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Mobility Framework & Equity Cabinet

- Guiding document for all Metro policy updates
- Led by the Equity Cabinet, a group of paid diverse community members
- Intended to connect racial equity directive with planning & outcomes
Equity Priority Areas

• Block group geographies
• Composite quintile score based on 5 factors:
  • People of color (40% of score)
  • People with low/no income (30% of score)
  • People with a disability (10% of score)
  • Households with low English proficiency (10% of score)
  • People who are born outside U.S. (10% of score)
Community Assets

• Locations throughout the County that serve public needs (education social services, health care; community gathering locations)

• Over 4000 locations identified

• Maintained by Service Planning, updated annually but continuously improved with community input
Using Equity Data in Service Planning

• Fixed route restructures
• Outreach
• Covid suspensions & restorations
• Service Guidelines
Job Equity Score

• Based on density of low and mid-wage jobs & jobs held by people of color

More jobs/per acre, the higher the Job Equity score
Route Opportunity Index

- Based on block group EPA scores
- Available for all routes with stops
- Quintile ranking of the percent of route’s stops in block groups with an EPA score of 5

More stops in high equity block groups, the higher the Opportunity Index score
Equity Metrics

• One locational data set:
  Community Asset geodatabase

• Three statistically derived metrics:
  1. Equity Priority Areas Scores
  2. Opportunity Index Route Scores
  3. Job Equity Score
Why develop a locational suitability analysis for F2FR Flexible Services?

• Model county-wide flexible service planning
• Merge planning processes for flexible services
• Align with the recommendations in the Mobility Framework
Definitions

Feeder-to-Fixed Route (F2FR) Service
Local transit service that provides users with connections to main-line principal arterial service, with the intention of feeding the existing fixed-route network. Serves to address the first-mile last-mile problem.

Transit Connection Locations (TCLs)
Focal points for transit and economic activity that were selected for this analysis based on areas identified by county and regional transportation plans.

Accessibility
The ease of reaching goods, services, and destinations. The Transit Accessibility score measures—in relative terms and on average—how poor the accessibility is to jobs and community assets in the area surrounding each transit connection location (TCL).
Key Policy Questions

**WHO**
- Priority Populations
  - Refugee / Immigrant individuals
  - Disabled individuals
  - Limited English Proficiency individuals
  - People of Color / Indigenous individuals
  - Low- or No-Income individuals
  - Additional Vulnerable Groups

**WHAT**
- Jobs
  - All jobs
  - Low-wage jobs

**WHEN**
- Service Times / Days
  - All-day (weekday)
  - Off-Peak (weekday)
  - Peak (weekday)
  - Weekend

**WHICH**
- F2FR Service
  - Single-hub Model - scored within hub buffer
  - High trip count at hub
  - Mid / low population density restriction
- Other Flexible Services
  - No population density restriction
  - Multi-hub Model - variable scoring processes
Two-Pronged Approach

Unmet Need
- High Concentrations of Priority Populations
- Low All-Day Transit Accessibility

Service Feasibility
- Trip Count Filter: 40th percentile of transit trips
- Density Filter: 4-18 residents/acre
Analytical Approach

Transit Connection Locations

County Unmet Need Block Group Scores

Scoring each 2-Mile Service Area

Ranked and Filtered Transit Connection Locations

King County
METRO
Spot Improvements

• Low-cost, quick-fix traffic changes to improve transit operations

Examples:
• Queue jump signals
• Traffic signal modifications
• Turn prohibitions
• Channelization (changing width, alignment, or direction of lanes)
• Dedicated bus lanes
How Did We Prioritize Before?

- Does it address a safety concern?
- Ridership
- Bus volumes
- Amount of measured delay

Projects limited by
- Cost
- City resources/opportunities
Where are projects Located?

- Prioritization measures tend to favor projects in the City of Seattle
- Spot Improvements benefit people on the bus, not necessarily where the project is located
- Opportunity Index provides appropriate and useful ESJ prioritization
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associated Routes</th>
<th>Safety (Y/N)</th>
<th>Impacted Daily Riders</th>
<th>AM/PM peak buses/hr</th>
<th>Delay (sec.)</th>
<th>Opportunity Index (max of all routes)</th>
<th>Safety Score</th>
<th>Ridership Score</th>
<th>Frequency Score</th>
<th>Delay Score</th>
<th>ESJ Score</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>128, 150, F Line</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6790</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124, 522, 545</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>9200</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 9, 106</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>8800</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150, 162, 183</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3460</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111, 212, 218, 550</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6720</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50, 55, 773, C Line</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7480</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spot Improvement Intake & Prioritization Spreadsheet (excerpt)**

- ESJ score combined with other metrics to determine total score
- Locations with high total score likely to be selected for further development
- Multiple routes at one location: Use highest scoring route as ESJ score
Stories + Numbers = A Balanced Approach

Data & Analysis
- Equity Analysis
- System Evaluation Data

Community Input
- Stakeholder Meetings
- Mobility Board Workshop
- Employer Engagement
- Rider Survey
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