SPECIAL MEETING

Pursuant to K.C.C. 1.24.035 A. and F., this meeting is also noticed as a meeting of the Metropolitan King County Council, whose agenda is limited to the committee business. In this meeting only the rules and procedures applicable to committees apply and not those applicable to full council meetings.

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Public Comment
4. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of the November 19, 2019 meeting pp. 5-10

Consent

5. Proposed Motion No. 2019-0453 pp. 11-16

A MOTION confirming the executive’s appointment of David Osborn, who resides in council district seven, to the King County Lake Geneva management district advisory board.

Sponsors: Mr. von Reichbauer

Leah Krekel-Zoppi, Council Staff
6. **Proposed Motion No. 2019-0438** pp. 17-24

A MOTION providing direction to the conservation futures advisory committee on priorities for allocating conservation futures tax levy funds.

*Sponsors:* Mr. Dunn

Jeff Muhm, Chief Policy Officer

**Discussion and Possible Action**

7. **Proposed Ordinance No. 2019-0437** pp. 25-34

AN ORDINANCE renewing and extending a six-month moratorium prohibiting the establishment of new or expansion of existing major fossil fuel facilities.

*Sponsors:* Mr. Upthegrove and Ms. Kohl-Welles

Andy Micklow, Council Staff

**Discussion Only**

8. **Proposed Ordinance No. 2019-0413** pp. 35-120


**Sponsors:** Mr. Upthegrove

Erin Auzins, Council Staff

9. **Proposed Motion No. 2019-0464** pp. 121-422

A MOTION relating to public transportation, adopting the Metro Mobility Framework Recommendations Summary and outlining a process for the development of updates to the Metro transit department's adopted policies.

**Sponsors:** Ms. Balducci

Paul Carlson and Terra Rose, Council Staff

**Discussion and Possible Action**

10. **Proposed Ordinance No. 2019-0444** pp. 423-446

AN ORDINANCE approving the grant funding allocation for the projects funded through the WaterWorks grant program, Round 4, in accordance with the 2019-2020 Biennial Budget Ordinance, Ordinance 18835, Section 108, and Ordinance 18261.

**Sponsors:** Mr. Upthegrove

Mike Reed, Council Staff

**Adjournment**
1:30 PM Tuesday, November 19, 2019 Room 1001

DRAFT MINUTES

Pursuant to K.C.C. 1.24.035 A. and F., this meeting is also noticed as a meeting of the Metropolitan King County Council, whose agenda is limited to the committee business. In this meeting only the rules and procedures applicable to committees apply and not those applicable to full council meetings.

1. Call to Order

Chair Upthegrove called the meeting to order at 1:38 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Present: 6 - Ms. Balducci, Ms. Kohl-Welles, Mr. McDermott, Mr. Dembowski, Mr. Upthegrove and Mr. von Reichbauer

Excused: 1 - Ms. Lambert

3. Public Comment

The following persons spoke:
1. Alex Tsimerman
2. Julien Loh
3. Kassech Zenebe
4. Leslie Morgan
5. Elizabeth Burton
6. Annie Phillips
7. David Kappler

4. Approval of Minutes

Councilmember von Reichbauer moved approval of the minutes of the November 5, 2019 meeting. Seeing no objections, the minutes were approved.
Discussion and Possible Action

5. Proposed Ordinance No. 2019-0433

AN ORDINANCE relating to planning and permitting, and amending Ordinance 10870, Section 330, as amended, and K.C.C. 21A.08.030 and Ordinance 10870, Section 331, as amended, and K.C.C. 21A.08.040.

*Erin Auzins, Council Staff, briefed the committee and answered questions from the members.*

A motion was made by Vice-Chair von Reichbauer that this Ordinance be Recommended Do Pass. The motion carried by the following vote:

- **Yes:** 5 - Ms. Kohl-Welles, Mr. McDermott, Mr. Dembowski, Mr. Upthegrove and Mr. von Reichbauer
- **No:** 1 - Ms. Balducci
- **Excused:** 1 - Ms. Lambert

6. Proposed Ordinance No. 2019-0409

AN ORDINANCE relating to the operation and maintenance of the Seattle Streetcar on behalf of the city of Seattle; adopting an agreement between King County and the city of Seattle.

*Terra Rose, Council Staff, briefed the committee and answered questions from the members.*

Councilmember McDermott moved amendment 1. The motion passed.

Councilmember McDermott moved title amendment T1. The motion passed.

A motion was made by Councilmember McDermott that this Ordinance be Recommended Do Pass Substitute. The motion carried by the following vote:

- **Yes:** 5 - Ms. Balducci, Ms. Kohl-Welles, Mr. McDermott, Mr. Dembowski and Mr. Upthegrove
- **Excused:** 2 - Ms. Lambert and Mr. von Reichbauer

7. Proposed Motion No. 2019-0434

A MOTION relating to communitywide greenhouse gas emissions; directing the executive to conduct further outreach and engagement with local governments and other stakeholders, and to develop a toolkit for local governments to use in planning, implementing and monitoring actions to reduce greenhouse gases.

*Jake Tracy, Council Staff, briefed the committee and answered questions from the members.*

A motion was made by Councilmember Balducci that this Motion be Recommended Do Pass Consent. The motion carried by the following vote:

- **Yes:** 5 - Ms. Balducci, Ms. Kohl-Welles, Mr. McDermott, Mr. Dembowski and Mr. Upthegrove
- **Excused:** 2 - Ms. Lambert and Mr. von Reichbauer
8. **Proposed Ordinance No. 2019-0435**

AN ORDINANCE requiring the implementation of a strategy to accelerate the adoption of electric vehicles; amending Ordinance 17166, Section 2, as amended, and K.C.C. 18.50.010 and adding a new chapter to K.C.C. Title 18.

Jenny Giambattista, Council Staff, briefed the committee and answered questions from the members. John Resha, Assistant General Manager, Finance and Administration, and Diane Carlson, Director, Capital Division, King County Metro, provided comments and answered questions from the members. Matt Kuharic, Senior Climate Change Specialist, Department of Natural Resources and Parks, and Megan Smith, Director of Climate and Energy Initiatives, King County Executive's Office, also answered questions from the members. Tom Koney, Deputy Director, Department of Executive Services, also provided comments.

This matter was Deferred

9. **Proposed Ordinance No. 2019-0436**

AN ORDINANCE relating to the King County Strategic Climate Action Plan; requiring the 2020 Strategic Climate Action Plan Update and all subsequent updates be developed using an environmental justice framework and the inclusion of a green jobs strategy and a sustainable and resilient community strategy; and amending Ordinance 17270, Section 2, as amended, and K.C.C. 18.25.010 and Ordinance 17166, Section 2, as amended, and K.C.C. 18.50.010.

Jenny Giambattista, Council Staff, briefed the committee. Megan Smith, Director of Climate and Energy Initiatives, King County Executive's Office, answered questions from the members.

A motion was made by Councilmember Dembowski that this Ordinance be Recommended Do Pass. The motion carried by the following vote:

**Yes**: 5 - Ms. Balducci, Ms. Kohl-Welles, Mr. McDermott, Mr. Dembowski and Mr. Upthegrove

**Excused**: 2 - Ms. Lambert and Mr. von Reichbauer
Discussion Only


This matter was Deferred
Other Business

There was no other business to come before the committee.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Approved this _____________ day of _______________

______________________________
Clerk's Signature
SUBJECT

Proposed Motion 2019-0453 would confirm the Executive’s appointment of David Osborn, who resides in Council District seven, to the King County Lake Geneva Management District Advisory Board, for a term to expire on June 30, 2022.

BACKGROUND

Ordinance 18282 created Lake Management District No. 2 in the Lake Geneva Watershed, after following the process required by RCW Chapter 36.61. Section 7 of Ordinance 18282 created a “Lake Management District No. 2 Advisory Committee” to advise the County on the administration of the district. The committee is to be comprised of five members, including:

- Three property owners in the district, one of whom must be a representative of the Lake Geneva Property Owners Association;
- A representative from the King County Parks and Recreation Division; and
- A representative from the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife.

The committee members who represent property owners are to be nominated by the Executive and confirmed by the Council. Committee members are appointed to three year terms.

APPOINTEE INFORMATION

Mr. Osborn is a member of the Lake Geneva Property Owners Association, where he has served as Vice President. Mr. Osborn is retired from the industrial and food processing industries, and previously worked as a research biochemist and microbiologist.

ANALYSIS

Staff has not identified any issues with the proposed appointment. It appears to be consistent with the requirements of Ordinance 18282.
ATTACHMENTS

1. Proposed Motion 2019-0453
2. Transmittal Letter
Motion

Proposed No. 2019-0453.1  Sponsors von Reichbauer

1 A MOTION confirming the executive's appointment of
2 David Osborn, who resides in council district seven, to the
3 King County Lake Geneva management district advisory
4 board.
5
6  BE IT MOVED by the Council of King County:
7  The county executive's appointment of David Osborn, who resides in council
8 district seven, to the King County Lake Geneva management district advisory board, for
the remainder of a three-year term to expire on June 30, 2022, is hereby confirmed.

KING COUNTY COUNCIL
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

________________________________________
Rod Dembowski, Chair

ATTEST:

________________________________________
Melani Pedroza, Clerk of the Council

APPROVED this _____ day of _______________, ______.

________________________________________
Dow Constantine, County Executive

Attachments: None
October 4, 2019

The Honorable Rod Dembowski
Chair, King County Council
Room 1200
COURTHOUSE

Dear Councilmember Dembowski:

Enclosed for consideration and approval by the King County Council is a motion confirming the appointment of David Osborn, who resides in council district seven, to the King County Lake Geneva Management District Advisory Board, for the remainder of a three-year term expiring June 30, 2022.

Enclosed with this transmittal are the following attachments: Attachment A - Osborn application; Attachment B - Osborn financial disclosure form; Attachment C - LGMD board profile; and Attachment D - Osborn appointment letter. This appointment request supports the King County Strategic Plan goal of public engagement by expanding opportunities to seek input, listen, and respond to residents.

If you have any questions about this appointment, please have your staff call Rick Ybarra, liaison for boards & commissions, at 206-263-9651.

Sincerely,

Dow Constantine
King County Executive

cc: King County Councilmembers
    ATTN: Carolyn Busch, Chief of Staff
    Melani Pedroza, Clerk of the Council
    Dwight Dively, Director, Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget
    Rick Ybarra, Liaison for Boards & Commissions
    Chris Knutson, Staff Liaison
    David Osborn

King County is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer
and complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act
SUBJECT

Proposed Motion 2019-0438 would provide direction to the Conservation Futures Advisory Committee for Council priorities on the use of Conservation Futures Tax (CFT) funds for acquisition of property rights in and around Soos Creek park, and the Spring Lake-Desire park-McGarvey Park complex open space areas in the Fairwood community.

SUMMARY

Proposed Motion 2019-0438 would use the Council’s authority under K.C.C. 26.12.010 to express the Council’s interest in prioritizing CFT projects around Soos Creek park and the Spring Lake-Lake Desire park-McGarvey park open space complex. The proposed motion notes that these areas provide wildlife habitat and aquatic resources in the Fairwood community.

Actual CFT project applications in response to the stated priority would be submitted by King County (as the local government for the area) through the regular CFT review process. If project applications are received, the CFT Advisory Committee will review the applications as part of its review process during spring 2020. The CFT Advisory Committee will transmit its recommendations for funding to the Council and Executive during the summer. The Executive will propose specific funding recommendations to the Council as part of the 2021-2022 biennial budget.

BACKGROUND

Conservation futures tax (CFT) levy funds are authorized by state law¹ to acquire property rights to conserve open space lands. CFT levy funds are collected throughout King County as a dedicated portion of the property tax. Open space lands are defined in K.C.C. 26.12.003 and RCW 84.34.020 to include open space, agricultural lands, and timber lands. CFT funds are allowed to be used to protect, preserve, maintain, improve, restore, limit the future use of, or other otherwise conserve open space lands.

---

¹ Conservation futures are established in RCW 84.34.200 through .240.
K.C.C. chapter 26.12 defines the process and criteria for the allocation of CFT levy funds, done through the county’s budget process. Project applications are submitted to King County, normally by the local jurisdiction where the property is located. These project applications are reviewed by the CFT Advisory Committee, which makes a recommendation to the Executive on funding allocations based on the selection criteria. The Executive includes recommendation for funding allocation in the proposed budget, which the Council reviews, amends, and adopts. In most case project applicants are required to have a local match to the CFT funds, and to enter into an interlocal agreement with the County to ensure continued conservation of the acquired property.

**ANALYSIS**

K.C.C. 26.12.010.B. allows the Council to establish evaluation priorities for the CFT Advisory Committee to consider during their project selection and funding recommendation process. A Council motion establishing priorities would give the CFT Citizens’ Oversight Committee direction to look for and prioritize projects that meet criteria defined in the motion.

Proposed Motion 2019-0438 would set an evaluation priority for one or more projects that includes the purchase of property rights in and around Soos Creek Park and the Spring Lake-Desire park-McGarvey Park complex open space areas. The proposed motion notes that these areas, which are located in the Fairwood community of unincorporated King County, provide wildlife habitat, aquatic resources and community separation for the area.

Submittal of a project application would be subject to the submittal requirements in the code. If the Council chooses to set a priority, the code requires a motion to be adopted by the Council no later than March 1 of each year. This proposed motion would be in effect for the 2020 application review cycle, for projects that would be proposed to the Council for funding in 2021.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Proposed Motion 2019-0438
Motion

Proposed No. 2019-0438.1  Sponsors Dunn

A MOTION providing direction to the conservation futures advisory committee on priorities for allocating conservation futures tax levy funds.

WHEREAS, RCW 84.34.010 declares that it is in the best interest of the state to maintain, preserve, conserve and otherwise continue in existence adequate open space lands for the production of food, fiber and forest crops and to ensure the use and enjoyment of natural resources and scenic beauty for the economic and social well-being of the state and its citizens, and

WHEREAS, RCW 84.34.210 authorizes the county to acquire property rights "to protect, preserve, maintain, improve, restore, limit the future use of, or other otherwise conserve, selected open space land, farm and agricultural land, and timber land," and

WHEREAS, property right acquired under this authorization are defined as conservation futures, and

WHEREAS, RCW 84.34.230 authorizes the use of a property tax levy to fund the acquisition of conservation futures and the maintenance and operation of acquired properties, and

WHEREAS, RCW 84.34.240 authorizes counties to establish a special conservation futures fund to which the levy proceeds are credited, and

WHEREAS, King County has established a conservation futures tax levy and
WHEREAS, King County is required to establish a process to help ensure, over
time, that the distribution of the tax levy is throughout the county, and
WHEREAS, K.C.C. chapter 26.12 establishes an annual process for distribution
of the tax levy to acquire open space lands, including green spaces, greenbelts, wildlife
habitat and trail rights-of-way, and
WHEREAS, the process includes an advisory committee that makes project and
funding allocation recommendations for each project to the executive, and
WHEREAS, the executive makes project and funding recommendations as part of
the budget process, and
WHEREAS, K.C.C. 26.12.010 allows the council to adopt a motion providing
direction to the conservation futures advisory committee on priorities for evaluating
project applications, and
WHEREAS, K.C.C. 26.12.025 establishes criteria for conservation futures project
selection, which provides: "wildlife habitat or rare plant reserve; salmon habitat and
aquatic resources; scenic resources; community separator; historic or cultural resources;
urban passive-use natural area or greenbelt; park, open space or natural corridor addition;
and passive recreation opportunity in an area with unmet needs; and projects that seek to
redress historic disparities in access to or health benefits of open space in opportunity areas.
Additional criteria may include: educational or interpretive opportunity; impact to open
space resources; feasibility, including ownership complexity, a willing seller or sellers or
community support; partnerships; if the property identified in an adopted comprehensive
plan, park open space, habitat, cultural resource or community plan; transfer of
motion development rights participation; stewardship and maintenance; regional significance;
adopted financial policies; and any other criteria consistent with chapter 84.34 RCW," and
Motion 15513 gives additional detail on project eligibility criteria, and
WHEREAS, Soos Creek park is located within a wildlife habitat network corridor
that provides habitat for over one hundred twenty bird species, including the red tailed
hawk and the great blue heron, and other animals such as black bears, cougars, bobcats,
red foxes and coyotes, and
WHEREAS, Soos Creek park serves as a community separator, provides passive
recreational opportunities, and provides salmon habitat and aquatic resources, and
WHEREAS, addition of forested open space properties adjacent to Soos Creek
park would add to the natural corridor, would protect wildlife habitat, would bolster the
park's function as a community separator and would provide greater access to the park for
residents living on its east side, and
WHEREAS, the Spring Lake-Lake Desire park-McGarvey park open space
complex consists of over nine hundred twenty five acres of contiguous protected open
space in an area that contains over five miles of recreational trails, and
WHEREAS, the Spring Lake-Lake Desire park-McGarvey park open space
complex serves as a community separator and provides salmon habitat and aquatic
resources, as well as habitat for deer, coyotes, river otters and bears, and
WHEREAS, addition of open space properties to the Spring Lake-Lake Desire
park-McGarvey park open space complex would protect wildlife habitat and bolster the
complex's function as a community separator, and
WHEREAS, use of conservation future tax levy funds for purchase of property
rights in the area of the Soos Creek park and the Spring Lake-Lake Desire park-
McGarvey park open space complex for wildlife habitat, aquatic resources, a community
separator, or addition to an existing open space area meets the criteria in K.C.C.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT MOVED by the Council of King County:

A. The council establishes as a priority for the conservation futures advisory
committee's consideration during the annual project selection and funding
recommendation process, one or more projects that includes the purchase or property
rights for the purpose of wildlife habitat, aquatic resources, community separator function
or open space system addition in or near Soos creek park, including parcel numbers
3423059062 and 3323059034, and the Spring Lake-Lake Desire park-McGarvey park
open space complex, including parcel number 2523059086, in the unincorporated
Fairwood community, to preserve the existing open space.

B. The department of natural resources and parks, water and land resources
division, is requested to work with landowners and jurisdictions in which properties
reflecting this priority is located, in submitting project proposals that meet this priority, as
part of the 2020 conservation futures tax levy funding selection process provided for in K.C.C. 26.12.010.
SUBJECT

Proposed Ordinance 2019-0437 would extend a current moratorium prohibiting the establishment of new or expansion of existing major fossil fuel facilities.

SUMMARY

The Council adopted Ordinance 18866 in January 2019 prohibiting the establishment of new or expansion of existing major fossil fuel facilities in King County. In July 2019, the Council adopted Ordinance 18946 renewing and extending the moratorium prohibiting the establishment of new or expansion of existing major fossil fuel facilities for an additional six months.

Proposed Ordinance 2019-0437 would extend the moratorium for an additional six months, through July 2020. It is anticipated that the Council will take action on the Comprehensive Plan update, which includes integrated work related to the moratorium study, in June 2020 after the current major fossil fuel facilities moratorium expires.

BACKGROUND

In January 2019, the council adopted Ordinance 18866. This ordinance established a six-month moratorium prohibiting the establishment of new or expansion of existing major fossil fuel facilities and directing the Executive to produce a detailed study to address the issues and circumstances necessitating the moratorium. This moratorium was adopted pursuant to the Shoreline Management Act, RCW 90.58.590, and the Washington state Growth Management Act, RCW 36.70A.390. The required public hearing was held on March 13, 2019. Findings adopted in this ordinance cite the impact of greenhouse gas emissions and fossil fuels, as a major source of carbon dioxide, on the earth's climate and the potential public health and ecological risks that could result from new major fossil fuel facilities.

Ordinance 18866 directed the Executive to study major fossil fuel facilities and:
- Review use classifications for major fossil fuel facilities and evaluate whether the classifications are consistent with state laws and adequately address the impacts and concerns identified in the findings of fact;
• Review literature on the community impacts of major fossil fuel facilities and efforts by other local governments to limit the impacts of this use type;
• Propose any necessary amendments to development regulations, permitting processes, environmental policies, the Comprehensive Plan, and the shoreline master program;
• Review and recommended any necessary changes to performance and maintenance guarantee procedures;
• Evaluate the economic and employment opportunities created from the shift to renewable energy sources; and
• Evaluate county-owned and operated fossil fuel facilities for potential health impacts.

As a requirement of Ordinance 18866, the Executive transmitted a letter in May 2019 that provides an update on the current status of the "detailed study to address the issues and circumstances necessitating the moratorium." The status letter states that Executive staff are making steady progress on the integrated work on the Moratorium Study and 2020 Comprehensive Plan update. The letter recommends renewing the moratorium to align with the 2020 Comprehensive Plan update process. In July 2019, the Council adopted Ordinance 18946, which renewed and extended the moratorium for six months through January 2020.

**ANALYSIS**

The current moratorium expires on January 27, 2020. RCW 90.58.590 and RCW 36.70A.390 authorize local governments to renew a moratorium, subject to certain criteria including public hearing and adopting findings of fact. Proposed Ordinance 2019-0437 would renew and extend the moratorium for an additional six months, commencing on January 25, 2020. It is anticipated that the Council will take action on the Comprehensive Plan update, which includes integrated work related to the moratorium study, in June 2020 after the current major fossil fuel facilities moratorium expires.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Proposed Ordinance 2019-0437

---

1 Ordinance 18866
AN ORDINANCE renewing and extending a six-month
moratorium prohibiting the establishment of new or
expansion of existing major fossil fuel facilities.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF KING COUNTY:

SECTION 1. Findings:

A. King County has the authority, under to constitutional police powers, home
rule authority, the Shoreline Management Act of 1971, chapter 90.58 RCW, and the
Washington state Growth Management Act, including chapter 36.70A RCW ("the
GMA"), to establish and renew a moratorium to preclude the acceptance of certain new
development applications while the county studies related land use issues.

B. The scientific consensus is that warming of the earth's climate is occurring at
an unprecedented rate due to anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions driven by human
activities and population growth according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate
Change Sixth Assessment Report.

C. The state of Washington found significant environmental, economic, public
safety and public health impacts resulting from climate change on this state, in both
chapter 80.80 RCW and Executive Order No. 14-04.

D. The state of Washington and King County are threatened by impacts resulting
from climate change, including warming temperatures, sea level rise on coastal
communities, diminishing snowpack and water availability, ocean acidification and forest decline.

E. King County and thirty-nine cities adopted as part of the countywide planning policies shared countywide targets in 2014 to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by fifty percent by 2030 and eighty percent by 2050 against a 2007 baseline.

F. The King County council unanimously adopted the 2015 King County Strategic Climate Action Plan in November 2015 under Motion 14449, including goals, targets and priority actions to meet these shared emission reduction targets.

G. Fossil fuels, including petroleum, coal and natural gas, are a major source of carbon dioxide, heavy metals, nitrogen oxide and sulfur dioxide, contributing to climate change and environmental pollution.

H. On numerous occasions across the United States and Canada, spills of crude oil from train derailments and tanker ships and natural gas pipeline explosions have caused numerous fatalities and illnesses, substantial loss of property and significant environmental damage.

I. King County has grave concerns about the safety of the public and environment, and the strain on public services and existing infrastructure resulting from the siting and operation of new major fossil fuel facilities.

J. In 2017, movement of crude oil and petroleum products through Washington state by rail had reached fifty-four million barrels of oil compared to no oil being moved by rail before 2012, and one hundred seventy-seven million barrels moved by pipeline within the state, a twenty-seven percent increase since 2006.

K. New major fossil fuel facilities create significant public health risks, including
air polluting resulting in impaired respiratory functions from fine particulates, noise
pollution affecting hearing loss and psychological health and exposure to heavy metals
and contaminated drinking sources resulting in cancers, premature death and lung and
heart diseases.

L. New major fossil fuel facilities pose a threat to King County's ecology,
including extensive land disturbing activities that impact natural ecosystems,
contamination of surface water and aquifers, sedimentation of rivers and streams, seismic
and geological instability and destruction of critical habitat for wildlife.

M. New and expanded major fossil fuel facilities and related land uses will
generate increased vehicle trips, noise, dust, debris and odor. The impacts of new major
fossil fuel facilities in unincorporated King County has not been fully investigated.

N. In Quinault Indian Nation v. Imperium Terminal Services LLC, 187 Wn.2d 460 (2017), the Washington Supreme Court held that the Ocean Resources Management Act ("the ORMA") applied to a land-based petroleum terminal facility. Previous decisions had limited the scope of the ORMA to on-water uses. The court recognized that the ORMA is intended to address environmental threats to Washington's coastal waters and threats posed by increased expansion of the fossil fuel industry along the Pacific Coast and held that it must be applied to a terminal expansion project that would transfer millions of gallons of petroleum products across the threshold of Washington's coast. King County should evaluate whether the ORMA should also be applied to projects within its jurisdiction. If the ORMA is determined not to apply, King County should evaluate whether it should adopt substantively similar local regulations.

O. Local governments have core responsibilities for upholding the public health,
safety and welfare, mitigating and preparing for disasters, protecting and preserving
natural systems and supporting economic development.

P. King County is preparing an update of the Comprehensive Plan, scheduled to
be adopted in June 2020. As part of the 2020 Comprehensive Plan update, King County
is reviewing major fossil fuel facilities and related land uses in unincorporated King
County to ensure that the range of impacts from major fossil fuel facilities are identified,
avoided and mitigated in order to protect public health and safety, air and water quality,
habitats, natural resource lands and other resources and functions.

Q. It is in the public interest that any land use, zoning and development
regulations are consistent with the King County Comprehensive Plan, the Shoreline
Management Act, the State Environmental Policy Act, the Growth Management Act and
other environmental and land use laws.

R. On January 28, 2019, in accordance with RCW 36.70A.390 and RCW
90.58.590, the county council adopted Ordinance 18866 as an emergency, declaring a
six-month moratorium prohibiting the establishment of new or expansion of existing
major fossil fuel facilities.

S. Following the adoption of the moratorium, the executive transmitted the
required study addressing the issues and circumstances necessitating the moratorium.

T. The detailed study identifies proposed policy and code amendments that are
consistent with and implement the direction in Ordinance 18866 and the 2020
Comprehensive Plan Scope of Work adopted by Motion 15329.

U. RCW 90.58.590 authorizes two six-month extensions of an original
moratorium, and on July 10, 2019, the council extended the original moratorium for six

v. In order to continue to fully investigate whether existing regulations and policies sufficiently protect public health and the county's natural ecosystems, surface water, and geology, and whether additional regulations are necessary to properly mitigate such impacts, it is in the public interest to renew the moratorium on the acceptance of applications for development or expansion of major fossil fuel facilities and the establishment of new or expansion of existing major fossil fuel facilities for a six-month period.

SECTION 2. A. Commencing on January 25, 2020, the moratorium declared under Ordinance 18866 and renewed and extended by Ordinance 18946 on the acceptance of applications for the establishment of new or expansion of existing, which is increasing the size, quantity or scope, of major fossil fuel facilities in unincorporated King County is hereby renewed and extended for an additional six months. An application shall not be accepted and a building permit, occupancy permit, department of public health approval, other development permits or approval of any kind shall not be issued for any of the purposes or activities prohibited by this ordinance. Any applications for land use approvals or other permits that are accepted as a result of error or by use of vague or deceptive descriptions during the moratorium are null and void and without legal force or effect. All lawfully existing uses, structures or other developments may continue to be deemed lawful conforming uses and may continue to be maintained, repaired and redeveloped, so long as the use is not expanded, under the terms of the land use and shoreline rules and regulations in place at the time of the moratorium. This moratorium shall not apply to uses and facilities necessary to address a bona fide
imminent threat to the public health, safety and welfare. This moratorium shall also not apply to uses and facilities necessary for public safety, including, but not limited to, police, fire and rescue agencies.

B. During the moratorium, the council shall consider the executive's study of major fossil fuel facilities identified in Ordinance 18866, Section 2.C.

SECTION 3. For the purposes of this ordinance:

A. "Fossil fuels" means petroleum and petroleum products, coal, and natural gas, such as methane, propane and butane, derived from prehistoric organic matter and used to generate energy. Fossil fuels do not include by-products such as asphalt, plastics, fertilizers, paints, or denatured ethanol.

B.1. "Major fossil fuel facilities" means:

a. large-scale uses and facilities engaged in the wholesale distribution, extraction, refinement or processing of fossil fuels;

b. terminals engaged in the bulk movement of fossil fuels, excluding railyards, fuel storage for airports and marine servicing facilities; and

c. bulk storage of fossil fuels in excess of two million gallons.

2. "Major fossil fuel facilities" do not provide direct sale or distribution to consumers.

SECTION 4. Severability. If any provision of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid or should any portion of this ordinance be
preempted by state or federal law or regulation, the remainder of the ordinance or the
application of the provision to other persons or circumstances is not affected.
SUBJECT

Proposed Ordinance 2019-0413 would adopt the 2020 King County Comprehensive Plan update, which includes the Skyway-West Hill Community Service Area Subarea Plan.

SUMMARY

The 2020 King County Comprehensive Plan (KCCP) update is a midpoint update under the County’s Comprehensive Planning structure. As transmitted by the Executive, changes to the KCCP are those identified in the adopted scope of work adopted by the Council in February 2019. At the previous two meetings, Executive staff briefed the Executive’s proposed Skyway-West Hill Community Service Area (CSA) Subarea Plan, and the 2020 KCCP update.

At today's meeting, Council staff will cover all of the items in the Executive’s transmitted Plan, and our identified key issues. Council staff analysis is ongoing, and the issues identified in this briefing may not be exhaustive of all substantive and technical issues the Council may want to consider. Those topics where Council staff have identified key issues include:

- **Four-to-One Program.** The changes proposed by the Executive generally create consistency with the existing program, between the KCCP, Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) and the King County Code (K.C.C.). That said, the changes are policy choices for the Council to consider.

- **Agricultural Production Districts and Public Facilities.** The changes proposed by the Executive would allow for intrusion into the Agricultural Production Districts (APDs) by public facilities in certain circumstances and with appropriate mitigation. This is a policy choice for the Council to consider.

- **Non-Resource Industrial Uses.** The changes proposed by the Executive would limit where industrial zones outside the Urban Growth Area (UGA) boundary can be located. This is a policy choice for the Council to consider.
• **Transfer of Development Rights Program.** The changes proposed by the Executive would allow for urban-to-urban transfer of development rights (TDR), with certain criteria. This is a policy choice for the Council to consider, and some of the changes may go beyond what was included in the adopted scope of work.

• **Regional Affordable Housing Task Force.** The changes proposed by the Executive would include lead-in text to Chapter 4 to acknowledge the work of the Regional Affordable Housing Task Force and future work by the Affordable Housing Committee of the Growth Management Planning Council. The scope of work called for the KCCP to acknowledge approval of the Regional Affordable Housing Plan and Action Strategy, which is missing from the Executive's proposal.

• **Affordable Housing Report.** The Executive transmitted a report that lists and describes past and upcoming housing projects on County-owned property; describes the Home and Hope Initiative, and detail the plan for completing the inventory required to be transmitted by June 2020. The Council may want to consider whether the criteria for the future inventory meet the Council's policy goals, and consider whether the Council supports the Home and Hope Initiative, which the Council has not taken official action on.

• **Cottage Housing.** The Executive's transmitted update includes modest changes to the cottage housing regulations regarding site size, parking, and design standards, which are policy choices for the Council to consider.

• **Accessory Dwelling Units/Accessory Living Quarters (ADU/ALQ).** The changes proposed by the Executive would modify standards for ADUs generally intended to encourage development of ADUs in the urban area and Rural Towns, and add separate requirements for ALQs. These changes are policy choices for the Council to consider.

• **Residential Density Incentive Program.** The Executive transmitted a report that makes recommendations for modifying the Residential Density Incentive (RDI) program. Those recommendations are at a high-level and are not accompanied by code or policy changes. The Council may want to consider whether to direct further work on this, either by the Affordable Housing Committee of the Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) or by Executive staff.

