

Department of Transportation King Street Center, KSC-TR-0422 201 South Jackson Street Seattle, WA 98104-3856

Memorandum

June 2009

TO: Interested parties

FM: David Hull, Supervisor (Service Planning

avereful

RE: 2008 Route Performance Report

The *2008 Route Performance Report* provides performance information related to King County Metro's fixed route services. The objective of the report is to help planners and decision makers identify individual services that may require modification, expansion, or discontinuation.

Data

The 2008 Route Performance Report uses annualized fall 2008 ridership, operating and financial data to measure route performance. The fall service change data is used to identify changes in the transit network between the fall of 2007 and the fall of 2008. Since the information is based on only one of the three service changes, the annualized numbers in this report will differ slightly from other Metro information that is compiled using data for all of 2008.

2008 Trends

In general, ridership-based performance measures increased across all subareas and times of day between fall 2007 and fall 2008. Fare receipts increased by almost one and half times from the annualized fall 2007 amount resulting in an increase in the Fare Revenue/Operating Expense ratio by about 36 percent over the same time period. Although some of the increase in fare revenue can be attributed to an increase in Metro's fare, much of the increase in due to ridership growth. Average rides per platform hour of service increased from 31 in fall 2007 to 34 in fall 2008.

The rapid growth in ridership continued a trend seen since 2005 that has resulted in a 22 percent increase in ridership in just three-years. During that same period, the size of the Metro transit network increased by almost 100,000 service hours through the implementation of Transit Now High Ridership, Rapidly Developing area and

Partnership programs. Each subarea experienced ridership growth during all times of day. The East subarea saw double-digit ridership increases in the off-peak and night periods, reflecting the increase in service resulting from Transit Now investment and restructure of central eastside service implemented in February 2008. Comparing between subareas from fall 2008 data to fall 2007, the largest percentage growth occurred in the East Subarea, up 10.5 percent. The largest absolute growth occurred in the West Subarea, up 6 million rides on an annualized basis.

How to Use the Route Performance Report

The Route Performance Report uses five performance measures to evaluate routes performance: Rides per Revenue Hour; Fare Revenue/Operating Expense ratio; Passenger Miles per Revenue Hour; and Passenger Miles per Platform Mile. These measures are combined to create a summary score that can be used to judge a route's overall performance. The Route Performance Report compares routes within each subarea by time of day to account for similarities in operating conditions. For each subarea and time period, thresholds based upon average route performance are used to determine both "strong" and "below minimum" performance routes. Routes that rank within the "Strong" performance rating may be good candidates for further investments and expansion. Routes that fall in the "Below minimum" performance, or for discontinuation if the function the route provides can occur in a different way that improves the efficiency of the Metro Transit Network. Major revisions or deletion of a route intended to improve system performance are subject to a public process and must be approved by the County Council.

The performance thresholds are updated every three years to account for changes in the overall route network performance. It is Metro's goal to improve network performance and efficiency continually by expanding high performance routes and improving the performance of low performing services. The performance thresholds used in this report are based on fall 2008 route data and are shown in a table on page viii of the report.

Why Measure Route Performance?

The Route Performance Report allows planners and decision-makers to regularly monitor performance of Metro routes in order to improve efficiency while meeting the needs of King County Metro riders. As the King County population and employment grows and land use and the transit operating environment changes, adjustments to the Metro system are needed to maintain the most effective and efficient system possible. This is particularly important even in normal times when the need for transit service outpaces Metro's ability to expand service. Understanding individual route performance could be even more important as the national economic recession and falling sales tax revenues affect King County Metro's ability to maintain the existing transit network.

Additional Information

Should you have any questions about the *Report on 2008 Route Performance*, please call David Hull, Service Planning Supervisor, at 263-4734, or Ted Day, Transit Planner III, at 684-1304.

2008 Route Performance Report

Prepared by King County Metro Transit

Service Development Section: Service Planning

Scheduling

July 2009

Table of Contents

Preface

Part I: Introduction

1. Performance Groups and Performance Measuresi
1.1 Performance Groupsi
Performance Group Designation 1: Planning Subareasi
Performance Group Designation 2: Time of Dayiii Other Considerations in Performance Group Designationiii
1.2 Performance Measures: Discussion and Examplesiv
Performance Measure 1: Riders per revenue houriv
Performance Measure 2: Ratio of fare revenue to operating expensev
Performance Measure 3: Passenger miles per revenue hourv
Performance Measure 4: Passenger miles divided by platform milesvi
Performance Measure 5: "Route Effectiveness Sum"vi
2. Route Performance Summary for 2008 ix
2008 system-wide performance measures tablex
East subarea system-wide performance measures tablexi
East subarea performance thresholds table xii
South subarea system-wide performance measures table xiii
South subarea performance thresholds tablexiv
West subarea system-wide performance measures tablexv
West subarea performance thresholds tablexvi
3. Abbreviations Used in Tablesxvii

Part II: Route Performance 2008

1.	East Planning Subarea	.1
2.	South Planning Subarea	.5
3.	West Planning Subarea	.10

Preface

The Route Performance Report was created as a result of direction from the Six-Year Transit Development Plan, which was first written and adopted in 1996, and was updated and readopted in 2002. This plan has helped to guide King County Metro policies and decisions so that transit can better provide mobility to people throughout King County. The plan has also made transit more relevant to the changing travel needs of people in the area. This plan sets forth objectives and strategies for transit, paratransit, rideshare services, and supporting capital facilities in King County, and establishes the policy basis on which annual operating and capital program decisions are made.

The Route Performance Report was developed in response to Strategy M-3 of the Six Year Plan, which states:

Strategy M-3 Regularly monitor and report bus service performance and ridership systemwide and at the route level to identify services that may require modification, expansion or termination based on their performance. Develop and recommend to the Regional Transit Committee (RTC) an approach to peer agency comparison that identifies:

- the appropriate measures of performance;
- the major factors, internal and external, that vary among transit agencies and affect performance;
- the extent to which those factors can be tracked for a small group of peer agencies to inform the performance comparisons, and
- a list of five peer agencies considered to be most comparable to King County Metro Transit based upon agency characteristics and the ability to track major performance-related factors.

Since 1996, the RTC has worked with Metro to develop service evaluation guidelines and to review the annual Route Performance Report, in which each route in the system is measured against those guidelines. This report is used as a tool to monitor the success of individual routes, to better understand how Metro evaluates route performance, and to give the RTC an opportunity to comment on and evaluate how performance is measured.

The 2008 performance report contains two main parts, the introduction and a section on 2008 route performance. The contents of each part are described below.

Part I: Introduction

Part I contains background information on how routes are designated into performance groups, how performance is measured, and summary tables of how routes performed in 2008 according to their performance group.

Performance Groups: All of Metro's routes are grouped according to specific shared characteristics; their designated subarea and the time of day that is being evaluated. These groupings are referred to as "performance groups" within this document. Each performance measure for each route is most useful when compared only to the performance measures of other routes that are in the same subarea at the same time of day. This section offers an explanation of how routes are defined and divided into performance groups, including an explanation of those groups that are excluded from evaluation. The production and allocation subareas are also introduced.

Performance Measures: Following an explanation of how routes are classified, the five performance measures are introduced and described:

- > Performance Measure I: Riders per revenue hour
- > Performance Measure II: Ratio of fare revenue to operating expense
- > Performance Measure III: Passenger miles per revenue hour
- > Performance Measure IV: Passenger miles divided by platform hours
- Performance Measure V: "Route Effectiveness Sum"

Performance thresholds are described that were established for 2008. Routes in Metro's system compare to these thresholds, according to their performance group. A reference guide for abbreviations that are used in the route performance tables is also provided.

Part II: 2008 Route Performance

This section of the report offers a list of all the routes in Metro's system that were evaluated and gives information about how they performed in 2008. This information is presented by subarea in tables in order of performance and provides the score that each route received for each performance measure.

2008 Annual Route Performance Report

Part I: Introduction

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

July 2009

1. Performance Groups and Performance Measures

1.1 Performance Groups

Metro's routes are divided into groups, first by subarea and then by time of day, to enable a meaningful comparison among them. Routes that serve specific subareas and specific markets generally share characteristics with other routes in their performance group. It is more difficult and less meaningful to compare the effectiveness of all routes regardless of

their specific purpose and characteristics. For example, a comparison of route 14 (west subarea) and route 113 (south subarea) would not be useful because the two routes serve different subareas and different purposes. A comparison of peak period route 14 (west subarea) performance could be more meaningfully compared to peak period route 15 (west subarea), as they serve a similar function in the densest area of the county. Further description of how this works and why route performance is measured this way follows.

Performance Group Designation 1: Planning Subareas

Planning Subareas – East, South, and West – were defined when the Long Range Policy Framework for Public Transportation was



adopted by the King County Council in 1993. These subareas share characteristics such as density, land use, population, and more. The map on the right shows the subarea boundaries.

Grouping by subarea is complicated by the fact that many of Metro's routes serve multiple subareas. In the Route Performance Report, all routes that cross subarea boundaries are allocated to only one subarea. The subarea that the route is assigned to is determined by where most of the morning boardings on that route occur – the "production" subarea. To provide a useful comparison between current and past route performance, routes are reported in the same subarea as in prior years, even if that designation has changed elsewhere. For example, some routes have been changed to a different subarea or are split between subareas for the purpose of allocating new hours of service between subareas, according to the subarea allocation policy¹.

The following table lists those routes that have different production and allocation subareas. The subarea that each route is categorized by in this report is listed under "Production Subarea."

Route	Productio Subarea	on Allocation Subarea	Route	Production Subarea	Allocation Subarea
		_			
East Produ	iction Suba	rea Routes	South cor	ntinued	
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 DART	EAST	EAST-WEST	150 TB	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST
			174	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST
South Proc	duction Sub	oarea Routes	194	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST
101	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST	194 TB	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST
101 TB	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST			
106	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST	West Proc	duction Subare	a Routes
107	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST	23	WEST	SOUTH-WEST
113	SOUTH	WEST	39	WEST	SOUTH-WEST
120	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST	126	WEST	SOUTH-WEST
121	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST	128	WEST	SOUTH-WEST
121 TB	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST	128 TB	WEST	SOUTH-WEST
125	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST	331	WEST	EAST-WEST
125 NT	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST	982 CUS	r west	EAST
125 TB	SOUTH	SOUTH-WEST			

¹ Subarea designations are used to allocate new service hours. Metro's current new service allocation policy states that 40% of new service hours will be implemented in both the south and the east subareas, and 20% of new service hours will be implemented in the west subarea. This policy was designed to increase the amount of service in the east and south subareas, as service levels are lower than those in the west subarea due to historic patterns of transit implementation. For planning purposes, the hours that comprise the routes that serve more than one subarea are allocated 50/50 between subareas in order to fairly distribute hours.

Performance Group Designation 2: Time of Day

Route performance within each subarea is evaluated separately for three time periods that have different ridership characteristics. The three time periods are peak, 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 lasting four hours in both the morning and the evening on weekdays (excluding holidays). See Page xvii for the definition of service time periods.

Other Considerations in Performance Group Designation

Other factors affect how Metro's routes are categorized, such as routes with multiple variants and routes that should be excluded from evaluation because they provide very little service and transportation benefits to riders. These considerations are described below.

Routes defined by route number, part of route, and type of route. Some route numbers include multiple variations, or "route variants," or route types (e.g. express or shuttle routing) that are evaluated separately for performance. Route parts (north and south, or east and west) can be considered as completely distinct routes, and are always listed separately in the report. These include:

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 including 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 offer 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 are shown separately in the route performance tables.

Route type variants with less than five trips in a time period. These specific route variants are generally combined with the route in an adjacent time period to more accurately reflect overall performance. For instance, route 272 provides commuter service from the Eastgate area to the University of Washington, with a few trips that occur in the offpeak time period. These offpeak trips are included as part of the peak period because there are so few and the peak travel period for the University of Washington is different from normal commute hours. Express variants that have a total of less than five trips and 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. Custom bus, school routes, DART routes, and other routes funded partially by partner entities are excluded from evaluation. A new small group of exception variants have been added in 2008 for trips that are traveling between a route terminal and bus base. These trips cannot be fairly compared to route variants that could be eliminated for poor performance.

