora Village	48.5	21%	315	18.1	11.4
WEST		Night	48 N			Loyal Heights	48.4	22%	115	7.1	3.6
WEST		Night	15			Blue Ridge	48.1	24%	164	10.0	6.2
WEST		Night	48 S		TB	Mount Baker	47.8	21%	118	7.3	3.5
WEST		Night	7			Rainier Beach	46.9	19%	179	12.1	6.1
WEST		Night	73			Jackson Park	46.5	21%	192	12.0	6.7
WEST		Night	18			North Beach	46.5	26%	154	9.1	5.9
WEST		Night	4 N			East Queen Anne	44.7	17%	45	3.9	-0.1
WEST		Night	14 N			Summit	43.9	12%	51	5.2	-0.6
WEST		Night	15		TB	Ballard	42.7	16%	107	6.7	1.8
WEST		Night	67			North Seattle	40.9	17%	119	8.6	2.6
WEST		Night	7		TB	Rainier Beach	40.9	14%	145	10.6	3.4
WEST		Night	43			U. District	40.8	18%	110	10.5	3.3
WEST		Night	4 N		NT	East Queen Anne	39.6	23%	58	5.6	1.4
WEST		Night	14 S			Mount Baker	38.6	15%	71	5.4	0.0
WEST		Night	5			Shoreline CC	38.5	17%	163	7.5	3.0
WEST		Night	26			East Green Lake	38.0	16%	92	6.1	0.9
WEST		Night	71			Wedgwood	37.4	17%	146	10.1	3.5
WEST		Night	4 S			Judkins Park	37.1	15%	60	5.8	-0.2
WEST		Night	2 S			Madrona	37.1	15%	59	5.5	-0.3
WEST		Night	36			Rainier Beach	36.6	17%	142	9.1	3.0
WEST		Night	12			Interlaken Park	35.1	14%	58	5.8	-0.6
WEST		Night	65			Lake City	34.9	14%	93	6.0	0.3
WEST		Night	42		NT	Rainier View	34.9	20%	169	9.8	4.2
WEST		Night	3 S			Madrona	34.7	14%	51	4.8	-1.1
WEST		Night	75			Northgate	34.0	15%	135	8.0	1.9
WEST		Night	54			Fauntleroy	34.0	15%	185	8.7	3.1
WEST		Night	55		SH	Admiral District	33.6	11%	43	2.0	-3.0
WEST		Night	41			Lake City	32.6	13%	250	13.3	5.5
WEST		Night	18		TB	Crown Hill	32.0	12%	95	5.9	-0.4
WEST		Night	60			White Center	29.6	14%	101	6.2	0.0
WEST		Night	128			Admiral District	29.1	13%	107	5.3	-0.4
WEST		Night	372		EX	Woodinville P&R	29.0	9%	156	5.3	-0.2
WEST		Night	83			U. District	27.8	12%	162	7.8	1.2
WEST		Night	66		EX	Northgate	27.5	12%	116	7.3	0.2
WEST		Night	346			Aurora Village	27.3	9%	108	5.2	-1.4