• **Sea Level Rise.** The Executive's transmitted Plan would add requirements that impact Vashon-Maury Island by establishing a sea level rise risk area and setting regulations for development within this area. These regulations would be new policy for the County.

• **Fossil Fuel Facilities.** The changes proposed by the Executive would make a series of changes, including prohibiting coal mines, separating local use of fossil fuels from larger distribution-scale fossil fuel facilities, and establishing new development regulations for fossil fuels and fossil fuel facilities. These changes are complex and interconnected and represent the largest policy change in the 2020 KCCP from a Council staff analysis perspective.

• **Organics Composting Facility Regulations.** The Executive transmitted a report that analyzes how the County regulates organic composting facilities. The Council included this item in the scope of work as an Area Zoning and Land Use Study. The Executive analyzed it as code study and noted that the study did not examine the feasibility of individual sites in the Rural Area because that is something that
occurs once a private operator selects a site and makes application for permits. The Council may wish to direct further work on this item as an Area Zoning and Land Use Study or code update, or whether to adopt any code changes identified in the code study.

- **Economic Development.** The Executive's proposal would make changes to Policy ED-604 in Chapter 10 of the KCCP, to remove examples of organizations that it will partner with on programs that strengthen the County’s economy. By not identifying any organizations, it changes the policy to give it less direction. Council staff would characterize this as broader than a "data, maps and references" update, and since it was not identified in the scope of work, could not be adopted as part of the midpoint update.

- **Bear Creek UPD.** The Executive’s transmitted Plan would establish permanent zoning for areas developed under development agreements that are expiring in 2020 and 2023. In addition to a series of map amendments, lead-in text in Chapter 11 would be updated. Council staff analysis of the proposed Bear Creek Map Amendments is ongoing, and some of the changes may be outside the adopted scope of work for the midpoint update.

- **KCCP Map Amendments.** The Executive proposes six map amendments related to:
  - Expanding the Snoqualmie APD
  - City of Woodinville Roundabout intrusion into the APD and outside the UGA
  - Upzoning a parcel in North Highline related to the White Center Impact Hub
  - Modifying the UGA, land use and zoning in the East Cougar Mountain Potential Annexation Area, and associated changes to a special district overlay and p-suffix condition
  - Modifying the UGA in Maple Valley for infrastructure and address split designations

- **Subarea Planning Technical Changes.** The Executive proposes changes that would reflect the focus of the CSA subarea plans on land use issues. The changes are inconsistent and not reflected throughout the KCCP and K.C.C., and are proposed in Chapter 11, which is not currently limited to land use issues and includes other topics, such as transportation, parks and open space, environment, etc.

- **Skyway-West Hill CSA Subarea Plan.** The Skyway-West Hill CSA Subarea Plan would add 15 new policies, 5 action items, and identifies 12 map amendments related to housing, commercial and industrial uses, and community character. Council staff expect to work with the Councilmember for this area in discussion of policy analysis and development of any amendments.

- **Skyway-West Hill Map Amendments.** There are 12 proposed map amendments that would:
  - Remove existing Special District Overlay (SDO) and p-suffix conditions
  - Create consistency between land use designations and zoning classifications
  - Increase residential density in two areas on Renton Avenue South
  - Modify two areas at Renton Avenue South and Martin Luther King Jr. Way South from Community Business to Neighborhood Business
Establish a mixed-use SDO on Martin Luther King Jr. Way South
Add a new p-suffix condition limiting existing mobile home parks to that use
Expand the CB zoning of the Skyway Business District

- **Skyway-West Hill Code Amendments.** The Executive proposes Code changes to implement the recommendations of the Skyway-West Hill CSA Subarea Plan.

- **Skyway-West Hill (SWH) Community Center Feasibility.** The Executive transmitted Appendix C that responded to a 2019-2020 budget proviso. Council staff will continue analysis regarding whether the terms of the proviso have been met.

- **Workplan Action Items.** The Executive proposed modifications to one of the Workplan Action Items, and separately sent a letter with expected delays to at least three additional Workplan Action Items. These changes are not anticipated as part of the scope of work for the midpoint update.

- **Equity and Social Justice Impact Analysis of the 2020 Amendments to the King County Comprehensive Plan.** As required by the scoping motion, the Executive transmitted a report for an equity impact analysis. This is the first time that such an analysis has been done for the KCCP. Council staff continues to work with Executive staff to understand the analysis, and where the analysis could inform the Council's policy decisions for the 2020 KCCP update.

- **Skyway-West Hill Equity Impact Analysis Report.** Appendix E to the Skyway-West Hill CSA Subarea Plan is an equity impact analysis (EIA) completed by Berk Consulting. Berk's EIA and Council staff have identified risks with the current draft of the Subarea Plan that the Council may want to consider when deliberating on the plan, map amendments and code changes proposed by the Executive.

- **Skyway-West Hill Service Delivery and Facilities in Potential Annexation Areas Report.** Appendix D to the Skyway-West Hill CSA Subarea Plan is a report on delivery of services and facilities that compares services provided to youth, for transit and economic development as required by a 2019-2020 biennial budget proviso. Council staff will continue analysis regarding whether the terms of the proviso have been met.

**BACKGROUND**

**Comprehensive Plan Midpoint Update**

The King County Comprehensive Plan (KCCP) is the guiding policy document for land use and development regulations in unincorporated King County. In 2018, the Council approved a change to the County’s Comprehensive Planning structure and schedule. ¹ The restructure adopted and codified into the King County Code (K.C.C.) allows for three main types of updates to the plan: annual updates, midpoint updates, and 8-year updates. ² The next 8-year update to the KCCP will be transmitted to the Council in 2022, with adoption in 2023.

---

¹ Ordinance 18810
² K.C.C. 20.18.030
Because of the length of time between the last major update in 2016 and the next 8-year update in 2023, as part of the restructure ordinance, the Council included a requirement for the 2020 KCCP update, both in the K.C.C. and as a Workplan Action Item in the KCCP. The 2020 KCCP update is considered a midpoint update under K.C.C. 20.18.030.D.4. Midpoint updates allow substantive changes to the Comprehensive Plan, including changes to the urban growth area, if they are identified in the scoping motion.

In February 2019, the Council adopted the scoping motion for the 2020 KCCP update. Motion 15329 outlined the key issues that the Council and the Executive identified for specific consideration in the KCCP update. The scoping motion set the work plan for the 2020 KCCP update and unlike the 8-year update, topical areas, including land use and zoning changes and urban growth area changes, are limited to what is included in this scoping motion.

It is worth noting that while the 2020 KCCP update is considered a midpoint update, the Code and the KCCP would also allow changes allowed as part of an annual update. K.C.C. 20.18.030.B. states, in part: “Every year the Comprehensive Plan may be amended to address technical updates and corrections, to adopt community service area subarea plans and to consider amendments that do not require substantive changes to policy language or do not require changes to the urban growth area boundary....” K.C.C. 20.18.030.B. lists 16 categories that limit the kinds of changes that can be considered as part of what is referred to as the annual update in this section of code. Changes allowed as part of an annual update can be included as part of the ordinance that adopts the 2020 KCCP update.

Community Service Area Subarea Plan

As part of the 2016 KCCP, the Council included Workplan Action #1, Implementation of the Community Service Area (CSA) Subarea Planning Program. As part of this Workplan Action item, the County has started subarea planning using the geography of the six rural Community Service Areas, and for the five remaining large urban unincorporated potential annexation areas, as shown in the map in Chapter 11 and below.
The focus of the CSA subarea plans are on land use issues in these subarea geographies, including:

[A] regular assessment of the Community Service Area's goals, population changes, new development, employment targets and similar demographic and socioeconomic indicators. These assessments are called Community Service Area Subarea Plans. To address the unique issues in each geography, Community Service Area subarea plans may also have more refined, land uses focuses on rural town centers, urban neighborhoods, or corridor approaches.

The high level review along with more detailed land use planning will be guided by a series of criteria such as community interest, social equity, funding, and new development. Equity and social justice principles will play a particularly key role during subarea plan public engagement activities. People of color, low-income residents, and populations with limited English proficiency will be informed and offered equitable and culturally-appropriate opportunities to participate in its planning process.

The schedule for the CSA Subarea Plans is also found in Chapter 11. The Council review time frame is shown in the "Adoption Year" for each CSA Subarea Plan. CSA Subarea Plans are reviewed and approved as part of an annual update to the KCCP.
Schedule of Community Service Area Subarea Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Year</th>
<th>Adoption Year</th>
<th>Geography</th>
<th>Other Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>North Highline PAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>Snoqualmie Valley/NE King CSA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-22</td>
<td>2022-23</td>
<td>No Subarea Plan</td>
<td>Eight-Year Comp. Plan Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-23</td>
<td>2023-24</td>
<td>Greater Maple Valley/Cedar CSA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-24</td>
<td>2024-25</td>
<td>Fairwood PAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024-25</td>
<td>2025-26</td>
<td>Bear Creek/Sammamish CSA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025-26</td>
<td>2026-27</td>
<td>Southeast King County CSA</td>
<td>Potential Midpoint Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026-27</td>
<td>2027-28</td>
<td>Four Creeks/Tiger Mountain CSA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027-28</td>
<td>2028-29</td>
<td>East Renton PAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028-29</td>
<td>2029-30</td>
<td>Federal Way PAA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029-30</td>
<td>2030-31</td>
<td>No Subarea Plan</td>
<td>Eight-Year Comp. Plan Update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The planning year is a 12-month, July to June process. The adoption year is a 12-month, July to June process.

Vashon-Maury Island Subarea Plan. In 2017, the Council reviewed and adopted the first subarea plan created under the new CSA subarea planning program: the Vashon Maury-Island CSA Subarea Plan. The plan was a robust document that included adoption of many new policies across all policy areas of the KCCP: land use; rural area and natural resource lands; housing and human services; environment; parks, open space and cultural resources; transportation; and services, facilities and utilities. An implementation matrix was also included that outlined one or more “actions” for implementation of each policy in the subarea plan. The adopted plan also included a Workplan with three action items for implementation of the subarea plan.

Council review of the plan identified several areas of substantive policy issues in the transmittal, including inconsistency with the GMA, inconsistency with adopted KCCP policies, changes to current countywide and area-specific policy direction, potential for unanticipated County responsibilities, King County budget impacts, and service implications countywide and/or for other CSA geographies. It was also apparent that the required coordination and collaboration between DPER and PSB might not have occurred as required. Partly as a result of these issues, the Council adopted the budget provisos described below.

Skyway-West Hill SWAP and West Hill Community Plan Update. In 2014, the County adopted Motion 14221, which called for a comprehensive update to the 1994 West Hill

---
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Community Plan.\textsuperscript{4} Around this same time, Executive staff were also providing technical assistance to a community-led effort to update some elements of the Community Plan. This community-led effort resulted in the development of a series of proposed local implementation actions called the Skyway-West Hill Action Plan (SWAP). The SWAP was proposed to be adopted as an addendum to the existing 1994 Community Plan during the 2016 update of the KCCP.\textsuperscript{5} No policy changes to the Community Plan were included in the proposed SWAP.

The SWAP was a community-developed document, and was drafted prior to the adoption of the new subarea planning program framework in the 2016 KCCP. The SWAP process did not include comprehensive review and/or updates to the underlying Community Plan, as called for by Motion 14221 or the underlying subarea planning program goals. Additionally, a variety of policy issues, such as substantive budgetary impacts, were identified during Council review of the transmitted SWAP. As a result, the 2016 KCCP directed the Executive to work with the community to review the proposed SWAP and to comprehensively update the Community Plan within the context of the subarea planning program. The 2016 KCCP included a March 1, 2018 deadline for transmittal of the subarea plan. However, due to the adoption of the budget provisos discussed below, Executive work on development of the Skyway-West Hill subarea plan was put on hold while that work was completed.

\textit{2017-18 King County subarea planning budget provisos.} Following Council review of the proposed 2016 SWAP and the transmitted 2017 Vashon-Maury Island CSA Subarea Plan, the Council identified the need for the Executive to reassess the subarea planning program, including the program’s structure and schedule, the elements of subarea plans, and interdepartmental roles in the development of subarea plans. As a result, Proviso P2 of Section 5 and Proviso P3 of Section 47 of Ordinance 18602, a supplemental 2017-2018 King County Budget ordinance, were adopted in November 2017.

The two provisos restricted $200,000 each from DPER’s and PSB’s budgets, and directed that no funds could be expended on subarea planning activities, unless and until the Council acts on the motion to approve the proviso response. The key elements of the subarea planning program restructure plan called for in the provisos are as follows.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{A. Consistency.} Methods to ensure subarea plans will be consistent with existing laws, policies, and adopted budget direction.
\item \textbf{B. DPER and PSB coordination.} Recommendations for coordination and collaboration between DPER and PSB’s Regional Planning Unit in the development of subarea plans.
\item \textbf{C. Departmental consultation.} Methods to ensure subarea plans will be developed in consultation with and with concurrence by other County departments.
\item \textbf{D. Schedule.} Evaluation of potential changes to the subarea planning schedule to ensure sufficient time to complete plan development and adoption, including
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{4} Adopted in 1993 via Ordinance 11166. Only minor map and zoning amendments to the Community Plan have been adopted since 1993.

\textsuperscript{5} Included as Attachment J to the Executive’s transmitted 2016 KCCP.
considering whether subarea plans should be developed and/or adopted at the same time as major KCCP updates are developed and/or adopted.

In May 2018, the Council adopted Motion 15142, which approved the Executive's plan to restructure the Community Service Area subarea planning program. The restructure was largely implemented through Ordinance 18810 in October 2018 as part of the 2018 KCCP update. The changes to the subarea planning structure in Ordinance 18810 include:

- Modifying the Comprehensive Plan from a 4-year update cycle to an 8-year cycle.
- Modifying the Council review time frame from a 9-month March to December review, to a 12-month July to June review. It also set a deadline for Council adoption of the KCCP at the end of each June.
- Modifying the CSA Subarea planning structure to make the approach for subarea plan development and adoption in a manner that is similar to the current KCCP process. Each subarea plan is proposed have a two-year process, where Executive development of a proposed plan would take one year, and Council review and adoption would take one year. Development of a subarea plan would be led by the Permitting Division, in coordination with PSB and other County departments through an interdepartmental team. Similar to the KCCP, the Plan proposes to include the following process for development of subarea plans.
  - Internal scoping with County departments, Councilmembers, and Council staff
  - External scoping with the community
  - Development of a Public Review Draft
  - A public comment period
  - Development of an Executive recommended plan
  - Transmittal to the Council for review and possible action
- Pausing the development of CSA subarea plans during the development of the 8-year KCCP updates.
- Narrowing the scope of the CSA subarea plans to focus on land use issues, such as review of land use designations, zoning classifications, Special District Overlays (SDOs), and property-specific (P-Suffix) development conditions. Other “built environment” topics are also proposed to be addressed, but would be done so in the context of existing functional plans, such as the Transportation Needs Report (TNR) and Regional Trail Needs Report (RTNR). Additionally, the plans are proposed to “generally rely” on the adopted policies of the KCCP; potential for new, subarea-specific policies would be limited.
- Including an implementation matrix to reflect community-identified priorities, similar to the matrix in the Vashon-Maury Island CSA Subarea Plan. Development of the “actions” in the matrix is proposed to be informed by the adopted County budget, including review of existing and planned programmatic work and funded, planned, and unfunded capital plans and projects for the subarea. The Plan states that this proposed process would have communities prioritize their interests, which would then be considered as part of future biennial budgets.
• Including monitoring the implementation of the subarea plans and using performance measures is proposed, which is expected to result in a reduction or elimination of “the need for workplan items” when adopting subarea plans.
• Modifying the schedule and geography (as described earlier in this staff report) to reflect these changes.
• Better coordination between the Permitting Division and the Regional Planning Unit in PSB, using an interdepartmental staff team, and “documenting leadership support” for proposed policies and actions within their respective departments. The Council also approved two additional FTEs as part of the 2019-2020 budget for subarea planning to implement the restructure.

Skyway-West Hill SWAP and West Hill Community Plan Update. The Skyway-West Hill CSA Subarea Plan is included in the Executive's transmittal of Proposed Ordinance 2019-0413, as Attachments F and G. The Executive's proposed plan includes a Subarea Plan, proposed Map Amendments, a community center feasibility analysis, an equity analysis of service delivery, and an equity impact review of the plan.

Public Participation

K.C.C. 20.18.160 and RCW 36.70A.140 call for “early and continuous” public engagement in the development and amendment of the comprehensive plan and any implementing development regulations. As part of that process, the Executive is required to publish a Public Review Draft (PRD) of the KCCP that allows for public input on the draft changes to the plan. For the 2020 KCCP update, the Executive issued the PRD on July 1, 2019, which was open for public comment through July 31, 2019. The Executive hosted five community meetings on the PRD, in Carnation, Skyway, Maple Valley, Vashon-Maury Island, and North Highline. An additional meeting focusing on sea level rise was held on Vashon-Maury Island on July 2, 2019. For the Skyway-West Hill CSA Subarea Plan, the Executive held four focus group meetings, three community meetings, and 22 stakeholder interviews.

Following closure of the PRD comment period, the Executive considered the public feedback and finalized the proposed 2020 KCCP update. The Executive transmitted a recommended KCCP update to the Council on September 30, 2019, as required by K.C.C. 20.18.030.D.4. The Council will review and deliberate on the Executive’s proposal, with adoption expected by the end of June 2020.

ANALYSIS

Committee Review Process

At two previous briefings, Executive staff have briefed the changes proposed by the 2020 KCCP update and the Skyway-West Hill CSA Subarea Plan. At this briefing, Council staff will start to present our initial analysis of the Executive's legislation.

At today's briefing, Council staff analysis will include a description of every change in the legislation, and highlight any "key issues." Key issues may include new policy for the Council to consider; inconsistency with the adopted scope of work for the 2020 midpoint
update; inconsistency with the GMA, CPPs, KCCP or Code or with another adopted County policy; new program or service that could require additional resources to implement; and/or changes to policies that require an accompanying code change.

Council staff will also brief the Executive's ESJ analyses at this Committee meeting, and key issues identified with these analyses. The scope of work required the Executive to "complete an equity impact analysis using the tool developed by the county Office of Equity and Social Justice, to identify, evaluate and describe both the positive and negative potential equity impacts of the policy, land use, zoning and development regulations proposed in the Plan." There is an equity impact analysis included in a report for the 2020 KCCP update, a second included as Appendix E to the Skyway-West Hill CSA Subarea Plan, in compliance with the scope of work direction. There is a third level of service equity impact analysis that was required by a 2019-2020 biennial budget proviso, included as Appendix D to the Skyway-West Hill CSA Subarea Plan.

At future meetings, Council staff will brief the Committee on a few identified topics where more in-depth analysis will be presented. For those topics not briefed in Committee, Council staff will provide the analysis offline to members as desired, consistent with past reviews of the KCCP. Attachment 3 to this staff report includes the tentative Committee and Full Council review schedule for the 2020 Update.

Key Issues Analysis

The key issues analysis is organized topically, generally around which chapter of the KCCP the topic would appear in. For each topic the write-up includes a brief description of each change and any Council staff-identified key issues. At the end is a discussion of those items identified in the adopted scoping motion that were not included in the Executive's transmitted 2020 KCCP update.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four-to-One Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

The Four-to-One Program is one method to expand the urban growth area boundary, with the intent to create a contiguous band of open space along the original 1994 urban growth area boundary. For properties that meet the criteria, the program allows landowners to apply to have their land considered, where for every acre of land potentially added to the urban growth area, four acres of land is added as permanent open space.

The adopted 2016 KCCP contained a Workplan action item that calls for a review of the Program, and directed the Executive to work on this through the King County Growth Management Planning Council.

Changes in KCCP. Changes in Chapter 2 of the KCCP related the four-to-one program include the following changes. Some of the changes make the KCCP policies consistent with either current practice or existing Code:

- Updates to lead-in text to update the program numbers
- Modifications to policies to:
o Change the County's policy for the four-to-one program from one that the County actively pursues to one that the County may support
o Limit the use of the urban portion of proposals to residential development
o Make the recommendation for adoption more discretionary
o Require the open space portion to primarily be on-site
o Add a criteria for designation of the open space regarding the size and configuration of open space and the County's ability to maintain it
o Add a criteria for the use of the open space regarding the potential for public access
o Require all infrastructure for the urban portion be within the urban area
o Require applications to be submitted through the docket process
o Require that for proposals located adjacent to a City, the approval of the four-to-one proposal prohibits development of the urban portion of the project until it has been annexed by the City, and until an interlocal agreement is signed between the City and the County approving the project

Changes in Title 20. The changes in Title 20 include:

- Removes the option to apply for a four-to-one proposal through a site-specific land use map amendment
- Modifies the application and approval process to require:
  - Submittal of an application through the docketing process
  - A preapplication conference
  - Recording of a conservation easement after enactment of the ordinance and dedication to King County at the time of plat recording or annexation
  - Agreement from the assigned City to annex the urban portion
  - For proposals adjacent to a City, that the County and the City enter into an interlocal agreement approving the proposal and prohibiting development until after annexation
- Modifies criteria and program requirements to:
  - Prohibit land zoned forest and mineral from being part of a 4-to-1 proposal (agricultural zoned lands are already excluded)
  - Require open space to be given a land use and zoning consistent with intended use (existing code requires a rural designation)
  - Modify the open space requirement to be "primarily" on-site and remove the minimum depth of the open space buffer
  - Add criteria for the size and configuration of the open space and the County's ability to manage the property
  - Add criteria for potential for public access

Key Issues

Council staff analysis is ongoing for this issue, particularly around: 1) whether the requirements of the Workplan Action item have been met; 2) whether the proposed policy and code changes match the recommendations of the code study, and 3) whether the proposed changes are consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies.
**GMPC Role in UGA Amendments**

What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

The Executive proposes changes to two policies related to the Growth Management Planning Council's (GMPC) role in approving modifications to the urban growth area boundary. This change makes the policies consistent with current practice, where all modifications (not just expansions) require review and recommendation from the GMPC. This change was identified as part of the 4-to-1 program work.

Key Issues

None identified by Council staff.

**Hirst Decision and Water Availability**

What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

The Executive proposes changes to two chapters of the KCCP to align with recent developments stemming from the Washington State Supreme Court's decision in *Whatcom County v. Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board* (aka Hirst) and Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 6091.

The proposed changes discuss King County's current process and position on permit-exempt wells, but do not change any KCCP policies. Specifically, the changes:

- Amend lead-in text in Chapter 5 of the KCCP to state that King County is participating in the Department of Ecology's Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Committee (WREC) in each of the County's five Watershed Resource Inventory Areas, to develop flow restoration strategies to mitigate the consumptive use of new permit-exempt wells drilled in the next 20 years.
- Amend and add lead-in text in Chapter 9 of the KCCP to state that King County's permitting process, which includes a hierarchy of water service (with Group A water systems being the first priority), as well as its participation in the WREC process, is consistent with new state law adopted in response to Hirst. The code underlying the permitting process, K.C.C. 13.24, predates Hirst, and is not proposed to be changed with the 2020 KCCP update.

Key Issues

None identified by Council staff.
SO-230 Repeal

What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

The Executive's proposal is to remove Special District Overlay (SDO) SO-230 by repealing K.C.C. 21A.38.240. The recommendation to repeal is the result of the Executive's Floodplain Densities Area Zoning and Land Use Study, which was prompted by a 2018 docket request and changes made as part of the 2016 KCCP.

The SDO applies to 426 parcels that are or were previously zoned RA-5, and sets a maximum density of one dwelling unit per ten acres, rather than the standard one dwelling unit per five acres in the RA-5 zone, for any of these properties that contains a critical area. The SDO also requires subdivisions on any such property to cluster development outside of the critical area.

The Area Zoning and Land Use Study notes that, due to public ownership, parcel size below ten acres, and past annexations, only 72 of the 426 parcels would theoretically be subdividable if the SDO is removed. As critical area and floodplain regulations have strengthened since the SDO was adopted in 1997, the Executive states these areas will be adequately protected with existing regulations and the SDO is no longer needed.

Key Issues

None identified by Council staff.

Agricultural Production Districts & Public Facilities

What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

The Executive's proposed KCCP update would modify several policies in Chapter 3 to provide an allowance for public infrastructure intrusion into Agricultural Production Districts (APD) and establish parameters for mitigation surrounding the loss of land within APDs.

- Policy R-652 is modified to encourage King County to work with Cities adjacent to APDs to minimize impacts of public infrastructure and facilities on farming and farmlands in addition to urban development.
- Policy R-655 is modified to require the County to ensure public infrastructure intrusions minimize the disruption of agricultural activities, to establish agreements with jurisdictions or agencies, and if reduction of the total APD acreage occurs, to require the agreements to follow criteria established in new Policy R-657.
- Policy R-656 is split into two policies. Modified Policy R-656 identifies the County's role in the removal of land from the APD and establishes a new criterion allowing lands needed for public infrastructure to be removed from the APD.
- New Policy R-657 establishes criteria for off-site mitigation when land is removed from the APD, including addition of agricultural land abutting the affected APD, addition of comparable land in another APD at a rate of 1.5 times the amount removed, or mitigation through fees that restore unfarmed land into production at two times the value of the land removed if comparable land is not available in another APD.
Key Issues

Expanding options to mitigate the removal of APD land is a new policy. The proposed changes would prioritize addition of agricultural land in the same APD, followed by adding agricultural land in another APD or mitigation funding to restore unfarmed land into production.

Non-Resource Industrial Uses

What's new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

The proposed KCCP update would modify several policies to curtail expansion of non-resource related industrial uses in the Rural Area in order to reduce growth pressure, limit impacts on natural resources, and reduce the demand for infrastructure expansion. Modified policies clarify that industrial zoning is limited to existing sites (Policy R-512), corrects a limitation on industrial uses on industrial parcels (Policy R-513), and clarifies that existing legal industrial uses in the Rural Area may continue as nonconforming uses (Policy R-515).

Key Issues

- Existing criteria that address the creation of industrial lands in the Rural Area would be narrowed to only existing sites, which is a policy choice.
- Policy R-513 is modified to remove limiting new industrial uses in Rural Towns and the designated industrial area adjacent to the Rural Neighborhood Commercial Center of Preston, which is a policy choice.

Transfer of Development Rights

What's new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

The Executive proposes modifications to the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program by amending K.C.C. chapter 21A.37 and Chapter 3 of the KCCP. The proposed changes would allow properties identified as urban residential, medium land use and zoned R-4, R-6, R-8, or R-12 to qualify as TDR sending sites, if the property has been determined an "equity area" by the Conservation Futures Advisory Committee and has been awarded CFT funding by the County. Specifically, the proposal includes:

- Amending K.C.C. 21A.37.010 to state that urban lands located in equity areas are worthy of preservation.
- Amending K.C.C. 21A.37.020, and KCCP Policy R-316 and lead-in text in Chapter 3 to include properties with an urban land use designation as potential sending sites, if the property is designated urban, and zoned R-4, R-6, R-8, or R-12, is in an equity area as defined in K.C.C. 26.12 and is approved by the Council for conservation futures tax funding.
- Amending K.C.C. 21A.37.040 to establish that the amount of TDRs is based on the base density of the zone in which the land is located, and each TDR can be used for one additional unit above base density.
• Amending K.C.C. 21A.37.070 to specify that, for these urban-to-urban TDR projects, the application must include confirmation that the property is in an equity area and has received a CFT award.
• Amending K.C.C. 21A.37.100 to allow the TDR bank to acquire these new TDR properties.

The proposal would also modify K.C.C. 21A.37.020 to allow "lands that are managed by King County for purposes of residential or commercial development" to qualify as sending sites.

Key Issues
• Allowing urban-to-urban TDR projects is a policy choice.
• The scoping motion allows changes relating to the recommendations of the TDR Program Report required by Workplan Action 4. The proposed change relating to lands managed by King County (in K.C.C. 21A.37.020) is not covered by the scoping motion for the 2020 midpoint update, as it is not discussed in the TDR Program Report.

Human Services Role

What's new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

The transmitted 2020 KCCP update adds language to Policy H-201 that describes the County’s regional human services roles and activities to include new work since 2016. This reflects the priority populations identified in the Veterans, Seniors, & Human Services Levy that was approved by the voters in 2017.

Key Issues
None identified by Council staff.

Vapor Products

What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

The Executive proposes a modification to Policy U-143 in Chapter 2 that would require areas of multifamily buildings open to the public be smoke-free and vapor-free. A new policy in Chapter 7 requires the County to ban tobacco and vaping products in King County parks, in order to advance public health and clean environments and avoid exposure to these products.

Key Issues
None identified by Council staff.
Regional Affordable Housing Task Force

What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

Regional Affordable Housing Task Force. The Housing section of KCCP Chapter 4 currently identifies King County as a "Regional Convener" for housing policy. The transmitted 2020 KCCP update would add language to this section referencing the work of the Regional Affordable Housing Task Force (RAHTF), including the seven goals of the Five-Year Action Plan:

1. Create and support an ongoing structure for regional collaboration;
2. Increase construction and preservation of affordable homes for households earning less than 50 percent area median income;
3. Prioritize affordability accessible within a half-mile walkshed of existing and planning frequent transit service, with a particular priority for high-capacity transit stations;
4. Preserve access to affordable homes for renters by supporting tenant protections to increase housing stability and reduce risk of homelessness;
5. Protect existing communities of color and low-income communities from displacement in gentrifying communities;
6. Promote greater housing growth and diversity to achieve a variety of housing types at a range of affordability and improve jobs/housing connections throughout King County; and
7. Better engage local communities and other partners in addressing the urgent need for and benefits of affordable housing.

The proposed language also references the new Affordable Housing Committee of the King County Growth Management Planning Council, which serves as a regional advisory body to recommend actions and assess progress towards the Five-Year Action Plan.

Key Issues:

- The scoping motion called for the 2020 KCCP update to "reflect the approval of the Regional Affordable Housing Plan and Action Strategy." This approval occurred with Motion 15372, which declared the recommendations of the RAHTF as policy of the Council. The Executive’s proposed language does not reflect Council’s approval, but rather the Action Plan’s goals and a status report of the Affordable Housing Committee.
Affordable Housing Report. The scoping motion required the Executive to transmit an affordable housing report that includes: 1) an update on all current efforts to create affordable housing on County-owned property\(^6\), and 2) a plan for developing an inventory of all County-owned properties and their feasibility for development of affordable housing, to be transmitted to the Council by June 1, 2020.

The Report transmitted as part of the 2020 KCCP update includes a listing and description of nine past housing projects\(^7\) on County-Owned property and nine additional housing projects\(^8\) that are currently underway.

The Report also provides a description of the “Home & Hope Initiative”. This initiative is an effort by King County, Enterprise Community Partners, City of Seattle, and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to identify underutilized property owned by public or nonprofit agencies and promote the development of affordable housing and early education centers on those properties.

Following the summary of efforts currently underway, the Report details the Executive’s plan for completing an inventory of all County land with an analysis of the land’s feasibility for affordable housing. The Report indicates that the analysis would be transmitted to Council by June 1, 2020, as called for in the Scoping Motion. The properties identified based on the criteria below would then be assessed for their potential based on zoning regulations, current use, long-term operational needs and planning efforts, financial feasibility for affordable housing, potential for shared use, and potential to integrate affordable housing into future redevelopment planning.

The proposal states that land included in the inventory would be limited to those that meet all of the following conditions:

- Developable;
- In urban areas or rural towns in King County; and
- Either in high opportunity communities or in areas with close proximity to transit.