Excluded routes 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, with a policy goal for custom and school routes to generate enough revenue to cover 100% of marginal operating costs.

1.2 Performance Measures: Discussion and Examples

➢ Performance Measure 1: Riders per revenue hour. This measure determines how many riders get on or off the bus in one hour of revenue service. Routes with many riders boarding and alighting the bus during each trip tend to perform well on this measure. A high number of ons and offs is typical for routes operating in areas of dense population, employment and commercial activity, where many riders make short trips. The length of the trip and the density of the population and employment along the route tend to be positively correlated with performance on this measure. There are exceptions, however, 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 seats are full and the number of revenue hours per trip is small. The range on this measure is high, with 98% of the route variants having between 9 and 100 rides per revenue hour.

Routes 2S and 70 Example – To illustrate how this measure works, a comparison of route 2S and route 70 is useful. Route 2S is a relatively short route between Madrona and downtown Seattle. Route 70 is a longer route that travels between the University District and downtown Seattle. Routes 2S and 70 have a similar number of annual peak-period trips (15,600 and 15,400, respectively) and riders (565,300 and 540,100). However, the average travel time for route 2S is 20-25 minutes per trip, while route 70 averages 35-40 minutes per trip. Since one of the factors impacting this measure is time spent carrying riders, route 2S performs much better on this measure (91.2 rides per revenue hour) than route 70 (52.5 rides per revenue hour).

A weakness of this performance measure is that it fails to capture a route's total cost. This measure only considers the hours that a bus is in service and does not take into account other times when the bus is in service such as the time a route spends traveling to and from the base (the "deadhead"), operator breaks, and scheduled layover periods, all of which have a cost. Riders per revenue hour is used in the Route Performance Report to not unduly penalize routes with long deadheads caused by the location of Metro's bus bases. However, using the riders per revenue hour performance measure fails to provide distinction between the costs of operating different types of services, such as express and local service. Riders per platform hour would be a different way of measuring performance that would capture the entire cost of a route, including cost accrued while not serving customers.

Route 218 and 245 Example – The difference between riders per revenue hour and riders per platform hour is illustrated by routes 218 and 245. Route 218 is a weekday commuter service providing direct service to downtown Seattle during the morning

and returning to Issaquah-Highlands Park and Ride in the afternoon. Route 245 is a two-way service between Kirkland and Factoria that operates throughout the day, seven days a week. Routes 218 and 245 serve a similar number of annual riders during the peak periods (349,000 and 339,000 respectively). Based on riders per revenue hour alone, route 218 is the more productive route, because it serves 25 more riders per revenue hour than route 245,but riders per revenue hours does not account for the high cost of the route 218 one-way service design. Because route 218 has a long deadhead time the cost per rider is almost twice the cost per rider on the route 245. Using the riders per platform hour measure, route 245 serves 4.8 more riders per platform hour than route 218. Both routes have value to riders even though they serve distinctly different markets. To reiterate, the weakness of the riders per revenue hour measure is that it does not allow for distinction between the different costs of providing service that is designed for different markets.

Performance Measure 2: Ratio of fare revenue to operating expense. This performance measure refers to the percentage of operating costs recovered from fares paid by customers. This ratio is positively correlated with the number of riders per revenue hour, since more riders getting on and off the coach during an hour of service results in the collection of more fare revenue. There are exceptions to this general rule as some routes have unusually high or low fare revenue per rider. Two 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.

Routes 3N and 240 Example – An illustration of the relationship between riders per hour and fare return to operating expense hails from a comparison of routes 3N and 240 during off-peak hours. Route 240 carries 344,700 riders annually during off-peak hours and averages only 19.9% fare recovery. On the other hand, route 3N carries fewer riders at 206,100 annual rides, but averages 58.5% fare recovery. Route 3N outperforms route 240 on this measure because there is a much higher level of passenger activity with many riders getting on and off each hour of operation (or hour of expense).

Performance Measure 3: Passenger miles per revenue hour. This measure places a high value on routes that provide long distance trips. One rider may occupy one seat for the same number of miles on a long distance trip as do many riders each traveling a shorter distance. Performance on this measure is correlated with route length, average vehicle speed, 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 distribution of values for this measure across the individual route, with 98% of the route variants having between 34 and 777 passenger miles per revenue hour.

Routes 190 and 191 Example – Routes 190 and 191 share many of the same characteristics. They travel about the same number of miles between Redondo Heights park-and-ride and downtown Seattle (21 miles) and have the about the same

number of trips (3,000 and 2,700 annually) and riders (87,100 and 98,300). Additionally, they both travel between 58,000 and 64,000 miles annually. However, these routes perform dramatically different on this measure. In 2008, route 190 averaged 502 passenger miles per revenue hour, while route 191 averaged only 360 passenger miles per revenue hour. The difference can be accounted for by taking a closer look at the route design. Route 191 travels a long distance on Highway 99, a slower road with many traffic lights, before getting on I-5, Seattle's main freeway that travels north and south. On the other hand, route 190 travels almost exclusively via I-5. These different pathways cause there to be a large difference between the speed and revenue miles per revenue hour of the two routes. Additionally, route 190 makes almost no stops between Redondo Heights and Seattle, so the vast majority of passengers travel the full length of the route. Conversely, the route 191 has intermediate stops, so some riders travel fewer miles than others, making the average trip length less than that of the route 190.

> <u>Performance Measure 4: Passenger miles divided by platform miles.</u> In the 2004 Route Performance Report, this measure replaced the Six Year Plan Strategy M-3 which measured "passenger miles divided by revenue seat miles." The Six Year 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." This is better assessed by looking at the entire amount of travel time that a vehicle is in service, not just the time that the bus is picking up and dropping off passengers.

Two difficulties 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" results in a number that directly addresses the usefulness of transit in reducing total vehicle miles traveled. In addition, it eliminates the variability inherent in using seats as a multiplier and includes all miles that a coach travels.

Routes 10 and 158 Example: Routes 10 and 158 cost about the same to operate during the peak period (\$1.2 and \$1.24 million per year, respectively). However, due to the fact that route 10 is designed to serve local trips and route 158 is designed to provide regional commute trips, route 158 has a higher number of passenger miles per platform mile (16.13) than route 10 (13.4). However, route 10 generates 195% more revenue than route 158. This illustrates the drawback of this measure, which is that it penalizes routes that make more stops, operate at lower miles per hour and on which there are a lot of on and off activity that increases the farebox recovery ratio.

Performance Measure 5: "Route Effectiveness Sum" The route effectiveness sum compares the routes in a specific group (based on subarea and time of day) only with other routes in that specific group, as are the previous four measures. These routes are compared using a summary score that is calculated by adding the scores for each of the four individual performance measures for each route. These scores define a mathematical relationship between the standard deviation of a route's performance and the group average performance for each measure. An extremely high or low score on one or two of the four measures may be enough to skew the overall Route Effectiveness Sum to a high or low number, even though the route performs near average on the other measures. This does not generally affect the measure significantly as few routes have both strong performance in one or more measures and below minimum performance in one or more measures.

Performance Thresholds. Performance thresholds are established every three years to allow comparison of route performance from year to year. These thresholds are different for each subarea and each part of the day to allow for a meaningful comparison of routes. Strong performance is defined as those routes whose effectiveness sum is at least one standard deviation above the average. Below minimum performance routes are those whose route effectiveness sum is one standard deviation or more below the mean. In years that performance thresholds are calculated, the average Route Effectiveness Sum for each group of routes is 0, and the high (positive) and low (negative) scores will be equal in distance from zero.

The performance thresholds for 2008 – 2010 are based on subarea performance by time period in 2008. The data that was used to develop these thresholds comes from the annualized fall 2008 information on regular service routes. This data excludes paratransit, special service, the downtown Seattle Ride-Free Area, and the routes in groups that are excluded from performance evaluation such as custom bus services. In 2008, about half of the routes have a positive Route Effectiveness Sum and about half have a negative Route Effectiveness Sum. This is typical for years in which performance thresholds are created. However, in 2009 and 2010, there may be an imbalance in positive and negative scores depending on whether the routes in the group perform better or worse than in 2008.

The table below defines the performance thresholds form 2008-2010. Routes are classified as follows:

Strong performance: Routes that are one standard deviation above the mean; **Below minimum performance**: One standard deviation below the mean

Performance Thresholds: 2008 – 2010 (Revised using Fall 2008 Route Data)						
Subarea	Performance	Guide-	Rides/	Fare Rev.	Psgr.Miles	Pass. Miles
	Thresholds*	Time	Rev. Hr.	/ Op. Exp.	/ Rev. Hr.	/ Plat. Miles
		Peak	34.1	19%	292	8.78
	Strong	OffPeak	25.0	15%	127	6.70
ГАСТ		Night	21.9	11%	131	5.52
EASI		Peak	18.4	10%	254	5.62
	Minimum	OffPeak	11.2	7%	71	3.80
		Night	12.9	7%	88	3.30
	Strong	Peak	41.8	24%	353	11.80
		OffPeak	44.2	25%	291	13.80
COLITU		Night	33.7	17%	218	9.00
SOUTH		Peak	15.7	11%	182	5.00
	Minimum	OffPeak	18.8	11%	182	7.70
		Night	10.3	5%	148	5.40
		Peak	64.5	39%	238	18.10
	Strong	OffPeak	60.8	36%	183	14.00
MEGT		Night	37.2	20%	119	7.40
WESI		Peak	20.8	15%	136	5.10
	Minimum	OffPeak	22.3	14%	84	5.60
		Night	13.5	7%	60	3.30

2. Route Performance Summary for 2008

The purpose of route evaluation is to track performance over time, and identify opportunities for system improvement. Thresholds are updated every three years so that there will always be room for improvement. When thresholds are updated, as they were in 2008, some route performance may fall below minimum without a reduction in any one measure. This may occur because the performance bar was raised. Since the performance thresholds will stay the same between the 2008 report and the 2010 report, it will be valid to compare routes between these years. The best measure for comparing routes from year to year is the Route Effectiveness Summary. Any route that experiences an increase in Route Effectiveness from 2008 to 2009 or 2010 is improving in performance. Performance of King County Metro Routes is summarized for 2008 in the table on the next page. Also included is the percent change in each measure from 2007.

Following the systemwide table that summarizes route performance are more detailed descriptions of each subarea's performance, including changes from 2007 and total numbers of routes in each subarea that perform above or below the performance thresholds, broken down by time period.

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 also not included, although they are separately noted in the table summarizing 2008 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.

	Service Delivered in 2008 (Change from 2007)								
2008	Annual Revenue Hours	Annual Revenue Miles	Annual Trips	Annual Platform Miles	Annual Platform Hours				
Poaka	1,022,722	15,875,219	1,435,331	22,663,074	1,583,884				
reaks	(+2.1%)	(+1.2%)	(+3.1%)	(+1.1%)	(+2.3%)				
OffDeels	882,322	12,850,955	1,361,965	13,683,892	1,261,072				
OffPeak	(+1.9%)	(+1.1%)	(+2.6%)	(+1.2%)	(+2.1%)				
Night	338,084	5,330,861	588,044	6,257,296	532,269				
Night	(+3.4%)	(+2.6%)	(+3.1%)	(+2.9%)	(+4.0 %)				
Total	2,243,128	34,057,035	3,385,340	42,604,262	3,377,225				
Iotai	(+2.2%)	(+1.4%)	(+2.9%)	(+1.4%)	(+2.5%)				
Except. Routes	78,826	1,209,540	170,288	1,430,641	109,840				

2008 SYSTEM-WIDE PERFORMANCE MEASURES

	Rider Use in	n 2008 (Change	e from 2007)	Performance Measures			
2008	Annual Rides	Annual Passenger Miles	Annual Fare Revenue	Rides / Rev. Hr.	Fare Rev / Op. Exp	Psgr. Miles / RevHr	Psgr. Miles/ PlatMi
Pooko	55,762,660	296,285,583	\$65,445,346	54.52	32.1%	290	13.1
I Cans	(+7.5%)	(+7.6%)	(+39.8%)	(+5.3%)	(+28.4%)	(+5.5%)	(+6.5%)
OffBook	48,491,891	209,780,140	\$47,948,750)	54.96	31.8 %	238	15.3
UllFeak	(+9.1%)	(+10.5%)	(+57.2%)	(+7.1%)	(+45.2%)	(+8.7%)	(+9.3%)
Night	12,518,964	58,200,971	\$12,402,538	37.03	19.0%	172	9.3
Night	(+6.6%)	(+6.2%)	(+53.9%)	(+3.1%)	(+39.7%)	(+3.0%)	(+3.3%)
Total	116,773,515	564,266,695	\$125,796,634	52.06	30.0%	252	13.2
Total	(+8.1%)	(+8.5%)	(+47.4%)	(+5.8%)	(+35.7%)	(+6.3%)	(+6.5%)
Except. Routes	1,569,625	7,431,847	\$2,008,447	19.91	17.1%	94	5.2

Metro experienced significant ridership growth between fall 2007 and fall 2008, with ridership increases at all times of day and in all subareas.

