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**Metro Connects Policy Updates**

Community Advocates Workshop

September 29, 2020
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**Recap and Goals for Today**

* Recap of past meetings​
* Early August – overview of policy updates​
* Late August – proposed changes to Service Guidelines (workshop #1)​
* Today: Discuss potential changes to the Metro Connects service network maps, based on planning to-date, an equity analysis, and other factors
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**Reminder: Three Policy Documents to Update**

**Strategic Plan:** Goals, strategies, objectives, performance measures

**Metro Connects:** Long-range plan Vision for service in 2040

 [highlighted to indicate that this is what we will discuss today]

**Service Guidelines:** How service is put on the road; formulas to add, reduce service
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**Metro Connects Network Map Updates**

Three key changes include

1. Update implementation timelines and known changes​
2. Identify equity gaps​
3. Evaluate RapidRide Network
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**Metro Connects Network Map Updates: Implementation Timelines and Known Changes**

Current Metro Connects Network Map

* Includes a 2025 version and a 2040 version

Updated Metro Connects Network Map

* Will include an interim version in place of the 2025 network, and a 2050 version in place of the 2040 version
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Current Metro Connects Network Map

* Equity Factors: race and income

Updated Metro Connects Network Map

* Equity factors: race, income, language spoken, immigrants and refugees, disability
* Accessibility analysis: refined analysis based on the Mobility Framework
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**Process for Equity Gap Analysis of Interim Network**

**Demographic Analysis**

Analyze proximity of both priority populations and other households to bus stops

1. ½ mile of frequent service
2. ¼ mile of local service
3. Limited Access

Use same approach and data from the Service Guidelines update (block groups)

**Accessibility Analysis (in progress)**

**Next Steps**

* Work with the Equity Cabinet and other stakeholders to determine how to prioritize which gaps to address and develop potential mobility solutions
* Discuss potential alternative approaches to addressing gaps with partners (i.e. more affordable housing in areas with better access, improved bike and whalk access to bus stops, etc.)
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**Map: Access for all populations**

* Map illustrates where access to transit service is limited for both priority and other populations
* Metro Connects interim network result in fewer gaps in access to transit for priority populations than other , but gaps remain

Map description: map shows where there are gaps in access to transit for priority populations in purple and gaps for-non priority populations in green. There is much more green than purple throughout the county. Concentrations of purple show up predominantly in south King County and South Seattle, but with some in east King County including Bellevue and Redmond.
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**Map: Priority Populations Focus**

Map focuses in on gaps for priority populations

Gaps are caused by different factors (service gaps, challenge in walkability to stops, etc.), some of which are out of Metro’s control

Map description: same map as in previous slide but with green removed to highlight the purple areas.
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**Results: Interim Network Improves Access**

Table showing how well the current network and the interim network score on a series of equity factors and what is the percent change between them.

**How close are transit stops to where all people live?**

 Frequent network: current network 53%; Interim network 57%; percent change 6%

 Full network: current network 71%; Interim network 77%; percent change 7%

**How close are transit stops to where Black & African Americans populations live?**

 Frequent network: current network 62%; Interim network 66%; percent change 5%

 Full network: current network 79%; Interim network 86%; percent change 8%

**How close are transit stops to where Low-Income persons live?**

 Frequent network: current network 60%; Interim network 64%; percent change 7%

 Full network: current network 78%; Interim network 83%; percent change 6%

**How close are transit stops to where People of Color live?**

 Frequent network: current network 56%; Interim network 60%; percent change 6%

 Full network: current network 75%; Interim network 81%; percent change 8%

**How close are transit stops to where people with disabilities live?**

 Frequent network: current network 55%; Interim network 68%; percent change 22%

 Full network: current network 80%; Interim network 81%; percent change 2%

 ​

**How close are transit stops to where people with Limited English Proficiency live?**

 Frequent network: current network 66%; Interim network 68%; percent change 3%

 Full network: current network 81%; Interim network 86%; percent change 6%
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**Results: Areas with Limited Access Still Exist**

Text description of map 1: same map as previous slide shown but zoomed in to Northeast King County (Shoreline, Lake Forest Park, north Seattle) showing very few areas of purple.