2006 Route Performance Report - West Subarea

Prod Subarea	Exceptions to Route Evaluation	Guide time	Route	Part	Key Type	Origin	Rides /Rev. Hour	Fare Rev. / Op.Exp Ratio	Pass. Miles / Rev. Hour	Pass. Miles/ Plat. Miles	"Route Effectiveness" Sum
WEST		Night	16			Northgate TC	26.9	12%	108	6.7	-0.3
WEST		Night	56			Alki	25.7	10%	127	5.8	-0.8
WEST		Night	74		SH	Sand Point	25.4	9%	53	2.9	-3.5
WEST		Night	42		TB	Rainier Beach	25.0	11%	95	6.1	-1.2
WEST		Night	1		SH	Kinnear	25.0	10%	31	2.3	-4.0
WEST		Night	347			Mountlake Terrace	24.1	10%	83	4.4	-2.3
WEST		Night	348			Richmond Beach	23.4	10%	83	4.9	-2.1
WEST		Night	23			White Center	23.1	9%	129	6.3	-0.8
WEST		Night	81			Ballard	22.8	10%	114	4.2	-1.9
WEST		Night	27			Colman Park	22.7	10%	53	3.7	-3.2
WEST		Night	21			Arbor Heights	22.6	9%	131	6.4	-0.8
WEST		Night	85			West Seattle	22.5	10%	170	7.8	0.7
WEST		Night	33			Discovery Park	21.5	8%	83	3.6	-3.0
WEST		Night	17			Loyal Heights	21.4	10%	91	5.0	-2.1
WEST		Night	24			Central Magnolia	21.3	10%	74	4.2	-2.8
WEST		Night	70			U. District	19.6	9%	40	3.7	-4.0
WEST		Night	345			Shoreline	18.6	9%	72	4.7	-3.0
WEST		Night	82			East Green Lake	15.5	7%	80	3.6	-3.9
WEST		Night	28		SH	Broadview	15.3	5%	65	2.6	-4.9
WEST		Night	331			Kenmore	14.8	6%	67	3.1	-4.5
WEST		Night	38			SODO	9.1	5%	14	0.9	-7.2
WEST		Night	84			Madison Park	8.6	4%	25	1.5	-6.9
WEST			average 2006 NIGHT - WEST				32.5	13%	102	6.3	0.0

2006 WEST PRODUCTION SUBAREA EXCEPTION ROUTES - NOT EVALUATED											
WEST	SH	Peak	7		SH	Rainier Beach	21.4	n.a.	45	2.5	
WEST	SH	Peak	36		SH	Rainier Beach	23.4	n.a.	38	2.1	
WEST	SH	Peak	43		SH	Capitol Hill	38.3	n.a.	61	5.2	
WEST	DH	Peak	600		EX	Seattle CBD	16.5	n.a.	200	6.9	
WEST	SCL	Peak	982		CUST	Redmond	51.5	n.a.	619	14.3	
WEST	SCL	Peak	984		CUST	Wedgwood	28.6	n.a.	4	0.1	
WEST	SCL	Peak	987		CUST	Rainier Beach	37.3	n.a.	401	11.4	
WEST	SCL	Peak	988		CUST	Mount Baker	60.8	n.a.	528	16.9	
WEST	SCL	Peak	994		CUST	Queen Anne	18.8	n.a.	148	4.8	
WEST	SCL	Peak	995		CUST	Laurelhurst	31.4	n.a.	77	2.6	
WEST		regular route average:	2006 WEST PEAK				53.0		194	10.5	

2006 WEST PRODUCTION SUBAREA EXCEPTION ROUTES - NOT EVALUATED											
WEST	SH	OffPeak	7		SH	Rainier Beach	34.1	n.a.	63	4.4	
WEST	SH	OffPeak	43		SH	Capitol Hill	43.3	n.a.	65	5.1	
WEST		regular route average:	2006 WEST OFF PEAK				51.8		147	11.2	

2006 Route Performance Report - West Subarea

Prod Subarea	Exceptions to Route Evaluation	Guide time	Route	Part	Key Type	Origin	Rides /Rev. Hour	Fare Rev. / Op.Exp Ratio	Pass. Miles / Rev. Hour	Pass. Miles/ Plat. Miles	"Route Effectiveness" Sum
2006 WEST PRODUCTION SUBAREA EXCEPTION ROUTES - NOT EVALUATED											
WEST	SH	Night	7		SH	Rainier Beach	18.5	n.a.	44	2.4	
WEST	SH	Night	43		SH	Capitol Hill	25.1	n.a.	69	4.7	
WEST	SH	Night	49		SH	U. District	12.9	n.a.	30	2.0	
WEST	regular route average: 2006 WEST OFF PEAK						32.5		102	6.3	