		Service Delive	red in 2008 (C	hange from 200	7)
2008	Annual Revenue Hours	Annual Revenue Miles	Annual Trips	Annual Platform Miles	Annual Platform Hours
Deelve	219,153	4,039,615	258,856	6,154,930	358,043
Peaks	(+1.1%)	(+0.5%)	(+4.6%)	(-0.1%)	(+1.7%)
OffDeels	136,354	2,338,568	178,551	2,519,562	196,420
OffPeak	(+6.7%)	(+6.1%)	(+14.0%)	(+7.3%)	(+8.6%)
Niaht	39,701	745,118	51,907	899,889	62,667
Night	(+14.7%)	(+14.0%)	(+22.5%)	(+15.4%)	(+15.9 %)
Total	395,207	7,123,301	489,314	9,574,380	617,129
	(+4.2%)	(+3.5%)	(+9.6%)	(+2.9%)	(+5.1%)

EAST SUBAREA PERFORMANCE MEASURES

2008	Rider Use 2008 (Change from 2007)			Performance Measures			
	Annual Rides	Annual Passenger Miles	Annual Fare Revenue	Rides / Rev. Hr.	Fare Rev / Op. Exp	Psgr. Miles / RevHr	Psgr. Miles/ PlatMi
Deeko	7,630,740	61,808,733	\$9,479,217	34.82	20.2%	282	10.0
Peaks	(+7.3%)	(+5.9%)	(+33.7%)	(+6.1%)	(+23.1%)	(+4.8%)	(+5.3%)
OffDeels	3,936,534	21,433,319	\$3,901,834	28.87	17.0%	157	8.5
OffPeak	(+16.1%)	(+12.5%)	(+67.8%)	(+8.8%)	(+44.1%)	(+5.4%)	(+4.9%)
Niaht	939,369	5,572,318	\$930,633	23.66	12.2%	140	6.2
Night	(+15.4%)	(+16.6%)	(+40.0%)	(+0.6%)	(+35.6%)	(+1.4%)	(+1.6%)
T. (a)	12,506,643	88,814,371	\$14,311,684	31.65	18.4%	225	9.3
Total	(+10.5%)	(+8.0%)	(+43.5%)	(+6.0%)	(+27.8%)	(+3.7%)	(+4.5%)

Using annualized fall 2008 ridership data, East Subarea ridership increased by over 10% between fall 2007 and fall 2008, leading all three subareas in percentage growth. There were also increases in performance during the offpeak and night time periods, where service was expanded and improved through an extensive restructure of services in Redmond and Kirkland that took place in February 2008. The amount of service provided increased by a larger percentage in the East Subarea than in the other two subareas as a result of Transit Now improvements and the February 2008 restructure.

			Number of Routes in 2008					
	2008	Rides / Rev. Hr.	Fare Rev / Op. Exp	Psgr. Miles / RevHr	Psgr. Miles/ PlatMi	Route Effectiveness		
Peaks	Above Strong	9	13	10	9	8		
	Below Minimum	8	9	2	7	8		
Off Peak	Above Strong	3	5	3	5	6		
	Below Minimum	3	3	1	3	2		
Night	Above Strong	2	2	2	3	2		
	Below Minimum	2	1	1	3	3		

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

Notable high performing routes include peak period routes that connect the eastside to downtown Seattle, and routes serving the future Bellevue-Redmond RapidRide corridor (230E, 253). Restructures in February 2008 discontinued two routes (route 220 and 254) that frequently performed below minimum standards in past reports and created two new routes that were above minimum standards in all categories, reflecting a more efficient use of redistributed resources. As time passes, the performance of routes affected by the restructure is expected to improve. Remaining routes that are low performing include those that serve low density or rural areas like Cottage Lake, Duvall, and North Bend (209, 232, 251, 929), routes with limited numbers of trips (201, 247), and those that lack connections to major employment centers (201, 219).

		Service Delive	red in 2008 (C	hange from 200	7)
2008	Annual Revenue Hours	Annual Revenue Miles	Annual Trips	Annual Platform Miles	Annual Platform Hours
Deeko	267,299	5,133,786	326,318	7,507,751	418,680
Peaks	(+2.5%)	(+1.6%)	(+2.2%)	(+1.7%)	(+1.9%)
	202,718	3,746,114	265,486	4,013,208	284,838
Опреак	(+0.5%)	(-0.5%)	(-1.2%)	(-0.7%)	(-0.2%)
	80,081	1,538,945	111,185	1,910,659	125,517
Night	(+0.7%)	(-0.5%)	(+0.4%)	(-0.1%)	(+0.9%)
Tatal	550,098	10,418,845	702,989	13,431,619	829,035
Iotal	(+0.7%)	(+0.5%)	(+0.6%)	(+0.7%)	(+1.0%)

SOUTH SUBAREA PERFORMANCE MEASURES

	Rider Use i	n 2008 (Chang	e from 2007)	Pe	erformanc	e Measur	es
2008	Annual Rides	Annual Passenger Miles	Annual Fare Revenue	Rides / Rev. Hr.	Fare Rev / Op. Exp	Psgr. Miles / RevHr	Psgr. Miles/ PlatMi
Deeke	12,404,381	103,869,987	\$15,226,094	46.41	26.6%	389	13.8
Peaks	(+5.2%)	(+5.3%)	(+33.8%)	(+2.6%)	(+22.6%)	(+2.9%)	(+3.0%)
OffDeels	10,151,387	73,559,283	\$10,057,295	50.1	28.3%	363	18.3
Опреак	(+8.6%)	(+9.0%)	(+56.8%)	(+8.0%)	(+46.6%)	(+8.4%)	(+9.6%)
Night	2,921,528	22,879,454	\$2,894,358	36.5	17.9%	286	12.0
Night	(+1.9%)	(+0.8%)	(+47.1%)	(+1.1%)	(+35.6%)	(+0.4%)	(+0.8%)
T . (.)	25,477,296	200,308,724	\$28,177,747	46.3	25.8%	364	14.9
iotai	(+6.1%)	(+6.1%)	(+42.6%)	(+4.5%)	(+31.6%)	(+4.6%)	(+4.9%)

2008 Fall annualized data shows ridership in the South Subarea increased significantly from between fall 2007 to fall 2008, though the percentage growth was smaller than in the other two subareas. The largest growth was in offpeak time periods, despite minimal service increases during those times. Service increases in the South included several peak period services that were added or expanded in 2008. The decrease in service delivered during offpeak hours was the result of an error in 2007 reporting that counted Route 919 as a regular route instead of an exception.

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

			Numb	er of Routes i	n 2008	
	2008	Rides / Rev. Hr.	Fare Rev / Op. Exp	Psgr. Miles / RevHr	Psgr. Miles/ PlatMi	Route Effectiveness
Peaks	Above Strong	12	11	14	12	11
	Below Minimum	9	9	11	10	12
Off Peak	Above Strong	7	6	3	7	7
	Below Minimum	4	6	4	6	5
Night	Above Strong	2	5	4	5	4
	Below Minimum	5	4	2	3	3

The South Subarea had relatively little change to the transit network between fall 2007 and fall 2008. The addition of more offpeak service on Route 164 was a notable success, as the route ranked above the performance threshold for four of five performance indicators during offpeak hours. Other notable high performers include all-day routes connecting South King County with Seattle (101, 120, 174, 194), Kent East Hill local routes (164, 168, 169), and routes serving the future Pacific Highway South RapidRide corridor (174).

The introduction of additional peak service to Kent East Hill split riders between two routes and resulted in lower performance on peak express services, as both new Route 157 and Route 161 performed below the minimum standard on two or more indicators. Some other relatively low-performing routes in the South Subarea include peak routes in areas with multiple service options like Federal Way (175, 179, 196) and low density areas like Vashon Island (119). Several of the weakest routes in the South Subarea are planned for major changes or discontinuation in 2009 with the Transit Connections project, including routes 170, 154, and 191.

		Service Delive	red in 2008 (C	hange from 200	7)
2008	Annual Revenue Hours	Annual Revenue Miles	Annual Trips	Annual Platform Miles	Annual Platform Hours
Deeke	536,270	6,701,818	850,157	9,000,393	807,162
Peaks	(+2.3%)	(+1.4%)	(+2.9%)	(+1.5%)	(+2.9%)
OffDeels	543,251	6,766,273	917,928	7,151,122	779,814
OffPeak	(+1.3%)	(+0.5%)	(+1.8%)	(+0.2%)	(+1.5%)
Niaht	218,301	3,046,798	424,952	3,446,748	344,084
Night	(+2.5%)	(+1.7%)	(+1.8%)	(+1.7%)	(+3.3%)
Tatal	1,297,823	16,514,889	2,193,037	19,598,263	1,931,061
lotal	(+1.9%)	(+1.1%)	(+2.2%)	(+1.1%)	(+2.4%)

WEST SUBAREA PERFORMANCE MEASURES

	Rider Use i	n 2008 (Chang	e from 2007)	Performance Measures						
2008	Annual Rides	Annual Passenger Miles	Annual Fare Revenue	Rides / Rev. Hr.	Fare Rev / Op. Exp	Psgr. Miles / RevHr	Psgr. Miles/ PlatMi			
Deeke	35,727,539	130,606,863	\$40,740,036	66.6	41.0%	244	14.5			
Peaks	(+8.4%)	(+10.4%)	(+43.8%)	(+5.9%)	(+33.1%)	(+8.0%)	(+8.2%)			
OffDeek	34,403,970	114,787,538	\$33,989,621	63.3	36.9%	211	16.1			
Опреак	(+8.5%)	(+11.1%)	(+56.2%)	(+7.1%)	(+47.0%)	(+9.3%)	(+11.0%)			
Niaht	8,658,067	29,749,199	\$8,577,547	39.7	20.7%	136	8.6			
Night	(+7.4%)	(+9.0%)	(+55.1%)	(+4.7%)	(+42.8%)	(+6.3%)	(+6.2%)			
	78,789,576	275,143,599	\$83,307,204	60.7	35.8%	212	14.0			
Iotal	(+8.3%)	(+10.5%)	(+49.7%)	(+6.3%)	(+39.3%)	(+8.2%)	(+9.4%)			

2008 annualized data shoes ridership in the West Subarea increased by over six million annual riders between fall 2007 and Fall 2008, a greater absolute ridership gain than the other subareas but a lower percentage gain than in the East Subarea. Ridership grew by similar percentages for all times of day. Overall transit service increased by less than 2% due in large part to implementation of the first Transit Now partnership with the City of Seattle.