Properties that meet these three criteria would be further excluded based on several criteria, including those that are used for parks and open space, stormwater facilities, and rights-of-way, or those that have critical areas or lacked supporting infrastructure.

---

\(^6\) Note that when a property is deemed by the Facilities Management Division to be unnecessary for essential government services, King County Code 4.56 requires that the Division assess the property’s suitability for affordable housing. If the property is suitable, the County must first attempt to make it available for affordable housing before disposing of the property through other means.

\(^7\) The past affordable housing projects are Greenbrier Heights, Hirabayashi Place Apartments, Nolo Apartments, Public Records Building, Public Health Building, Kenmore Sheriff Building, Harborview Hall, and West Wing.

\(^8\) The efforts underway are SODO Interim Housing, Elliot Avenue, White Center HUB, Meridian, Eastgate, Burien Transit Center, Kenmore Park-and-Ride, Kingsgate Park-and-Ride, and Northgate Park-and-Ride.
Key Issues:

- The Report includes a reference to the Home and Hope Initiative, on which the Council has not taken an official position.
- The Council may wish to consider whether the criteria listed above are consistent with Council priorities.

### Cottage Housing

What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

The proposed KCCP update would modify several zoning code provisions for cottage housing resulting from recommendations from a code study required by Workplan Action 8. The code study and a preceding Cottage Housing Report (transmitted in December 2018) analyzed existing zoning regulations around cottage housing and identified several recommendations.

Four code changes are proposed in this update, including:

- Removing a maximum site size
- Exempting attached garages less than 250 square feet from the maximum unit size
- Adding specific parking requirements for cottage housing, and
- Adding building design standards to create inviting streetscapes.

Key Issues

This is a new policy for the Council to consider.

### Accessory Dwelling Unit/Accessory Living Quarters

What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

The Executive's proposal would amend the K.C.C. in accordance with the recommendations of the accessory dwelling unit (ADU) and accessory living quarter (ALQ) code study. The changes are generally intended to encourage the development of ADUs and add additional requirements for ALQs.

Specific changes for ADUs include:

- Reduce the minimum lot size to construct a detached ADU from 5,000 square feet to 3,600 square feet in the urban areas, and from the applicable minimum lot size to 3,600 square feet in Rural Towns.
- Specify that ADUs may not exceed the base height for their applicable zone.

Specific changes for ALQs include:

- Specify that the ALQ shall not include an area within the building that is intended for the preparation and storage of food.
- Limit ALQs to one per lot.
• Specify that minimum lot size to construct a detached ALQ is 3,600 square feet in the urban areas and in Rural Towns (currently no minimum).
• Limit ALQs to 1,000 square feet of heated floor area (currently no limit).
• Specify that ALQs may not exceed the base height for their applicable zone.

Key Issues

• Reducing minimum lot size requirements for detached ADUs in urban areas and rural towns is a policy choice.
• Requiring ALQs to meet additional standards, beyond what is currently in code, and limiting ALQs to one per property, is a policy choice.

Residential Density Incentive Program

Residential Density Incentive Program. The scoping motion included a code study item to review the County’s Residential Density Incentive (RDI) Program to determine if any changes are needed to increase its use and improve its effectiveness. The RDI Program is codified through K.C.C. Chapter 21A.34. The Program as it currently exists allows for increased residential densities in urban areas and rural towns in exchange for certain public benefits.

Under the current program, project developers can provide public benefits in the following categories in order to earn above base densities. The categories are:

• Affordable housing
• Open space protection
• Historic preservation
• Energy conservation
• Public art
• Cottage housing
• Compact housing
• Walkable communities

Within each category are specific benefits that can earn density bonuses of up to 200 percent of the base density.

The Report indicates that the RDI Program has been utilized only a few times since it was put into place in 1993, though the Permitting Division does not have a formal tracking mechanism for Program usage.

Executive staff’s analysis as part of this code study determined that there are an additional 10,000 to 44,000 additional units that could be built if the RDI program were used on all eligible parcels at the maximum benefit of 200 percent of the base density.

The Report summarizes key themes heard in interviews with housing developers, which included:

• Incentives are only desirable if the resulting project is more profitable;
Existing base zoning is sufficient for large multifamily projects; There is private market demand for increased density in lower density zones; and Density is only one tool for policy makers to use.

Based on the analysis conducted, the Report recommends the following changes to the RDI Program:

1. Recalibrate the affordable rental housing incentive to increase utilization and the realized public benefit;
2. Focus the RDI on activities that promote affordable housing;
3. Consider mandatory inclusionary housing;
4. Consider an in-lieu fee of on-site mandatory affordable housing;
5. Develop and fund tracking, monitoring, and enforcement policies and programs;
6. Consider strengthening incentives at lower densities;
7. Consider developing resources and tools to target smaller developers; and
8. Explore flexible or dynamic models to maximize public benefit and utilization.

Key Issues:

- The RDI Report provides high-level policy recommendations but does not go into detail on how they could be implemented. Subsequently, no code change proposal was transmitted as part of the 2020 KCCP update. The Report states that it may inform the work of the Affordable Housing Committee of the GMPC as they conduct their work. Council may wish to pursue making code changes now, or directing further work on this item, to implement the recommendations of the code study, regardless of how the Affordable Housing Committee uses the Report.

### Sea Level Rise

What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

The proposed KCCP update would add several policies and accompanying code changes related to development potentially at risk from future sea level rise.

Changes in Chapters 5 and 6 of the KCCP related to sea level rise include:

- Modifying lead-in text to add "policy and regulations" in the County's climate change preparedness efforts.
- Adding Policy E-215c, which would require the County to implement land use regulations to increase resiliency to the anticipated impacts of climate change, including sea level rise, changing rainfall patterns and flood volumes, and extreme temperatures.
- Adding Policy E-215d, which would require the County to assess best available sea level rise projections two years prior to an 8-year KCCP update.
- Clarifying Policy S-785 and identifying the 100-year floodplain of Vashon-Maury Island as the coastal high hazard area.
Changes in Title 16 and Title 21A include:

- Creating definitions for sea level rise risk area and sea level rise protection elevation in Title 16 and Title 21A.
- Establishing additional building standards for developments within the sea level rise risk area.
- Creating a variance process from sea level rise building standards.
- Requiring a 75-foot buffer for sites with steep slopes that overlap with the sea level rise risk area or modified buffers in accordance with a study prepared by a geotechnical engineer.
- Prohibiting new wells in coastal high hazard areas.
- Requiring wells in sea level rise risk areas on Vashon-Maury Island to have testing of saltwater intrusion and requiring new wells to include surface seals.
- Requiring that the Permitting Division provide notice to applicants within a sea level rise risk area that properties may be impacted by sea level rise and that recommends voluntarily setting development further back than the minimum required.

Key Issues

This is new policy for the Council to consider. Council staff analysis of the package of changes for sea level rise is ongoing.

Shoreline Master Program

What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

The Executive's proposed KCCP update includes amendments to the Shoreline Master Program in regards to the County's official shoreline jurisdiction list, shoreline map, and associated code adopting the map and list.

The Executive proposes changes to the shoreline jurisdiction list to add Lake Fenwick, correct the Kimball Creek shoreline jurisdiction and other minor corrections.

The shorelines of the state map include four changes affecting 254 parcels: 1) redesignation of 180 King County Parks properties that were previously undesignated or with a designation not consistent with their current use, 2) assigning a residential designation for a group of residential properties along Lake Washington adjacent to the City of Newcastle that were previously undesignated, 3) corrections to designations for several properties on Vashon-Maury Island, and 4) assigning a residential designation for 32 residential properties adjacent to Kimball Creek near the City of Snoqualmie.

A proposed K.C.C. change would identify the official shoreline list and associated shoreline map as official documents identifying the shorelines of the state in unincorporated King County.

Key Issues

None identified by Council staff.
Mitigation Payment System

What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

The proposed K CCP update would also delete Policy T-229, which calls for the establishment of fees meant to mitigate growth related transportation impacts of new development and all references to the Roads Mitigation Payment System (MPS), which was repealed by the Council in 2016.9

According to Executive staff, the MPS did not generate significant revenue due to low development activity and that mitigating impacts to transportation can be addressed through alternative processes, including the State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) process.

Key Issues

None identified by Council staff.

Roadways/Pathways on Unincorporated Roads

What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

The proposed update adds lead-in text clarifying that sidewalks are allowed in Rural Towns and, under certain circumstances, in the Rural Area.

Key Issues

None identified by Council staff.

Fossil Fuel Facilities

What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

The Executive proposes changes to the KCCP and the zoning code to implement new regulations for fossil fuel facilities.

Changes in KCCP. Changes in Chapter 3 of the KCCP related to fossil fuel facilities include:

- Lead-in text that differentiates minerals (gravel, sand, valuable metallic substances) from coal.
- Modifying language in lead-in text and policies to change "mining" to "mineral extraction."
- Removing one type of mineral resource sites: "Owner Identified Potential Coal Mining Sites."
- Removing coal from policies regarding mineral resources and mineral extraction.
- Removing one coal mine from the list of "Designated Mineral Resource Sites."

---

9 Ordinance 18420
Changes in Chapter 9 of the KCCP related to fossil fuel facilities include:

- Modifications to existing lead-in text to further explain how the County will manage energy use.
- Adds a new section with lead-in text explaining the fossil fuel system and the impacts of the use of fossil fuels and fossil fuel facilities.
- Adds 6 new policies related to fossil fuels and fossil fuel facilities that:
  - Establish criteria for the County’s policies and regulations related to fossil fuel facilities;
  - Require a thorough review of fossil fuel facilities;
  - Establish criteria for approval of new fossil fuel facilities;
  - Require the use of the County’s equity impact review tool to identify and mitigate new, modified or expanded facilities;
  - Establish a periodic review for fossil fuel facilities;
  - Prohibit exploration, establishment or expansion of new or existing coal mines.
- Modifies lead-in text and policies relating to hazardous liquid and gas transmission pipelines to further specify the type of regulations the County will adopt.
- Modifies lead-in text and policies relating to crude oil transport to include transport by vessels, and to require the Office of Emergency Management to consider potential risks from fossil fuel facilities.

There is also a proposed definition for Fossil Fuel Facility added to the Glossary.

Changes in Title 21A. The changes in Title 21A related to fossil fuel facilities include:

- Modifications to existing definitions to separate local use of fossil fuels (such as gas tanks and utility facilities) to large fossil fuel facilities; to distinguish coal from mineral resources in the Code; to distinguish facilities that generate non-hydroelectric electricity from fossil fuel facilities; and to distinguish warehouse and wholesale trade uses for fossil fuel facilities from other uses.
- New definitions for fossil fuels, fossil fuel facilities.
- Modifications to the Government/Business Services Land Use table to add development conditions for Warehousing and Wholesale Trade and Transportation Services, to exclude fossil fuel facilities.
- Modifications to the Manufacturing Land Use table to add development conditions to Petroleum Refining and Related Industries to exclude fossil fuel facilities.
- Modifications to the Resource Land Use table to prohibit coal mines.
- Modifications to the Regional Land Use table to make the following changes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIC#</th>
<th>SPECIFIC LAND USE</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>RA</th>
<th>UR</th>
<th>R1-8</th>
<th>R12-48</th>
<th>NB</th>
<th>CB</th>
<th>RB</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Non-hydroelectric Generation Facility</td>
<td>C P12 ((S))</td>
<td>C P12 ((S))</td>
<td>C P12 ((S))</td>
<td>C P12 ((S))</td>
<td>C P12 ((S))</td>
<td>C P12 ((S))</td>
<td>C P12 ((S))</td>
<td>C P12 ((S))</td>
<td>C P12 ((S))</td>
<td>C P12 ((S))</td>
<td>C P12 ((S))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Oil and Gas Extraction</td>
<td>S22</td>
<td>((S))</td>
<td>S22</td>
<td>((S))</td>
<td>S22</td>
<td>((S))</td>
<td>S22</td>
<td>((S))</td>
<td>S22</td>
<td>S22</td>
<td>S22</td>
<td>((S))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Fossil Fuel Facility Type I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>Fossil Fuel Facility Type II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These changes allow non-hydroelectric generation facilities as a permitted use with the existing development condition regarding cogeneration, and otherwise allow the use as a conditional use (under existing code, the use would require a special use permit if not a cogeneration facility). Further oil and gas extraction would have a development condition added that would limit it in several zones to an accessory to waste management process.

Two new uses would be added: fossil fuel facility I and II, which would only be permitted in the Industrial zone, either as a conditional use or special use, and with development conditions. The development conditions would add criteria for what sorts of improvements require a CUP or SUP.

- Modifies the requirements for mineral extraction to require existing metal, coal and nonmetallic minerals uses to comply with Chapter 21A.22, which has specific requirements for permits, community meetings, periodic review, site design standards, operating conditions, reclamation, mitigation and monitoring and financial guarantees.
- Adds a new section to require periodic review of fossil fuel facilities.

Key Issues

Council staff analysis of the package of changes related to fossil fuel facilities is ongoing. This is new policy for the Council to consider, and the proposed KCCP and K.C.C. changes are complex and interconnected.

Organics Composting Facility Regulations Code Study

What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

Executive staff completed a code study of organics composting facility regulations in response to the adopted scope of work for the 2020 midpoint update to the 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan. Specifically, the scope of work directed the Executive to:

Review the potential for siting organic composting facilities. Consider sites in the rural area, including those that currently have a Mineral use designation and implementing zoning, and consider whether to modify the land use and zoning to Rural Area, either outright or with property-specific conditions that would be appropriate for organic composting facilities as a primary use. Consider modifying associated policies or development regulations associated with organic composting facilities as a materials processing use at such locations.

The study finds that the single organics composting facility currently operating in unincorporated King County is permitted as a Materials Processing Facility and that Materials Processing Facilities are allowed in the Forest, Mineral, Rural Area, and Industrial zones under certain development conditions. A Geographic Information System analysis completed as part of the code study indicated that there are hundreds of acres of Rural Area-zoned land potentially available for siting Materials Processing Facilities,

---

10 Motion 15329
and thousands of acres of Forest- and Mineral-zoned land for siting the facilities as an accessory use. According to the study, Material Processing Facilities are not allowed as primary uses in the Forest and Mineral zones due to the Growth Management Act provisions that prioritize primary forestry and mining uses on designated Natural Resource Lands.

The study concluded that no policy amendments are required or recommended at this time. Additionally, the study does not recommend any changes to existing development regulations for materials processing facilities. The following code amendments were considered, but ultimately not included in the KCCP transmittal:

- **Add organics composting to the definition of Materials Processing Facilities**: The study notes that this may add more clarity but is not likely to have a significant impact on siting and also could result in creating non-conforming uses, thus is not recommended.

- **Create a new standalone specific land use in the permitted uses table for organics processing facilities**: The study explains that instead of regulating composting facilities as Materials Processing Facilities, staff explored amending the code to create a new use covering the precise scope of composting facility operations, as it may lead to more clarity and could potentially aid siting. However, the study noted that stakeholder and public outreach would be required and identified this as an area for potential future study.

- **Evaluate whether interim facilities would help phase the transfer and processing of organics**: The study indicates that another option is to evaluate whether Interim Recycling Facilities, defined in K.C.C. 21A.06.640, would help with staging organics prior to being moved to composting facilities. Under this scenario, an interim facility would act like an indoor solid waste transfer station, but for organics. However, the study stated that this approach may be limited by the amount of commercial and industrial zoned land in unincorporated King County, and would likely require industry consultation, as well as stakeholder and public outreach.

The King County Organics Market Development Plan,\(^\text{11}\) in response to a budget proviso in the 2019-2020 biennial budget,\(^\text{12}\) recommended undertaking this code study as a strategy to expand and enhance the regional market for compost. The Market Development Plan was accepted by the Council on November 13, 2019.

**Key Issues**

- The Council included this item in the scoping motion as an Area Zoning and Land Use Study. The Executive analyzed it as a code study and noted that the study did not examine the feasibility of individual sites in the Rural Area because that is something that occurs once a private operator selects a site and makes application for permits. The Council may wish to direct further work on this item as an Area Zoning and Land Use Study.

\(^{11}\) Proposed Motion 2019-0353
\(^{12}\) Ordinance 18835, Section 102, Proviso P2
• The Council may wish to consider whether to adopt any code changes identified in the code study or to direct additional work.

### Economic Development

#### What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

The Executive's proposal would make changes to Policy ED-604 in Chapter 10 of the KCCP, to remove examples of organizations that it will partner with on programs that strengthen the County's economy. The two currently referenced organizations, the Regional Food Policy Council of the PSRC and Puget Sound Fresh, no longer function as described in the Policy.

#### Key Issues

The current Policy language names two organizations that the County will partner with to strengthen the interdependence and linkage between rural, resource and urban economies. The scoping motion does not identify modifying Economic Development policies. The Executive describes this change under the category of updates to "dates, data, maps and references," which is identified in the scoping motion. Council staff would not characterize this as an update under this category, as the PSRC is still an organization that addresses food policy and Puget Sound Fresh is now part of the Tilth Alliance. By not identifying any organizations, it changes the policy to give it less direction.

### Bear Creek Urban Planned Development

#### What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

The Bear Creek Urban Planned Development (UPD) was developed under three development agreements that will expire in the coming years: they are known as Trilogy, Redmond Ridge, and Redmond Ridge East. The Executive's proposed 2020 KCCP update includes a series of map amendments and modifications to lead-in text in Chapter 11 of the KCCP that describes the UPDs.

The map amendments include the following changes:

**Map Amendment 7.a** would change the land use designation of the critical area tracts, perimeter buffers, and golf course on 61 parcels within the Trilogy community from upd to op, with the intent of keeping these areas as open space.

**Map Amendment 7.b** would:

- Amend the land use designation of nine parcels in Trilogy from upd to cb.
- Amend the zoning classification on those nine parcels plus one additional parcel from UR-P-SO to CB.

---

13 Trilogy and Redmond Ridge will expire in September 2020, and Redmond Ridge East will expire in December 2023.  
14 Unless otherwise specified, these additional parcels have a land use designation of op.
Apply a P-suffix condition to one of the parcels, limiting the use of the parcel to self-service storage. The Executive states that this is to allow the continuation of the existing self-service storage facility.

Apply a P-suffix condition to the remaining nine parcels, prohibiting gasoline service stations and any associated underground fuel storage tanks. The Executive states that this is intended to protect water quality in the area.

**Map Amendment 7.c** would:

- Amend the land use designation on six parcels in Trilogy from **upd** to **uh**.
- Amend the zoning on the six parcels and five additional parcels from UR-P-SO to R-24.

**Map Amendment 7.d** would:

- Amend the land use designation on all Trilogy parcels north of Novelty Hill Road, except those amended by Map Amendment 7a. from **upd** to **um**.
- Amend the zoning of all Trilogy parcels north of Novelty Hill Road from UR-P-SO to R-6
- Amend the zoning of 12 parcels south of Novelty Hill Road from UR-P-SO to R-12.

The Executive states that these changes are consistent with the current development on the parcels.

**Redmond Ridge Map Amendments**

**Map Amendment 7.e** would amend the land use designation of the critical area tracts, perimeter buffers, and private parks on 61 parcels within the Redmond Ridge community from **upd** to **op**, with the intent of keeping these areas as open space.

**Map Amendment 7.f and Code Update** would:

- Amend the land use designation on 19 parcels from **upd** to **i**.
- Amend the zoning on these 19 parcels and one additional parcel from UR-P-SO to I.
- Add a P-suffix condition on the 20 I-zoned parcels, prohibiting meat and packing plants, poultry slaughtering and processing, petroleum refining and related industries, and primary metal industries.
- Amend the land use designation on 17 parcels from **upd** to **cb**.
- Amend the zoning on these 17 parcels and four additional parcels from UR-P-SO to O.
- Add a special district overlay to 7 of the O-zoned parcels that are undeveloped in order to allow additional retail uses on the parcels that typically are not allowed in the O-zone. This new overlay is found in Section 53 of the ordinance.

**Map Amendment 7.g** would:

- Amend the land use designation on eight parcels located between Novelty Hill Road and NE Marketplace Drive from **upd** to **nb**.
• Amend the zoning on the same eight parcels and one additional parcel from UR-P-SO to NB.

**Map Amendment 7.h** would:
• Amend the land use designation of six parcels from *upd* to *uh*.
• Amend zoning of the four of those parcels, and an additional four parcels from UR-P-SO to R-18.
• Amend zoning of one of the six parcels from UR-P-SO to R-24.

The Executive states that this is consistent with existing development on the parcels.

**Map Amendment 7.i** would:
• Amend the land use designation of a large number of parcels from *upd* to *um*.
• Amend the zoning of 13 parcels from UR-P-SO to R-12. Three of the parcels are ones changed from *upd* to *um*, one was given a land use designation of *uh* through map amendment 7.h, and the rest would be designated *op* through map amendment 7.e.
• Amend the zoning of the remaining *upd* to *um* parcels, in addition to a number of *upd to op* parcels, from UR-P-SO to R-6.

**Redmond Ridge East Map Amendments**

**Map Amendment 7.j** would amend the land use designation of the critical area tracts, perimeter buffers, and recreation tracts on 87 parcels within the Redmond Ridge East community from *upd* to *op*, with the intent of keeping these areas as open space.

**Map Amendment 7.k** would amend the land use designation of one parcel on Eastridge Drive from *upd to uh*, and amend the zoning of the same parcel from UR-P-SO to R-24. The Executive states that this is consistent with existing development on the parcel.

**Map Amendment 7.l** would:
• Change the land use designation on all parcels in Redmond Ridge East, except those addressed in 7.j and 7.k. The designation would change from *upd* to *um*.
• Change the zoning of all the parcels mentioned above, as well as those proposed for an *op* designation, from UR-P-SO to R-6.

The Executive states that these changes are consistent with existing development in the area.

**Removal of P-suffixes and SDOs**

**Map Amendment 7.m** would remove p-suffix condition BC-P04 from all parcels to which it currently applies. The condition requires dedication of right-of-way along Novelty Hill Road. The Executive states that the developments within the UPD have dedicated sufficient area already. The amendment also affects parcels outside of the UPD, and the Executive states that these parcels will be held to current King County Road Design and Construction Standards.
Map Amendment 7.n would remove p-suffix BC-P05 from all parcels to which it currently applies. Like BC-P04, this p-suffix requires right-of-way improvements during development. The Executive states that the developments within the UPD have dedicated sufficient area for rights-of-way already. The amendment also affects parcels outside of the UPD, and the Executive states that these parcels will be held to current King County Road Design and Construction Standards.

Map Amendments 7.o and 7.p would remove p-suffix conditions BC-P17 and BC-P21, respectively, from all parcels to which they apply. The conditions established a review process for the development of all parcels within the Trilogy and Redmond Ridge communities. The Executive states that these review processes were related to the development agreements and no longer apply now that the development agreements will no longer be in place.

Map Amendment 7.q and Code Amendment would repeal SO-070, which applies to all parcels in the Bear Creek UPD. The SDO establishes the area as a UPD, and is proposed for removal as the area will no longer be a UPD. K.C.C. 21.38.070 is likewise repealed.

Map Amendment 7.r and Code Amendment would repeal SO-110, which applies to all parcels in the Bear Creek UPD. The SDO establishes the area as a fully-contained community. The Executive states that this designation is no longer necessary with the removal of the UPD agreements. K.C.C. 21A.38.110 is likewise repealed.

Key Issues

• Council staff analysis of the proposed Bear Creek Map Amendments is ongoing, including a review of: 1) whether the proposed zoning and land use designations are consistent for each parcel in the UPD; 2) whether nonconforming uses will be created when the development agreements expire; and 3) whether any other policy or code changes are needed to implement these map amendments.

• Map Amendments 7.m and 7.n affect parcels outside of the UPD, which is not part of the scoping motion.

KCCC Map Amendments

What’s new in the 2020 KCCC Update?

The Executive proposes eight KCCC map amendments, in addition to the 18 Bear Creek Map Amendments discussed above and the 12 map amendments associated with the Skyway-West Hill CSA Subarea Plan.

Map Amendment 1 would expand the Snoqualmie APD by:

• Amending the land use designation of five parcels from ra to ag.
• Amending the zoning classification of four of those parcels from RA-10 to A-10.
• Amending the zoning of the remaining parcel from RA-10/RA-10-P to A-10/A-10-P. The existing p-suffix condition, SV-P03, which prohibits new or additional fill from being placed within the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) delineated floodway, is proposed to be retained.
• Add all five parcels to the Agricultural Production District.

All parcels are currently vacant.

**Map Amendment 2** would move the UGA boundary and APD so that a roundabout constructed by the City of Woodinville would be fully within the UGA and outside of the APD. It would also mitigate for the incursion into the APD. Proposed changes include:

- Amending the land use designation from *ra* to *ag* on two parcels.
- Amending the zoning classification on those parcels from RA-2.5-P to A-10-P.
- Adding those two parcels to the APD.
- Moving the UGA boundary so that the road and right-of-way portion of the roundabout is in the urban area.
- Removing this road and right-of-way portion from the APD.

The Executive states that these changes are in accordance with an agreement with the City of Woodinville.

**Map Amendment 3** would upzone one parcel in North Highline from R-6 to R-18, and accordingly change the land use designation from *um* to *uh*. The Executive states that this change is in accordance with a letter of intent signed by the County.

**Map Amendment 4** would repeal SO-230, which limits allowed densities on RA-5 zoned properties to one unit per ten acres. The change affects 314 parcels. The Executive states that these restrictions are no longer needed given current critical area and floodplain regulations. This map amendment is related to the SO-230 Repeal discussed above in this staff report.

**Map Amendment 5.a** would make changes to the East Cougar Mountain Potential Annexation Area:

- Amending the land use designation on three parcels from *upd* to *ra*.
- Amending the zoning classification on two of those parcels from UR-P-SO to RA-5.
- Amending the zoning on the remaining parcel from R-1-P to RA-5.
- Removing all three parcels from the UGA.

These changes are recommended by the Executive after the City of Issaquah indicated that they would not annex the area. Further, the Area Zoning and Land Use Study states that location of an urban planned development in this area is not feasible due to minimum sizes for UPDs and environmental constraints.

**Map Amendment 5.b** would remove SO-070 from nine parcels. The SDO designates an urban planned development on these parcels. These changes are in accordance with the East Cougar Mountain PAA Area Study. The Executive states that a UPD is no longer feasible on these properties.

**Map Amendment 5.c** would remove NC-P01 from 73 parcels. The p-suffix condition relates to the creation of a master planned development. The Executive states that the
remaining parcels are too small to create a master planned development and thus the development condition should be removed.

**Map Amendment 6** would add five parcels to the UGA adjacent to the city of Maple Valley, including:

- Changing the land use designation on five of the parcels from ra to op.
- Adding the five parcels to the UGA.

One of the parcels is currently bisected by the UGA boundary. The Executive states that three of the parcels are portions of stormwater detention ponds that are owned by the City of Maple Valley and are currently split by the UGA boundary, the fourth parcel contains a water district building and parks, and the fifth parcel is a water district water tank.

**Key Issues**

Council staff analysis of the map amendments is ongoing. In particular, Council staff is reviewing whether the UGA amendments are allowed by the CPPs and KCCP.

---

**VMI Implementing Actions Report**

What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

The scoping motion required a report on the status of the Priority 1 and Priority 2 Action Items identified in the Vashon-Maury Island (VMI) CSA Subarea Plan. Priority 1 Actions were scheduled to begin implementation in 2018 and 2019, and Priority 2 Actions were scheduled to begin no earlier than 2020.

The scoping motion asked for four pieces of information on each action:

- The implementing action's current status,
- A determination of whether existing KCCP policies or development regulations (or any other adopted plan) require changes in order to proceed with implementation,
- Whether those changes are recommended for inclusion in the 2020 KCCP update, and
- For those items that are not currently on schedule, an explanation of why and an evaluation of when they could be completed.

All Priority 2 Actions, which were not scheduled to begin until 2020, have not yet been implemented, with the exception of the Farmland Protection Program working with farmers on VMI to explore opportunities to increase farmland protection. The report states that this action is already underway.

With regards to the Priority 1 Actions, the report states that all actions are on schedule, and that no code changes are needed or proposed. It appears that Executive staff has interpreted the question of whether "existing Comprehensive Plan policies or development regulations (or any other adopted plan) require changes in order to proceed with implementation" to mean whether they are needed immediately, rather than whether they will be needed at some point to implement the action. For instance, H-5 asks the
Executive to revise the affordable housing SDO as needed, and the 2019 report on this topic suggested that revisions will be recommended in 2020.

In other cases, changes have been proposed as part of the 2020 KCCP update but the report states that changes are not needed or proposed:

- H-6 requires the county to research and consider amendments to the ADU code. Not only will this require code changes, but the changes have been proposed as part of the 2020 update. This is not reflected in the report.
- E-5 deals with mitigating sea level rise, including "developing policy," "creating disincentives for new construction," and "researching regulatory approaches." New regulations and policies around sea level rise are proposed as part of the 2020 KCCP update.

Key Issues

None identified by Council staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea Planning Technical Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?**

The Executive’s proposed updates include terminology changes around CSA Subarea Planning. These would include various technical changes throughout the Comprehensive Plan in order to reflect subarea planning efforts on land use issues in the CSA geographies.

This is recommended to take place in four locations in the KCCP, which are laid out below:

*Executive Summary:* The Executive Summary includes an overview of the twelve chapters within the Comprehensive Plan. The Executive proposed a change to the summary of Chapter 11 to specify that the policies would recognize the unique land use characteristics of unincorporated communities.

*Chapter 1:* Chapter 1 includes a section on Subarea Planning, which provides some policy framework around plan development. The lead-in text introducing subarea plans includes a proposed amendment to rename them “Community Service Area Land Use Plans.” Further, Chapter 1 includes a summary of each chapter of the Comprehensive Plan. In the summary of Chapter 11, Community Service Area Subarea Planning, the Executive proposes an amendment similar to the proposal for the Executive Summary referencing the County’s “land use subarea planning program.”

*Chapter 11:* In the 2018 annual update to the 2016 Comprehensive Plan, the Council approved a new line in the lead-in text for Chapter 11 stating that the focus of subarea plans will be on land use issues in subarea geographies. The Executive proposes amending the language to specify that land use is the primary focus on subarea plans.

Key Issues
- The Executive’s proposal in Chapter 1 to rename subarea plans as “Community Service Area Land Use Subarea Plans” is a policy choice. The Council may wish to maintain the current name of subarea plans as referenced in both the adopted Comprehensive Plan and K.C.C. 20.18.030, adopt the name proposed by the Executive in Chapter 1, or adopt a new name; the latter two options would require a change to King County Code. However, the Executive’s proposal only changes the name of subarea plans in a few places, so whichever name is chosen should be consistent throughout the Comprehensive Plan and King County Code. Also note that the relevant policy below the lead-in text is not amended accordingly.

- The Council may wish to consider whether they want Chapter 11 to describe a focus solely on land use characteristics of unincorporated communities or broader characteristics, especially since there are existing subarea plans and policies in this Chapter that are broader than the land use focus.

### Skyway-West Hill CSA Subarea Plan

**What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?**

The 2020 KCCP update would include adoption of the Skyway-West Hill CSA Subarea Plan. The Executive proposed draft would repeal the 1994 West Hill Plan and replace it with the Skyway-West Hill CSA Land Use Subarea Plan (Plan). The Plan includes a vision statement, plan purpose, guiding principles, subarea history, community engagement summary, community context, policies and action items, and map amendments. Appendices in this subarea plan include community background, a community center feasibility study proviso response, service delivery equity review proviso response, equity impact analysis, and community engagement process.¹⁵

This Plan adds 15 new policies, 5 action items, and identifies 12 map amendments (discussed separately in the Skyway-West Hill Map Amendments Section) related to housing, commercial and industrial uses, and community character.

