Discussion and trade-offs

- What problem are we trying to solve? What outcomes do you want to achieve?
- Should Metro account for social equity any differently than it does now? Are they defining social equity correctly? Are they using the appropriate measures in their analysis?
- Would you suggest any changes to service guidelines or the planning process to account for social equity objectives?
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Social Equity and Public Transportation
Metro’s rider demographics

**Metro riders by income (Rider/Non-Rider)**
- Less than $35K - 26%
- $35k-$75k - 30%
- Greater than $100k - 31%
- $75k-$100k - 12%

**Median Household Income**
- All Riders $67,988
- Regular Riders $65,396
- Infrequent Riders $72,811

**King County Households**
- $71,811

*American Community Survey, 2009-2013

**Metro riders by race/ethnicity (Rider/Non-Rider)**
- Caucasian - 76%
- Black - 4%
- Other - 4%
- Hispanic - 6%
- Asian - 11%

**King County Demographics (Census)**
- White 71%
- Black 6%
- Hispanic 9%
- Asian 16%

*Included in other categories

Service Guidelines Task Force
People with lower incomes and minority populations tend to rely more on public transit

- Households in King County making less than $35,000 per year are **50 percent more likely** to use transit than other income groups.

- Minority populations in King County are **40 percent more likely** to use transit to get to work than non-minority populations.
King County

Definition: All people have full and equal access to opportunities that enable them to attain their full potential.

Laws and Policies related to Equity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental Justice in Low Income and Minority populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improving Access to Persons with Limited English Proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Environmental Policy Act of 1969</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/ Regional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Washington State Environmental Policy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PSRC Transportation 2040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Washington State Growth Management Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• “Fair and Just” Principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Advancing Equity and Social Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Executive Translation Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Metro Strategic Plan and Service Guidelines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social Equity in Metro’s Service Guidelines
Social Equity is reflected in our data analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Social Equity</th>
<th>Geographic Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Riders in low-income areas</td>
<td>Connections to regional centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs and Students</td>
<td>Riders in minority areas</td>
<td>Connections to transit activity centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Social Equity factors included in annual analysis affects 68% of corridors

Methodology
1. Identify Census Tracts based on Social Equity factors
2. Calculate Boardings
3. Identify systemwide average
4. Meets Systemwide Threshold $\rightarrow$ Receives ‘Points’
Metro’s 2014 investment need reflects Social Equity factors

- 486,500 hours identified on 58 corridors
- Social Equity factors reflected in 44 corridors
  - 26 corridors meet both low-income and minority thresholds
  - 10 corridors meet only minority threshold
  - 8 corridors meet only low-income threshold
Social Equity factors increase investment need

- Social Equity factors identify higher target service levels
- If Social Equity factors were not included, over 50% of corridors would be identified as needing less investment
Social Equity factors decrease a route’s potential for reduction

- **4 Reduction Priorities**
  1. Lowest performing routes (bottom 25%), at or above target service level
  2. Restructures
  3. Low performing routes (25%-50%), at or above target service level
  4. Lowest performing routes (bottom 25%), **below target service level**

- Metro seeks to preserve service to the fourth reduction category so that we do not worsen the deficiency between the network we have and our target network

- When reducing service, Metro maintains connections to urban areas surrounded by rural land
Social Equity and Metro’s Planning and Community Engagement Process
Metro addresses social equity throughout its planning process.
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Equity is a guiding factor in how Metro plans service

- All planning processes include outreach to populations with the greatest needs based on social and economic factors.
- Metro develops and maintains partnerships with community organizations.
- Metro maintains service to all designated centers regardless of productivity, which benefits those with limited transportation options.
- Service equity analysis identifies the impacts of major service changes.
Service design guidelines influence how routes are planned and implemented

- Make network connections
- Serve multiple purposes and destinations
- Provide service that is easy to understand
- Space routes appropriately
- Provide direct service
- Consider route length and neighborhood route segments
Case study: Route 50

- Construction at the VA Medical Center required Metro to remove direct service to the facility.
- Metro will reinstate service on Route 50 to the Medical Center once construction is complete.
Case study: Route 27

- Route 27 was identified for reduction during the service reductions process due to route spacing design guidelines and performance.
Social equity and destination data
Destination data sets considered by Metro

- **Hoovers Dataset**
  - 7,092 Healthcare facilities
  - 7,495 Retail facilities
  - 2,758 Social service providers
  - 2,065 Grocery stores
  - 3,490 Personal services

- **Total of 22,900 records**
Example – how to value 7,000 healthcare destinations

Healthcare Facilities in King County
Source: Hoovers Data Set, 2012

- Ambulatory Health Care Services
- Chiropractors
- Dentists
- Hospitals
- Kidney Dialysis Centers
- Mental Health & Substance Abuse Services
- Nursing Homes
- Offices of independent physicians
- Optometrists
Healthcare facilities in the Central District
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Health care facilities in Auburn and Bellevue
Destination data use

- Destination data difficult to use in service guidelines analysis
- Planning and community engagement process could benefit from its use
  - Identify a database of social service agencies
  - Contact those in impacted areas when considering changes to service
Discussion and trade-offs

- What problem are we trying to solve? What outcomes do you want to achieve?
- Should Metro account for social equity any differently than it does now? Are they defining social equity correctly? Are they using the appropriate measures in their analysis?
- Would you suggest any changes to service guidelines or the planning process to account for social equity objectives?
Transit System Values
Values are reflected in Metro’s transit products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit products</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peak-only commuter-oriented service</td>
<td>Predominately freeway-based and oriented to commuters</td>
<td>Policy-driven, helps to manage our region’s roadways, supports economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban all-day service</td>
<td>Predominately all-day service that connects high density land uses</td>
<td>Productive, well used service that meets a variety of needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban all-day service</td>
<td>Predominately all-day service that connects medium-density land uses</td>
<td>Provides less productive, poorer performing service to ensure regional mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural service</td>
<td>Service that connects low-density land uses to centers</td>
<td>Provides less productive service to meet baseline mobility needs for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative services</td>
<td>Provides alternatives to fixed-route services, including VanPool, Rideshare, and other services</td>
<td>Provides mobility to places where fixed-route services may not be as effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion and trade-offs

- Would you suggest any changes to the values that currently shape Metro’s transit services? If so, what changes and why?
- Where would services be gained and where would they be decreased? From a county wide perspective, are those trade-offs acceptable?
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Social Equity and Transit System Values
April 30, 2015
Geographic Value factors increase investment need

- Geographic factors improve target service levels
- If Geographic Value factors were not included, 28% of corridors would receive less investment need

Change to current corridor investments if geographic value removed from analysis:
- No change to investment need (40 corridors)
- Change in investment (10 corridors)
- Lose all investment (8 corridors)