			Numb	er of Routes i	n 2008	
	2008	Rides / Rev. Hr.	Fare Rev / Op. Exp	Psgr. Miles / RevHr	Psgr. Miles/ PlatMi	Route Effectiveness
Peaks	Above Strong	22	17	21	18	18
	Below Minimum	22	22	12	20	22
Off Peak	Above Strong	17	16	13	12	10
	Below Minimum	15	15	9	15	15
Night	Above Strong	13	15	11	11	10
	Below	12	9	11	11	9

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

The highest performing West Subarea routes in 2008 were similar to previous years, with notable standouts including routes serving the future Ballard-Uptown RapidRide corridor (15, 15TB, 15X, 18); trolley bus routes serving Queen Anne, Capitol Hill, and other central Seattle neighborhoods; services connecting downtown Seattle and the University District; and route 48 South, which is planned for restructure in 2009.

Low performing routes in the West Subarea are concentrated among several types of routes. These routes include specialized peak routes with few trips or other nearby services (34, 35, 37, 79X, 256); routes serving predominantly low density, single-use residential areas (25, 31, 39); and neighborhood routes with limited connections to major employment areas (46, 51, 53). Several weak or below-average routes are planned for discontinuation or service reductions in 2009 as part of the Transit Connections project, including routes 32, 34, 39, 42, and 126.

3. Abbreviations Used in Tables

Production Subarea: Although some routes are now designated differently for the allocation of new service hours, routes were originally assigned to subareas based on 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.

2008 Annual Route Performance Report

Part II: Route Performance by Subarea

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

July 2009

1. EAST Planning Subarea

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

Prod Subarea	Exceptions to Route Evaluation	Guide time	Route	Part	Кеу Туре	Origin	Rides /Rev. Hour	Fare Rev. / Op.Exp Ratio	Pass. Miles / Rev. Hour	Pass. Miles/ Plat. Miles	"Route Effective- ness" Sum
		EACT									
FAST	2006 PEAN	Veets or exc	PRODU		formance	AREA	52 5	29%	546	14.4	3.6
FAST	1	l ess th	eeus sii0 an minim	um ner	formance	threshold (Fall 2008)	15.7	9%	38	3.2	-3.6
EAST		Peak	212	un per	loimanee	Eastaate	98.3	36%	925	19.5	9.7
FAST		Peak	229			Overlake	73.2	38%	753	21.9	82
FAST		Peak	218			Issaguah	72.3	23%	1276	21.2	8.6
FAST		Peak	312		ΕX	U of W - Bothell	63.4	29%	624	17.8	5.5
EAST		Peak	255		TB	Kirkland	63.2	30%	584	15.5	5.1
EAST		Peak	225			Overlake	60.0	36%	584	18.0	6.0
EAST		Peak	230	W	тв	Kirkland	56.1	35%	100	5.1	1.4
EAST		Peak	306		EX	Kenmore	55.5	31%	537	19.2	5.2
EAST		Peak	312		TEX	Kenmore	54.1	22%	513	14.0	3.2
EAST		Peak	230	Е		Redmond P&R	51.9	37%	178	10.1	2.6
EAST		Peak	253			Bear Creek P&R	51.3	40%	177	12.2	3.3
EAST		Peak	245			Kirkland	47.0	33%	185	11.1	2.2
EAST		Peak	255			Kingsgate	45.0	32%	428	19.6	4.4
EAST		Peak	252			Kingsgate P&R	43.0	18%	570	14.4	2.5
EAST		Peak	271		ТВ	Bellevue TC	41.8	26%	240	10.4	1.2
EAST		Peak	230	W		Kingsgate P&R	40.3	29%	149	8.8	0.9
EAST		Peak	268			E Lake Sammamish	37.5	19%	484	11.4	1.4
EAST		Peak	216			Sammamish	37.4	19%	614	16.3	2.8
EAST		Peak	271			Issaquah P&R	37.4	29%	233	11.2	1.4
EAST		Peak	237			Woodinville	35.8	12%	325	6.3	-0.9
EAST		Peak	214		ТВ	Issaquah	35.1	16%	494	10.4	0.8
EAST		Peak	266			Bear Creek P&R	34.8	14%	340	7.7	-0.5
EAST		Peak	240			Bellevue	34.7	27%	190	11.8	1.0
EAST		Peak	257			Kingsgate P&R	33.8	18%	451	12.5	1.2
EAST		Peak	311			Woodinville P&R	32.6	15%	573	12.9	1.4
EAST		Peak	205		EX	Mercer Island	32.4	19%	1/3	5.9	-1.1
EAST		Peak	215			North Bend	32.3	14%	643	10.5	1.0
EAST		Peak	233			Bellevue	32.0	22%	128	7.0	-0.8
EAST		Peak	265			Redmond P&R	31.2	15%	330	7.8	-0.6
EAST		Peak	201			Overlake P&R	30.7 20.6	19%	216	8.U	-U.b
EASI		Peak	203			Wercer Island	20.0 20.5	10%	01	2.3	-2.1
EASI		Peak	212			⊏asigate P&R	20.5 27.0	10%	221	1.0 67	-1.1
EASI		Peak	342			Bothell	21.9 27 0	13% 16%	2/4 402	0./ 10.2	-1.4
EASI		Peak	20U ววว			Juanita	21.0 27.5	10% 210/	402 82	10.Z	-17
EAST		Pedk	222			Ovenake	C. 12 26 7	∠170 120/	02 246	4.0 6.2	-1./
EASI		Peak	∠ა∠ 202			Duvali Moreer Island	20.7	13%	240 1/2	0.Z	-1.7
FACT		Peak	202				20.0 24 R	12/0	143 2∕/1	4.5	-2.0
FAST		Pook	200			Redmond	24.0	17%	241 102	62	-10
FAST		Peak	221			Northshoro D&P	24.0 24 3	17%	122	67	-1.3 -1.7
FAST		Pook	204			Kirkland	24.3	1//0	70	<u>о</u> .7 Д Л	-27
FAST		Peak	240			Issaniah	23.5	12%	211	5.0	-22
FAST		Peak	921			Fastrate P&R	20.7	16%	67	3.2	-27
EAST		Peak	277			Juanita	21.2	12%	178	5.5	-2.4

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
EAST		Peak	244		EX	Kenmore	20.8	9%	152	4.7	-3.0
EAST		Peak	238			Bothell	20.0	14%	82	4.0	-3.0
EAST		Peak	249			Redmond P&R	19.9	15%	70	3.9	-3.0
EAST		Peak	236			Woodinville	17.0	13%	63	3.4	-3.4
EAST		Peak	232		ТВ	Redmond	14.9	7%	53	1.6	-4.5
EAST		Peak	269			E Lake Sammamish	13.5	8%	95	3.7	-3.9
EAST		Peak	247			Overlake P&R	13.2	7%	94	2.6	-4.3
EAST		Peak	209			North Bend	10.1	5%	102	3.2	-4.4
EAST		Peak	219			Newcastle	9.9	6%	34	1.3	-5.0
EAST		Peak	251			North Creek	9.9	6%	72	2.8	-4.5
EAST		Peak	201			Mercer Island	5.1	3%	21	0.8	-5.7
EAST		Peak	929			North Bend	4.3	2%	44	1.2	-5.6
EAST		a	verage	2008	PEAK	- EAST	34.1	19%	292	8.78	0.0

	2008 OFF-PEAP	< - EAST PI	RODUCTIO	N SUBAREA					
EAST	Meets	or exceeds stro	ong performand	e threshold (Fall 2008)	36.2	22%	198	10.6	3.3
EAST	Le	ess than minim	um performano	ce threshold (Fall 2008,	13.8	8%	56	2.9	-3.3
EAST	OffF	Peak 253		Bear Creek P&R	50.7	33%	169	12.3	6.8
EAST	OffP	Peak 230	E	Redmond P&R	46.6	26%	191	10.9	5.4
EAST	OffF	Peak 245		Kirkland	38.2	23%	160	9.7	3.4
EAST	OffP	Peak 271		Issaquah P&R	35.0	22%	250	13.8	5.4
EAST	OffP	Peak 255		Kingsgate	34.4	18%	339	15.4	6.5
EAST	OffP	Peak 230	W	Kingsgate P&R	33.8	23%	122	8.8	2.3
EAST	OffF	Peak 240		Bellevue	30.9	20%	186	11.6	3.3
EAST	OffF	Peak 213		Mercer Island	28.7	23%	81	4.2	0.1
EAST	OffP	Peak 233		Bellevue	25.8	13%	106	5.9	-0.7
EAST	OffF	Peak 211	EX	North Bend	25.4	9%	207	5.2	-0.1
EAST	OffF	Peak 234		Northshore P&R	24.4	15%	140	7.9	0.4
EAST	OffF	Peak 221		Redmond	21.8	13%	96	5.6	-1.3
EAST	OffF	Peak 248		Kirkland	21.5	12%	81	5.0	-1.8
EAST	OffF	Peak 222		Overlake	20.7	12%	81	4.5	-2.0
EAST	OffP	Peak 203		Mercer Island	20.6	16%	42	2.1	-2.6
EAST	OffF	Peak 921		Eastgate P&R	19.5	13%	90	5.0	-1.7
EAST	OffP	Peak 204		Mercer Island	19.1	12%	65	3.3	-2.8
EAST	OffF	Peak 238		Bothell	19.0	11%	100	5.1	-1.9
EAST	OffF	Peak 249		Redmond P&R	17.3	11%	81	4.6	-2.5
EAST	OffP	Peak 236		Woodinville	15.1	10%	71	4.0	-3.1
EAST	OffF	Peak 209		North Bend	12.1	6%	142	4.8	-2.6
EAST	OffF	Peak 251		North Creek	9.8	5%	68	2.6	-4.6
EAST	OffP	Peak 929		North Bend	4.3	2%	59	1.9	-5.8
EAST		average	2008 MIDE	DAY - EAST	25.0	15%	127	6.72	0.0

Prod Subarea	Exceptions to Route Evaluation	Guide time	Route	Part	Кеу Туре	Origin	Rides /Rev. Hour	Fare Rev. / Op.Exp Ratio	Pass. Miles / Rev. Hour	Pass. Miles/ Plat. Miles	"Route Effective- ness" Sum
	2008 NIGH	T - EAST	PROD	UCTIO	ON SUE	BAREA					
EAST	/	Meets or exc	eeds stro	ng perf	formance	threshold (Fall 2008)	34.9	19%	219	8.9	3.5
EAST		Less th	an minim	um per	formance	threshold (Fall 2008,	8.9	4%	44	2.2	-3.5
EAST		Night	253		ТВ	Redmond	55.1	29%	171	7.8	6.1
EAST		Night	230	Е		Redmond P&R	43.4	24%	192	9.5	5.3
EAST		Night	271			Issaquah P&R	27.0	14%	188	8.4	2.3
EAST		Night	230	W		Kingsgate P&R	26.1	14%	127	6.8	1.0
EAST		Night	245			Kirkland	24.1	13%	98	4.6	-0.3
EAST		Night	255			Kingsgate	24.0	12%	258	11.3	3.4
EAST		Night	240			Bellevue	21.5	12%	159	7.8	1.0
EAST		Night	280			Bellevue TC	20.7	10%	345	9.6	3.3
EAST		Night	221			Redmond	17.1	9%	66	3.1	-2.2
EAST		Night	248			Kirkland	16.7	8%	55	2.6	-2.6
EAST		Night	222			Overlake	14.9	7%	61	2.8	-2.7
EAST		Night	234			Northshore P&R	13.6	7%	79	3.3	-2.5
EAST		Night	236			Woodinville	9.5	5%	42	1.5	-4.1
EAST		Night	238			Bothell	8.6	4%	46	1.9	-4.1
EAST		Night	209			North Bend	6.2	2%	84	1.9	-4.1
EAST		а	verage	2007	NIGHT	- EAST	21.9	11%	131	5.52	0.0