**Housing Policies**

- Increase residential density along transit corridors and commercial areas while retaining existing land use patterns in other residential neighborhoods.
- Encourage new development in medium-density neighborhoods.
- Retain existing multifamily zoning to continue to promote access to diverse housing choices.
- Complete an Equitable Housing Development Strategy Analysis to address the supply of affordable housing in King County with funding and policies specific to Skyway-West Hill.
- Recommending evaluation and addressing residential displacement for large development proposals.
- Support the preservation of mobile home parks and requiring redevelopment of mobile homes to include evaluation and mitigation of displacement impacts.

**Housing Action Items**

¹⁵ The community center feasibility study proviso response, service delivery equity review proviso response, equity impact analysis are described further elsewhere in this staff report.
• Develop an equitable housing development strategy report that will analyze strategies and tools to create and retain affordable housing.
• Evaluate the County's permit review process for public engagement and to pilot new techniques. The stated goal is to build capacity among local residents and to maintain/enhance the character of Skyway-West Hill.

**Commercial and Industrial Policies**

• Retain and extend the Community Business Center designation for the Skyway Business District.
• Recommend supporting and incentivizing opportunities for smaller-scale commercial development.
• Retain, and expand where appropriate, development conditions that support pedestrian-oriented community development within the Skyway Business District.
• Designate Martin Luther King Jr. Way S and Rainier Ave S as Neighborhood Business Centers.
• Require additional standards for commercial developments in the Martin Luther King Jr. Way S and Rainier Ave S Neighborhood Business Centers.
• Retain existing industrial zoning to support employment opportunities and local economic activity.

**Commercial and Industrial Action Item**

• Develop incentives within the Skyway Business District to support opportunities for smaller-scale commercial development and support locally owned and culturally significant businesses.

**Community Character Policies**

• Recommend incentivizing community-desired amenities for new developments located near commercial centers, transit corridors and parks and trails.
• Recommend involving the community to identify and potentially preserve cultural assets during permit review.

**Community Character Action Items**

• Develop a community-desired amenity program to provide bonuses to developers and property owners in exchange for the voluntary preservation or provision of cultural assets and community amenities.
• Engage with the City of Renton and seek to develop a joint planning or similar agreement that supports compatible development patterns and design of adjacent neighborhoods.

**Key Issues**

Council staff analysis of the package of changes related to the Skyway-West Hill CSA Subarea Plan, including associated map amendments and code amendments, is ongoing. This is new policy for the Council to consider.
What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

The Executive proposes twelve map amendments as part of the Skyway-West Hill CSA Subarea Plan:

**SWH Map Amendment 1** would remove P-Suffix WH-P04, the West Hill Area Design Standards, from 4,765 parcels. The P-suffix currently applies to nearly all parcels in the subarea and was put in place as part of the 1994 West Hill Subarea Plan.

The condition contains a number of requirements relating to home orientation, waste screening, and transit-related requirements. The document states that most of these requirements exist elsewhere in code.

**SWH Map Amendment 2** would remove SO-130 (adopted through K.C.C. 21A.38.140), residential infill standards, from 186 parcels in the R-8 zone. The overlay requires consolidation of individual parcels as a single development project when a subdivision application of one or more acres is made.

The SDO also requires recreation and open space to be sited adjacent to existing utility corridors or open space, and requires pedestrian access to the adjacent right-of-way corridors. The proposal would remove all of these requirements.

**SWH Map Amendment 3** would change the land use designation on 30 parcels from \( cb \) to \( uh \). The Executive characterizes this as a technical change, as the underlying zoning (R-24 and R-48) aligns with the \( uh \) designation rather than the \( cb \) designation.

**SWH Map Amendment 4** is an expansion of the Renton Avenue South Community Business Center. There are three components to the amendment:

- Change the land use designation of one parcel, adjacent to the existing community business center-designated parcels, from \( uh \) to \( cb \).
- Change the zoning on fourteen R-48 or R-24 to CB.
- Add SO-050, which applies to the existing CB parcels in the area, to the newly-zoned CB parcels. This SDO sets standards for pedestrian-oriented development.

**SWH Map Amendment 5** would change the land use designation of one parcel from \( uh \) to \( cb \). This is a technical change to create consistency with the CB zoning currently applied to the property.

**SWH Map Amendment 6** would increase the residential density in the vicinity of 78th Ave South and Renton Ave South. It would:

- Amend the land use designation on 55 parcels from \( um \) to \( uh \).
- Amend the zoning on 52 of those parcels from R-6-P to R-18.
- Amend the zoning on the remaining three parcels form R-12 to R-18.
- For all 55 parcels, apply a new P-suffix condition requiring all new development or redevelopment of multifamily buildings to provide at least 20 percent of the units
at a rate affordable for those making 60 percent or less of Area Median Income (AMI).

The P-suffix removed from the 53 parcels is WH-P04, discussed in SWH Map Amendment 1.

**SWH Map Amendment 7** would downzone the Rainer Avenue South commercial area near S 166th St. It would accomplish this through three changes:

- Amend the land use designation of seventeen parcels from co to nb.
- Amend the zoning of eleven of those parcels from CB to NB.
- Amend the zoning of the remaining six parcels from CB to O.

The amendment would also add a P-suffix condition intended to improve the pedestrian environment by requiring new commercial development and redevelopment of commercial buildings to locate near or construct new sidewalks, by adding requirements for building facades, and by requiring vehicle access from the rear alley or to a single driveway from the frontage street, where such streets exist.

The Executive states that the reason for this change is that the KCCP lists this area as a neighborhood business center, and the current land use map is in error in designating this area as "commercial outside of center."

**SWH Map Amendment 8** would, similar to Map Amendment 7, downzone the Martin Luther King Jr. Way South commercial area near South 129th St.

- Ten parcels would be changed from co to nb in the land use map.
- The same ten parcels would be rezoned from CB to NB.
- A new p-suffix would be added as well, adding pedestrian-oriented facade requirements, and requiring main building entrances to orient to the public street.

The Executive states that the reason for this change is that the comprehensive plan lists this area as a neighborhood business center, and the current land use map is in error in designating this as "commercial outside of center."

**SWH Map Amendment 9** would increase residential density and add a mixed-use special district overlay on Martin Luther King Jr. Way South near 64th Ave South. The proposal would:

- Amend the zoning on thirteen parcels from R-24 to R-48.
- Add a P-suffix condition to the same parcels that is identical to the P-suffix condition proposed in Map Amendment 6, except the condition only applies to new multifamily projects, not redevelopment.
- Add a P-suffix condition to nine of the thirteen parcels, which is identical to the P-suffix condition in Map Amendment 8.
- Add a special district overlay to the same nine parcels which would require all development proposals to be mixed-use. Standard mixed-use regulations would apply, except:
  - Professional offices would be allowed
  - For retail and personal services uses, parking areas would be permitted within the setbacks, the site must be accessible from at least one public
street, base height must conform to that of the R-48 zone, and building illumination and lighted signs must be designed so no direct rays are projected into neighboring residences or onto any street right-of-way.

**SWH Map Amendment 10** would add a P-suffix condition to seven parcels, limiting the use of the parcels to a mobile home park, which is the current use. As part of the subarea plan, the Executive has proposed that a Skyway-West Hill Equitable Housing Development Analysis Report be created, and that this report develop a process and criteria for removing this requirement from any of the parcels.

**SWH Map Amendment 11** would apply to the remaining 68 CB-zoned parcels in the subarea (should Map Amendments 7 and 8 pass). The amendment would state that marijuana retail uses would only be allowed on these parcels if the total number of marijuana retailers in the subarea did not exceed four.

**SWH Map Amendment 12** would change the zoning on 49 parcels along Renton Ave. S from R-6 to R-12. The Executive states that the reasoning for this change is that the parcels are close to a number of community amenities, bus stops, and the pedestrian-oriented commercial district.

**Key Issues**

These map amendments implement policies described in the Skyway-West Hill CSA Subarea Plan. If those policies are not adopted or are amended, the map amendments may need to be changed or removed to be consistent.

### Skyway-West Hill Code Amendments

**What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?**

The Executive proposes amendments to several code sections to implement the Skyway-West Hill CSA Subarea Plan. Changes include:

- Amending K.C.C. 20.12.015 to remove a reference to the West Hill Community Plan in the context of the 1994 King County Comprehensive Plan.
- Amending K.C.C. 20.12.337 to remove a reference to the West Hill Community Plan and replace it with a reference to the new subarea plan.
- Adding a Skyway-West Hill Neighborhood Business Mixed-Use Special District Overlay, in accordance with SWH Map Amendment 9. The SDO would require any development proposal on the parcels to be mixed-use development on nine parcels proposed to be upzoned from R-24 to R-48 area. The standard mixed-use requirements would apply, except:
  - Professional offices would be allowed, and
  - For retail and personal services uses, parking areas would be permitted within the setbacks, the site must be accessible from at least one public street, base height must conform to that of the R-48 zone, and building illumination and lighted signs must be designed so no direct rays are projected into neighboring residences or onto any street right-of-way.
• Amending K.C.C. 21A.38.050 related to pedestrian-oriented commercial development to do the following:
  o Include additional prohibited uses
  o Remove references to the West Hill Plan that is being repealed
  o Require existing buildings with sufficient setbacks to provide pedestrian improvements when undergoing substantial improvements
  o Remove the ability to waive landscaping requirements
  o Remove special parking requirements for the overlay.
  o Repeal 21A.38.140 (in accordance with Map Amendment 2).
  o Repeal the attachments to Ordinance 11166 (The West Hill Community Plan).

Key Issues

• Adoption of the Skyway-West Hill CSA subarea plan associated with these code changes are policy choices for the Council.
• Repeal of the West Hill Community Plan includes repeal of policies that are broader than the land use focus of the CSA Subarea Plan. Council may want to review these broader policies for potential inclusion in the KCCP if they are repealed.

### Skyway-West Hill Community Center Feasibility

What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

The Skyway-West Hill Community Service Area (SWH CSA) Subarea Plan includes an addendum regarding the Community Center Feasibility Study (Appendix C) as required by a 2019-2020 Biennial Budget proviso\(^\text{16}\). The proviso required the Executive to provide a “…feasibility study for a community center in Skyway-West Hill shall include, but not be limited to:

1. Potential sites for a community center;
2. Cost estimates for a community center; and
3. Barriers to development of a community center and methods to overcome those barriers.”

The Community Center Feasibility Study was prepared by the Department of Local Services (DLS) and the Parks and Recreation Division of the Department of Natural Resources and Parks (Parks). DLS and Parks relied on the Skyway Community Center: Conceptual Design Report, commissioned by Skyway Solutions and produced by Schemata Workshop in January 2014. The 2014 design report development was informed by three community workshops conducted in the fall of 2013, site tours of other community centers in the Seattle area, and site visits to potential sites for a community center in the SWH community. The business plan for the Community Center Feasibility was developed by Impact Capital and cost estimating was performed by Project Delivery Analysts, Inc.

---
\(^{16}\) Ordinance 18835 Section 84 Proviso P5.
The following summarizes the key findings of the Executive’s Community Center Feasibility Study:

1. **Potential sites for a community center.** The Feasibility Study identifies guidelines developed by surrounding Cities (Seattle and Renton) and common site characteristics of existing community centers in the Puget Sound region in order to narrow down potential sites for a community center. According to the Seattle Parks and Recreation 2011 Development Plan, "a community center should be provided within 1 ½ miles of every Seattle household." According to their 2011 Parks, Recreation and Natural Area Plan, the City of Renton has one facility per 8,417 residents. Common characteristics of community centers in the Puget Sound include a building size of 20,000 – 50,000 square feet, indoor and outdoor space that is largely flat, includes parking, safe ingress/egress, and proximity to public transportation.

Four of the potential sites included in the feasibility study were identified by the community during the 2014 Conceptual Design Report engagement sessions. The two additional sites currently owned by the County were added after the community engagement completed. These sites are seen in Table 1 below. A map can be seen on page 54 of Attachment F to the Proposed Ordinance.

**Table 1 – Potential Sites Identified for SWH Community Center**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Current Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Former Skyway Market property*</td>
<td>Thai Investments, LLC</td>
<td>12600 Renton Avenue S</td>
<td>1.34 acres</td>
<td>In the central business district with access to transit. Site has existing building (25,000 sf), parking lot. Possible brownfield.</td>
<td>Religious facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Fire Station #1*</td>
<td>King County Fire District No. 20</td>
<td>11619 84th Avenue S Parcel</td>
<td>.50 acres</td>
<td>Next to Bryn Mawr Elementary. Small parcel, with existing building, former fire station (3,750 sf)</td>
<td>Fire district for equipment storage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Operation Emergency Center*</td>
<td>JTA LLC</td>
<td>11410 Renton Avenue S</td>
<td>.96 acres</td>
<td>On main road, with access to transit, at border with Seattle. Site has existing building (2,384 sf), small parking lot.</td>
<td>Not currently in use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyway Park*</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>12010 71st Avenue S</td>
<td>22 acres</td>
<td>22-acre community park, no structures beyond small</td>
<td>Community park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

17 Attachment F to PO 2019-0413, Page 53
18 Attachment F to PO 2019-0413, Page 54
19 Asterisks indicate the site was considered by the community during the 2014 Conceptual Design Report engagement sessions.
2. **Cost Estimates for a community center.** The Feasibility Study outlines the estimated construction costs included in the 2014 Conceptual Design Report, an estimate provided by DLS, and an estimate from the Park’s capital project managers for a project similar to a community center. The cost estimates included in the 2014 Conceptual Design Report, using 2013 economics, were based on programming and support needs for a one-story facility that includes the following: flexible programming spaces for classes and small groups, basketball courts/gymnasium, swimming pool, reception hall, meeting rooms, kitchen area, administrative offices, restrooms and other building infrastructure. This estimated construction costs of approximately $10 million, $225 to $240 per square foot without a pool, and $350 per square foot with a pool.\(^{21}\) In 2019 this estimate was updated by Executive staff to reflect additional costs not considered during the development of the Skyway Community Center: Conceptual Design Report.\(^{22}\) This revised estimate is $20 million for base construction costs and a total cost of $41 million. This is within the range of $35 to $40 million in total project costs stated in the report as current conceptual estimates for community centers in King County.\(^{23}\)

3. **Barriers to development of a community center and methods to overcome those barriers.** The barriers identified in the report include:
   a. Lack of readily available location.
   b. Small population size for the Skyway-West Hill community\(^ {24}\) compared to YMCA established criteria of "an eight-square-mile area with approximately

\(^{20}\) According to Executive staff this parcel was originally slated for development by King County, Dept. of Community & Human Services but is now under consideration for acquisition by DNRP due to the wetland constraints.
\(^{21}\) Skyway-West Hill Land Use Subarea Plan, Page 58
\(^{22}\) According to Executive staff this includes, "design, project management, permitting fees, administration, and utility hook-up fees.” Page 59.
\(^{23}\) Skyway-West Hill Land Use Subarea Plan, Page 58
\(^{24}\) Approximately 18,500 residents
50,000 households as a reasonable service area to yield the level of participation necessary to sustain their facility and programs."
c. Potentially need a conditional use permit depending on zoning.
d. Cost of construction.
e. Finding a service provider and/or operator to build and operate the center.
f. Long-term operations and maintenance costs. YMCA estimated $4 - $5 million annual costs for a 14,000 square foot community center without a pool.

The methods to overcome barriers listed above are identified as:
   a. Increase SWH community engagement with existing nearby community centers and existing programming.
   b. Creating a "Community-Desired Amenities Program" incentivizing developers and property owners to invest in community facilities.
   c. Achieving a conditional use permit if needed.
   d. Regional aquatics recreation feasibility study produced that will "highlight the demand, need, and priorities for aquatic facilities" that could buttress efforts to site an aquatic center in or near the SWH community.
   e. Acquiring grant funding through Federal Community Development Block Grants, Washington Recreation and Conservation Office grants, Department of Commerce grants, King County Parks' Community Partnerships and Grants, etc.
   f. Public-private partnerships for funding, construction, and operations.

Key Issues

The purpose of the Community Center Feasibility Study was to provide information regarding potential sites, cost estimates, and barriers to development of a community center, and the key findings of that analysis are included above. The key issues identified below includes additional issues that were not identified in the Community Center Feasibility Study.

- The Council may wish to consider requesting the Executive to conduct an equity analysis related to including an aquatic facility in future SWH community center planning efforts. The 2014 report by Schemata Workshop indicated that "the plan was drawn so that the pool could potentially be excluded, or included in a future phase, without having to redo the entire plan." Construction and operational costs are higher for a community center that includes an aquatic facility.
- The Council may wish to consider requesting the Executive to conduct a more thorough analysis of organizations that serve or might consider serving SWH residents with community center-like programming in order to creatively provide activities and resources in the absence of a brick and mortar community center.

Proposed Motion 2019-0417 would acknowledge receipt of the Community Center Feasibility Study (and the Level of Service Equity Impact Analysis described below). The Proposed Motion will be heard in Committee in early 2020, and full Council staff analysis of whether this Feasibility Report complies with the terms of the proviso will be provided with that staff report.

25 Within five miles of the SWH library
26 Schemata Workshop, 2014 SWH Community Center Report, Page 6
What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

Prior to the transmittal of the Comprehensive Plan update, the Executive sent a letter to the Council providing a status update on all action items within the Workplan adopted in the 2016 Comprehensive Plan, including items amended as part of the 2018 update. As part of the Public Review Draft, the Executive proposed modifying the transmittal deadlines and scope of work for several Workplan Action Items that lined up with the letter sent to the Council. Ultimately, the transmitted 2020 KCCP update removes the changes shown in the PRD (except one for Action Item 12), because the scope of work for the midpoint update does not specify modifications to the Workplan, and these changes would not be allowed as part of an annual update.

The letter sent by the Executive includes delays to four Workplan items. These delays are laid out in Table 2 below, which includes a history of the timelines adopted for the four action items.

### Table 2 – Changes to Workplan Action Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Timeline in Ordinance 18247</th>
<th>Timeline in Ordinance 18810</th>
<th>Timeline in Executive's letter (and in PRD)</th>
<th>Item as reflected in the Transmitted PO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Skyway/ West Hill Subarea Plan</td>
<td>3/1/18</td>
<td>6/30/19</td>
<td>9/30/19</td>
<td>Transmitted with 2020 KCCP update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Alternative Housing Demonstration Project</td>
<td>Phase 1: Ordinance due 12/31/18&lt;br&gt;Phase 2: 12/31/20</td>
<td>Phase 1: Ordinance due 6/28/19&lt;br&gt;Phase 2: Report due 12/31/21</td>
<td>Phase 1: 12/31/19&lt;br&gt;Phase 2: within 2 years from final certificate of occupancy</td>
<td>Phase 1: 6/28/19&lt;br&gt;Phase 2: 12/31/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMI CSA 2. Vashon-Maury Island Sewer</td>
<td>6/30/19</td>
<td>unchanged</td>
<td>12/31/19</td>
<td>See VMI Section Below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27 Ordinance 18247 is the 2016 Comprehensive Plan.
28 Ordinance 18810 is the 2018 update to the 2016 Comprehensive Plan.
29 The Skyway/West Hill Subarea Plan was transmitted to Council as Attachment F to Proposed Ordinance 2019-0413.
The official due date is the column listed under Ordinance 18810, the amendments made in 2018 as part of the Comprehensive Planning restructure. The Executive has communicated through a letter that these four Workplan Action items will be delayed. In the Executive’s proposed 2020 KCCP update there are proposed changes to Action Item 12: Update Plat Ingress/Egress Requirements, and the other three are left unchanged. Executive staff have stated that the change to Action Item 12 was transmitted in error.

Key Issues

K.C.C. 20.18.030 and KCP Policy I-203, which provides detail on what can be changed in annual and midpoint updates, only allows for amendments to the Workplan as part of the 2018 subarea planning restructure. Additionally, although the Scope of Work adopted in Motion 15329 calls for the Comprehensive Plan to be updated to reflect outcomes of work done on Workplan Action Items, it does not call for changes to the Workplan schedule or scope of work.

The Council may want to consider amending the code and KCCP to allow for amendments to the Comprehensive Workplan in annual or midpoint updates in order to reflect these proposed timeline changes (and any others as desired by the Council). The change to code could either specifically allow for changes to the Workplan in annual or midpoint updates for the purpose of amending the timelines or broadly allow for any amendments to existing Workplan items. If the Council chooses to retain the prohibition against Workplan Items being amended in a midpoint update, the Executive’s proposed amendments to Action Item 12 should be removed.

Terminology and Data Updates and Corrections

What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

The transmitted 2020 KCCP update includes changes throughout to update terminology related to comprehensive plan updates, amendments, schedules and processes, as well as department name changes, dates, data, maps and references. Reviewing and updating this information is directed for inclusion in the 2020 KCCP update per the scoping motion. Additionally, grammatical corrections and citation corrections are incorporated throughout the transmitted 2020 KCCP update.

Key Issues

None identified by Council staff.

---

30 This action item was one of three adopted as part of the Vashon-Maury Island Subarea Plan adopted in 2017 and amended in Ordinance 18810.
Maps in KCCP Attachment A to Proposed Ordinance

What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

The Executive recommended 2020 KCCP update includes eight updates or new maps within Attachment A. Substantive changes are made only to the Mineral Resources Map, which removes reference to "Owner-Identified Potential Sub-Surface Coal Sties," which are also proposed to be removed from the types of mineral resources in King County.

Key Issues

None identified by Council staff. Depending on what amendments the Council makes to the transmitted plan, modifications to these maps may be needed.

Technical Appendix C and C1 Transportation Needs Report

Technical Appendix C includes the County’s Arterial Functional Classification of Roadways, the Transportation Inventory, and the Travel Forecast Summary, as well as the Transportation Needs Report (TNR) as outlined in Appendix C1.

2020 ARTERIAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION

King County’s arterial functional classification system classifies roadways based on the degree to which a roadway serves the movement of traffic or provides access to adjacent land uses. Arterial classifications can be used to guide transportation planning, roadway design and allocation of road improvement funds. King County designates three types of arterial roadways:

- **Principal arterials** that mostly serve "through traffic" across and between large subareas, with minimum direct service to abutting land uses;
- **Minor arterials** that provide for movement within the subareas and provide more direct access to abutting land uses than do principal arterials; and
- **Collector arterials** that link local neighborhood streets and larger arterials.

What’s new in the transmitted 2020 KCCP?

**Classification changes.** The proposed 2020 KCCP update includes nine classification changes as shown in Table 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>154 PL NE (NE 124 St - NE 116 St)</td>
<td>Local to Collector</td>
<td>This is the main access road that connects a principal arterial (NE 124th St) to 60 Acres Park, northeast of Redmond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Park Crescent (NE Novelty Hill Rd – Redmond Ridge Dr NE)</td>
<td>Local to Collector</td>
<td>This is the first of three road segments that form a loop connection to Novelty Hill Road (principal arterial). Serves Redmond Ridge and Redmond Ridge East developments. A portion of this segment is a T3 freight route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Cedar Park Crescent (Redmond Ridge Dr NE – Eastridge Dr NE)</td>
<td>Local to Collector</td>
<td>This is the second of three road segments that form a loop connection to Novelty Hill Road (principal arterial). Serves Redmond Ridge and Redmond Ridge East developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastridge Drive NE (NE 110 St – NE Cedar Park Crescent)</td>
<td>Local to Collector</td>
<td>This is the third of three road segments that form a loop connection to Novelty Hill Road (principal arterial). Serves Redmond Ridge and Redmond Ridge East developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Ave S (Des Moines Memorial Drive S – SR 99 SB on-ramp)</td>
<td>Local to Minor</td>
<td>This South Park road connects industrial and distribution warehouse traffic to a southbound SR-99 ramp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 129 St/64 Ave S/68 Ave S (S 129 St – to Renton Ave S)</td>
<td>Collector to Minor</td>
<td>This Skyway road provides a connection between Renton Ave S (minor arterial) and Martin Luther King Jr Way S /SR-90 (principal arterial)). This road also serves as a lifeline route, a T3 freight route and is a King County designated snow/ice route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68th Ave S (SR 900 – to Renton City Limits)</td>
<td>Collector to Minor</td>
<td>This road serves as a primary connection between SR 900 (principal arterial) and a city of Renton principal arterial. This road is a T3 freight route and a snow/ice route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Star Lake Rd (Military Rd S to S 277 St)</td>
<td>Local to Collector</td>
<td>This Star Lake area road provides the only east-west connection between two arterials: S 272nd St and S 288th St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 Ave S (S 277 St – Auburn City Limits)</td>
<td>Collector to Minor</td>
<td>This road connects S 277th St (principal arterial) with S 288th St (minor arterial), east of the Star Lake area. This road serves as a lifeline route and a T3 freight route.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2020 TRANSPORTATION INVENTORY

The KCCP includes an inventory of transportation services and facilities to meet the requirements for the transportation element required by the GMA.31

What’s new in the transmitted 2020 KCCP?

Air transportation system. The 2020 inventory identifies sixteen airports located within King County, six less than the twenty-two identified in 2016.

Marine transportation system. The 2020 inventory includes route maps for the Washington State Ferries and the King County Water Taxi which were not included in the 2016 inventory.

Land transportation system. The 2020 inventory includes updated figures for road infrastructure owned by King County. A comparison of the 2016 and 2020 figures are shown in Table 4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Type</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roadways</td>
<td>1,469 miles</td>
<td>1,466 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Signals</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardrail</td>
<td>114 miles</td>
<td>114 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Control Signs</td>
<td>Over 44,000</td>
<td>Over 47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Cameras</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Ditches</td>
<td>~ 4.7 million feet</td>
<td>~ 4.7 million feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage Pipe</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>~3 million feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2020 inventory removes a map of the County’s maintenance facilities that was provided in 2016 and provides a web link to the map instead.

Transit services. The 2020 inventory provides updated data and informational links for King County’s transit service options. The 2020 inventory also includes a new section on equity and sustainability, which references a new framework for the implementation of mobility services being developed by Metro Transit. The narrative explains the goal of this framework is to improve outcomes for priority populations and reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transportation.

2020 TRAVEL FORECAST SUMMARY

State law requires the Transportation Element of a Comprehensive Plan to include “forecasts of traffic for at least ten years based on the adopted land use plan to provide information on the location, timing, and capacity needs of future growth.”32

31 RCW 36.70A.070(6)(a)
32 RCW 70A.070(6)(a)
What’s new in the transmitted 2020 KCCP?

The 2020 Travel Forecast Summary, which runs a model scenario with a forecast year of 2031, was not updated from the 2016 KCCP and thus includes the same traffic forecasts included in the 2016 forecast summary. Forecasted pm peak hour traffic volumes on state facilities and local roads forecasted to see potential congestion are highlighted in two maps which illustrated potential congestion along the same road segments identified in the 2016 forecast.

APPENDIX C1 TRANSPORTATION NEEDS REPORT (TNR)

The Transportation Needs Report (TNR) is a long-term, comprehensive list of recommended improvements for unincorporated King County. King County uses this list, together with its six-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and biennial operating budget, to serve as the Growth Management Act-required transportation capital facilities plan element of the KCCP.33

What’s new in the transmitted 2020 KCCP?

Deleted projects. The 2020 TNR does not include 60 projects that were in the 2016 TNR. Of these, 33 were removed because they have been completed and the remaining 27 were removed due to updated technical information and completed studies.34

New projects. The proposed 2020 TNR includes 419 separate projects, totaling $1.72 billion, including 150 new projects, totaling approximately $333 million, not previously listed in the 2016 TNR. Table 5 shows the cost and percentage breakdown of the full TNR project list by project type.

Table 5 – 2020 TNR Projects by Project Family as a Percent of the TNR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Category</th>
<th># of Projects</th>
<th>Total TNR</th>
<th>% of TNR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity-Major</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$368,600,000</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$301,390,000</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$288,680,000</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmotorized</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$269,460,000</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection/Traffic Safety</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$192,260,000</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable Road Segments</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$167,430,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>$113,980,000</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$9,700,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardrail</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$9,510,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>419</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,721,010,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33 RCW 36.70A.070
34 Updated technical information and completed studies may determine that a project is no longer needed, or will not be feasible within the 20-year TNR planning timeframe. In addition, some projects are re-scoped and folded in with other TNR project needs rather than identified as a standalone need.
35 Totals equal over 100% due to rounding.
Table 6 below, illustrates the cost and percentage breakdown of the new projects as a percent of the total new project costs included in the 2020 TNR. The 15 new bridge projects make up the largest share of total added costs at approximately $95 million. The 78 new drainage projects make up over half of the total of new projects added and are second only to bridge projects in total added costs at approximately $82 million. It should be noted that whereas new capacity projects accounted for nearly $168 million in added costs in the 2016 TNR (68 percent of total new 2016 TNR costs), the 2020 TNR includes no new capacity projects. According to Road Services Division, the Travel Forecast was not updated for the 2020 TNR, therefore there was not sufficient new information to merit adding new capacity projects at this time. The 2023 KCCP update will include new forecasting and may result in additional new capacity projects.

Table 6 – New TNR Projects by Project Family as a Percent of New TNR Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Category</th>
<th>New Projects</th>
<th>New Projects Costs</th>
<th>% of Total New TNR Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity-Major</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$94,670,000</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmotorized</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$40,800,000</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersection/Traffic Safety Operations</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$44,430,000</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable Road Segments</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$70,970,000</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>$82,120,000</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardrail</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$460,000</td>
<td>.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
<td><strong>$333,450,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project needs as a percent of TNR in 2016 and 2020. Table 7 compares costs by project family between the proposed 2020 TNR and the 2016 TNR. Drainage and Reconstruction exhibit the most significant shifts in terms of need as a percent of the total TNR funds, having increased from 3 and 10 percent in 2016 to 7 and 17 percent respectively, in 2020. Drainage and nonmotorized projects show the greatest increase in total project cost, with drainage projects having nearly quadrupled and nonmotorized projects having tripled.

Table 7 – Comparisons of Project Needs in 2016 and 2020 TNR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Needs</th>
<th>2016 TNR</th>
<th>Need as % of TNR</th>
<th>2020 TNR</th>
<th>Need as % of TNR</th>
<th>% Change 2016-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity-Major</td>
<td>$307,000,000</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>$368,600,000</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>$229,000,000</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>$301,390,000</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction</td>
<td>$107,000,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$288,680,000</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>170%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmotorized</td>
<td>$84,900,000</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$269,460,000</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>217%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Needs</th>
<th>2016 TNR</th>
<th>Need as % of TNR</th>
<th>2020 TNR</th>
<th>Need as % of TNR</th>
<th>% Change 2016-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intersection/Traffic Safety Operations</td>
<td>$116,000,000</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$192,260,000</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable Road Segments</td>
<td>$85,900,000</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>$167,430,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage</td>
<td>$31,000,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>$113,980,000</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>267%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>$55,700,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$9,700,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardrail</td>
<td>$35,200,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>$9,510,000</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,051,700,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,721,010,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Financial Analysis

Both the 2016 and the 2020 TNRs include a financial analysis intended to quantify any anticipated revenue shortfall over the twenty year period on which the TNR is based. Table 8 shows how the anticipated shortfall has increased from the 2016 TNR as anticipated revenues continue to decline relative to the cost of providing current service levels. Unless a sustainable revenue source is identified, the impact of this decline will mean that Road Fund contributions to the roads capital program will cease by 2024, and all property taxes would be used for operating costs. As a result, the financial analysis expects that only $77 million of the estimated $172 million in TNR revenues will come from Roads’ funding sources through 2024. From 2025 through 2039, the remaining $95 million in anticipated revenues is expected to come from grants and other non-Road fund revenue sources.