Text description of map 2: map zoomed in to South King County (Federal Way, SeaTac, Des Moines, Skyway, Kent, Auburn, ,Covington, Renton) with many areas in purple.
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**Discussion: Metro Connects Equity Gap Analysis**

* Do the results of this analysis reflect what you see in your communities? What stands out?​
* How should Metro prioritize potential changes to the interim network?​
	+ Metro will not be able to address all the identified gaps, and some are best addressed by approaches other than changes to the transit network. ​
	+ Ideas to consider: % people of color and/or low-income, density, times of day
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**What Makes a RapidRide Corridor**

* RapidRide provides a high level of service through high frequency service, faster and more reliable travel, and premium amenities, which are central to high-capacity transit ​
* Significant capital investment is required to support this level of service​
* Each RapidRide corridor is unique and each will look different, but there are common standards for identifying corridors appropriate for future RapidRide service​
* Good candidates for RapidRide service should have:​
	+ Potential for strong service demand/high ridership​
	+ Build out the regional high-capacity transit network, providing connections

Text description of map: map shows 2040 RapidRide Network from current Metro Connects plan. Red lines indicate RapidRide corridors through and they are shown connecting communities throughout King County. Blue lines indicating Sound Transit’s planned link light rail network are overlaid to show the full planned high capacity transit network.
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**Metro Connects Network Map Updates: Evaluate RapidRide Network**

Current Metro Connects Service Map RapidRide network:

* Outdated (2016 information)
* 26 lines identified to build by 2040
* Equity factors: race and income

Updated Metro Connects Service Map RapidRide Network:

* Updated with lines planned or build since 2016
* Size network based on realities of time and cost to deliver (lines may change from RapidRide to frequent or another type of service, but not removed)
* Equity factors: based on Mobility Framework
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**Mobility Framework informed assessment approach**

**Guiding principles (examples)**​

* Invest where needs are greatest​
* Address climate crisis and environmental justice​
* Provide fast, reliable, integrated mobility services​
* Improve access to mobility​
* Encourage dense, affordable housing in urban areas near transit​
* Align investments with equity, sustainability, and financial responsibility ​

**Recommendations (examples)**​

* Provide additional transit service in areas with unmet need​
* Meet King County’s climate goals​
	+ Provide increased transit frequency, as funding allows, to make it more convenient for people to get out of their cars.​
* Support improvements to increase speed and reliability ​
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**Process for RapidRide Network Assessment**

* **Start​**

Define RapidRide characteristics.​

- Arterial bus rapid transit service​

- High frequency service with high level of amenities​

- Major capital investments in speed and reliability, stations and buses, access improvements, and other community priorities​

Include RapidRide corridors originally in Metro Connects + select non-RapidRide corridors​

* **Assessment Step 1​**
* Screen based on:​

- Strong service network demand​

- Helps build out regional high capacity transit network ​

* **Assessment Step 2​**
* Prioritize based on:​

- Equity ​

- Environmental​

- Capital/Speed and Reliability​

- Service​

- Implementation​

Determine total network size
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**Step 1: Identify Routes for Prioritization (in process)**

**Goal: Identify corridors that are good candidates for RaidRide service**

* Consider a minimum threshold for future ridership​
	+ 4,000 average daily riders (like F Line today)​
* Evaluate future ridership AND connectivity value​
	+ Ridership = Total rides per hour​
	+ Connectivity Value = Change in jobs accessible within 45 minutes if corridor removed​
* Remove routes that performed poorly on both measures​
* All remaining corridors move forward to Step 2 for prioritization

Text description of map: title is Current Planned Network. Shows red lines indicating RapidRide corridors that are either currently operating, under construction or budgeted.
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**Step 2: Prioritization Factors**

**Equity**​

* Priority populations served (totals or percent)​
* Low-income jobs\* within corridor​

**Environmental**​

* New riders gained​
* Reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled  (VMT)​
* Total number of housing/jobs within corridor​

**Capital/Speed and Reliability**​

* Speed & reliability needs​
* Corridor/roadway compatibility​

**Service**​

* Rides per hour​
* Essential Trips (COVID-19 ridership retained)​
* Connectivity value​

**Implementation:**Assessment of recent or planned transit/road investment within corridor

**Text description of graphic:** table showing how four RapidRide lines were scored on equity factors. The four RapidRide lines are I, J, K, and R. The four categories are how well it serves households identified as low-income, people of color, limited English speaking, and people with a disability. RapidRide I line scored medium on all factors except Limited-English where it scored low. RapidRide J scored high an all except Limited-English where it scored low. RapidRide K scored low on all factors. RapidRide R scored high on all factors.
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**Discussion**

* What questions or comments do you have about the prioritization approach and measures?​
* Do you feel like the approach aligns with the Mobility Framework and will advance equity and sustainability?
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**Closing and Questions**