2008 EAST PRODUCTION SUBAREA EXCEPTION ROUTES - NOT EVALUATED											
EAST	PART	Peak	200		Issaquah	11.3		32	1.8		
EAST	SCL	Peak	206		Newport Hills	66.1	38%	270	10.8		
EAST	SCL	Peak	207		Newport Hills	55.4	37%	204	10.0		
EAST	SCL	Peak	208		Newport Hills	54.2	36%	192	9.5		
EAST	DART	Peak	291	DART	Redmond	14.5	17%	51	4.1		
EAST	SCL	Peak	885		Bellevue	26.9	15%	57	2.3		
EAST	SCL	Peak	886		Clyde Hill	63.0	42%	49	4.4		
EAST	SCL	Peak	888		Eastgate	61.1	41%	283	13.5		
EAST	SCL	Peak	889		Bellevue	44.0	32%	157	7.2		
EAST	SCL	Peak	890		Eastgate	35.9	21%	159	5.9		
EAST	SCL	Peak	891		Mercer Island	39.0	19%	177	5.7		
EAST	SCL	Peak	892		Mercer Island	75.6	35%	264	8.9		
EAST	DART	Peak	926	DART	Crossroads	12.8	15%	40	2.6		
EAST	DART	Peak	927	DART	E Lake Sammamish	9.2	9%	58	3.4		
EAST	DART	Peak	935	DART	Juanita	9.5	9%	50	2.7		
EAST	SCL	Peak	986	CUST	Kirkland	50.5	77%	455	13.6		
EAST	SCL	Peak	989	CUST	Eastgate	46.6	67%	600	15.2		
EAST	regular	route ave	rage:	2008 East P	eak	34.1	19%	292	8.78		
	-	-					-	-		-	
EAST	PART	OffPeak	200		Issaquah	11.8		40	3.3		
EAST	DART	OffPeak	925	DART	Newcastle	1.2	1%	6	7.0		
EAST	DART	OffPeak	926	DART	Crossroads	11.9	11%	36	2.4		
EAST	DART	OffPeak	927	DART	E Lake Sammamish	7.8	7%	49	2.7		
EAST	DART	OffPeak	<u>935</u>	DART	Juanita	7.7	5%	41	2.1		
EAST	regular	route ave	rage:	2008 East C	OffPeak	25.0	15%	127.2	6.7		

2. SOUTH Planning Subarea

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

Prod Subar ea	Exceptions to Route Evaluation	Guide time	Route	Part	Кеу Туре	Origin	Rides /Rev. Hour	Fare Rev. / Op.Exp Ratio	Pass. Miles / Rev. Hour	Pass. Miles/ Plat. Miles	"Route Effective- ness" Sum
	2008 PEAK	- SOUTH		DUCT	ION SI	IBARFA					
SOUTH	20001 2/11	Meets or ex	ceeds str	ona pe	rformanc	e threshold (Fall 2008)	57.5	35%	535	16.9	3.2
SOUTH		Less th	han minir	num pe	rformanc	e threshold (Fall 2008)	26.1	14%	171	6.8	-3.2
SOUTH		Peak	164			Kent	85.0	51%	388	17.9	6.6
SOUTH		Peak	105			Renton Highlands	82.1	53%	187	11.8	4.2
SOUTH		Peak	106			Renton	75.1	46%	431	20.8	6.3
SOUTH		Peak	169			Kent P&R,TC	73.7	50%	301	17.0	5.1
SOUTH		Peak	120			Burien	68.0	41%	384	19.6	4.9
SOUTH		Peak	168			Timberlane	65.6	41%	295	13.1	3.0
SOUTH		Peak	194		ТВ	SeaTac	62.8	34%	604	19.2	5.1
SOUTH		Peak	101		ТВ	Renton CBD	62.7	37%	631	23.8	6.3
SOUTH		Peak	174			Federal Way P&R,TC	61.7	40%	404	18.8	4.3
SOUTH		Peak	166			Kent P&R,TC	61.4	44%	214	11.0	2.1
SOUTH		Peak	113			Shorewood	58.5	26%	408	12.5	1.6
SOUTH		Peak	101			Fairwood	58.1	36%	664	22.9	6.0
SOUTH		Peak	125		ТВ	White Center	56.9	38%	315	15.1	2.6
SOUTH		Peak	125			Shorewood	54.5	34%	322	13.0	1.8
SOUTH		Peak	122			Highline CC	51.4	32%	472	17.5	3.0
SOUTH		Peak	150		тв	Kent	51.2	33%	555	23.0	4.7
SOUTH		Peak	941		EX	Star Lake P&R	51.2	24%	697	15.7	3.2
SOUTH		Peak	121			Highline CC	49.2	27%	498	16.0	2.3
SOUTH		Peak	118			Vashon	48.8	23%	266	8.6	-0.8
SOUTH		Peak	180			Auburn	48.3	34%	246	12.3	0.8
SOUTH		Peak	107			Renton	45.9	32%	137	7.9	-1.0
SOUTH		Peak	194			Federal Way	44.3	26%	642	20.7	3.6
SOUTH		Peak	181			Green River CC	44.3	30%	207	9.9	-0.5
SOUTH		Peak	131		тв	Burien	44.2	27%	277	11.1	-0.2
SOUTH		Peak	116		EX	Fauntleroy	43.1	22%	301	11.8	-0.4
SOUTH		Peak	111			Renton	43.0	24%	572	16.6	2.2
SOUTH		Peak	158		TD	Lk Meridi/E Kent P&R	42.7	19%	648	16.1	2.0
SOUTH		Реак	132		IB	Burien	42.0	28%	279	12.5	0.1
SOUTH		Реак	1//			Federal Way	41.9	19%	796	18.1	3.2
SOUTH		Peak	132				41.ð	30% 20%	204	12.5	0.1
SOUTH		Peak	10/			rederal way	40.1 20.7	29% 210/	134	7 /	-2.0
SOUTH		Pedk	103				39.1 200	24% 160/	777	1.4 15 0	-2.0
SOUTH		Peak	197			Federal way	30.0 29.6	26%	124	15.0 7 /	2.2
SOUTH		Peak	140				38.4	20 /0	218	12.0	-2.1
SOUTH		Poak	119		TR		30.4 38 3	21/0 10%	176	6.2	-0.7
SOUTH		Pook	1/0			Rurien	30.3	28%	170	Q Q	-13
SOUTH		Pook	1/12		FX	Black Diamond	30.2 38.2	20%	587	3.3 16 7	-1.5 1.8
SOUTH		Peak	192			Federal Way	36.6	17%	524	10.7	-0.4
SOUTH		Peak	190			Star Lake P&R	36.6	15%	502	10.3	-0.7
SOUTH		Peak	162			Kent	35.9	14%	562	10.9	-0.4
SOUTH		Peak	121		тв	Burien	35.8	22%	265	10.1	-1.4
SOUTH		Peak	159			Kent P&R TC	34.4	17%	457	12.1	-0.6
SOUTH		Peak	114			Renton	33.8	18%	397	10.9	-1.1

Prod Subar ea	Exceptions to Route Evaluation	Guide time	Route	Part	Кеу Туре	Origin	Rides /Rev. Hour	Fare Rev. / Op.Exp Ratio	Pass. Miles / Rev. Hour	Pass. Miles/ Plat. Miles	"Route Effective- ness" Sum
SOUTH		Peak	182			Federal Way	33.5	17%	110	3.8	-4.2
SOUTH		Peak	133			Burien TC	33.0	18%	364	11.0	-1.3
SOUTH		Peak	139			Gregory Heights	32.4	23%	60	3.9	-3.9
SOUTH		Peak	152			Enumclaw	32.3	16%	548	11.4	-0.4
SOUTH		Peak	915			Enumclaw	32.3	15%	229	5.8	-3.3
SOUTH		Peak	134			Burien TC	32.2	18%	199	9.0	-2.6
SOUTH		Peak	123		EX	Burien	31.8	23%	289	13.6	-0.8
SOUTH		Peak	153			Kent	31.7	22%	110	6.5	-3.3
SOUTH		Peak	196			Federal Way S P&R	30.2	13%	425	7.9	-2.2
SOUTH		Peak	191			Star Lake P&R	29.6	14%	360	8.5	-2.4
SOUTH		Peak	170			McMicken Heights	29.4	18%	242	7.5	-2.9
SOUTH		Peak	167			Auburn P&R	29.3	16%	421	11.9	-1.2
SOUTH		Peak	155			Fairwood	28.1	17%	108	5.4	-4.2
SOUTH		Peak	118		EX	Vashon	26.8	19%	188	9.6	-2.8
SOUTH		Peak	179			Federal Way	26.1	12%	564	11.0	-1.2
SOUTH		Peak	157			Lake Meridian P&R	25.5	13%	395	8.7	-2.5
SOUTH		Peak	161			Kent	25.3	14%	281	7.1	-3.4
SOUTH		Peak	173			Federal Way P&R,TC	22.5	10%	335	6.9	-3.7
SOUTH		Peak	119		SH	Vashon	20.9	12%	124	4.1	-5.3
SOUTH		Peak	175			Federal Way P&R,TC	19.8	10%	310	7.3	-3.9
SOUTH		Peak	119		EX	Vashon	18.8	16%	178	10.7	-3.4
SOUTH		Peak	154			Auburn	16.8	7%	165	3.7	-5.8
SOUTH		Peak	149			Black Diamond	9.9	5%	154	4.2	-6.5
SOUTH		a	/erage	2008	PEAK	- SOUTH	41.8	24%	353	11.83	0.0

	2008 OFFP	PEAK - SOL	JTH PRC							
SOUTH		Meets or exce	eds strong	performan	ce threshold (Fall 2008)	63.1	36%	473	21.5	3.5
SOUTH		Less tha	n minimum	performan	ce threshold (Fall 2008)	25.4	14%	109	6.2	-3.5
SOUTH		OffPeak	164		Kent	85.6	46%	434	22.8	6.1
SOUTH		OffPeak	105		Renton Highlands	72.0	39%	203	12.7	2.1
SOUTH		OffPeak	169		Kent P&R,TC	69.2	43%	358	21.1	4.3
SOUTH		OffPeak	120		Burien	67.8	36%	388	22.0	3.8
SOUTH		OffPeak	174		Federal Way P&R,TC	66.6	39%	466	26.0	5.0
SOUTH		OffPeak	168		Timberlane	63.7	33%	292	13.0	1.7
SOUTH		OffPeak	166		Kent P&R,TC	63.4	41%	245	13.8	2.3
SOUTH		OffPeak	101	тв	Renton CBD	59.1	29%	564	25.7	4.2
SOUTH		OffPeak	106		Renton	58.2	33%	374	22.6	3.1
SOUTH		OffPeak	194	тв	SeaTac	57.9	26%	618	21.8	3.7
SOUTH		OffPeak	194		Federal Way	52.9	27%	912	33.4	6.6
SOUTH		OffPeak	125		Shorewood	49.9	29%	307	14.7	0.9
SOUTH		OffPeak	132	тв	Burien	46.0	27%	311	14.1	0.4
SOUTH		OffPeak	107		Renton	45.3	25%	159	8.9	-1.3
SOUTH		OffPeak	187		Federal Way	43.7	31%	153	8.1	-1.0
SOUTH		OffPeak	181		Green River CC	42.1	25%	248	13.7	-0.4
SOUTH		OffPeak	180		Auburn	40.5	25%	222	11.8	-0.8
SOUTH		OffPeak	150	ТВ	Kent	40.3	22%	453	21.2	1.3