### Table 8 – Revenue Shortfall in 2016 and 2020 TNR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2016-2035 (2016 TNR)</th>
<th>2020-2039 (2016 TNR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Costs</td>
<td>$1,051,700,000</td>
<td>$1,721,010,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Revenue</td>
<td>$289,349,991</td>
<td>$172,705,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortfall</td>
<td>$762,350,000</td>
<td>$1,548,305,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Program

Under the ADA, regulations require that pedestrian facilities such as curb ramps and signal push buttons be upgraded to be accessible to people with disabilities whenever a roadway is altered. Though there are no stand-alone ADA projects in the 2020 TNR, certain types of roads capital projects, such as some non-motorized and paving projects, result in upgrades to ADA infrastructure.

---

36 Totals equal over 100% due to rounding.

37 The Road Fund Contribution is funded primarily by a dedicated unincorporated area property tax and gas tax distribution. Property tax revenue projections are based on the most recent approved King County, Office of Economic and Financial Analysis forecast as of July 2019.
The 2016 TNR indicated that the Road Services Division would complete an inventory of ADA location needs by the end of 2017. However, the Road Services Division determined in 2017 that it had insufficient internal staff resources to complete the ADA Transition Plan within that initial timeframe. The 2020 TNR states that, the Road Services Division completed an ADA Self Evaluation in 2019 that produced a geospatial inventory of sidewalks, pathways, curb ramps, crosswalks and signal push buttons associated with the unincorporated King County road network. The data gained from this Self Evaluation will inform the Transition Plan, which is currently under development and is set to be completed by 2020.

**Roadside Maintenance and Operations.** The 2020 TNR does not include a narrative section related to removing, retrofitting or re-engineering objects in the roadside clear zone that was included in the 2016 TNR Roadside Maintenance and Operations subsection of Chapter 2. According to the Road Services Division, the division no longer maintains a program dedicated to such projects and the TNR sections removal reflects the programs cessation.

**Bridge and Culvert Rails.** The 2020 TNR does not include a narrative section on Bridge and Culvert Rails that was included in the 2016 TNR. According to the Road Services Division, the section was removed for 2020 because underlying project priorities and needs are currently being updated. Due to budget constraints, the Roads Guardrail Program has focused, in the recent past, on new guardrail construction and retrofits and, when feasible, bridge and culvert guardrails have been upgraded or replaced as a function of other larger scale capital projects. Future updates to the TNR may include an updated narrative description of this subset of the guardrail system.

**Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Corridor Projects.** The 2005 ITS Strategic Plan established criteria for prioritizing projects and using that criteria identified 34 ITS corridor projects across the County. The 2016 TNR stated that, of those 34 identified projects, seven were completed, two received partial improvements, two had construction planned for 2016-17, and nine corridors had been annexed by other jurisdictions. For the 2020 TNR, 16 projects remain to be completed only two of which are high priority projects.

**Small Scope Operational Projects.** The 2020 TNR removes a section on Small Scope Operational Projects that was included in the 2016 TNR as the Road Services Division no longer maintains a program dedicated to such projects. According to the Road Services Division, these small scale projects are completed through other existing programs, such as the School Safety or Traffic Safety programs. TNR projects that continue to be identified as needs and were previously categorized as ‘Small Scope Operational’ program are categorized within the 2020 TNR as either Nonmotorized or Intersection - Traffic Safety Operations.

**Fish Passage Prioritization.** The 2020 TNR references a new Culvert Replacement and Fish Passage Program which was developed by the Road Services Division to support the County’s Fish Passage Restoration Program. Under the program, projects are identified in collaboration with the Water and Land Resources Division and selected based on the safety and condition of the public road system and fish passage purposes. Identified projects are included in the TNR Drainage category.
Bridge Load Rating. The 2020 TNR includes new information related to bridge weight carrying capacity. In 2013, Federal Highway Administration released new standards for calculating bridge weight-carrying capacity, thus requiring the Road Services Division to evaluate all 178 County vehicular bridges using the updated federal formula. The 2020 TNR states that a bridge load rating update program is underway, with 71 ratings complete at the year-end of 2018 and resulting in nearly 30 percent of the evaluated bridges receiving new weight restrictions. The Road Services Division estimates the load rating analysis on the remaining county vehicular bridges will be complete by 2022 and expects the number of weight restricted bridges to increase as more evaluations are completed.38

Vulnerable Road Segment. A vulnerable road segment is one that is abnormally expensive to maintain and/or that requires frequent repair, as identified in a 2005 Vulnerable Road Segments Study. These segments typically involve failing infrastructure around or beneath the roadway, such as failing retaining walls or seawalls, chronic settlement problems, or roadways close to rivers with repetitive erosion problems. The 2020 TNR includes eight new vulnerable road segments (VRS) from those included in the 2016 TNR. The eight new vulnerable road segments are:

- SE David Powell Rd;
- S 272nd Way;
- 356th Dr SE;
- S Peasley Canyon Road;
- NE Tolt Hill Road;
- NE Ames Lake Road;
- SE Auburn Black Diamond; and
- NE 124 St east of 162 Way NE

The new road segments were identified after a 2019 review which incorporated more current information than the last VRS review which occurred in 2011. The 2020 TNR includes VRS projects recommended in the 2005 VRS study, as well as, the 2011 and 2019 updates.

Assessment of Current Facilities. The 2020 TNR provides an update regarding the Road Services Division's facility needs that were initially identified in the 2014 update to the Strategic Plan for Roads Services and referenced in the 2016 TNR. In 2017, the Road Services Division conducted a Regional Maintenance Facility Siting Assessment which identified candidate site alternatives for the Vashon and Cadman maintenance facilities. The 2020 TNR narrative explains that the Road Services Division intends to use proceeds of future property sales to fund the acquisition of suitable land on Vashon Island and a more centrally located facility in northeast King County. In addition, the Road Services Division, with consultant assistance, is currently updating the King County Road Services Regional Maintenance Facility Siting Assessment Report. At this time however, no other real property/acquisition activities have been initiated.

38 FHWA rules required Group 1 bridges (under 200 feet) to be evaluated under the updated weight-carrying capacity formula by December 31, 2017 and Group 2 bridges (all other structures not in Group 1) by December 31, 2022.
**Drainage projects.** The 2016 TNR referenced a new prioritization system for drainage projects which was to be based on the benefits to water quality and was to be complete by the end of 2016. The 2020 TNR however, utilizes the same prioritization system as the 2016 TNR which rates projects based on a Field Priority Score and Habitat Evaluation. According to the 2020 TNR, the benefits to water quality evaluation system was developed using 2014 grant funding, but was insufficient to operationalize the findings and is now on hold pending additional funding. Furthermore, despite using the same methodology as 2016, the 2020 TNR includes 78 new drainage projects. According to the Road Services Division, this is the result of a subset of drainage needs not being included in the 2016 TNR due to insufficient information. This subset has now been analyzed and resulted in additional Drainage capital needs being included in the 2020 update.

**Key Issues**

None identified by Council staff.

---

**Equity and Social Justice Impact Analysis of the 2020 Amendments to the King County Comprehensive Plan**

**What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?**

The 2020 KCCP update includes an equity impact analysis, which was requested in the scoping motion, which specified that the analysis should use the tool developed by the Office of Equity and Social Justice (OESJ) to "identify, evaluate and describe both the positive and negative potential equity impacts of the policy, land use, zoning and development regulations proposed in the Plan."

The Executive’s Equity and Social Justice Impact Analysis of the 2020 Amendments to the King County Comprehensive Plan (ESJ Analysis) states that the Determinants of Equity that are most directly impacted by the 2020 KCCP update include:

- Built and Natural Environment;
- Neighborhoods;
- Housing;
- Transportation;
- Community Economic Development;
- Parks and Natural Resources; and
- Food Systems.

The Executive considered the first three phases of the OESJ equity impact review process in assessing each of the topical areas identified in the Council-adopted Scope of Work:

- Phase 1: Scope. Identify who will be affected;
- Phase 2: Assess equity and community context; and
- Phase 3: Analysis and decision process.

According to the ESJ Analysis, Phase 4: Implementation and Phase 5: Ongoing Learning will occur after adoption of the 2020 KCCP update.
Key Issues

Outreach and Engagement: Council staff has requested additional information on the community outreach processes conducted for the KCCP update. The Executive's ESJ Analysis notes that because the 2020 KCCP is a midpoint update, "departments did not use a public engagement process to develop the scope of work." Some outreach to existing stakeholders such as community and non-profit groups occurred, but no formal engagement process occurred.

Some parts of the process, including the Skyway-West Hill Land Use Plan and Bear Creek Urban Planned Development Area Study, had their own public processes that were more extensive and targeted outreach to specific communities.

According to the ESJ Analysis, meeting notifications were sent to 11,000 property owners and groups that indicated that interpretation and translation could be requested. In addition, outreach was conducted to people and organizations identified by OESJ. Council staff has requested information on what OESJ recommended and whether and how the recommendations were implemented.

The Executive's ESJ Analysis also indicates that following the public comment period, Executive staff considered the input and refined the plan. Council staff has requested information on specific changes made as a result of the public comments.

Analysis of Topical Areas: Council staff reviewed the Executive's analysis of each topical area identified in the adopted Scope of Work. The Executive's analysis and Council staff comments are summarized briefly in Table 8 below.

Table 9 – Analysis of Topical Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope of Work Items</th>
<th>Summary of Executive-Identified Relevant Determinants and Analysis</th>
<th>Council Staff Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Text and Policy Proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update existing demographic and economic data, maps, and references</td>
<td>N/A. Technical changes that do not affect any policies.</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Plan Update Terminology</td>
<td>N/A. Technical changes for internal consistency.</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Technical Appendix C:</td>
<td>Determinants: Transportation; the Housing and Community</td>
<td>On page 17, the narrative states that “When selecting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that there are some discrepancies between the determinants identified in the narrative contained in pages 15-40 and determinants identified in summary tables on pages 13-14 of the Executive's ESJ Analysis. This column includes information and analysis from both sections of the report.

The Executive's ESJ Analysis indicates that the terms "N/A" or "Technical changes" indicate that the substance of the work is narrow: it references existing work, corrects errors or omissions, standardizes terminology throughout the Plan, does not propose changes, or change the policy focus in the Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope of Work Items</th>
<th>Summary of Executive-Identified Relevant Determinants and Analysis</th>
<th>Council Staff Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Transportation - Arterial Classifications, Transportation Inventory, and Transportation Needs Report** | Economic Development determinant may also be affected.  
This appendix describes the overall transportation system in unincorporated King County. | specific projects...Roads uses the Equity Impact Review Tool...to prioritize transportation improvements.” Council staff is requesting more information on how Roads utilizes the Equity Impact Review Tool. |
| **Update Technical Appendix A: Capital Facilities** | N/A. No changes proposed. | No comments. |
| **Reflect Cessation of the County Mitigation Payment System** | N/A. Technical changes for consistency with past King County Code amendments. | No comments. |
| **Clarify Non-Resource Industrial Uses and Development Standards Policies** | N/A. Technical changes to clarify existing policy intent. Positive potential equity impact of this action is clarifying County policies that were previously unclear. | No comments. |
| **Reflect Approval of Regional Affordable Housing Plan and Action Strategy** | Determinant: Housing. The amendments describe the Regional Affordable Housing Task Force work and do not change any policies. | No comments. |
| **Update Description of the County's Regional Human Services Roles and Activities** | Determinant: Housing. Technical changes to reference existing work. | The amendments are focused on describing new roles the County plays in human services. In addition to the Housing determinant, these changes also relate to the following determinants: Job Training, Health & Human Services, Community Economic Development, Law & Justice and Neighborhoods. |
The proposal would update policies to identify, avoid and mitigate impacts from fossil fuel facilities. There are no active proposals, so localized impacts are challenging to assess. According to the Executive's analysis, "[h]istorically, these types of facilities have been | No comments. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope of Work Items</th>
<th>Summary of Executive-Identified Relevant Determinants and Analysis</th>
<th>Council Staff Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>more frequently sited in lower-income areas,&quot; so there could be positive potential equity impacts. In addition, there could be potential positive impacts across the county because of complementary efforts to promote clean energy. A potential negative impact could be associated with less employment if fossil fuel companies decide not to site facilities in unincorporated King County.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Policy and Regulations to Prepare for Sea Level Rise</td>
<td>Determinant: Built and Natural Environment. This action would affect people who own and inhabit some waterfront properties on Vashon-Maury Island. Benefits may accrue to the public through less development in certain areas and protecting Vashon's drinking water supply. The potential negative impacts include increased development costs, which would have greater short-term impacts on those with lower incomes.</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Shoreline Master Program Regulations Consistent with State Law</td>
<td>N/A. No changes proposed.</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Shoreline Environment Designations and Maps</td>
<td>Technical changes to match designations to existing criteria. The potential positive impact would be to create greater consistency among shoreline designations to protect shorelines, which broadly benefits all residents. The potential negative impact could include the burden on individual homeowners to understand the designations and related impacts on development or shoreline management.</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Work Items</td>
<td>Summary of Executive-Identified Relevant Determinants and Analysis</td>
<td>Council Staff Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflect State and Federal Decisions Related to Regulation of Vapor Products</td>
<td>Determinants: Parks and Natural Resources and Built and Natural Environment. Common areas of multifamily buildings would be required to be vapor-free to the extent allowed by federal and state law, and it appears that the intent is to prohibit vaping in County parks. Communities identified in the Equity and Social Justice ordinance are disproportionately represented on several health indicators; lessening the potential public health impact of vapor products would potentially be beneficial to such communities.</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflect Federal Designation of &quot;Opportunity Zones&quot; in Unincorporated King County</td>
<td>N/A. No changes proposed given the lack of authority jurisdictions have to regulate.</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Provision of Sidewalks/Pathways in Rural and Urban Unincorporated King County</td>
<td>N/A. Technical changes to better explain existing approach.</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize County Local Government Roles and Responsibilities Update Plan to Reflect Skyway-West Hill Land Use Plan</td>
<td>N/A. No changes proposed. Determinants: Built and Natural Environment, Neighborhoods, Housing, Transportation, and Community Economic Development. A specific equity analysis was conducted for this subarea plan.</td>
<td>No comments. The Executive identified Transportation as an affected determinant, but the scope of this subarea plan does not include transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Plan to Reflect Outcomes of Transfer of Development Rights Program Review</td>
<td>Built and Natural Environment, and Parks and Natural Resources determinants. The proposal is intended to increase open space in underserved areas, which would be focused in parts of the County that have high mobility &amp; environment materials.</td>
<td>According to the Executive’s ESJ Analysis, program staff interviewed developers to assess the viability of various potential approaches. Council staff is requesting information on the options discussed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Council Staff Comments are not included in this table. The comments are based on the analysis and proposed changes related to the scope of work items. The table provides a summary of the executive's identified relevant determinants and analysis for each scope of work item.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope of Work Items</th>
<th>Summary of Executive-Identified Relevant Determinants and Analysis</th>
<th>Council Staff Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Update Cottage Housing Regulations</td>
<td>Housing determinant. The changes are intended to increase overall housing supply and supply of smaller units. The benefits would accrue to developers and those looking for smaller housing units. The changes could have an impact on affordability, but increasing housing supply in low-income areas can include higher risk of gentrification and displacement.</td>
<td>The Community and Economic Development determinant may be affected in addition to Housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Plan to Reflect Changes in Water Law Related to Permit Exempt Wells</td>
<td>N/A. No policy changes proposed given changes to state law following state Supreme Court ruling.</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Plan to Reflect Outcomes of Four-to-One Program Review</td>
<td>Built and Natural Environment, Housing, and Parks and Natural Resources determinants. The proposed amendments would clarify provisions, add evaluation criteria, and strengthen requirements related to annexation.</td>
<td>The Housing determinant may not be significantly affected. While the proposed changes could add to the urban growth area, the minimum density for areas converted to urban is not proposed to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Report on Priority 1 and Priority 2 Implementing Actions from Vashon-Maury Island Community Service Area Subarea Plan</td>
<td>N/A. No changes proposed – this is a status report.</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Agricultural Production District Offsite Mitigation Strategies</td>
<td>Food Systems. The proposed update would clarify requirements for mitigating loss of designated agricultural lands caused by public works projects. The benefits would be to protect agricultural lands and mitigate loss of land. The burdens would accrue to those responsible for mitigating disturbances to designated agricultural lands.</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Work Items</td>
<td>Summary of Executive-Identified Relevant Determinants and Analysis</td>
<td>Council Staff Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Area Zoning and Land Use Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear Creek Urban Planned Developments (Redmond Ridge, Trilogy, and Redmond Ridge East) Land Use and Zoning</td>
<td>Built and Natural Environment, Housing, Community Economic Development, Parks and Natural Resources, and Transportation. The amendments are intended to transition from the current (expiring) development agreement to standard County land use and zoning. Outreach was conducted with residents and community groups.</td>
<td>It is unclear how the proposed changes relate to the Community Economic Development or Transportation determinants. Staff is working to understand any potential impacts to those determinants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snoqualmie Valley Agricultural Production District Expansion</td>
<td>Food Systems. The amendments add a few parcels into the Agricultural Production District (APD), which would have area-wide benefits. The parcels are owned by Hmong farmers, giving this a positive potential impact on equity.</td>
<td>No comments, though Council staff is confirming the type of farming conducted to assess whether the Food Systems determinant is affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammamish Agricultural Production District Boundary, and Associated Urban Growth Area Boundary Changes</td>
<td>Food Systems. The proposed update would add parcels back into the APD, which has area-wide benefits.</td>
<td>There would not be a substantial increase to the APD, so there is no significant potential impact on the Food Systems determinant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Development and Social Services Colocation on Parcels Adjacent to Dick Thurnau Memorial Park in North Highline</td>
<td>Housing, Neighborhoods, and Health and Human Services. The amendments would allow for the development of the White Center Hub project. The County engaged with stakeholders in developing this proposal. The benefits include low-income housing with supportive services. Negative potential impacts are associated with the direct impacts of redevelopment.</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeal of Special District Overlay SO-230: Flood Plain Densities</td>
<td>Parks and Natural Resources, Housing and the Built and Natural Environment determinants. The proposal would reduce duplicative regulations.</td>
<td>It is not clear how the proposal would impact the Housing determinant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Work Items</td>
<td>Summary of Executive-Identified Relevant Determinants and Analysis</td>
<td>Council Staff Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnation Potential Annexation Area Land Use Changes to Facilitate Annexation</td>
<td>N/A. No changes proposed.</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Cougar Mountain Potential Annexation Area Urban Growth Area Changes</td>
<td>Housing, and Built and Natural Environment. Changes are proposed to land use designations in the potential annexation area.</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Maple Valley Urban Growth Area Changes</td>
<td>Housing. The amendments would change existing conditions as the land would transfer from the County to the City. This would potentially allow the County and City to more efficiently deliver services.</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siting of Organic Composting Facilities</td>
<td>Built and Natural Environment. No amendments are proposed at this time.</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Code Studies and Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Accessory Dwelling Unit Regulations to Expand their Use</td>
<td>Housing. The Executive’s analysis involved a review of County regulations related to accessory dwelling units to determine if changes could be made to promote their use. Increasing the use of ADUs could potentially increase supply of affordable housing units.</td>
<td>The proposed update would amend code provisions related to ADUs and ALQs. The proposal would reduce the minimum lot size for ADUs, which could promote their use. However, the proposal would restrict the number of ALQs to one per lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Residential Density Incentive Program to Increase Use and Effectiveness</td>
<td>Housing determinant. No amendments are proposed at this time – there are recommendations to be considered in future updates.</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize the State’s 2014 Washington State Wetland Rating System</td>
<td>N/A. No changes proposed.</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Existing Subarea Plans for Consistency with Adult Beverages Ordinance</td>
<td>N/A. No changes proposed – pending adoption of Proposed Ordinance 2018-0241.</td>
<td>No comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing and County-Owned</td>
<td>Housing determinant. No amendments are proposed, though there is a plan to</td>
<td>The Executive’s ESJ Analysis indicates the benefits of the planned inventory would be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Properties Report and Plan for Inventory | develop an inventory of sites that could be feasible for affordable housing, and that could lead to actions in the future. | countywide. Note that the criteria for the inventory includes that the property must be either in a "high opportunity zone" or an area with close proximity to transit, so the inventory is likely to focus on urban areas.

---

**Skyway-West Hill Equity Impact Analysis Report**

What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

The Skyway-West Hill Community Service Area (SWH CSA) Subarea Plan includes an addendum in Appendix E, Equity Impact Analysis Report (EIA Report). The Equity Impact Analysis was completed by a third-party consultant, BERK Consulting. The consultant reviewed and produced their analysis based on the Public Review Draft of the SWH CSA Subarea Plan and associated land use and zoning map amendments that were released for public review and comments during July 2019.

The following summarizes the key findings from BERK Consulting’s Equity Analysis:

1. **Community Engagement.** The analysis evaluates the Executive’s community engagement activities for each of the following stakeholder groups and population of concern: (1) Language Communities; (2) Racial and Ethnic Groups; (3) Youth; (4) Seniors and Elderly; (5) Persons with Disabilities; (6) Neighborhoods; (7) Renters and Low-Income Households; (8) Businesses; and (9) Community Service Providers. In summary, the analysis has determined that Executive staff’s engagement with each stakeholder groups were not well documented and BERK Consulting could not verify whether engagement was conducted for each of the stakeholder groups and population of concern. Moreover, despite facilitating community meetings for specific stakeholder groups, the analysis could not verify whether those community meetings were attended by the targeted community members or non-targeted community members.

The analysis also stated that Executive staff did not apply the County’s Equity Impact Review Tool until after most of the engagement was conducted. Therefore, efforts to reach some of the stakeholder groups were not well documented, and it is quite possible that some groups did not receive significant, or any, outreach or engagement.

2. **Need for Affordable Housing and Displacement.** The analysis states that based on King County market trends, housing costs in SWH will continue to rise which would cause increasing housing cost-burden pressures on many existing residents and continued economic displacement of vulnerable groups including
low-income, persons of color, limited English speakers, and persons with disabilities. Over 70 percent of SWH residents are people of color, of which approximately a third of residents identify as Asian, about a quarter of residents identify as Black or African American, and one in ten residents identify as Latino. The analysis states that there are significant racial disparities within SWH that impact vulnerability to land use change. For instance, about 73 percent of White households are owner-occupied compared to only 29 percent of Black households.

3. **No Guarantee of Affordable Housing.** The Subarea Plan includes new requirements to require that percentage of units in new residential buildings be affordable to low-income households, and incentives to provide additional community benefits. The analysis states that such changes are designed to influence the decisions of private developers or others who wish to build in SWH, however, the County cannot guarantee these outcomes since it is ultimately up to individual developers and landowners to decide whether to move forward with projects in SWH. The analysis also states that if the new zoning requirements and incentives are not attractive to developers, they could result in a reduction in future development activity compared to taking no action. Furthermore, comparison to neighboring jurisdictions indicates this could be a real risk and is deserving of continued analysis during the implementation phase.

4. **Implementation Phase.** The analysis states that the County would have opportunities to engage community members in activities such as identifying and mapping cultural and community assets that should be considered for protection and enhancement, and identifying community-desired amenities that can support the ability of vulnerable residents to remain in SWH and overcome barriers to success during the implementation phase. The analysis also states that it is essential that the County develop effective strategies for inclusive engagement and building the capacity of community groups and leaders to effectively advocate for community needs during the implementation phase.

5. **Youth and Cross-Generational Equity.** The County’s Equity Impact Review Tool states that cross-generational equity is a key framework for equity where the “effects of current actions on the fair and just distribution of benefits and burdens would impact future generations of communities and employees. Some examples include income and wealth, health outcomes, white privilege, resource depletion, climate change and pollution, real estate redlining practices, and species extinction.” The analysis states that nearly a quarter of SWH residents are younger than 18 years of age and one aspect of pursuing cross-generational equity is considering the unique needs and circumstances of children and teens.

The analysis also states that disparities in homeownership also contribute to cross-generational equity issues, as persons of color are less likely to generate wealth through homeownership that can be transferred to future generations.

6. **Bryn-Mawr and Skyway.** When viewing the demography of the two primary census tracts in the study area, there are social and economic differences between the “Mostly Skyway” tract and the “Mostly Bryn Mawr” tract. For example, the median household income for the “Mostly Bryn Mawr” tract is $86,318 with 56
percent of the households as renters and the median household income for the
“Mostly Skyway” tract is $49,104 with 25 percent of the households as renters. The
analysis states that the majority of the proposed SWH CSA Subarea land use
changes are located in, or within close proximity to, the “Mostly Skyway” tract. In
addition, there are three proposed amendments in the SWH CSA Subarea Plan
for the Rainier Avenue South Business district that are in a third census tract
located outside the “Mostly Bryn Mawr” tract in the easternmost portion of the study
area.

The analysis also states that it would be important to engage with people from both
census tract areas to collect input on priorities and concerns.

7. **Determinants of Equity.** The analysis evaluated the assessment of the potential
direct and indirect impacts of implementing the SWH CSA Subarea Plan to the
County’s Determinants of Equity. The analysis states that the proposed SWH
CSA Subarea Plan would not have direct impacts on any Determinants of Equity
or directly address any community concerns. Instead, the impacts will be indirect
because the County’s subarea plans are limited to consideration only of land use
changes as directed by the 2018 Comprehensive Plan Work Plan Action 1 and
does not include other needs identified by the community. As such, the Plan is
limited in what it can offer the community that may have more direct impacts.

8. **Other Equity Impacts.**

- **Commercial Districts** – The analysis states that the most significant risk to
  new commercial development is the loss of existing businesses valued by
  community members, and a new policy to involve community members
during permit and project review to identify important existing cultural assets
  impacted by development proposals can help to mitigate this risk.

- **Community Character and Cultural Assets** – The analysis states that given
  that the Community-Desired Amenities Incentives (SWH Action 4) are yet
to be defined, BERK Consulting could not evaluate their potential
effectiveness at encouraging for-profit developers to include community-
desired amenities or preserve cultural assets in their development
proposals.

- **Community Capacity Building** – The analysis states that it is difficult for
  community members to understand the complexity of the land use planning
  process, what a land use plan is, and how it may or may not influence
  outcomes in their own neighborhoods and lived experience. The analysis
discovered that some community leaders critiqued Executive staff for
conducting outreach using complex jargon, providing unclear community
impacts, and providing unclear direction on how community members could

---

41 As per K.C.C. 2.10.210.A, "Determinants of equity" means the social, economic, geographic, political
and physical environment conditions in which people in our county are born, grow, live, work and age that
lead to the creation of a fair and just society. Access to the determinants of equity is necessary to have
equity for all people regardless of race, class, gender or language spoken. Inequities are created when
barriers exist that prevent individuals and communities from accessing these conditions and reaching
their full potential. There are fourteen determinants identified in K.C.C. 2.10.210.A.
most effectively engage with the process. During the later stage of the subarea planning process, Executive staff engaged community group representatives in smaller group discussions.

Key Issues

As mentioned above, given that the purpose of the EIA Report was to analyze the equity impacts of the proposed SWH CSA Subarea Plan and the planning process, key findings of that analysis are included in the summary section above. The key issues identified below includes additional equity issues identified by Council staff that were either not identified or beyond the scope of the EIA Report.

- **No Changes Based On Equity Impact Analysis** – Council staff compared the Public Review Draft and the transmitted SWH CSA Subarea Plan and found that there were no changes made by the Executive based on the Equity Impact Analysis Report. Council staff analysis is on-going to determine how the Executive plans to use the findings of the Equity Impact Analysis Report to inform the SWH CSA Subarea Plan implementation, and how the Council could modify the plan to address the analysis in the EIA Report.

- **SWH Action Items** – The SWH CSA Subarea Plan proposes three action items (SWH Action Item 1: SWH Equitable Housing Development Strategy Report; SWH Action Item 3: Small-Scale Commercial and Business Retention Incentives Program; SWH Action Item 4: Community-Desired Amenities Incentives) that are intended to assess the needs of the community (in particular communities of color, low-income populations, and limited English proficient individuals) to inform the planning process and therefore with full use of the OESJ EIR tool, these actions would have been conducted prior to finalizing a proposal for the SWH CSA Subarea Plan. Given that the Executive has transmitted the SWH CSA Subarea Plan without conducting these action items, it could be inferred that the proposed SWH CSA Subarea Plan is incomplete. The EIA Report does not explicitly state that this is the case, but it does allude to this gap throughout the analysis.

- **Analysis Using Determinants of Equity** – As stated in the summary section, the report evaluated the assessment of the potential direct and indirect impacts of implementing the SWH CSA Subarea Plan to the County’s Determinants of Equity. The analysis states that the proposed SWH CSA Subarea Plan would not have direct impacts on any Determinants of Equity or directly address any community concerns. The Determinants of Equity Report\(^{42}\) provides quantitative metrics that identify disproportionate impacts to communities of color, low-income populations, and limited English proficient individuals for each of the fourteen determinants of equity. Council staff is inquiring with Executive staff whether they could utilize these metrics to conduct a deeper analysis to determine whether there are direct impacts.

What’s new in the 2020 KCCP Update?

The Skyway-West Hill Community Service Area (SWH CSA) Subarea Plan includes an addendum related to Service Delivery and Facilities Provided by King County in the Five Potential Annexation Areas Report (Report) in Appendix D, as required by a 2019-2020 Biennial Budget proviso\(^43\). The proviso required the Executive to provide “a description of the services and facilities provided by the county in the five potential annexation areas, which are Skyline/West Hill, North Highline, Fairwood, East Renton and Federal Way…[which shall include] and at a minimum, description of services and facilities provided in each of the five potential annexation areas for youth, transit and economic development…and other services desired by the SWH community during the planning process.” The proviso also required that the Executive “use the county’s Equity Impact Review tool to identify, evaluate and describe both the positive and negative potential impact of local service delivery in Skyway-West Hill.”

The Report was completed by a third-party consultant, BERK Consulting. The Report provides an inventory of the following services provided in the five potential annexation areas:

- Youth Services, including youth programs provided by the County’s Department of Community and Human Services – Employment and Education Resources division, County contracted services for youth and young adults, County contracted services for infants and youth with developmental challenges, services provided by organizations that were awarded Best Starts for Kids (BSK) levy funds, and youth recreational facilities and parks programming;
- Transit Service and Facilities; and
- Economic Development Services.

The Report states that the SWH CSA Subarea Plan is limited to consideration only of land use changes as directed by the 2018 Comprehensive Plan Work Plan Action 1, and therefore, proposing changes to service delivery was out of scope for the SWH CSA Subarea Plan. The Report also states that given that the Equity Impact Review tool is designed for evaluating impacts of proposed policies rather than existing policies, use of the tool to evaluate the potential positive and negative impacts to youth, transit, and economic development County services in SWH, as required by the proviso, cannot be completed. As an alternative, and to satisfy the requirement of the proviso, BERK Consulting evaluated the County services and their potential impacts in SWH for each of the fourteen Determinants of Equity\(^44\).

Key Issues

\(^{43}\) Ordinance 18835 Section 84 Proviso P5.

\(^{44}\) As per K.C.C. 2.10.210.A, “Determinants of equity” means the social, economic, geographic, political and physical environment conditions in which people in our county are born, grow, live, work and age that lead to the creation of a fair and just society. Access to the determinants of equity is necessary to have equity for all people regardless of race, class, gender or language spoken. Inequities are created when barriers exist that prevent individuals and communities from accessing these conditions and reaching their full potential. There are fourteen determinants identified in K.C.C. 2.10.210.A.
• **No Changes Based On the Service Delivery and Facilities Report** – Council staff compared the Public Review Draft and the transmitted SWH CSA Subarea Plan and found that there were no changes made by the Executive based on the Report. Council staff analysis is on-going to determine how the Executive plans to use the findings of the Report to inform changes, if any, to the SWH CSA Subarea Plan or to services in SWH.