Prod Subar	Exceptions to Route	Guide	Pouto	Dort	Key	Origin	Rides /Rev.	Fare Rev. / Op.Exp	Pass. Miles / Rev.	Pass. Miles/ Plat. Milos	"Route Effective- ness" Sum
ea		ume	Noule	Fan	туре	Oligili	Hour	Ratio	Hour	WIIIes	Sum
SOUTH		OffPeak	183			Kent	40.1	23%	213	12.0	-1.1
SOUTH		OffPeak	140			Burien	39.3	25%	200	12.3	-1.0
SOUTH		OffPeak	148			Fairwood	38.5	24%	155	8.9	-1.8
SOUTH		OffPeak	132			Highline CC	38.5	25%	268	13.9	-0.4
SOUTH		OffPeak	131			Highline CC	37.3	25%	248	13.7	-0.6
SOUTH		OffPeak	182			Federal Way	32.9	15%	137	5.7	-3.4
SOUTH		OffPeak	139			Gregory Heights	32.8	19%	67	4.4	-3.6
SOUTH		OffPeak	155			Fairwood	29.4	17%	127	7.8	-3.2
SOUTH		OffPeak	915			Enumclaw	27.0	12%	181	5.1	-3.8
SOUTH		OffPeak	118		ТВ	Vashon	25.7	11%	304	9.5	-2.7
SOUTH		OffPeak	119		SH	Vashon	17.2	8%	95	3.1	-5.4
SOUTH		OffPeak	149			Black Diamond	13.2	6%	107	3.3	-5.7
SOUTH		OffPeak	118			Vashon	10.5	5%	44	1.4	-6.6
SOUTH		OffPeak	912			Covington	9.1	5%	464	14.3	-2.7
SOUTH		av	/erage	2008	OFFP	EAK - SOUTH	44.2	25%	291	13.84	0.0

2008 NIGHT - SOUTH PRODUCTION SUBAREA									
SOUTH	Meets or exc	eeds strong p	performant	e threshold (Fall 2008)	44.0	22%	366	14.4	3.5
SOUTH	Less the	an minimum	performan	ce threshold (Fall 2008)	23.3	11%	69	3.6	-3.5
SOUTH	Night	169		Kent P&R,TC	56.0	28%	258	11.6	5.0
SOUTH	Night	120		Burien	52.9	24%	365	16.5	5.6
SOUTH	Night	140		Burien	43.9	23%	229	11.1	2.7
SOUTH	Night	174		Federal Way P&R,TC	42.9	22%	415	17.9	4.8
SOUTH	Night	194		Federal Way	40.2	19%	682	21.1	6.4
SOUTH	Night	166		Kent P&R,TC	39.7	22%	133	6.0	0.5
SOUTH	Night	106		Renton	38.9	21%	239	12.5	2.0
SOUTH	Night	168	Timberlane	38.6	17%	167	5.6	-0.5	
SOUTH	Night	101	ТВ	Renton CBD	37.8	16%	370	15.0	2.5
SOUTH	Night	164		Kent	36.7	17%	173	7.6	-0.2
SOUTH	Night	105		Renton Highlands	34.4	16%	85	4.2	-1.8
SOUTH	Night	125	NT	Shorewood	34.2	25%	245	11.7	2.2
SOUTH	Night	180	ТВ	Auburn	32.4	15%	143	5.6	-1.6
SOUTH	Night	150	ТВ	Kent	31.3	15%	409	16.8	2.2
SOUTH	Night	125		Shorewood	30.9	13%	211	6.0	-1.5
SOUTH	Night	181		Green River CC	29.8	13%	136	4.7	-2.4
SOUTH	Night	148		Fairwood	28.3	13%	107	5.5	-2.6
SOUTH	Night	187		Federal Way	27.3	14%	86	3.4	-2.9
SOUTH	Night	131		Highline CC	22.2	11%	165	6.7	-2.8
SOUTH	Night	107		Renton	20.8	10%	67	3.1	-4.6
SOUTH	Night	132		Highline CC	20.5	11%	168	7.4	-2.9
SOUTH	Night	125	ТВ	White Center	20.4	9%	110	5.6	-3.9
SOUTH	Night	139		Gregory Heights	14.2	8%	36	2.0	-6.1
SOUTH	av	erage 200	T - SOUTH	33.7	17%	217	9.0	0.0	

Prod Subar ea	Exceptions to Route Evaluation	Guide time	Route	Ke Part Typ	y De Origin	Rides /Rev. Hour	Fare Rev. / Op.Exp Ratio	Pass. Miles / Rev. Hour	Pass. Miles/ Plat. Miles	"Route Effective- ness" Sum
	2008 2011									
	2008 300 I	Peak	110	N SUDAN	Ronton	30.6	18%		1 0/	
SOUTH		Peak	901			32.3	31%		3.84	
SOUTH	DART	Peak	903			26.3	30%	91	5.04	
SOUTH	DART	Peak	908	DAF	T Renton Highlands	16.3	13%	30	2 11	
SOUTH	DART	Peak	909	DAF	R Renton	16.1	15%	40	2.62	
SOUTH	DART	Peak	917	DAF	RT Algona	22.4	21%	74	3.83	
SOUTH	DART	Peak	918	DAF	RT Kent	33.3	34%	55	3.59	
SOUTH	DART	Peak	919	DAF	RT Auburn	17.6	17%	42	2.62	
SOUTH	CUST	Peak	952	CUS	T Auburn P&R	22.8	23%	604	11.24	
SOUTH	regular	route ave	erage:	2008 SOI	JTH PEAK	41.8	24%	353	11.8	
SOUTH	DART	OffPeak	901	DAF	RT Dash Point	27.8	26%	47	3.20	
SOUTH	DART	OffPeak	903	DAF	RT South Campus	23.7	24%	82	4.46	
SOUTH	DART	OffPeak	908	DAF	Renton Highlands	13.9	9%	25	1.78	
SOUTH	DART	OffPeak	909	DAF	RT Renton	14.5	11%	36	2.36	
SOUTH	PART	OffPeak	914	DAF	RT Kent	15.7		67	5.09	
SOUTH	PART	OffPeak	916	DAF	RT Kent	14.4		70	5.30	
SOUTH	DART	OffPeak	917	DAF	RT Algona	23.2	17%	70	3.46	
SOUTH	DART	OffPeak	919	DAF	RT Auburn	19.0	15%	45	2.86	
SOUTH	regular	route ave	erage:	2008 SOI	JTH OFFPEAK	44.2	25%	291	13.8	
	B 4 B T					07.0	0 4 0 (10		
SOUTH	DART	Night	901	DAF	C Dash Point	27.0	21%	46	2.93	
SOUTH	DARI	Night	903		CI South Campus	24.3	1/%	84	4.42	
SOUTH	regular	route ave	erage:	2008 SO	UTH NIGHT	33.7	1/%	217	9.0	

3. WEST (or NORTH) Planning Subarea

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

Prod Subarea	Exceptions to Route Evaluation	Guide time	Route	Part	Кеу Туре	Origin	Rides /Rev. Hour	Fare Rev. / Op.Exp Ratio	Pass. Miles / Rev. Hour	Pass. Miles/ Plat. Miles	"Route Effective- ness" Sum
	2008 PEAK	- WEST	PROD	UCTIO	ON SU	BAREA					
WEST		Meets or ex	ceeds st	rong pe	erformanc	e threshold (Fall 2008)	85.3	54%	375	18.2	3.1
WEST		Less i	han minii	mum pe	erformand	ce threshold (Fall 2008,	43.7	24%	102	8.0	-3.1
WEST		Peak	15			Blue Ridge	109.7	65%	296	16.7	5.1
WEST		Peak	1			Kinnear	105.4	71%	146	14.4	3.8
WEST		Peak	41		ТВ	Northgate P&R	103.7	43%	753	22.3	7.7
WEST		Peak	15		EX	Blue Ridge	96.9	46%	460	18.2	4.7
WEST		Peak	3	Ν		North Queen Anne	95.8	68%	115	12.3	2.4
WEST		Peak	13			Seattle Pacific U.	95.4	69%	127	14.2	2.9
WEST		Peak	48	S		Rainier Beach	95.3	64%	265	16.3	4.0
WEST		Peak	2	Ν		West Queen Anne	95.1	67%	116	12.8	2.4
WEST		Peak	56		EX	Alki	94.3	43%	486	19.7	4.8
WEST		Peak	4	N		East Queen Anne	94.3	68%	132	13.7	2.8
WEST		Peak	2	S		Madrona	91.2	62%	127	12.9	2.0
WEST		Peak	14	N		Summit	91.1	52%	111	13.5	1.3
WEST		Peak	48	Ν	IB	Ravenna	91.0	21%	118	2.0	-3.0
WEST		Реак	18		TO	North Beach	91.0	59%	248	13.0	2.7
WEST		Реак	15	~		Ballard	90.4	63%	265	15.1	3.5
WEST		Peak	48	3		Columbia City	89.3	65%	193	13.6	2.1
WEST		Peak	14		EX	Sand Point	00.J	47% 500 /	429	10.0	4.1
WEST		Peak	10		FV		07.0 07.5	38%	117	13.4	1.0
WEST		Peak	18		EX	North Beach	87.3 97.0	48%	418	17.5	3.9
WEST		Peak	12		тр	Interlaken Park	07.0 96.7	027	70		1.0
WEST		Peak	72				00.7 96.4	51% 610/	200	9.0 27.0	0.1
WEST		Peak	7 Z 5 A				00.4	2/10/	549	16.4	0.0
WEST		Peak	370			Fauntieroy	84.4	34 /0	327	10.4	0.8
WEST		Peak	2	N	FX	West Queen Anne	84.0	30%	187	9 N	-0.2
WEST		Peak	11		LA	Madison Park	82.7	58%	133	10.6	0.2
WEST		Peak	73		FX	Jackson Park	82.5	57%	364	24 4	53
WEST		Peak	68			Northgate TC	82.5	61%	167	11.8	1.6
WEST		Peak	5		EX	Greenwood	82.3	41%	395	17.4	3.0
WEST		Peak	4	S		Judkins Park	82.2	51%	111	11.5	0.4
WEST		Peak	3	S		Madrona	81.9	51%	112	12.8	0.7
WEST		Peak	8		тв	Capitol Hill	81.3	46%	97	7.1	-0.9
WEST		Peak	49			U. District	81.2	49%	202	23.1	3.2
WEST		Peak	48	Ν	EX	Loyal Heights	81.0	40%	266	12.3	0.9
WEST		Peak	18		тв	Crown Hill	80.0	48%	210	14.5	1.4
WEST		Peak	26			East Green Lake	79.9	50%	190	11.5	0.8
WEST		Peak	73		TEX	Roosevelt	79.5	44%	342	19.3	3.0
WEST		Peak	48	Ν		Loyal Heights	79.2	49%	178	10.9	0.5
WEST		Peak	71		EX	Wedgwood	78.8	51%	357	22.6	4.2
WEST		Peak	24		тв	Central Magnolia	78.5	48%	273	16.1	2.1
WEST		Peak	3	S	тв	First Hill	75.8	45%	85	12.0	-0.4
WEST		Peak	44			Ballard	75.3	47%	162	16.6	1.2
WEST		Peak	358		EX	Aurora Village	75.1	50%	418	24.7	4.8
WEST		Peak	55			Admiral District	74.5	40%	403	19.7	3.1

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
						1					
WEST		Peak	17		EX	Loyal Heights	74.5	39%	407	18.8	2.9
WEST		Peak	36		тв	Beacon Hill	74.5	52%	216	19.3	2.4
WEST		Peak	67			North Seattle	74.3	48%	1/4	11.2	0.2
WEST		Peak	28		IB	Whittier Heights	73.9	38%	217	9.3	-0.5
WEST		Peak	301		EX	Shoreline	/3.8	40%	873	24.3	7.4
WEST		Реак	28			Broadview	72.6	12%	221	12.4	-1./
WEST		Реак	24		EV.	Central Magnolia	/1./	50%	215	13.0	1.0
WEST		Реак	21		EX	Arbor Heights	69.8	37%	420	16.9	2.2
WEST		Peak	8		FV	Mount Baker	69.0 C0.4	48%	132	10.2	-0.5
WEST		Реак	20		EX	East Green Lake	68.1	40%	279	15.3	0.9
WEST		Peak	43		A I T	U. District	67.9	44%	158	17.5	0.8
WEST		Peak	5				67.7 C7.5	43%	200	15.4	1.1
WEST		Peak	9		EV	Rainier Ave	07.3	40%	213	11.5	-0.3
WEST		Peak	40		тр	Lake City	67.4 67.2	48%	164	10.9	-0.2
WEST		Peak	42		ID	Rainier Beach	67.3	39%	222	15.2	0.1
WEST		Peak	30			Rainier Beach	67.0 66.6	4270 200/	240 474	10.0 22.7	0.0 20
WEST		Poak	41				66.4	30%	4/4	11.2	0.4
WEST		Peak	33	c		Discovery Park	66.4	30% 15%	200	126	-0.4
WEST		Peak	14	3	EV	Nount Baker	65 0	40%	101 202	12.0	-0.4
WEST		Peak	20		EA	Broadview	64.9	3%	102	14.7	-0.0
WEST		Peak	00		EV	White Center	64.6	49/0	193	14.7	0.7
WEST		Peak	1			Rainier Beach	04.0 62.0	3270	204	16.5	-0.0
WEST		Poak	42			Admiral District	63.7	18% 18%	303	10.5	2.4
WEST		Peak	75			Northgoto	63.5	40%	211	14.4	0.5
WEST		Poak	75			Shorolino CC	63.1	36%	270	12.4	-0.1
WEST		Peak	90			International Dist	63.1	5070	79	8.0	-4.9
WEST		Peak	27			Colman Park	61 4	41%	104	76	
WEST		Peak	7		тв	Rainier Beach	60.6	38%	107	18.2	0.4
WEST		Peak	42		10	Rainier View	60.0	43%	235	14.9	0.4
WEST		Peak	373		FX		58.9	31%	200	12.8	-0.4
WEST		Peak	17			Loval Heights	58.6	41%	206	12.8	-0.4
WEST		Peak	56			Alki	58.5	37%	178	9.3	-1.6
WEST		Peak	19			West Magnolia	57.8	36%	201	10.9	-1.2
WEST		Peak	76			Wedawood	57.4	29%	333	13.7	-0.2
WEST		Peak	303		EX	Shoreline	57.1	29%	549	18.9	2.4
WEST		Peak	75		ТВ	Lake City	56.6	37%	161	8.5	-2.0
WEST		Peak	42		NT	Rainier View	56.1	49%	289	22.7	2.6
WEST		Peak	54			Fauntlerov	56.1	34%	334	18.1	1.0
WEST		Peak	346			Aurora Village	55.1	41%	193	11.3	-1.0
WEST		Peak	66		EX	Northgate	54.5	42%	203	17.6	0.3
WEST		Peak	32		EX	Rainier Beach	54.5	35%	258	13.4	-0.5
WEST		Peak	7			Rainier Beach	53.8	35%	183	16.7	-0.5
WEST		Peak	23			White Center	53.8	38%	255	15.8	0.1
WEST		Peak	30			Sand Point	53.6	36%	168	10.3	-1.8
WEST		Peak	16			Northgate TC	53.5	39%	189	13.2	-0.9
WEST		Peak	31			Magnolia	52.8	33%	161	8.6	-2.4
WEST		Peak	372		EX	Woodinville P&R	52.8	33%	324	15.5	0.1

Prod Subarea	Exceptions to Route Evaluation	Guide time	Route	Part	Кеу Туре	Origin	Rides /Rev. Hour	Fare Rev. / Op.Exp Ratio	Pass. Miles / Rev. Hour	Pass. Miles/ Plat. Miles	"Route Effective- ness" Sum
					-	•					
WEST		Peak	70			U. District	52.5	36%	113	13.1	-1.7
WEST		Peak	64		EX	Lake City	51.4	31%	283	14.0	-0.6
WEST		Peak	77		EX	North City	51.0	28%	408	16.0	0.4
WEST		Peak	21			Arbor Heights	49.6	33%	238	12.5	-1.3
WEST		Peak	355		EX	Shoreline CC	48.6	24%	341	11.7	-1.3
WEST		Peak	45		EX	Queen Anne	48.6	21%	153	6.1	-4.0
WEST		Peak	73			Jackson Park	48.2	24%	194	7.4	-3.3
WEST		Peak	316			Shoreline	46.6	27%	277	11.5	-1.7
WEST		Peak	57			W. Seattle Junction	45.9	30%	228	11.1	-2.0
WEST		Peak	330			Lake City	45.7	24%	104	5.0	-4.5
WEST		Peak	72			Lake City	45.2	26%	163	7.8	-3.4
WEST		Peak	345			Shoreline	45.0	42%	169	12.7	-1.3
WEST		Peak	304			Shoreline	44.3	24%	511	17.3	0.8
WEST		Peak	34		EX	Rainier Beach	43.1	21%	199	8.0	-3.5
WEST		Peak	22			White Center	43.0	31%	163	9.9	-2.7
WEST		Peak	348			Richmond Beach	42.9	34%	121	7.9	-3.2
WEST		Peak	347			Mountlake Terrace	42.7	35%	147	9.8	-2.7
WEST		Peak	4	Ν	NT	East Queen Anne	42.3	30%	37	3.3	-5.1
WEST		Peak	39			Rainier Beach	40.8	26%	174	9.7	-3.2
WEST		Peak	217			Seattle CBD	39.9	25%	408	15.8	-0.4
WEST		Peak	79		EX	Lake City	37.3	21%	194	7.9	-3.9
WEST		Peak	38			SODO	37.3	28%	52	3.8	-5.3
WEST		Peak	308			Lake Forest Park	37.0	22%	397	13.7	-1.2
WEST		Peak	331			Kenmore	35.0	24%	141	8.3	-4.1
WEST		Peak	242			North Seattle	34.4	19%	409	12.0	-1.7
WEST		Peak	243			Jackson Park	32.6	18%	246	6.8	-4.2
WEST		Peak	51			West Seattle	32.2	21%	53	3.1	-6.1
WEST		Peak	256		- 14	Seattle CBD	31.4	19%	274	9.5	-3.4
WEST		Peak	37		EX	Admiral District	29.7	17%	218	8.8	-4.1
WEST		Peak	46			Shilshole	28.7	15%	75	3.4	-6.4
WEST		Peak	25			Laurelhurst	27.4	22%	77	6.0	-5.5
WEST		Peak	301			Shoreline	19.8	12%	199	8.2	-5.2
WEST		Peak	53			Admiral District	18.5	12%	51	2.8	-7.4
WEST		Peak	35			Seattle CBD	17.0	11%	71	3.8	-7.3
WEST		Peak	126		DEALS	Rainier Beach	13.6	9%	56	2.7	-7.8
WEST		a	verage	2008	PEAK	- WEST	64.5	39%	238	13.1	0.0

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
	2008 OFFP	FAK - W	EST PF		ICTION	SUBAREA					
WEST		Meets or ex	ceeds st	rona pe	erformanc	e threshold (Fall 2008)	83.1	49%	267	19.5	3,3
WEST		Less	than minii	num pe	erformand	ce threshold (Fall 2008)	38.5	22%	100	8.4	-3.3
WEST		OffPeak	2	Ň		West Queen Anne	121.2	67%	171	17.9	5.6
WEST		OffPeak	1			Kinnear	106.5	56%	178	16.7	4.0
WEST		OffPeak	3	S	тв	First Hill	100.6	57%	123	19.8	3.7
WEST		OffPeak	13			Seattle Pacific U.	97.6	58%	151	15.9	3.3
WEST		OffPeak	3	Ν		North Queen Anne	95.5	59%	120	12.9	2.3
WEST		OffPeak	10			Capitol Hill	95.3	53%	141	16.5	2.7
WEST		OffPeak	4	Ν		East Queen Anne	94.3	55%	128	13.0	2.1
WEST		OffPeak	11			Madison Park	91.3	55%	149	13.5	2.3
WEST		OffPeak	2	S		Madrona	91.2	54%	154	16.1	2.7
WEST		OffPeak	15			Blue Ridge	89.1	56%	251	17.5	4.2
WEST		OffPeak	14	Ν		Summit	88.8	38%	117	13.3	0.6
WEST		OffPeak	68			Northgate TC	87.7	58%	195	15.5	3.3
WEST		OffPeak	67			North Seattle	86.4	54%	197	17.1	3.3
WEST		OffPeak	18		ТВ	Crown Hill	83.9	51%	199	13.8	2.3
WEST		OffPeak	36		ТВ	Beacon Hill	83.9	48%	269	24.7	4.9
WEST		OffPeak	14	S		Mount Baker	83.8	52%	170	17.4	2.7
WEST		OffPeak	48	S		Rainier Beach	83.6	51%	240	15.7	3.2
WEST		OffPeak	18			North Beach	81.0	54%	215	15.4	2.9
WEST		OffPeak	48	S	ALT	Columbia City	80.2	48%	173	12.6	1.4
WEST		OffPeak	12			Interlaken Park	78.7	43%	120	14.2	0.6
WEST		OffPeak	358		EX	Aurora Village	77.0	44%	470	31.1	7.9
WEST		OffPeak	8		тв	Capitol Hill	76.1	41%	104	9.1	-0.8
WEST		OffPeak	72		EX	Lake City	75.2	45%	354	25.9	5.5
WEST		OffPeak	12		ТВ	First Hill	75.1	47%	81	12.3	0.0
WEST		OffPeak	73		EX	Jackson Park	73.4	44%	335	23.4	4.7
WEST		OffPeak	49			U. District	72.7	37%	179	20.4	1.7
WEST		OffPeak	48	Ν		Loyal Heights	72.6	43%	163	11.4	0.4
WEST		OffPeak	26			East Green Lake	72.6	46%	168	12.4	0.8
WEST		OffPeak	9		EX	Rainier Ave	72.2	39%	255	17.3	2.2
WEST		OffPeak	7		IR	Rainier Beach	/2.1	38%	238	23.1	3.0
WEST		OffPeak	44	c		Ballard	69.7	30% 270/	105	17.1	0.8
VVESI		OffDeel	4	3 6		Juakins Park	00.0	31% 240/	109	13.0	0.0-
WEST		OffDool	3	3	TEV	Iviadrona	00.4 60 0	34% 270/	209	13.3	-0.9
WEST		OffPool	13				00.Z	31% 160/	290	10.0	2.0 1.7
WEST		OffDool	00			Pointer Decet	07.0 67.5	40% 200/	202	10.0 20 E	1./
WEST		OffPool	30 12				67.5	360/	200	10.0	2.0 1 1
VVEOI		OffPeak	43 71		FY		64 5	J10∕	302	23 D	3.6
WEST		OffPook	7 T 48	s		Mount Baker	64 3		149	10.0	-0.7
WEST		OffPeak	-+0 65	0		l ako Citu	63.6	38%	149	11 2	-0.6
WEST		OffPook	0J 0J			Lake City Mount Baker	61 Q	38%	120	99	-1 3
WEST		OffPeak	۵ 42		тв	Rainier Reach	60.6	29%	191	14 1	-0.4
WEST		OffPeak	28			Broadview	60.4	38%	208	13.5	0.4
WEST		OffPeak	-3			Rainier Beach	60.1	34%	199	17.9	0.8