• **Analysis Using Determinants of Equity** – As stated in the summary section, the Report provides a broad evaluation of potential impacts to SWH for some County services with respect to each determinant of equity. The Determinants of Equity Report\(^\text{45}\) provides quantitative metrics that identify disproportionate impacts to communities of color, low-income populations, and limited English proficient individuals for each of the fourteen determinants of equity. Council staff is inquiring with Executive staff whether they could utilize these metrics to conduct a deeper analysis to determine whether existing youth, transit and economic development County services to SWH would have positive or negative impact on those metrics, in order to better comply with the proviso requirements.

The quantitative findings could be combined with findings from the completed SWH CSA Subarea Plan action items (SWH Action Item 1: SWH Equitable Housing Development Strategy Report; SWH Action Item 3: Small-Scale Commercial and Business Retention Incentives Program; SWH Action Item 4: Community-Desired Amenities Incentives) to identify proposals to modify existing and/or establish new youth, transit, and economic development County services to positively impact communities of color, low-income populations, and limited English proficient individuals of the SWH community.

### Scoping Motion Items Not Included

The scoping motion included several topics that were not ultimately included in the transmitted 2020 KCCP update. They include the following topics, with Council staff's understanding of why they were not included with the transmitted Update.

#### I. Text and Policy Proposals

1. Update technical appendices to reflect new projects, changes in service providers, and other minor updates. This includes: Appendix A: Capital Facilities.\(^\text{46}\)

   Executive staff note that this was excluded because a "listing of all types of implementation plans is not required under GMA. In the review process, numerous issues were raised about timing, adoption, status, and more. Given the number of issues, and the optional nature, the list was removed."

---


\(^46\) Appendix C and C1, as identified in the scoping motion, were transmitted and are discussed elsewhere in this staff report.
2. As necessary, update Comprehensive Plan to reflect federal designation of "Opportunity Zones" in unincorporated King County.

Executive staff note that because the opportunity zones are "just one designation under federal tax law, and not subject to County regulation, it was not necessary to update the KCCP to incorporate opportunity zones.

3. In recognition of the county’s local government role and responsibilities, updates to improve coordination, accountability, and service delivery in unincorporated areas at rural or urban service levels."

Executive staff note that they "considered this scope item and proposed no changes in the transmitted 2020 KCCP update related to this item."

III. Code Studies

1. Update any P-suffix conditions or special district overlays adopted as part of existing subarea plans to be consistent with the changes ultimately made by the winery, brewery and distillery ordinance (Proposed Ordinance 2018-0241).

Proposed Ordinance 2018-0241, up for full Council public hearing on December 4, 2019, made the changes called for by this scoping motion item. No changes to the KCCP are needed.

Key Issues

None identified by Council staff.

INVITED

- Ivan Miller, Comprehensive Plan Manager, Regional Planning Unit, PSB

ATTACHMENTS

Each Councilmember has been provided with a binder that includes the Proposed Ordinance and all attachments. The materials will not be included in each staff report. Other materials are available online at the link provided below.

1. Transmittal Letter
2. Fiscal Note
3. 2020 Comprehensive Plan Update Schedule, as of November 25, 2019
4. Motion 15329 – Scope of Work for 2020 Update

LINKS

All components of the transmitted 2020 update to the 2016 KCCP, as well as additional information about the Council’s review of the proposal, can be found at:
The components of the proposed legislation and their attachments include:

- Proposed Ordinance 2018-0153
  - Attachment A - 2020 Update to the 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan
  - Attachment B - Appendix C: Transportation
  - Attachment C - Appendix C1: Transportation Needs Report
  - Attachment D - Amendments to Land Use and Zoning Maps
  - Attachment E - Amendments to Shorelines of the State Map
  - Attachment F - Skyway-West Hill Land Use Subarea Plan
  - Attachment G - Skyway-West Hill Land Use Subarea Plan Amendments to Land Use and Zoning Maps
  - Attachment H - Attachment K to the Shoreline Master Program
  - Attachment I - Appendix S: Public Participation Summary for 2020 Update

Also included are supporting documents included in the transmittal package, which do not get adopted as part of the legislation, but provide useful information:

- Transmittal Letter
- Regulatory Note
- Fiscal Note
- Plain Language Summary
- Policy I-207 Amendment Analysis Matrix
- Area Land Use and Zoning Studies
- Code Studies and Reports
- Public Comment and Response

There is related legislation, a motion acknowledging receipt of the community center feasibility and local services equity impact analysis report. The reports are included as Appendices C and D in Attachment F to Proposed Ordinance 2019-0415.

- Proposed Motion 2019-0417
September 30, 2019

The Honorable Rod Dembowski  
Chair, King County Council  
Room 1200  
C O U R T H O U S E

Dear Councilmember Dembowski:

This letter transmits an ordinance adopting the 2020 update to the 2016 King County Comprehensive Plan (2020 update). In 2018, the County restructured its comprehensive planning program, moving to an 8-year statutory update schedule and allowing a midpoint review every four years. Because of the timing of the next statutory update in 2023, the Council directed a midpoint review in 2020, via Workplan Action 14 in Ordinance 18810 and King County Code 20.18.030.

The process began on January 1, 2019 with submittal of the Scope of Work to the King County Council. King County Motion 15329 adopted the scope on February 27, 2019 and serves as the foundation for the 2020 update. The unique timing of the 2020 update meant that the typical scoping and public review processes were shorter than usual. Several land use and code studies were conducted, as directed; the outcomes of these studies are included with this transmittal.

The 2020 update would advance planning in King County through the following proposals.

- Establish regulations for fossil fuel facilities to protect public health and safety.
- Establish policy and regulatory changes to prepare for sea level rise impacts.
- Establish new zoning for the Bear Creek Urban Planned Development.
- Make changes to reflect the Regional Affordable Housing Plan and Action Strategy.

The 2020 update also includes the Skyway-West Hill Community Service Area Land Use Subarea Plan, which replaces the existing 1994 West Hill Community Plan. This subarea plan, led by the Permitting Division of the Department of Local Services, will be the first conducted under the restructured subarea planning process adopted by the Council in Ordinance 18810.
While the 2020 update does not include any substantive expansions of the Urban Growth Area, there are minor technical changes in some areas, and the plan includes a proposed contraction of the Urban Growth Area for a portion of the area known as the East Cougar Mountain Potential Annexation Area (PAA).

This transmittal package includes the following documents.
- Ordinance adopting amendments to the King County Code.
- Comprehensive Plan and King County Code Amendments.
- Comprehensive Plan Policy I-207 Analysis.
- Plain Language Summary of Code Amendments.
- Forty-two Land Use and Zoning Map Amendments.
- Eight Area Land Use and Zoning Studies.
- Ten Code Studies and Reports.
- Public Participation Report.
- Other Miscellaneous Items.

As in past updates, a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review and threshold determination will be completed in advance of final action by the King County Council.

The 2020 update is consistent with the King County Strategic Plan. By addressing public health and safety, housing, environmental, and other issues, it responds to the Strategic Plan's vision statement that the County is a diverse and dynamic community with a healthy economy and environment where all people, businesses, and organizations have the opportunity to thrive.

The County’s Comprehensive Plan and development regulations are a core element of the County’s climate action strategy. By focusing new development in urban areas served by high capacity transit, and protecting working farms and forests the sequester carbon, the county curbs growth in greenhouse gas emissions as the region grows. Consistent with the county’s Strategic Climate Action Plan, this 2020 update hold the line on sprawl and strengthens protection of public health and safety from risk of fossil fuel facilities and mining. This 2020 update also proposes new development standards to reduce risks of sea level rise. The amendments in the 2020 update align with the goals related to Accessible and Affordable Housing, a Healthy Environment, and others.

It is estimated that this report required approximately 10,300 staff hours to produce, costing approximately $770,000.

I urge your careful consideration of the proposed plan and implementing regulations. Together, they will help to ensure that our region continues to manage growth effectively while ensuring the County’s compliance with the Growth Management Act.
If you have any questions about this transmittal, please contact Lauren Smith, Director, Regional Planning, at 206-263-9606.

Sincerely,

Dow Constantine
King County Executive

Enclosures

cc: King County Councilmembers
      ATTN: Carolyn Busch, Chief of Staff
            Melani Pedroza, Clerk of the Council
            Dwight Dively, Director, Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget (PSB)
            Lauren Smith, Director, Regional Planning, PSB
2019-2020 FISCAL NOTE

Ordinance No. 2019-XXXX

Title: 2020 Update to the 2016 Comprehensive Plan
Affected Agency and/or Agencies: Executive Office
Note Prepared By: Ivan Miller
Date Prepared: 9/3/2019
Note Reviewed By: Chris McGowan
Date Reviewed: 9/5/2019

Description of request:

This legislation adopts the proposed changes to King County Comprehensive plan.

Revenue to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures from:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures by Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019-2020</th>
<th>2021-2022</th>
<th>2023-2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes and Assumptions:

Although adoption of the Comprehensive Plan does not itself have any effect on the fiscal affairs of King County, some of the policy changes within the plan may result in unpredictable future changes to revenues and expenditures.
Proposed Ordinance 2019-0413  
2020 King County Comprehensive Plan Update and Skyway-West Hill CSA Subarea Plan

King County Council committee review and adoption schedule
*As of November 25, 2019 – subject to change*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>September 30, 2019</strong></td>
<td>Executive’s Transmittal of 2020 King County Comprehensive Plan Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>October 15</strong></td>
<td><strong>Briefing in Mobility and Environment Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>• Executive staff brief Skyway-West Hill CSA Subarea Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Opportunity for public comment</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>November 5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Briefing in Mobility and Environment Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>• Executive staff brief 2020 Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Opportunity for public comment</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>November 19</strong></td>
<td><strong>Briefing in Mobility and Environment Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>• Deferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Opportunity for public comment</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Briefing in Mobility and Environment Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>• Key Issues Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Opportunity for public comment</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>January 7, 2020</strong></td>
<td><strong>Briefing in Mobility and Environment Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td><em>Opportunity for public comment</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>January 21</strong></td>
<td><strong>Briefing in Mobility and Environment Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td><em>Opportunity for public comment</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Briefing in Mobility and Environment Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td><em>Opportunity for public comment</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Briefing in Mobility and Environment Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
<td>• Review of striking amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review of individual amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Opportunity for public comment</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March 17</strong></td>
<td><strong>Possible vote in Mobility and Environment Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1:30 p.m.  | - Consideration of amendments  
              - Vote on Committee recommendation on proposed 2020 King County Comprehensive Plan Update and Skyway-West Hill CSA Subarea Plan  
              *Opportunity for public comment* |
| June 10    | **Public Hearing at full Council**  
              *Public Hearing at full Council & opportunity for public comment* |
| 9:30 a.m.  | **Possible vote at full Council**  
              - Consideration of amendments  
              - Vote on final adoption of proposed 2020 King County Comprehensive Plan Update and Skyway-West Hill CSA Subarea Plan |

All meetings will take place in the Council Chambers on the 10th Floor of the King County Courthouse, at 516 3rd Ave, Seattle WA.
Motion 15329

Proposed No. 2019-0015.3

Sponsors Upthegrove

A MOTION relating to comprehensive planning, specifying
the scope of work for the proposed amendment to the King
County Comprehensive Plan in 2020 in accordance with
K.C.C. 20.18 and 2018 King County Comprehensive Plan
Workplan Action 14.

WHEREAS, King County enacted the 1994 King County Comprehensive Plan
("the plan") to meet the requirements of the Washington State Growth Management Act,
and

WHEREAS, K.C.C. chapter 20.18.060 establishes a process for amending the
plan and a program for public participation and states that every eight years, beginning in
2021, the county shall complete a comprehensive review of the plan and consider
substantive amendments to the plan, and

WHEREAS, K.C.C. chapter 20.18.030 allows, if adopted by motion, for a limited
update to the plan at the midpoint of the eight-year cycle, and

WHEREAS, the 2018 amendment to the plan included workplan Action 14,
directing a 2020 Comprehensive Plan Midpoint Update, and

WHEREAS, while K.C.C. chapter 20.18.030 allows the 2020 update to consider
substantive amendments, the update is a discretionary action by the county and does not
serve as the statutory update as required by RCW 36.70A.130;
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT MOVED by the Council of King County:

The scope of work for the 2020 King County Comprehensive Plan Midpoint Update in Attachment A shall proceed as established by this motion and be the basis for developing amendments to the plan, and for performing the associated environmental analysis.

Motion 15329 was introduced on 1/14/2019 and passed as amended by the Metropolitan King County Council on 2/27/2019, by the following vote:

Yes: 8 - Mr. von Reichbauer, Mr. Gossett, Ms. Lambert, Mr. McDermott, Mr. Dembowski, Mr. Upthegrove, Ms. Kohl-Welles and Ms. Balducci
No: 1 - Mr. Dunn
Excused: 0

KING COUNTY COUNCIL
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Rod Dembowski, Chair

Melani Pedroza, Clerk of the Council

Attachments: A. King County Comprehensive Plan 2020 Midpoint Update, dated February 27, 2019
King County Comprehensive Plan
2020 Midpoint Update

Scope of Work

In accordance with King County Code 20.18.030 and 20.18.060, and 2018 Comprehensive Plan Workplan Action 14

A. Background

In 2018, King County restructured its long-range planning processes and shifted from a Four-Year "Major" Update cycle to an Eight-Year Statutory Update cycle. In moving to an Eight-Year Cycle, the County created the option for a limited scope "Four-Year Midpoint Update" Cycle wherein a smaller-range of substantive changes to policies and amendments to the urban growth area boundary may be considered only as established by motion.

The 2018 update to the King County Comprehensive Plan, in workplan action #14, directs that the scope of the 2020 update include: (a) changes as called for by applicable workplan action items in the Comprehensive Plan, (b) any policy changes or land use proposals that should be considered prior to the 2023 statutory update, (c) review and inclusion of changes related to docket proposals that were recommended to be reviewed as part of the next "major" update, (d) aligning the language in the Comprehensive Plan and Title 20 regarding what is allowed during annual, midpoint and eight-year updates, and (e) reviewing and updating the terminology to consistently describe the various updates. While the 2020 update may consider substantive amendments, the update is a discretionary action by the County and does not serve as the statutory update required by 36.70A.130 Revised Code of Washington.

B. Topical Areas

The following topics are to be considered in the 2020 Midpoint Update. For the 2020 Midpoint Update, the Executive shall complete an equity impact analysis using the tool developed by the county office of equity and social justice, to identify, evaluate and describe both the positive and negative potential equity impacts of the policy, land use, zoning and development regulations proposed in the Plan. This impact analysis shall
be transmitted with the 2020 Midpoint update, and included within the Comprehensive Plan if appropriate.

I. Text and Policy Proposals

- As necessary to be addressed prior to the 2023 Statutory Update, update demographic and economic data, maps, and references (including references to plans, program, and departmental restructures such as the Department of Local Services, Metro, etc.).

- Updates to terminology to consistently describe what is allowed during annual, midpoint and eight-year updates.

- Update technical appendices to reflect new projects, changes in service providers, and other minor updates. This includes Appendix C: Transportation, Appendix C1: Transportation Needs Report, and Appendix A: Capital Facilities.

- Amend Transportation chapter to reflect the County's cessation of the Mitigation Payment System, consistent with adopted changes to the King County Code.

- Update Rural Area and Natural Resource Land chapter policies and text related to non-resource industrial uses and development standards in the Rural Area to clarify uses compared to sites, and clarify the parcels to which the policies apply (this is an outcome of the 2018 Cedar River Rural Industrial Study).

- Update Comprehensive Plan to reflect the approval of the Regional Affordable Housing Plan and Action Strategy.

- Update Housing and Human Services chapter policies that describe the County's regional human services roles and activities to include new work since 2016.

- Review Comprehensive Plan policies, and associated development regulations and permitting processes, to ensure that the range of impacts from the extraction, processing, production, transport, storage, and use of fossil fuels, including the impacts from construction and operation of fossil fuel infrastructure, are identified, avoided and mitigated, in order to protect public health and safety, air and water quality, habitats, natural resource lands, and other resources and functions.

- In recognition of the growing risks of sea level rise to homes, businesses, and infrastructure in coastal areas, develop policy and regulatory changes to prepare
for these impacts. This will include evaluation of regulations that address development in and adjacent to areas at risk to flooding and erosion damage.

- Updates to the Shorelines chapter, including associated Shoreline Master Program regulations to ensure consistency with state requirements, and related updates to Shoreline Environment Designations and maps.

- As necessary, update Comprehensive Plan to reflect state and federal decisions related to regulation of vapor products, as defined at 70.345 Revised Code of Washington.

- As necessary, update Comprehensive Plan to reflect federal designation of "Opportunity Zones" in unincorporated King County.

- Review and update policies and development regulations (including road standards) and related provision of sidewalks/pathways in rural and urban unincorporated King County, with a focus on improving public safety and improving physical fitness. Include evaluation of providing sidewalks/pathways in conjunction with other planned improvements.

- In recognition of the county's local government role and responsibilities, updates to improve coordination, accountability, and service delivery in unincorporated areas at rural or urban service levels.

- Update the Plan to reflect outcomes from work done on the 2018 Comprehensive Plan Workplan Action Items, as follows:
  
  o Action 1: Community Service Area Subarea Planning Program.
  
  o Action 4: Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) Program Review and Study.
  
  o Action 8: Cottage Housing Regulations Review.

  o Action 13: Water Availability and Exempt Wells.
  
  o Action 18: Review of the Four-to-One Program.

- Review the Priority 1 and Priority 2 implementing actions from the Vashon-Maury Island CSA Subarea Plan and provide either a report or recommended policy or code changes to: 1) determine the implementing actions current status, 2) determine whether existing Comprehensive Plan policies or development regulations (or any other adopted plan) requires changes in order to proceed with implementation, 3) whether those changes are recommended for inclusion in the
2020 KCCP Update, and 4) for those items that are not currently on schedule, an explanation why and an evaluation of when they could be completed.

- Review of existing policies and regulations related to the design and siting of public infrastructure and/or facilities within and adjacent to APDs to identify potential offsite mitigation strategies. Examples of such strategies could include in-lieu fee programs, transfer of development rights or restoration of existing APD lands to return them to agriculture production capable land.

II. Area Zoning and Land Use Proposals

- In advance of the expiration of development agreements for the Bear Creek Urban Planned Developments (Redmond Ridge, Trilogy, and Redmond Ridge East), review and establish the comprehensive plan land use designation and zoning classifications in a manner consistent with the development patterns in said agreements and reflecting current conditions in the area.

- Consider expansion of the Agricultural Production District (APD) boundary to increase opportunities for farming, including areas near the Snoqualmie APD – Fall City area and Carnation area, and the Enumclaw APD.

- As mitigation for the encroachment of the NE 171st Street roadway and roundabout intrusion into the APD: (1) consider changes to the Sammamish Agricultural Production District (APD) boundary to include portions of parcels identified or agreed to by the County for potential acquisition or easement by the City of Woodinville; and (2) consider changes to the urban growth area boundary to incorporate the additional right-of-way on NE 171st Street.

- Review land use designations and implementing zoning on parcels adjacent to the northern edge of Dick Thurnau Memorial Park in North Highline to evaluate their potential as a mixed use site, allowing the co-location of affordable housing units, non-residential buildings with social services, co-working spaces, and other potential non-residential uses.

- Analyze deletion of Special District Overlay SO-230: Flood Plain Densities on all parcels to which it applies (this is an outcome of a 2018 Docket Request).

- Work with the City of Carnation to identify options, processes and timelines for potential land use changes to facilitate annexation.

- Work with the City of Issaquah, the City of Bellevue, and residents in the East Cougar Mountain Potential Annexation Area on potential land use changes and
urban growth area boundary changes (this is an outcome of the 2016 Comprehensive Plan and a 2017 Docket Request).

- Work with the City of Maple Valley to consider amendments to the Urban Growth Area boundary for five parcels adjacent to the Maple Woods Subdivision to facilitate transference of city- or water-district owned parcels with stormwater detention ponds or water tanks into the City's corporate boundary.

- Review the potential for siting organic composting facilities. Consider sites in the rural area, including those that currently have a Mineral use designation and implementing zoning, and consider whether to modify the land use and zoning to Rural Area, either outright or with property-specific conditions that would be appropriate for organic composting facilities as a primary use. Consider modifying associated policies or development regulations associated with organic composting facilities as a materials processing use at such locations.

III. Code Studies

- Review the County's regulations related to accessory dwelling units to determine if changes can be made to make this housing option more widely used (this is an implementation action from the Vashon-Maury Island Community Service Area Subarea Plan).

- Review the County's Residential Density Incentive Program at King County Code 21A.34 to determine if any changes are needed to increase its use and improve its effectiveness.

- Technical updates to critical areas and shoreline regulations to recognize the 2014 Washington State Wetland Rating System for Western Washington, and to consider other proposed amendments deemed necessary for consistency with state guidance.

- Update any P-suffix conditions or special district overlays adopted as part of existing subarea plans to be consistent with the changes ultimately made by the winery, brewery and distillery ordinance (Proposed Ordinance 2018-0241).

IV. Reports

As part of the transmittal package for the 2020 Comprehensive Plan update, the Executive will include an affordable housing report that includes 1) an update on all current efforts to create affordable housing on County-owned property, and 2) a plan for
developing an inventory of all County-owned properties and their feasibility for development of affordable housing, to be completed by June 1, 2020.

C. Public Outreach Plan

King County Regional Planning staff, along with staff from the Executive Departments, will conduct a multi-phased approach to public outreach for the 2020 King County Comprehensive Plan.

Scoping. The first phase will occur following transmittal of the scope to the County Council during the period of January and February. Stakeholders will have the opportunity to comment during the Council's review and adoption of the scope.

CSA Outreach. The second phase will occur through participation at the Community Service Area outreach activities that have typically occurred during the period of April through June. Comments will be solicited and accepted as part of these outreach activities.

Public Comment Period. The third phase will take place from approximately July 1 to July 31, 2019 as part of a public comment period on the Public Review Draft. A series of open houses specifically focused on the Comprehensive Plan will be held during this comment period.

Council Review and Adoption Period. An Executive Recommended Plan will be transmitted to the County Council on September 30, 2019. The Council will conduct additional public outreach as part of committee meetings, a public hearing, and other processes as managed by Council.

General Outreach. Throughout the entire process, the Comprehensive Plan website will be updated, stakeholders on the Comprehensive Plan mailing list will be notified at key milestones, and public comments will be accepted.

In addition to the Comprehensive Plan mailing list, outreach will occur through the Community Service Area Unincorporated Area Newsletter, other Department of Local Services engagement process, the Office of Equity and Social Justice's outreach mechanisms, and through County Commissions.
D. State Environmental Policy Act Analysis

SEPA analysis for the 2020 update will commence with the release of the public review draft in the summer 2019, and continue through the review of the draft by the assigned King County Council committee. SEPA will be concluded in advance of action by the full King County Council. This is scheduled to occur in summer 2020.
SUBJECT

A briefing on: (1) the King County Metro Mobility Framework, a report that reflects the work of the Metro Equity Cabinet and Metro in response to the requirements of Motion 15253; and (2) Proposed Motion 2019-0464, which would adopt a summary of recommendations contained in the Mobility Framework report and outline Metro’s process for 2020 updates to Metro policy documents.

SUMMARY

The Mobility Framework final report was transmitted by the Executive (2019-RPT0156) and comprises the report itself and six appendices in response to Motion 15253. No action by the County Council is required.

At the same time, the Executive transmitted Proposed Motion 2019-0464, titled: “A MOTION relating to public transportation, adopting the Metro Mobility Framework Recommendations Summary and outlining a process for the development of updates to the Metro transit department’s adopted policies.” The Recommendations Summary is a five-page set of highlights of the Mobility Framework Final Report. The motion text also describe elements of Metro’s process for developing updated policy documents in 2020. According to Metro staff, the Executive and Metro chose to transmit the proposed motion, even though it is not required by either Motion 15252 or Motion 15253, to provide a clear statement of Regional Transit Committee (RTC) and Council response to the Mobility Framework.

Proposed Motion 2019-0464 has been designated a non-mandatory dual referral to the Regional Transit Committee and the Mobility and Environment Committee under K.C.C. 1.24.065.l as an issue that would benefit from interjurisdictional discussion. The RTC may act on Proposed Motion 2019-0464 at a special meeting on December 5. Following RTC action, the proposed motion will be referred to the Mobility and Environment Committee.
**BACKGROUND**

**Mobility Framework Background.** Motion 15253, approved concurrently with the County’s 2019-2020 biennial budget, requires Metro to develop a framework to ensure that innovations in mobility put people first, use space equitably and efficiently, and are coordinated with transit policies and regional funding strategies. The motion specifies that the framework should include:

- A review of emerging technologies and local and national best practices;
- Opportunities to coordinate mobility innovations with fixed-route and other services;
- A review of potential policies for the allocation of public space, including streets, sidewalks, transit stops and station areas, focused on efficiency and equity of use;
- A review of industry-wide workforce trends, including the potential implications of new mobility options on labor needs, career opportunities, recruitment, training and economic prospects of transportation workers; and
- The development of guiding principles to inform the framework.

Additionally, the motion suggests that the development of the framework should include outreach to regional partners, transit riders and local communities, including but not limited to low-income populations, communities of color, immigrants and refugees, and limited English-speaking populations. Framework development should be coordinated with the efforts outlined in Motion 15252, which calls for the Executive to initiate a regional planning effort to develop and propose a strategy to convene regional leaders to develop a funding plan to implement Metro Connects and explore ways to support the ongoing maintenance needs of King County’s transportation infrastructure.

A scoping document for the mobility framework outlining the timeline, expected work tasks and budget, as well as the proposed coordination with the regional planning effort under Motion 15252 was filed with the Clerk on April 18, 2019. On May 21, 2019, the Mobility and Environment Committee heard a briefing on the Mobility Framework Scoping Document.

**Mobility Framework Development Process.** According to Metro, the Mobility Framework was co-created by Metro staff and an Equity Cabinet, which was made up of 23 community leaders compensated for their time and expertise. Attachment 4 is a list of Equity Cabinet members and their affiliations. This Equity Cabinet model was based on a process used by the King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks for addressing disparities in access to parks and open space.

Per Metro, the Equity Cabinet began meeting twice monthly in early May 2019 to develop a list of guiding principles and working in subcommittees, based on their own expertise, to develop recommendations within five theme areas: Investments, Surrounding Land Use, Innovation, Workforce, and Engagement. They also worked with Metro staff to ensure that their recommendations considered input from elected officials, other regional partners and stakeholder/community groups, and the general public.

---

1 2019-RPT0061.
In October, the Executive transmitted the final Mobility Framework as a stand-alone report and also transmitted Proposed Motion 2019-0464, which would adopt a Mobility Framework Recommendations Summary and provides an outline of Metro's plans to update its adopted policy documents. The proposed motion is pending in the Regional Transit Committee. Following RTC action, which could occur at a December 5, 2019 special RTC meeting, the motion will be referred to the Mobility and Environment Committee.

ANALYSIS

Proposed Motion 2019-0464 would adopt the Metro Mobility Framework Recommendations Summary, which is Attachment A to the Proposed Motion, and outline a process for development of updates to Metro's policy documents.

Proposed Motion Text. The proposed motion consists of a series of 18 clauses describing key factors leading to the creation of the Mobility Framework that was transmitted to the County Council at the end of October. Following this narrative component, the proposed motion contains two parts. Part A adopts the Recommendations Summary. Part B describes the Metro Transit Department's planning process to update its “adopted policies and associated reporting requirements.” The policy documents are the:

- Strategic Plan for Public Transportation 2011-2021 (Transit Strategic Plan),
- King County Metro Service Guidelines,
- King County Ferry District 2014-2018 Strategic Plan, and
- METRO CONNECTS Long-Range Plan.

The anticipated outcome of the process is “to incorporate recommendations from the mobility framework, as well as policies needed to implement METRO CONNECTS.”

The motion text summarizes eight process elements:

- Regular reports to the RTC and the County Council's standing committee with Metro jurisdiction, the Mobility and Environment Committee;
- Outreach to a wide range of stakeholders including cities;
- Ongoing consultation with the Metro Equity Cabinet;
- Provision of updated information to supplement METRO CONNECTS, including changes in population, congestion, inflation and construction costs, mobility needs, and innovations;
- Analysis of METRO CONNECTS funding options;
- Identification of the components of the METRO CONNECTS 2040 network that can be implemented using existing funding;
- Analysis of opportunities to assist local jurisdictions with speed and reliability improvements and increased access to transit; and
- Analysis of innovative mobility services testing, implementation, and partnerships.
Metro staff propose to engage the RTC in early 2020:

- January 2020: Strategic Plan and performance measures updates,
- February 2020: updated METRO CONNECTS costs and prioritization,

The Executive intends to transmit an ordinance to the Council in mid-year, approving updates to the Transit Strategic Plan, Service Guidelines, and METRO CONNECTS (the updates would incorporate Marine Division/Passenger Ferry provisions). The proposed ordinance is anticipated to be a mandatory dual referral that would be referred to the RTC for initial review.

**Mobility Framework Recommendations Summary (Attachment A).** The Mobility Framework Recommendations Summary is a five-page overview of the Mobility Framework report focused on the recommendations and the guiding principles that informed the recommendations. The Mobility Framework Final Report includes additional detail to support each of the recommendations, as well as appendices describing travel and population trends, best practices research related to the provision of equitable and sustainable mobility services, and the community engagement approach used. The full report was submitted to the County Council at the same time as Proposed Motion 2019-0464, but is not an attachment to the proposed motion.² It is included for reference as Attachment 3 to this staff report.

The Recommendations Summary begins with an Introduction describing the Equity Cabinet and stating that the Mobility Framework responds to Motions 15253 and 15252 as well as significant changes: (1) the County's growing and diversifying population; (2) increasing housing prices and the associated transportation challenges that result from displacement; (3) the worsening climate crisis; and (4) the need to integrate traditional, fixed-route transit with rapidly evolving new mobility services.

The Summary lists the 10 overarching Guiding Principles and provides one sentence summaries of recommendations in five categories. The recommendations are intended to “build on and strengthen Metro’s existing network of transit services.” These recommendations, in an even more abbreviated form, are:

**Investments**

- Provide additional transit service in areas with unmet need (see discussion of “unmet need” and “priority populations,” below)
- Support investments to increase safety
- Support improvements to increase speed and reliability

**Surrounding Land Use**

- Increase dense, mixed use zoning and affordable housing in urban areas near transit, while working to minimize displacement of priority populations
- Develop station area and right-of-way guidelines

² 2019-RPT0156.
- Develop people-friendly street design near transit
- Meet King County’s climate goals by reducing car use, developing green infrastructure, promoting climate justice

**Innovation**

- Change Metro’s adopted policies to assert the role of innovation, address new mobility services, and support innovative, equitable, sustainable mobility
- Develop new mobility guidelines for how Metro partners with private providers
- Facilitate integrated payment and planning
- Enhance communications and engagement
- Convene and support jurisdictions

**Workforce**

- Strategically partner with the labor community
- Use future transportation innovations to target new riders as potential employees
- Use strategic and culturally specific communication methods
- Build infrastructure to provide pathways to mobility-related employment
- Use strategic workforce planning
- Purposefully foster a sustainable learning culture within Metro
- Require the centering of equity in all contracts and subcontracts

**Engagement**

- Strengthen communication and marketing efforts
- Build lasting relationships in communities
- Use a coordinated cross-departmental approach to engagement
- Develop an equity-centered engagement framework
- Develop a community liaison program
- Identify metrics to measure success and continually improve

The Recommendations Summary concludes with a description of Next Steps to update Metro policy documents.