Prod Subarea	Exceptions to Route Evaluation	Guide time	Route	Part	Кеу Туре	Origin	Rides /Rev. Hour	Fare Rev. / Op.Exp Ratio	Pass. Miles / Rev. Hour	Pass. Miles/ Plat. Miles	"Route Effective- ness" Sum
WEST		OffPeak	372		EX	Woodinville P&R	60.0	32%	349	20.6	2.8
WEST		OffPeak	42			Rainier View	59.8	38%	247	17.1	1.4
WEST		OffPeak	72			Lake City	59.6	38%	252	18.3	1.7
WEST		OffPeak	5			Shoreline CC	59.4	35%	287	18.3	1.9
WEST		OffPeak	75			Northgate	58.4	38%	216	16.2	0.9
WEST		OffPeak	4	Ν	NT	East Queen Anne	55.4	35%	73	6.7	-2.9
WEST		OffPeak	41			Lake City	55.2	30%	397	22.8	3.5
WEST		OffPeak	73			Jackson Park	55.1	34%	232	15.4	0.5
WEST		OffPeak	128			Admiral District	54.9	35%	342	21.4	2.9
WEST		OffPeak	5		ALT	Northgate TC	53.8	32%	276	18.4	1.3
WEST		OffPeak	71			Wedgwood	53.4	33%	216	16.1	0.3
WEST		OffPeak	346			Aurora Village	52.4	30%	203	12.0	-0.9
WEST		OffPeak	55			Admiral District	51.3	28%	318	17.8	1.3
WEST		OffPeak	42		NT	Rainier View	49.5	40%	211	14.7	0.3
WEST		OffPeak	54			Fauntleroy	49.3	28%	330	19.0	1.6
WEST		OffPeak	24			Central Magnolia	48.8	28%	165	9.7	-2.1
WEST		OffPeak	16			Northgate TC	48.3	30%	168	12.5	-1.4
WEST		OffPeak	30			Sand Point	48.1	27%	146	10.1	-2.3
WEST		OffPeak	348			Richmond Beach	47.0	29%	184	11.8	-1.5
WEST		OffPeak	70			U. District	46.1	24%	119	12.9	-2.4
WEST		OffPeak	60		тв	Georgetown	45.6	27%	96	8.0	-3.4
WEST		OffPeak	27			Colman Park	44.0	24%	83	7.0	-4.1
WEST		OffPeak	21			Arbor Heights	44.0	27%	233	13.4	-0.9
WEST		OffPeak	56			Alki	43.6	27%	190	11.8	-1.7
WEST		OffPeak	345			Shoreline	42.9	34%	197	14.5	-0.7
WEST		OffPeak	17			Loval Heights	42.1	28%	159	10.8	-2.2
WEST		OffPeak	66		EX	Northgate	42.0	26%	159	13.1	-2.0
WEST		OffPeak	347			Mountlake Terrace	40.0	24%	151	9.8	-2.9
WEST		OffPeak	30		тв	Sand Point	38.6	21%	116	7.0	-4.1
WEST		OffPeak	128		TB	West Seattle	37.2	18%	156	8.2	-3.7
WEST		OffPeak	23			White Center	35.7	22%	170	10.4	-2.9
WEST		OffPeak	331			Kenmore	35.6	24%	166	10.1	-2.9
WEST		OffPeak	39			Rainier Beach	35.1	21%	180	11.1	-2.8
WEST		OffPeak	31			Magnolia	34.0	19%	129	8.3	-4.1
WEST		OffPeak	22			White Center	34.0	22%	147	10.1	-3.4
WEST		OffPeak	75		TN	Northgate	33.8	19%	130	6.9	-4 4
WEST		OffPeak	38			SODO	33.3	21%	59	45	-5 5
WEST		OffPeak	33			Discovery Park	30.5	18%	127	8.2	-4.3
WEST		OffPeak	00 QQ			International Diet	29.8	1070	35	43	-7.5
WEST		OffPeak	51			West Seattle	23.9	12%	42	23	-7.2
WEST		OffPoak	30		SH	Sand Point	19.4	9%	29	1.7	-7.9
WEST		OffPoak	25		5.1		19.4	13%	60	49	-6.6
WEGT		OffPeak	2J 52			Admiral District	16.1	9%	61	3.0	-7.2
WEST		OffPoak	33			Admiral District	13.0		74	33	-7.5
WEST		a	verade	2008	OFFPE	EAK - WEST	60.8	36%	183	14.0	0.0

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
	2008 NIGH	T - WEST		UCT							
WEST	2000 MIGH	Meets or ex	ceeds st	rona pe	erformanc	e threshold (Fall 2008)	50.8	27%	178	10.7	3.4
WEST		Less	han minii	mum pe	erformand	ce threshold (Fall 2008	23.8	12%	59	4.1	-3.4
WEST		Night	8		ТВ	Capitol Hill	65.0	29%	90	6.7	2.6
WEST		Night	2	Ν		West Queen Anne	63.3	36%	81	7.6	3.6
WEST		Night	14	Ν		Summit	63.0	22%	81	8.3	1.9
WEST		Night	49			U. District	58.6	31%	141	14.3	5.6
WEST		Night	10			Capitol Hill	57.1	26%	75	6.9	1.5
WEST		Night	11			Madison Park	57.1	34%	93	7.3	2.9
WEST		Night	15			Blue Ridge	55.8	35%	183	11.2	5.6
WEST		Night	67			North Seattle	55.1	28%	117	8.2	2.7
WEST		Night	48	S	тв	Mount Baker	54.7	29%	138	8.5	3.2
WEST		Night	48	Ν		Loyal Heights	54.2	29%	134	7.9	2.9
WEST		Night	15		ТВ	Ballard	54.0	27%	139	8.5	2.9
WEST		Night	358		EX	Aurora Village	53.9	28%	335	19.0	9.4
WEST		Night	44			Ballard	53.7	25%	104	8.6	2.1
WEST		Night	7			Rainier Beach	50.7	30%	199	13.7	5.6
WEST		Night	18			North Beach	50.3	35%	159	9.4	4.3
WEST		Night	4	N		East Queen Anne	48.7	24%	43	3.8	-0.9
WEST		Night	12	~		Lake City	47.2	26%	191	12.4	4.3
WEST		Night	14	5		Mount Baker	47.2	23%	107	8.3	1.3
WEST		Night	/3	c		Jackson Park	47.1	27%	195	12.6	4.6
WEST		Night	2	3 N		Madrona	40.2	25%	07	0.4	0.2
WEST		Night	3	IN		North Queen Anne	40.1	23%	43	4.1	-1.1
WEST		Night	43			U. District	45.5	20%	127	12.3	3.1
WEST		Night	13			Seattle Pacific U.	44.0	24%	120	0.0	0.0
WEST		Night	20			East Green Lake	43.0 /1 /	24 /0	102	03	1.1
WEST		Night	J 1		сп	Shoreline CC	41.4	2070	70	5.5	-1.0
WEST		Night	7		TR	Rainier Roach	40.4	20%	150	11 0	-1.0
WEST		Night	42		NT	Rainier View	39.8	28%	211	12.2	4.3
WEST		Night	71			Wedgwood	38.8	22%	151	10.2	1.8
WEST		Night	36			Rainier Beach	38.6	22%	164	10.2	21
WEST		Niaht	372		EX	Woodinville P&R	38.6	15%	206	7.3	0.9
WEST		Night	55		SH	Admiral District	37.7	15%	63	2.9	-2.9
WEST		Night	75			Northgate	37.5	22%	139	8.4	1.0
WEST		Night	4	S		Judkins Park	37.3	18%	60	5.8	-1.6
WEST		Night	3	S		Madrona	37.2	18%	55	5.1	-2.0
WEST		Night	41			Lake City	36.3	18%	259	14.1	4.1
WEST		Night	65			Lake City	34.6	19%	88	6.0	-1.1
WEST		Night	75		TN	Northgate	34.5	17%	116	6.4	-0.8
WEST		Night	30		тв	Sand Point	34.1	20%	113	7.5	-0.2
WEST		Night	18		ТВ	Crown Hill	33.8	16%	97	6.1	-1.5
WEST		Night	346			Aurora Village	33.4	14%	119	6.0	-1.4
WEST		Night	12			Interlaken Park	32.8	16%	44	4.4	-2.9
WEST		Night	4	Ν	NT	East Queen Anne	32.6	22%	44	3.8	-2.4
WEST		Night	81			Ballard	32.4	16%	175	6.4	-0.1

Prod Subarea	Exceptions to Route Evaluation	Guide time	Route	Part	Кеу Туре	Origin	Rides /Rev. Hour	Fare Rev. / Op.Exp Ratio	Pass. Miles / Rev. Hour	Pass. Miles/ Plat. Miles	"Route Effective- ness" Sum
WEST		Night	54			Fauntleroy	32.1	16%	212	10.2	1.6
WEST		Night	60			White Center	31.6	18%	107	6.6	-1.0
WEST		Night	347			Mountlake Terrace	31.5	16%	123	6.4	-1.1
WEST		Night	66		EX	Northgate	30.1	17%	136	8.9	-0.1
WEST		Night	42		ТВ	Rainier Beach	30.0	16%	112	7.2	-1.2
WEST		Night	348			Richmond Beach	29.0	16%	100	5.9	-1.9
WEST		Night	16			Northgate TC	28.8	15%	129	7.7	-1.0
WEST		Night	28			Broadview	28.4	14%	113	6.5	-1.7
WEST		Night	83			U. District	27.7	14%	159	7.7	-0.7
WEST		Night	21			Arbor Heights	26.7	14%	143	7.0	-1.3
WEST		Night	17			Loyal Heights	26.3	14%	106	5.9	-2.2
WEST		Night	56			Alki	26.2	12%	128	6.0	-2.1
WEST		Night	128			Admiral District	25.1	14%	126	6.5	-1.8
WEST		Night	85			West Seattle	24.8	14%	257	11.8	1.9
WEST		Night	27			Colman Park	23.7	13%	54	3.7	-4.1
WEST		Night	345			Shoreline	22.9	13%	95	6.3	-2.6
WEST		Night	24			Central Magnolia	22.2	12%	80	4.6	-3.6
WEST		Night	23			White Center	21.7	11%	120	6.2	-2.6
WEST		Night	82			East Green Lake	20.5	11%	117	5.3	-3.0
WEST		Night	33			Discovery Park	20.1	9%	75	3.2	-4.6
WEST		Night	30		SH	Sand Point	17.8	8%	40	2.0	-5.9
WEST		Night	331			Kenmore	16.3	9%	75	3.6	-4.9
WEST		Night	70			U. District	14.7	8%	34	3.1	-6.0
WEST		Night	28		SH	Broadview	14.0	5%	43	1.5	-6.8
WEST		Night	84			Madison Park	11.9	7%	47	2.9	-6.2
WEST		Night	38			SODO	9.8	6%	21	1.2	-7.4
WEST		a	verage	2008	- WEST	37.3	20%	118.7	7.4	0.0	

2008 WEST PRODUCTION SUBAREA EXCEPTION ROUTES - NOT EVALUATED												
WEST	SH	Peak	7	SH	Rainier Beach	17.2	8%	37	2.1			
WEST	SH	Peak	10	SH	Capitol Hill	6.0	1%					
WEST	SH	Peak	36	SH	Rainier Beach	31.4	16%	56	3.3			
WEST	SH	Peak	43	SH	Capitol Hill	31.2	19%	57	4.8			
WEST	DH	Peak	600	EX	Seattle CBD	13.0	10%	197	6.8			
WEST	SCL	Peak	981	CUST	North Seattle	15.1	62%	183	6.0			
WEST	SCL	Peak	982	CUST	Redmond	51.6	69%	610	13.9			
WEST	SCL	Peak	984	CUST	Wedgwood	41.4	61%	379	12.7			
WEST	SCL	Peak	987	CUST	Rainier Beach	46.3	61%	667	19.8			
WEST	SCL	Peak	988	CUST	Mount Baker	52.6	72%	463	15.5			
WEST	SCL	Peak	994	CUST	Queen Anne	25.1	73%	240	7.8			
WEST	SCL	Peak	995	CUST	Laurelhurst	30.9	72%	147	4.9			
WEST	regular	route ave	rage: 2	008 WEST	PEAK	64.5	39%	238	13.1			

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
	2008 WEST	I PRODU	CTION	SUB	AREA	EXCEPTION ROL	IIES - NO	DI EVAL	UATE	ט	
WEST	SH	OffPeak	7		SH	Rainier Beach	40.3	22%	89	6.3	
WEST	SH	OffPeak	10		SH	Capitol Hill	18.8	2%	6	0.1	
WEST	SH	OffPeak	43		SH	Capitol Hill	36.7	20%	49	3.8	
WEST	regular	route ave	erage:	2008	WEST	OFF PEAK	60.8	36%	183	14.0	

	2008 WEST PRODUCTION SUBAREA EXCEPTION ROUTES - NOT EVALUATED									
			_							
WEST	SH	Night	7	SH	Rainier Beach	18.4	8%	37	2.0	
WEST	SH	Night	36	SH	Rainier Beach	16.8	7%	27	1.4	
WEST	SH	Night	43	SH	Capitol Hill	24.5	12%	66	4.4	
WEST	SH	Night	49	SH	U. District	14.3	6%	30	2.1	
WEST	regular	route aver	age: 20	08 WEST	OFF PEAK	37.3	20%	119	7.4	