**Why a Proposed Motion?**

According to Metro staff, the Executive and Metro chose to transmit the proposed motion, even though it is not required by either Motion 15252 or Motion 15253, to provide a clear statement of RTC and Council response to the Mobility Framework. Metro chose to transmit a motion (Proposed Motion 2019-0464) that would adopt the Mobility Framework’s recommendations and outline a process for Metro’s 2020 policy updates for two reasons:

- First, given the importance of the Mobility Framework’s recommendations to Metro’s updates of its policy documents (the Strategic Plan for Public Transportation, Service Guidelines, and Long-range Plan/METRO CONNECTS),
Metro felt it was vital to ensure that the RTC and Council had the chance to formally review and adopt the Framework recommendations and, if desired, amend them. This adoption process will ensure that Metro’s work to develop policy updates is based on Framework recommendations that are acknowledged by elected leaders to be an appropriate basis for future policy choices.

- Second, Metro felt it important to seek RTC and Council input on the process by which it plans to complete its policy updates. As a result, Proposed Motion 2019-0464 outlines a process that Metro should follow for the policy updates, including guidelines for community engagement, work with the Equity Cabinet, consultation with elected officials and regional leaders, and information and analysis to include in the updates. Outlining this process in a motion gives the RTC and Council the chance to review, approve, and, if desired, amend the process to ensure that it meets the goals of the elected leaders who will ultimately be asked to review and adopt the policy documents.

**Mobility Framework Final Report.** As mentioned previously, the Mobility Framework itself has been transmitted separately to the County Council (2019-RPT0156); it is Attachment 3 to the staff report. There is no formal action for the RTC or County Council (i.e., approve, accept, amend, etc.) but it is available as a resource. The Mobility Framework is about 70 pages long. There are also include six appendices:

- Appendix A: Travel and Population Data, Trends, and Implications
- Appendix B: Best Practices
- Appendix C: Analysis of Recommendations
- Appendix D: Community Engagement
- Appendix E: Motion 15253
- Appendix F: Crosswalk of Requirements of Motion 15253

Two concepts that are central to the Mobility Framework are “priority populations” and “areas of unmet need.” Metro staff provided additional information on these concepts in response to Council staff inquiries, which is reproduced below.

**What is the origin of Metro’s definition of priority populations, and what process was used to determine which populations would be prioritized?**

Metro Staff Response: The Mobility Framework defines and uses the term “priority populations” frequently. The definition of priority populations in the Mobility Framework is taken from King County’s Determinants of Equity report, which defines priority populations as those that “include low income, people of color, and those with LEP.” The Determinants of Equity report was developed in response to Ordinance 16948, which established definitions and directed implementation steps to achieve King County’s fair and just principle. As the Determinants of Equity report noted, “It is becoming more widely recognized that King County residents do not enjoy the same health, resources, and opportunities because of their race and where they live.”

As Metro began work on the Mobility Framework, Metro staff coordinated with staff from the Office of Equity and Social Justice to expand the priority population definition specifically for the Mobility Framework to include people with disabilities, in
acknowledgement of Metro’s federally mandated role in providing ADA access and paratransit services for people with disabilities.

The specific words used to describe the priority populations in the Mobility Framework (“low- and no-income people, black, indigenous, and people of color, immigrants and refugees, people with disabilities, and members of limited-English speaking communities”), was developed by the Equity Cabinet to express the Determinants of Equity priority populations definition in a way that Equity Cabinet members determined to be inclusive and respectful.

What was the methodology for determining the “Areas of Unmet Need” and how do they compare to the Service Guidelines methodology for determining unmet system needs?

Metro Staff Response: The first Investment recommendation is to “Provide additional transit service in areas of unmet need, defined as areas with high density; a high proportion of low-income people, people of color, people with disabilities, and members of limited-English speaking communities; and limited mid-day and evening service.”

Equity Cabinet members spent time reviewing travel trends and demographic patterns to determine areas of unmet need in transit service allocation, and worked through several modeling exercises with Metro staff and consultants to review different approaches to defining need. The areas of unmet need ultimately identified by the Equity Cabinet were determined to be those that “include areas of high density; a high proportion of low-income people, people of color, people with disabilities, and members of limited-English speaking communities; and that have limited mid-day and evening transit service to schools, jobs, and child care centers and other ways to build wealth and opportunities.” (Please note that the methodology used for Metro’s adopted Service Guidelines, Ordinance 18301, does not currently include people with disabilities and members of limited-English speaking communities.)

On a more technical level, the map that was included in the Mobility Framework recommendations uses census block groups in the top 60th percentile of the z-score composite. These areas were used as the initial subset of “priority areas” and those areas with population densities of greater than the median density (8 people per acre) were considered the final “areas for investment.” Additional filters and maps were developed to highlight areas with: (1) population densities greater than 15 people per acre to denote areas that could be served with fixed-route transit; and (2) block groups between 4 and 15 people per acre that could be served by alternative services.

The areas of unmet need map developed with the Equity Cabinet was then used to identify a number of priority routes (see Appendix C to the Mobility Framework report). Metro is in the process of analyzing the alignment between these areas and routes and the existing Service Guidelines. Any changes to adjust how the Service Guidelines take into account the areas of unmet needs and priority routes from the Mobility Framework would be made as part of an update to the Service Guidelines.
As currently adopted, the Service Guidelines identify how service levels for a total of 113 transit corridors connecting 85 centers are established and receive investments within an All-Day and Peak Network. Service levels are set based on:

- Productivity: households, jobs within ¼ mile of stops per corridor mile (50% of score)
- Social Equity: percent boardings in low-income, minority census tracts (25% of score)
- Geographic Value: primary connection between regional or transit activity centers (25% of score)

As Metro prepares to update its Service Guidelines, staff and consultants will model scenarios using different definitions and weightings for the social equity measure to identify implications for service investment in the transit network under different conditions. As these scenarios are analyzed, they will be reviewed with the Equity Cabinet, stakeholders, and elected leaders to identify how different definitions and weightings for social equity could implement the Mobility Framework recommendations and could affect the network of regional transit service.

INVITED

1. Tessa McClellan, Mobility Programs Manager, Metro Transit Department

ATTACHMENTS

1. Proposed Motion 2019-0464 (and its attachments)
2. Transmittal Letter
3. Mobility Framework Final Report
4. Metro Equity Cabinet Membership
Motion

Proposed No. 2019-0464.1  Sponsors Balducci

A MOTION relating to public transportation, adopting the
Metro Mobility Framework Recommendations Summary
and outlining a process for the development of updates to
the Metro transit department's adopted policies.

WHEREAS, recent developments in transportation technologies have led to
innovations in mobility that have changed the way people travel, and
WHEREAS, these innovative mobility services offer many new transportation
options but do not always put people first or use public space equitably and efficiently,
and
WHEREAS, these innovative mobility services are not yet well-integrated with
public transit, meaning that it can be difficult for passengers to plan and pay for their
mobility needs, and
WHEREAS, implementing mobility services in King County has been
complicated by the recent increase in housing prices, which has resulted in many
households living farther away from jobs, school and other destinations, in less-dense
areas that can be more difficult to serve with fixed-route public transit and that are often
not well served by innovative mobility services, and
WHEREAS, transportation is one of the largest sources of greenhouse gas
emissions in King County, making it essential that King County develop strategies to
reduce vehicle miles traveled by fossil-fuel burning, single-occupancy vehicles, and

WHEREAS, those challenges require a vision for a regional mobility system that

is innovative, integrated, equitable and sustainable, and

WHEREAS, Motion 15253 required the Metro transit department to develop a

regional mobility framework for the equitable implementation of innovations in transit

service and mobility that should include: guiding principles; a review of emerging

technologies and local and national best practices; analysis of potential implications for

the Metro transit department and opportunities to integrate mobility innovations with

fixed-route and other services; coordination with regional transit planning efforts; a

review of potential policies for the allocation of public space; a review of industry-wide

workforce trends; information on how transit policies should be updated; and engagement

with regional partners, transit riders and local communities, including but not limited to

low-income populations, communities of color, immigrants and refugees and limited-

English-speaking populations, and

WHEREAS, as required by Motion 15253, the Metro transit department

transmitted a scoping document on April 18, 2019, which included a timeline, expected

work tasks and a budget to develop the mobility framework, and

WHEREAS, Motion 15252 required the executive, working in coordination with

the council, to initiate a regional planning effort during 2019 to address the

implementation of METRO CONNECTS, the Metro transit department's long-range

transit service and capital plan, as well as the ongoing maintenance needs of King

County's transportation infrastructure, and that, as part of this effort, the Metro transit

department should prepare updated information to supplement METRO CONNECTS to
adjust for increased population growth, increasing regional congestion, inflation and construction costs, regional mobility needs and innovations in transportation, and

WHEREAS, as required by Motion 15252, the Metro transit department transmitted a status report on May 31, 2019, which described the coordination of the development of the mobility framework with regional transit planning and funding efforts and the progress in preparing updated information to supplement METRO CONNECTS, and

WHEREAS, to implement the efforts required by Motions 15252 and 15253, the Metro transit department convened the King County Metro equity cabinet, which was comprised of twenty-two community leaders representing communities countywide including, but not limited to, low-income people, communities of color, immigrants and refugees, limited-English speaking communities and people with disabilities, to cocreate the mobility framework, and

WHEREAS, the Metro transit department conducted extensive outreach and engagement around the development of the mobility framework with regional partners, elected leaders, stakeholder organizations, transit riders, local communities, low-income populations, communities of color, immigrants and refugees, limited-English-speaking populations, people with disabilities and others, and

WHEREAS, the process of developing the mobility framework began with the development of guiding principles, as required by Motion 15253, which were drafted by the King County Metro equity cabinet and then reviewed and refined by the regional transit committee, local elected officials, stakeholder organizations and community members, and
WHEREAS, the Metro transit department conducted analysis on emerging technologies and local and national best practices, as required by Motion 15253, and that information was used to develop the mobility framework, and

WHEREAS, the Metro transit department conducted analysis of potential implications for public transit services, opportunities to integrate mobility innovations with fixed-route and other services, potential policies for the allocation of public space and industry-wide workforce trends, as required by Motion 15253, and that information was used to develop the mobility framework, and

WHEREAS, the Metro transit department has begun a process to prepare revisions and updates to countywide public transit policies, including the Strategic Plan for Public Transportation, the King County Metro Service Guidelines and the METRO CONNECTS - King County Metro Long-Range Plan, as required by Motion 15253, and has described this process and a proposed timeframe for these updates within the mobility framework, and

WHEREAS, the Metro transit department has begun a process to prepare updated information to supplement METRO CONNECTS to adjust for increased population growth, increasing regional congestion, inflation and construction costs, regional mobility needs and innovations in transportation, as required by Motion 15252, and has described this process and a proposed timeline for this updated information within the mobility framework, and

WHEREAS, the mobility framework proposes recommendations in the areas of investments, surrounding land use, innovation, workforce and engagement that, if implemented, will help lead to a regional mobility system that is more innovative,
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT MOVED by the Council of King County:

A. The Metro Mobility Framework Recommendations Summary, which is Attachment A to this motion, is hereby adopted.

B. The Metro transit department, under the leadership of the executive and working in coordination with the council, shall engage in a planning process to update its adopted policies and associated reporting requirements during 2020, including, but not limited to, the Strategic Plan for Public Transportation, the King County Metro Service Guidelines, the King County Ferry District 2014-2018 strategic plan and the METRO CONNECTS - King County Metro Long-Range Plan, to incorporate recommendations from the mobility framework, as well as policies needed to implement METRO CONNECTS. The process shall include:

1. Regular reports to the regional transit committee and the mobility and environment committee, or its successor;

2. Outreach and engagement with regional partners, communities historically lacking in access to or underserved by transit, the Sound Cities Association, the city of Seattle, King County's regional transportation boards, transit riders and local communities, including, but not limited to, low-income populations, communities of color, immigrants and refugees, people with disabilities and limited English speaking populations;

3. Ongoing consultation with the King County Metro equity cabinet to ensure that the recommendations of the mobility framework are incorporated into the updates to the Metro transit department's adopted policies;
4. Updated information to supplement METRO CONNECTS to adjust for increased population growth, increasing regional congestion, inflation and construction costs, regional mobility needs and innovations in transportation;

5. Analysis of funding options to implement METRO CONNECTS;

6. Identification of the components of the METRO CONNECTS 2040 network that can be implemented using existing funding;

7. Analysis of opportunities to assist local jurisdictions in implementing capital investments to improve speed and reliability for transit and to increase access to transit;

and

8. Analysis of opportunities to test, implement, partner with and respond to
innovative mobility services and the development of policies related to the role of
innovative mobility services within the public transit network.

KING COUNTY COUNCIL
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

______________________________
Rod Dembowski, Chair

ATTEST:

______________________________
Melani Pedroza, Clerk of the Council

APPROVED this _____ day of ______________, ______.

______________________________
Dow Constantine, County Executive

Attachments: A. Metro Mobility Framework Recommendations Summary
Introduction

King County Metro’s Mobility Framework envisions a regional network of traditional and new transportation services that gets people where they want to go, when they want to get there, while contributing to healthy communities, a thriving economy, and a sustainable environment.

The Mobility Framework was community-led and co-created with the King County Metro Mobility Equity Cabinet, a group of 23 community leaders representing riders countywide, including but not limited to low-income people, black, indigenous, and people of color, immigrants and refugees, limited-English speaking communities, and people with disabilities.

The Mobility Framework responds to Motion 15253, which asked Metro to develop a regional mobility framework to ensure that innovations in mobility put people first, use public space equitably and efficiently, and are coordinated with transit policies and regional funding strategies. It also responds to Motion 15252, which asked Metro to provide updated information to supplement METRO CONNECTS, Metro’s adopted long-range plan, and to work with regional leaders and community members to develop a plan to implement METRO CONNECTS.

The Framework also responds to several other significant changes in our region that have implications for Metro’s service to the people of King County:

- **The county’s growing and diversifying population**, and the persistent inequities that exist despite our region’s economic success, which requires a renewed focus on the unmet mobility needs of black, indigenous, and people of color, low-income people, immigrants and refugees, limited-English speaking communities, and people with disabilities;

- **Increasing housing prices and the associated transportation challenges that result from displacement**, when households must move farther from work, school, and other destinations, to places that are often less dense and therefore less well-served by transit;

- **The worsening climate crisis** and the need to significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions from car travel, promote climate resiliency, and improve health outcomes; and
The need to integrate traditional, fixed-route transit with rapidly evolving new mobility services to help people move quickly and seamlessly throughout the region.

In responding to these challenges, the Mobility Framework articulates a vision for a regional mobility system that builds on Metro’s existing network of transit services to become more innovative, integrated, equitable, and sustainable. The Mobility Framework includes 10 Guiding Principles and Recommendations in five thematic areas.

The Equity Cabinet spent much of 2019 working with Metro staff to review adopted policies, and to study King County’s changing demographics, travel trends and needs, best practices, and emerging mobility technologies. The Framework was also informed by extensive outreach and engagement with local elected officials, stakeholder organizations, and community members.

Guiding Principles

The Guiding Principles offer overarching guidance for how Metro and partners can work together to achieve a regional mobility system that is innovative, integrated, equitable, and sustainable. They were developed in partnership with the Equity Cabinet and with input from elected officials, regional partners, and community stakeholders. These Guiding Principles will guide updates to Metro’s Strategic Plan for Public Transportation, which will be updated during 2020.

- Invest where needs are greatest
- Address the climate crisis and environmental justice
- Innovative equitable and sustainably
- Ensure safety
- Encourage dense, affordable housing in urban areas near transit
- Improve access to mobility
- Provide fast, reliable, integrated mobility services
- Support our workforce
- Align our investments with equity, sustainability, and financial responsibility
- Engage deliberately and transparently

Following the development of the Guiding Principles, the Equity Cabinet developed Recommendations in five thematic areas that consolidated the Guiding Principles: investments, surrounding land use, innovation, workforce, and engagement. Input from elected officials, community stakeholders, regional partners, and the general principles informed these recommendations.
Recommendations

The Recommendations below are meant to build on and strengthen Metro’s existing network of transit services.

They address Metro’s role as a provider of fixed-route public transit and community-based mobility services; as an employer and contractor; as a partner to jurisdictions around the region; as a co-provider of services with private mobility companies; and as part of a local government that prioritizes equity and sustainability. They provide guidance for ways Metro can add to and build on its existing, regional network of mobility services with the goal of achieving a mobility network that is innovative, integrated, equitable, and sustainable.

The recommendations span from visionary to long overdue and are essential to the future of the regional mobility system. Metro looks forward to working with local municipalities, organized labor, partner transit agencies, community-based organizations, and/or private mobility providers to fund and implement these recommendations.

Investments

- **Provide additional transit service in areas with unmet need**, defined as areas with high density; a high proportion of low-income people, people of color, people with disabilities, and members of limited-English speaking communities; and limited mid-day and evening service. Adapt Metro’s adopted policies to meet this need and to ensure regular and ongoing evaluation of the needs of these areas. $

- **Support investments to increase safety**, including bus safety features, a safety app or other technology, and amenities such as lighting, real-time arrival signs, and informational campaigns. $

- **Support improvements to increase speed and reliability** to make transit investments most successful and to provide incentives for local jurisdictions to prioritize use of the right-of-way for transit and access to transit. ★$

Surrounding Land Use

- **Increase dense, mixed use zoning and affordable housing in urban areas near transit**, while working to minimize displacement of priority populations through the Growth Management Planning Council, by developing a King County Transit-oriented Development policy, and by updating Metro’s adopted policies to provide incentives for jurisdictions that provide increased density and/or affordable housing. ★$

Key

★ Indicates that Metro must partner to implement this recommendation.

$ Indicates need for additional funding.
- **Develop station area and right-of-way guidelines** that prioritize transit use and access for people who walk, bike, or roll to the station. ★$  
- **Develop people-friendly street design near transit**, including traffic-calming measures and ways to make bus stops safe for all ages, genders, and abilities. ★$  
- **Meet King County’s climate goals by reducing car use, developing green infrastructure, promoting climate justice** and prioritizing ways to make transit convenient and accessible. $  

### Innovation

- **Change Metro’s adopted policies to assert the role of innovation, address new mobility services, and support innovative, equitable, sustainable mobility** to ensure they supplement transit services and work first for priority populations.  
- **Develop new mobility guidelines for how Metro partners with private providers** that incentivize an equity and climate focus.  
- **Facilitate integrated payment and planning** to help customers plan and pay for multimodal trips, in partnership with ORCA agencies and private providers. ★$  
- **Enhance communications and engagement** to raise awareness of mobility innovations.  
- **Convene and support jurisdictions** in developing a regional framework for innovative mobility partnerships. ★  

### Workforce

- **Strategically partner with the labor community** to build new “communities of ridership” and benefit Metro employees, priority populations and the environment. ★$  
- **Use future transportation innovations to target new riders as potential employees.**  
- **Use strategic and culturally specific communication methods** to build sustainable community relationships.  
- **Build infrastructure to provide pathways to mobility-related employment**, including a “school without a school,” an equity in mobility summer internship program, an approach to assist with costs associated with workforce development and employment pathways, and community-based mobility career hubs. ★$  
- **Use strategic workforce planning** to meet current and future workforce needs. ★$  
- **Purposefully foster a sustainable learning culture within Metro.**  
- **Require the centering of equity in all contracts and subcontracts.**
Engagement

- **Strengthen communication and marketing efforts** to ensure that priority populations are aware of existing mobility services, innovative new pilots, service changes, affordability programs, and other efforts.
- **Build lasting relationships in communities** and compensate community members for their time and expertise.
- **Use a coordinated cross-departmental approach to engagement**, including a continuing King County Equity Cabinet.
- **Develop an equity-centered engagement framework** by co-creating with the community and measuring equity and sustainability over time.
- **Develop a community liaison program** to hire people to act as a conduit to the community.
- **Identify metrics to measure success and continually improve**, and regularly report on engagement metrics.

Next Steps

The Mobility Framework, designed by an Equity Cabinet of community leaders, will guide updates to Metro’s adopted policies, including Metro’s Strategic Plan, long-range plan (METRO CONNECTS), and Service Guidelines, as well as the Transportation Goal Area of the Strategic Climate Action Plan. The Mobility Framework’s recommendations will also guide the development of Metro’s 2021-2022 biennial budget proposal and ongoing regional planning efforts to fund and implement METRO CONNECTS.

As required by Motion 15252, the update to METRO CONNECTS will include updated information to adjust for population and employment growth, increasing regional congestion, inflation and construction costs, regional mobility needs and innovations in transportation.

Work to update Metro’s policy documents (specifically, the Strategic Plan for Public Transportation, Service Guidelines, and METRO CONNECTS) will begin during the first half of 2020 to align with the recommendations of the Mobility Framework and to provide detailed implementation guidance for how the Mobility Framework’s recommendations can be realized. Updates to these policy documents will benefit from input from Equity Cabinet members, elected leaders, stakeholder organizations, and communities.

Metro looks forward to working closely with elected leaders, stakeholder groups, and community members to fund and implement these recommendations and move forward together toward a regional mobility system that is innovative, integrated, equitable, and sustainable.
Dear Councilmember Dembowski:

This letter transmits a proposed motion that will, if enacted, adopt Metro’s Mobility Framework Recommendations Summary and a process to update King County Metro Transit’s adopted policies. The proposed motion and recommendations summary respond to Motion 15253, which directed King County Metro Transit to “begin a planning effort during 2019 to develop a framework for the equitable implementation of innovations in transit service and mobility” and file a scoping document by April 18, 2019.

The scoping document, filed by the required deadline, included a commitment to transmit the completed Mobility Framework to the King County Council by October 31, 2019. The proposed motion and recommendations summary are transmitted separately from the Mobility Framework report and its associated appendices.

King County Metro’s Mobility Framework envisions a regional network of traditional and new transportation services that gets people where they want to go, when they want to get there, while contributing to healthy communities, a thriving economy, and a sustainable environment. The recommendations in the attached summary support that vision. In addition to responding to the requirements in Motion 15253, it responds to several other significant changes in our region that affect Metro’s service, including:

- King County’s growing and increasingly diverse population;
- Increasing housing prices and the associated transportation challenges that result from displacement, when households must move farther from work, school, and other destinations, to places that are often less in-demand, less dense and therefore less well-served by transit;
- The worsening climate crisis and the need to quickly and significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transportation, promote climate resilience, and improve health outcomes; and,
- The need to integrate traditional, fixed-route transit with new mobility services to help people move quickly and seamlessly throughout the region.
Motion 15253 required that the framework be informed by outreach and engagement with regional partners, transit riders, and local communities, including but not limited to low-income populations, communities of color, immigrants and refugees, and limited English-speaking populations. As a result, the Mobility Framework was co-created with the King County Metro Mobility Equity Cabinet, a group of 23 community leaders representing low- and no-income people, communities of color and indigenous people, immigrants and refugees, limited-English speaking communities, people with disabilities, and other countywide community groups. Engagement with regional partners, transit riders, jurisdictions, elected officials, advocacy organizations, and other stakeholder groups also informed the framework.

The recommendations in the Mobility Framework will guide updates to Metro’s adopted policies, including Metro’s Strategic Plan, long-range plan (METRO CONNECTS), and Service Guidelines, as well as the Transportation Goal Area of the Strategic Climate Action Plan. They will also guide the development of Metro’s 2021-2022 biennial budget proposal and ongoing regional planning efforts to fund and implement METRO CONNECTS.

Development of the Mobility Framework has been coordinated with Metro’s income-based approach to fares. However, because of the different legislative requirements and transmittal requirements for the two efforts, Metro’s plan for an income-based approach to fares will be transmitted separately.

The Mobility Framework’s recommendations summary will advance goals in the Strategic Plan for Equity and Social Justice by recommending changes to policies, programs, services, and investment strategies to better advance equity through Metro’s operations. They will also support goals in the Strategic Plan for Public Transportation, including “provide equitable opportunities for people from all areas of King County to access the public transportation system” and “help reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the region.” Finally, by including recommendations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through transportation, the framework will advance the objectives in the King County Strategic Climate Action Plan.

This report required an estimated 1,200 staff hours to prepare, costing $60,000. The estimated printing costs are nominal.
Thank you for considering this legislative package. The Mobility Framework’s recommendations will help our region move toward an innovative, integrated, equitable, and sustainable mobility system that will benefit Metro’s customers and all King County residents. I look forward to working with elected officials and partners region-wide to implement them.

Please contact Tessa McClellan at 206-263-5750 or tmcclellan@kingcounty.gov with questions. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dow Constantine
King County Executive

Enclosures

cc: King County Councilmembers
    ATTN: Carolyn Busch, Chief of Staff
    Melani Pedroza, Clerk of the Council
    Dwight Dively, Director, Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget
    Rob Gannon, General Manager, Metro Transit Department
    Chris O’Claire, Mobility Division Director, Metro Transit Department
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1 Letter from the Equity Cabinet

Dear Friend,

Our region is growing quickly, with more than 30,000 people arriving here every year. Job growth is keeping up, with opportunities in both high-tech and old-tech, including careers that didn’t even exist a generation ago. Construction has blossomed around the region, with buildings going up in nearly every neighborhood and light rail lines being extended to the north, south, and east of Seattle. Even the way people travel is changing, with innovative mobility technologies launched every few months — from electric scooters and bikes for rent, to cars and shuttles that can be hailed with a phone app, to plans for driverless deliveries and more.

King County is changing. Unfortunately, not everyone has benefited from these changes.

Rising rents and home prices have meant that many people struggle to afford housing or must move further out. This means that, more and more, our families are paying a larger portion of their income on housing and transportation, two of the three major drivers to wealth, along with food costs. The need to move farther out has also led to increasing congestion on our roads and highways, making it more time consuming to get around, particularly for people who do not or cannot drive. Many people — particularly low- and no-income people, black, indigenous and people of color, immigrants and refugees, people with disabilities, and members of limited-English speaking communities — have experienced the inequities of our region’s economic growth and need better ways to get around, because of where they live or the hours of the day they need to travel.

In addition, some of the new mobility innovations may worsen congestion rather than relieve it. The climate crisis requires that we find ways to quickly and significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions caused by fossil fuel-powered vehicles. We must also build equitable, climate resilient communities. Climate change, rising housing costs, congestion, and other factors lead to cumulative health impacts and disparities in King County. Those disparities are often based on where people live, racial backgrounds, and limited and unequal access to relevant services.

We believe mobility is a basic human right that allows communities and individuals to access the opportunities needed to thrive. Mobility equity must respond to decades of local, regional, and state investments and land use plans that have led to disproportionate health and economic impacts for low-income communities of color. Mobility equity must be intersectional with other aspects of people’s lives, such as their health and economic opportunities. For a mobility system to deliver meaningful
equity outcomes, Metro needs a detailed equity strategy and roadmap that holds Metro and local elected leaders accountable to delivering mobility benefits to low-income communities of color. We are dedicated to leading from a place of self-determination despite the history of underinvestment, compounded by institutional racism and oppression. Our communities are resilient and have come together to provide direction on centering leadership from our communities. This is the purpose of our Mobility Framework.

We represent a variety of communities and organizations. We have spent much of the last year working together as the King County Metro Mobility Equity Cabinet. We believe that it is vital that community members work together with public agencies to co-create solutions and policy and to address challenges to those most impacted, and we are proud to have played a key role with Metro. As part of our work, we have reviewed Metro’s adopted policies, as well as King County’s Strategic Climate Action Plan and Equity and Social Justice Plan. We have also analyzed demographic patterns, travel trends, transit use, new mobility technologies, and adopted transportation policy. Following this research, we developed equity and sustainability-centered recommendations to guide Metro’s work and to prepare our region for mobility innovations in a way that puts low- and no-income people, black, indigenous, and people of color, immigrants and refugees, people with disabilities, and members of limited-English speaking communities first; uses public space efficiently and equitably; and addresses our climate goals.

This Mobility Framework is based around 10 Guiding Principles:

- Invest where needs are greatest
- Address the climate crisis and environmental justice
- Innovate equitably and sustainably
- Ensure safety
- Encourage dense, affordable housing in urban areas near transit
- Improve access to mobility
- Provide fast, reliable, integrated mobility services
- Support our workforce
- Align our investments with equity, sustainability, and financial responsibility
- Engage deliberately and transparently

The Mobility Framework also includes recommendations in five areas:

- **Investments**: Metro’s financial support for transit service, new mobility innovations, fares, capital investments, and safety improvements

- **Surrounding Land Use**: Support for dense, mixed-use neighborhoods near transit, affordable housing, and better access to transit

- **Innovation**: Metro’s role in the regional, integrated network (new technology and services), and Metro’s role with private providers

- **Workforce**: Metro’s role with current and future Metro employees and contract employees, as well as influence on the treatment of private providers’ workforce
Engagement: Metro’s policies for how it engages with the community regarding mobility investments

We thank Metro for taking this important step and centering equity, sustainability, and community power. We urge leaders around King County to do everything possible to ensure that our regional mobility services are integrated, innovative, equitable, safe, and sustainable.

On behalf of the Equity Cabinet, and in partnership with Metro, we are proud to submit this Mobility Framework to King County Executive Dow Constantine, the King County Council, and the Regional Transit Committee. We look forward to working with you to see these recommendations incorporated into Metro’s policy documents and then put into action to ensure King County addresses mobility and climate challenges and creates long-lasting opportunities to serve those most in need in our communities.

Sincerely,

The King County Metro Mobility Equity Cabinet

Paulina López, Co-Chair
Executive Director,
Duwamish River Cleanup Coalition

Tony To, Co-Chair
Director Emeritus,
HomeSight

Michelle Benetua
Community Partnerships & Planning Manager,
Seattle Parks Foundation

Niesha Brooks
Community Leader

Lylianna Allala
Community Leader

Sarneshea Evans
Outreach & Partnerships Manager,
Friends of Waterfront Seattle

Leda Chahim
Community Leader

Virginia Herrera-Páramo
Para los Niños

Rita Green
Education Chair
NAACP Youth Coalition

Alex Mayo
Community Activist

Ellany Kayce
Nakani Native Program

Jessica Ramirez
Director of Community Engagement
Puget Sound Sage

Munira Mohamed
Executive Director
East African Community Services

Leo Segovia
Economic Justice Manager
Ingersoll Gender Center

Linwood Robinson
Member
King County
Transit Advisory Commission

Anna Zivarts
Rooted in Rights

Jeff Smith
United Indians of All Tribes Foundation

Chalisa Thompson
University of Washington student

Tamieko Cook
Recording Secretary
Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 587

Sili Savusa
Executive Director
White Center Community Development Association

Lavanya Madhusudan
Board Member
Got Green

Anna Zivarts
Rooted in Rights

Pah-tu Pitt
Community Leader
Figure 1: Photo of King County Metro Mobility Equity Cabinet

Equity Cabinet members pictured in front row, left to right: Anna Zivarts, Paulina López, Tamieko Cook, Jessica Ramirez, Linwood Robinson, Sarneshea Evans, Michelle Benetua, Sili Savusa, Chalisa Thompson

Equity Cabinet members and Metro staff pictured in back row, left to right: Jeff Smith, De’Sean Quinn (Metro), Pah-tu Pitt, Alex Mayo, Rob Gannon (Metro), Mozart Guerrier, Tessa McClellan (Metro)

(Not all Equity Cabinet members pictured)
Dear Friend,

On behalf of the thousands of dedicated King County Metro employees who provide half a million rides in and around King County every day — on buses, light rail, paratransit, streetcar, community shuttles, and water taxis — I am proud to present Metro and the Equity Cabinet’s Mobility Framework.

The recommendations in this Framework will guide our work as we prepare updates to Metro’s Strategic Plan, long-range plan (METRO CONNECTS), and Service Guidelines, as well as King County’s Strategic Climate Action Plan, and develop a 2021-2022 budget proposal. More important, these recommendations will help us center equity and sustainability as we continue to improve, innovate, and increase public transit ridership and overall mobility in this era of new mobility advances.

The Mobility Framework represents a new approach for Metro. That is because it was not developed solely by our staff, as most documents of this kind have been. Instead, it was co-created with the diverse communities we serve, led by the 23 members of the King County Metro Mobility Equity Cabinet. They drove the development of the Guiding Principles and recommendations, worked with Metro to direct the consultant analysis and research (captured in Appendices A-D, which were created by the consultant team), and helped draft the Mobility Framework document. It has been an honor to work with this group, and I am very grateful for the months of time Equity Cabinet members invested in developing this Framework: reviewing best practices, analyzing travel trends and needs, discussing and debating potential recommendations, and pushing Metro to do more and do better.

The final product captures the Equity Cabinet members’ work and reflects their deep knowledge and applied expertise. It embodies Metro’s commitment to investing where needs are greatest. Implementing these recommendations will help Metro do our part to achieve healthier communities, a thriving economy, and a sustainable environment.

We look forward to working with our elected officials, regional partners, and community members to fund and implement these recommendations. We are excited to continue the journey and move forward together.

Sincerely,

Rob Gannon
General Manager
3 Executive Summary

INTRODUCTION

King County Metro’s Mobility Framework envisions a regional network of traditional and new transportation services that gets people where they want to go, when they want to get there, while contributing to healthy communities, a thriving economy, and a sustainable environment.

The Mobility Framework was community-led and co-created with the King County Metro Mobility Equity Cabinet, a group of 23 community leaders representing riders and a variety of organizations and communities countywide, focused on low- and no-income people, black, indigenous, and people of color, immigrants and refugees, people with disabilities, and limited-English speaking communities.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The Guiding Principles below set a vision for how Metro and partners can achieve a regional mobility system that is innovative, integrated, equitable, and sustainable. Safety and financial responsibility will remain high priorities for Metro.

- Invest where needs are greatest
- Address the climate crisis and environmental justice
- Innovate equitably and sustainably
- Ensure safety
- Encourage dense, affordable housing in urban areas near transit
- Improve access to mobility
- Provide fast, reliable, integrated mobility services
- Support our workforce
- Align our investments with equity, sustainability, and financial responsibility
- Engage deliberately and transparently

Following the development of the Guiding Principles, the Equity Cabinet developed recommendations in five thematic areas that consolidated these principles: investments, surrounding land use, innovation, workforce, and engagement. Input from elected officials, community stakeholders, regional partners, employees, and the general public informed these recommendations.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations in this Mobility Framework are visionary and crucial to centering equity and sustainability in Metro’s work. Many of them cannot be implemented by Metro alone and require action and collaboration from partners,
including local jurisdictions, transit agencies throughout the region, and others. Metro looks forward to working with regional elected officials and partners to fund and implement these recommendations.

The recommendations are meant to provide guidance for ways Metro can **add to and build on** its existing, regional network of mobility services, with the goal of achieving a mobility network that is innovative, integrated, equitable, and sustainable.

### Investments

- **Provide additional transit service in areas with unmet need**, defined as areas with high density; a high proportion of low-income people, people of color, people with disabilities, and members of limited-English speaking communities; and limited mid-day and evening service. Adapt Metro’s adopted policies to meet this need and to ensure regular and ongoing evaluation of the needs of these areas. $
- **Support investments to increase safety**, including bus safety features, a safety app or other technology, and amenities such as lighting, real-time arrival signs, and informational campaigns. $
- **Support improvements to increase speed and reliability** to make transit investments most successful and to provide incentives for local jurisdictions to prioritize use of the right-of-way for transit and access to transit. ★$

### Surrounding Land Use

- **Increase dense, mixed-use zoning and affordable housing in urban areas near transit**, while working to minimize displacement of priority populations through the Growth Management Planning Council, by developing a King County Transit-Oriented Development policy, and by updating Metro’s adopted policies to provide incentives for jurisdictions that provide increased density and/or affordable housing. ★$★
- **Develop station area and right-of-way guidelines** that prioritize transit use and access for people who walk, bike, or roll to the station. ★$★
- **Develop people-friendly street design near transit**, including traffic-calming measures and ways to make bus stops safe for all ages, genders, and abilities. ★$★
- **Meet King County’s climate goals by reducing car use, developing green infrastructure, promoting climate justice**, and prioritizing ways to make transit convenient and accessible. $
Innovation

- Change Metro’s adopted policies to assert the role of innovation, address new mobility services, and support equitable and sustainable mobility to ensure innovations supplement transit services and work first for priority populations.
- Develop new mobility guidelines for how Metro partners with private providers that incentivize an equity and climate focus.
- Facilitate integrated payment and planning to help customers plan and pay for multimodal trips, in partnership with ORCA agencies and private providers. ★$★
- Enhance communications and engagement to raise awareness of mobility innovations.
- Convene and support jurisdictions in developing a regional framework for innovative mobility partnerships. ★

Workforce

- Strategically partner with the labor community to build new “communities of ridership” and benefit Metro employees, priority populations, and the environment. ★$★
- Use future transportation innovations to target new riders as potential employees.
- Use strategic and culturally specific communication methods to build sustainable community relationships.
- Build infrastructure to provide pathways to mobility-related employment, including a “school without a school,” an equity-in-mobility summer internship program, an approach to assist with costs associated with workforce development and employment pathways, and community-based mobility career hubs. ★$★
- Use strategic workforce planning to meet current and future workforce needs. ★$★
- Purposefully foster a sustainable learning culture within Metro.
- Require the centering of equity in all contracts and subcontracts.

Engagement

- Strengthen communication and marketing efforts to ensure that priority populations are aware of existing mobility services, innovative new pilots, service changes, affordability programs, and other efforts.
• **Build lasting relationships in communities** and compensate community members for their time and expertise.

• **Use a coordinated cross-departmental approach to engagement,** including a continuing King County Equity Cabinet.

• **Develop an equity-centered engagement framework** by co-creating with the community and measuring equity and sustainability over time.

• **Develop a community liaison program** to hire people to act as a conduit to the community.

• **Identify metrics to measure success and continually improve,** and regularly report on engagement metrics.

**NEXT STEPS**

The Mobility Framework will guide updates to Metro’s adopted policies, including Metro’s Strategic Plan, long-range plan (METRO CONNECTS), and Service Guidelines, as well as Metro’s 2021-2022 biennial budget proposal and the Transportation Goal Area of the King County 2020 Strategic Climate Action Plan. Metro has invited the Equity Cabinet to remain involved throughout this process and will also engage elected leaders, stakeholder organizations, and communities.

Metro will continue to work closely with elected leaders, stakeholder groups, jurisdictions and other regional partners, and community members to implement and fund these recommendations. Metro will also work with current and future employees and labor partners to implement these recommendations in day-to-day planning and operations.
4 Introduction: Innovative, Integrated, Equitable, Sustainable Mobility

King County Metro’s Mobility Framework envisions a regional network of traditional and new transportation services that gets people where they want to go, when they want to get there, while contributing to healthy communities, a thriving economy, and a sustainable environment.

The Mobility Framework was co-created with the King County Mobility Equity Cabinet, a group of 23 leaders representing riders countywide, including low- and no-income people, black, indigenous, and people of color, immigrants and refugees, people with disabilities, and limited-English speaking communities. The Equity Cabinet was chaired by two of these community leaders, who led the work of developing the Mobility Framework. The Framework’s Guiding Principles and Recommendations center these communities because the use of a targeted universalism\(^1\) approach will result in greater prosperity for all King County residents. Targeted universalism — in this case, leading with race and prioritizing strategies to address the populations mentioned above — allows Metro to define goals for all, identify obstacles faced by specific groups, and tailor strategies to address the barriers in those situations. This approach is also consistent with direction in the King County Equity and Social Justice Strategic Plan and Ordinance 16948.

However, Metro recognizes the importance of serving all customers, and this focus is not meant to exclude people with identities that may fall outside these frames, including but not limited to LGBTQ+ people, youth, seniors, people who have been involved with the justice system, and other communities. Instead, targeted universalism acknowledges that identities are often intersectional (for instance, low-income youth, or youth of color), and by developing focused strategies to benefit populations that have been most historically underserved, Metro can provide the greatest benefit for all.

The Mobility Framework responds to Motion 15253, which asked Metro to develop a regional Mobility Framework to ensure that innovations in mobility put people first, use public space equitably and efficiently, and are coordinated with transit policies and regional funding strategies. Appendix E, "Motion 15253," includes the complete legislation, and Appendix F, “Crosswalk of Requirements of Motions 15253,” summarizes how this Framework addresses each motion requirement.

\(^1\) Targeted universalism is defined in King County’s Equity and Social Justice Strategic Plan as: “Led by those most affected and lifting up their assets, we define goals for all; identify obstacles faced by specific groups, and tailor strategies to address the barriers in those situations” (developed by King County using multiple sources).
The Mobility Framework also responds to other significant regional changes, including:

- King County’s rapidly growing and diversifying population;
- The transportation challenges that result from displacement, when households must move farther from work, school, and other destinations, to places that are often less in-demand, less dense, and therefore less well-served by transit;
- The worsening climate crisis and the need to quickly and significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transportation, promote climate resilience, and improve health outcomes; and
- The need to integrate traditional, fixed-route transit with new mobility services to help people move quickly and seamlessly throughout the region.

In responding to these challenges, the Mobility Framework articulates a vision for a regional mobility system that is innovative, integrated, equitable, and sustainable.

The current Metro-operated transit system provides half a million rides every weekday and is nationally recognized for its performance. In 2018, the American Public Transportation Association named Metro the best large transit system in North America for its achievements in ridership, safety, innovation, sustainability, and equity. However, Metro recognizes the need to do more to address the trends and challenges mentioned above, center equity and sustainability in its policies and practices, and contribute to healthy communities, a thriving economy, and a sustainable environment.

The vision articulated in the Mobility Framework builds on Metro’s current system, as well as METRO CONNECTS, Metro’s adopted long-range plan. METRO CONNECTS outlines the goal of delivering 70 percent more service by 2040, using innovations to connect people to fixed-route transit, ensuring 77 percent of people of color and 87 percent of low-income residents live near frequent transit service, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions each year by 1.7 million metric tons.

Equity Cabinet members spent much of 2019 working with Metro staff to review adopted policies, King County’s changing demographics, travel trends and needs, best practices, and emerging mobility technologies. Their work aims to help Metro and other agencies put their commitments to equity into practice and guide regional leaders in the planning, development, implementation, and evaluation of equitable mobility. Extensive outreach and engagement with local elected officials, jurisdictions and other regional partners, stakeholder organizations, and community members also informed the Framework.

**AN INNOVATIVE MOBILITY SYSTEM**

Transportation is changing rapidly. New technologies, services, apps, and innovations — from shared e-scooters to driverless delivery pods, Uber, Lyft, and more — are changing how people and goods move. Many more mobility options exist today than a decade ago, and more will arise in the years and decades to come. With the rise of shared mobility and vehicle automation, the transportation
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industry is on the cusp of a profound and swift revolution in human mobility, as in the early 1900s, when U.S. cities began the transition from horses and buggies to cars (see Figure 2, Mobility Transformations from 1900 to 1913).

Figure 2  Mobility Transformations from 1900 to 1913

These new mobility services are changing people’s travel patterns and expectations, as they offer opportunities for greater efficiency and connectivity. However, they can also compete with public transit for riders and right-of-way, offer fewer well-paid and secure job opportunities, increase traffic congestion and greenhouse gas emissions, and be unaffordable or inaccessible for some populations.

Ride-hail services, including Uber, Lyft, and other shared-ride options, can be faster, more flexible, and more convenient than transit, taxis, and even personal single-occupancy vehicles. These alternative services can increase mobility in lower-density or lower-ridership areas that are hard to serve with fixed-route transit. King County Metro’s Shared Mobility Technical Report (2017) found shared mobility could help reduce car ownership. For example, up to 17-22 percent of existing vehicles in King County could be eliminated if cost was a consumer’s only consideration in deciding whether to switch to shared mobility options. But these new services alone cannot meet the region’s mobility, equity, and climate needs. Recent studies show that more than half the trips made via Uber or Lyft would have been walking, biking, or transit trips, rather than trips in private vehicles. In King County, about 40 percent of Uber and Lyft rides take place in just four neighborhoods within Seattle that are already the densest, most congested, and best-served by transit, bike lanes, and walkable streets.

Vehicle automation, though further in the future, is another industry trend with significant implications. Automation can save labor costs, which is why ride-hailing companies are working hard to develop autonomous (self-driving) vehicles to

become cost-effective. Autonomous vehicles could also improve safety, optimize roadway capacity, and increase capacity. However, automation could result in additional empty or single-occupancy vehicles, adding to traffic congestion and emissions. Automation could also cause the loss of many transportation sector jobs.

Micromobility options, or smaller transportation services, including scooter and bike share, can be a flexible and affordable way for people to travel, including to or from transit. As smaller transportation modes, micromobility services use space efficiently and can thus help reduce congestion. They are often electric, potentially supporting climate goals. However, without regionally-integrated infrastructure and regulations to ensure people know when and where they can use and park micromobility options, these services can create safety issues on public streets and sidewalks.

As a mobility agency with a long-range plan (METRO CONNECTS) that envisions Metro investing in, incorporating, and encouraging technological innovation, Metro is embracing new services that can make travel easier and more convenient and connect more people to transit. Metro already tests innovative mobility services, such as the Via to Transit program, which allows riders to order a shared shuttle to take them to and from five transit hubs in southeast Seattle and Tukwila. With approximately 800 daily riders as of late July 2019, Via to Transit has and continues to exceed ridership expectations. For more information, visit the Via to Transit website.

However, Metro and its partners must also work to mitigate the challenges of innovations, such as roads crowded with empty cars, the potential for increased carbon pollution, unaffordable or inaccessible services, and people choosing to travel alone in ride-hail vehicles instead of taking transit. Metro and its partners must do more to lead on innovation in an equitable and sustainable way. This could include employing and testing innovative strategies through pilot programs and services and using its influence to ensure private-sector mobility innovations advance the region’s goals.

**AN INTEGRATED MOBILITY SYSTEM**

As a mobility agency, Metro provides and supports an integrated mobility system that combines existing, high-capacity, fixed-route transit services with new mobility options. METRO CONNECTS envisions an integrated transit network that includes connections between different services operated by different partners, including Metro’s RapidRide, frequent, express, local transit, and water taxi services; Sound Transit’s Link light rail, bus rapid transit, express bus, and Sounder services; and the Seattle Streetcar. Such a network requires ensuring high-capacity, fixed-route transit serves as the backbone of an interconnected system that is universally accessible through walking, biking, rolling, park-and-rides, and other first-last mile services.

Traveling the first or last mile to or from the fixed-route transit network can be challenging, especially where good connections do not exist. New mobility services can help to solve the first-last mile challenges and give passengers many different opportunities to get to transit, but they can be confusing, complicated, expensive, and hard to access. Navigating between a range of public and private mobility options can be particularly difficult for people who live in areas with fewer choices available, for people with disabilities and the elderly, and for limited-English speaking communities.
As noted above, Metro has already piloted ways to integrate new mobility services into the public transit system, especially to address first-last mile connections. However, Metro and its partners must find more opportunities to bring people to transit and integrate new, private mobility services into public transit payment and planning systems. Metro must ensure that all forms of mobility are as accessible as possible, especially for communities of color, low- and no-income people, immigrants and refugees, limited-English speaking populations, and people with disabilities. Finally, Metro and other agencies must continue to partner, in a way that expresses Metro and King County’s values, while planning service expansions to ensure seamless, integrated, travel options for customers.

AN EQUITABLE MOBILITY SYSTEM

King County is growing and changing. Between 2010 and 2018, the county gained nearly 260,000 new residents. More than half of that growth occurred in dense areas with high concentrations of jobs, including Seattle and downtown Bellevue. King County also expects one million more people and 850,000 new jobs by 2040. Though some have benefited from growth in jobs and population, these factors have also likely contributed to rising housing costs, which in turn have likely contributed to displacement and a shift of lower-income people to communities in less urban parts of the county.

Data shows a loss of low-income households in areas such as Seattle that have become more expensive, and a gain of those populations in relatively less in-demand and therefore more affordable areas of King County, including many cities in south King County. This displacement often means that people must travel farther to work, school, or the other services they need, often from less-dense neighborhoods that are not as well-served by frequent, fixed-route transit service. This challenge is intensified by the fact that low-wage jobs are often less well-served by transit, because they are often located further away from major employment centers and often require mid-day or late evening shift hours, rather than the traditional 9-to-5 schedule of office work.

High costs for housing in many areas of King County have resulted in economic burdens for a larger portion of the population. In King County, $83,000 per year (about 350 percent of the federal poverty level) is seen as the “self-sufficiency” income threshold for a family of four, the income that is needed to meet basic needs in high-cost areas of the county. However, 22 percent of King County’s population is below 200 percent of the federal poverty level (about $50,200 for a family of four), and 13 percent of the population lives at or below the federal poverty level (about $25,100 for a family of four). These low- and no-income households are more likely than higher-income households to use transit or walk for more of their trips.

King County is also becoming more diverse. Nearly one quarter of King County residents were born outside the United States, more than 10 percent have limited English proficiency, and 39 percent are people of color. Black, indigenous, and people of color use transit more for work, compared to non-Hispanic white workers.

METRO CONNECTS articulates the importance of access to public transportation in expanding opportunities for people to thrive by envisioning frequent, all-day transit options to jobs, education, and other destinations. It also sets a goal of growing the transit network so that 77 percent of people of color and 87 percent of low-income
residents live near frequent service. Metro cannot meet these goals and equitably meet the community’s mobility needs without considering the patterns of change across King County. Metro must also meet growing demand for transit services in the denser areas of King County, which are often more expensive and higher income. However, these areas are often already better served by transit, in response to density, which can exacerbate disparities. The needs of lower-income, more-diverse, and less-dense communities, as well as the needs of workers who do not have traditional peak-hour schedules must be addressed differently and with high-quality mobility services.

A SUSTAINABLE MOBILITY SYSTEM

In King County and globally, climate change is already affecting the environment, economy, and human health. The average annual air temperature in the Puget Sound region is increasing, and the region is already experiencing more heat-related health impacts, including more illnesses and more hospitalizations and deaths. Low- and no-income people, black, indigenous, and people of color, immigrants and refugees, people with disabilities, and limited-English speaking communities tend to bear a disproportionate burden of the impacts of climate change in King County and across the globe. That is because they are more likely to be exposed to hazards because of where they live or work, such as flooding or other natural disasters, with less open space and other amenities, and with higher exposure to diesel, industrial processes, and other pollutants. In addition, how a family or community is affected by poverty, language barriers, and access to health care and insurance can affect their ability to recover after a hazard event.

In an urbanizing world, the transportation sector is a major generator of climate-altering gases. Transportation generates more than one third of greenhouse gas emissions in King County. It also has a profound influence on the lives of the adults and children living around fossil fuel emissions. For example, air quality made worse by air pollution can be linked to increased asthma-related conditions and increases in respiratory and cardiovascular diseases.

As a result, Metro and other transportation providers play a key role in confronting the climate crisis by reducing vehicle miles traveled by fossil fuel-burning single-occupancy vehicles. While Metro system-wide ridership continues to grow slowly, Metro has begun to lose its “market-share” of regional trips, failing to keep up with both population and employment growth. Total vehicle miles for work trips, per
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person, have also increased, along with the greenhouse gas emissions from those vehicles. This may be because people are traveling further for work, potentially as a result of moving farther away from job centers.

In general, fixed-route transit is easier and less expensive to provide and more competitive with single-occupancy vehicles in areas with higher population density. Research confirms that compact mixed-land use supported by high-capacity and frequent transit is the most important contributor to reducing transportation emissions.9 Residents not only have access to transit to travel to work, but other services such as schools, day care, shopping, and health care are located nearby and more universally accessible.

Metro, as a transit agency, does not have jurisdiction over land use decisions. Metro and local jurisdictions must work together to provide dense, mixed-use, affordable land use near transit, so that it is easier and more cost-effective to provide accessible transit that connects people to opportunities and can compete with single occupancy vehicle travel, therefore reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Metro and partners must also continue supporting climate resilient communities and preparing for climate impacts.

King County’s Strategic Climate Action Plan articulates a King County Countywide Climate Goal of reducing regional greenhouse gas emissions by 80 percent by 2050 (compared to 2007). Projections show that achieving that countywide target requires 12 percent of the reduction target to be achieved by reducing car trips, specifically King County-wide reductions in total light-duty vehicle miles traveled by 20 percent by 2030 and reduction of per person vehicle miles traveled by 50 percent by 2050, in alignment with Washington State goals (RCW 47.01.440).

METRO CONNECTS envisioned that Metro would contribute to King County’s overarching climate goals by removing 300,000 cars from roadways daily and reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 1.7 million metric tons per year. Implementation would reduce emissions by eight percent (compared to 2007). The Puget Sound Regional Council’s 2050 vision incorporates the transit-focused land use strategy, service improvements, and goals in METRO CONNECTS. Vision 2050, if realized, is projected to achieve a 22 percent reduction in per person vehicle miles traveled and a 16 percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from land use and transportation only. This means King County, local jurisdictions, and Metro will need additional strategies to achieve the King County Countywide Climate Goals and vehicle miles traveled reduction targets. Those strategies could include, but are not limited to, more service, more density, transportation demand management, parking policies, pricing, vehicle electrification, and a clean fuels standard. For example, Metro has already committed to moving towards a zero-emissions bus fleet by 2040 as part of Metro’s work on this issue.

For more information on the travel, population, industry, and climate trends explained in Section 4, see Appendix A, “Travel and Population Data, Trends, and Implications.”

---

9 Foundation work based on extensive review of research highlighting the importance of compact development on transportation emissions can be found at Ewing et al. 2008. Growing Cooler: The Evidence on Urban Development and Climate Change. Urban Land Institute.
5 Co-Creating the Mobility Framework

EQUITY CABINET

An Equity Cabinet, chaired by community leaders, and Metro staff co-created this Mobility Framework, considering input from elected officials, regional partners, community stakeholders, and the public. This approach is consistent with engagement best practices. The Equity Cabinet is comprised of 23 leaders, who were compensated for their time and expertise, representing communities and riders countywide including, but not limited to, low- and no-income people, black, indigenous, and people of color, immigrants and refugees, people with disabilities, and limited-English speaking communities. This process built on the success and momentum of King County’s Department of Natural Resources and Parks’ Open Space Equity Cabinet, which embedded an equity-based approach into how the region invests in open space to address disparities in access to parks and open space. Metro welcomed some new members to this Equity Cabinet, but many continued from the Open Space Equity Cabinet. The Equity Cabinet approach was essential because traditional engagement methods may limit the participation of low- and no-income communities, black, indigenous, and people of color, immigrants and refugees, limited-English speaking communities, and people with disabilities.

The Equity Cabinet began meeting twice monthly in early May 2019. These leaders developed the Mobility Framework’s Guiding Principles and Recommendations. They also worked with Metro staff to direct the supporting research, analysis, and engagement. Equity Cabinet members identified opportunities for Metro to center equity and sustainability by providing high-quality mobility services focused in areas of unmet need. Equity Cabinet members also highlighted opportunities to integrate new and innovative mobility services, invest in transit and related infrastructure, and partner with local jurisdictions and private partners to encourage transit-supportive land use that avoids displacement.

RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Metro staff and a consultant team performed the research, analysis, and engagement needed to develop the Mobility Framework. This analysis is provided in Appendices A-D, which were created by the consultant team. The consultant team conducted extensive research on travel and mobility trends, as summarized above and provided more fully in Appendix A, “Travel and Population Data, Trends, and Implications.” This research helped the Equity Cabinet consider recommendations within the context of the growth and change occurring in King County and the transportation industry.
The consultant team also completed an extensive review of best practices to understand how transit agencies, cities, and companies around the United States and abroad are integrating innovative transportation options, advancing equity, and addressing climate change (see Appendix B, “Best Practices”). The best practices research focused around the five thematic areas identified by the Equity Cabinet: investments, surrounding land use, innovation, workforce, and engagement. It included all the areas required by Motion 15253, including emerging technologies, opportunities to coordinate innovations with fixed-route and other services, outreach and engagement, allocation of public space, workforce trends, and potential updates to policies. The Equity Cabinet considered these best practices when developing recommendations. Finally, the consultant team conducted qualitative and quantitative analysis on many of the Mobility Framework Recommendations, summarized in Appendix C, “Analysis of Recommendations.”

**ENGAGEMENT**

Outreach and engagement with regional partners, transit riders, and local communities shaped the Mobility Framework. In addition to engaging with the Equity Cabinet, Metro and the consultant team conducted robust engagement with stakeholders and the public to inform the development of the Guiding Principles and recommended actions. As directed by the Equity Cabinet and Motion 15253, the engagement strategy prioritized low- and no-income people, black, indigenous, and people of color, immigrants and refugees, people with disabilities, and limited-English speaking communities. This approach is also consistent with direction in the King County Equity and Social Justice Strategic Plan.

Metro engaged with dozens of regional partners and stakeholders to shape the Guiding Principles and inform the recommendations. The consultant team also reached hundreds of members of the general public through an online survey and direct engagement at festivals, classes, and other events. Metro worked with the Equity Cabinet to ensure the Mobility Framework’s Guiding Principles and Recommendations incorporated stakeholder and public input. Appendix D, “Community Engagement,” summarizes this work and the key themes that emerged.

**PHASED APPROACH: GUIDING PRINCIPLES TO RECOMMENDATIONS**

Metro staff worked with the Equity Cabinet to use information from the research, analysis, and engagement to develop the Mobility Framework through a phased approach. While the consultant team conducted travel trends research, the Equity Cabinet developed Guiding Principles for the Mobility Framework, working with Metro to incorporate input from elected officials, stakeholder organizations, jurisdictional partners, and others.

After developing the Guiding Principles, the Equity Cabinet organized them into five thematic areas: investments, surrounding land use, innovation, workforce, and engagement. The consultant team then tailored the best practices review to address the issues identified through the travel trends analysis and to align with the five thematic areas.

Next, the Equity Cabinet worked in subcommittees, based on their own expertise, to develop recommended actions for Metro and partners across the five thematic areas.
They considered the travel trends analysis, best practices review, and community and stakeholder feedback.

Figure 3, “Process for Completing the Mobility Framework,” illustrates this process:

10 KCC refers to the King County Council
6 Guiding Principles

The Mobility Framework is based on 10 Guiding Principles, developed in partnership with the Equity Cabinet and with input from elected officials, regional partners, and community stakeholders. The Guiding Principles offer guidance for how Metro and partners can put people first and build on the current system to achieve regional mobility that is integrated, innovative, equitable, and sustainable.

Consistent with the King County Equity and Social Justice Strategic Plan, the Guiding Principles aim to advance strategies that serve low- and no-income people, black, indigenous, and people of color, immigrants and refugees, people with disabilities, and limited-English speaking communities.

INVEST WHERE NEEDS ARE GREATEST

Invest in and measure the outcomes of public transportation services and improvements in geographic areas and at times of day in which there is unmet need, particularly as experienced by low- and no-income people, black, indigenous, and people of color, immigrants and refugees, people with disabilities, and limited-English speaking communities. Understand peoples’ needs and create effective partnerships that make transportation services affordable for people for whom cost is a barrier.

ADDRESS THE CLIMATE CRISIS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Reduce demand for single occupancy and other high-emissions transportation modes. Help King County achieve its greenhouse gas emissions reduction and other climate-related goals by providing integrated transportation services and working to increase transit ridership. Partner with communities to prepare for the impacts of climate change and support resilience in communities disproportionately affected by climate change.

INNOVATE EQUITABLY AND SUSTAINABLY

Implement and partner on innovative new services and emerging technologies in ways that complement transit and use public space equitably and efficiently. Innovations should support fair labor practices, include data-sharing and/or other accountability measures, and serve low- and no-income people, black, indigenous, and people of color, immigrants and refugees, people with disabilities, and limited-English speaking communities.
ENSURE SAFETY
Provide a safe and secure experience for passengers, communities, and Metro employees. Coordinate enforcement in ways that are equitable and culturally appropriate.

ENCOURAGE DENSE, AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN URBAN AREAS NEAR TRANSIT
Work to minimize displacement and increase affordable housing options in urban areas near transit by partnering with local jurisdictions and other organizations. Support programs that incentivize equitable transit-oriented communities and community-centered development.

IMPROVE ACCESS TO MOBILITY
Partner with jurisdictions and community-driven organizations to ensure equitable and efficient use of public space (such as streets, bike lanes, sidewalks, and curbs) and prioritize access to mobility services, including bike, walk, and roll access. Partner to increase access to and awareness of transportation choices to increase ridership. Strategies should prioritize low- and no-income people, black, indigenous, and people of color, immigrants and refugees, people with disabilities, and limited-English speaking communities.

PROVIDE FAST, RELIABLE, INTEGRATED MOBILITY SERVICES
Partner to grow and deliver an integrated regional network of traditional and innovative transportation services that moves people quickly and reliably and increases ridership. Support jurisdictions in making transit-supportive improvements, such as making improvements to the right-of-way to increase speed and reliability of service and adopting transit-supportive land use.

SUPPORT OUR WORKFORCE
Partner with employees, labor, contractors, and communities to support a high quality of life and offer high-skill, high-wage careers, including training and apprenticeships, and opportunities to benefit from transportation-related innovations. Recruit and hire from communities with the greatest barriers to transit and employment, including but not limited to low- and no-income people, black, indigenous, and people of color, immigrants and refugees, people with disabilities, and limited-English speaking communities. Use innovation to engage transit’s workforce and create new pathways to living wage jobs.

ALIGN OUR INVESTMENTS WITH EQUITY, SUSTAINABILITY, AND FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
Budget and invest in a way that advances equity and sustainability, while upholding Metro’s responsibility to spend public dollars wisely. Exercise sound financial
management and ensure Metro’s long-term financial sustainability. Track and measure progress toward equity and sustainability outcomes, consistent with Metro’s value-driven, data-supported approach.

ENGAGE DELIBERATELY AND TRANSPARENTLY

Be open to shared decision-making and co-creation. Use meaningful, inclusive, and community-driven approaches to develop, provide, and evaluate mobility choices and supporting infrastructure that serve low- and no-income people, black, indigenous, and people of color, immigrants and refugees, people with disabilities, and limited-English speaking communities in a way that works for them.
7 Recommendations

After developing the Guiding Principles, the Equity Cabinet organized them into five thematic areas: investments, surrounding land use, innovation, workforce, and engagement. Equity Cabinet members met in subcommittees based on these thematic areas to review information on travel trends, demographic patterns, and best practices, and then developed recommendations in each area.

The recommendations address Metro’s role as a provider of fixed-route public transit and community-based mobility services; as an employer and contractor; as a partner to jurisdictions around the region; as a co-provider of services with private mobility companies; and as part of a local government that prioritizes equity and sustainability. They provide guidance for ways Metro can add to and build on its existing, regional network of mobility services, with the goal of achieving a mobility network that is innovative, integrated, equitable, and sustainable and that contributes to healthy communities, a thriving economy, and a sustainable environment in King County and beyond.

These recommendations span from visionary to long overdue and are essential to the future of the regional mobility system. Metro looks forward to working with local municipalities, organized labor, transit agencies, community-based organizations, and/or private mobility providers to fund and implement these recommendations.

In these recommendations, priority populations, unless otherwise specified, are defined as: black, indigenous and people of color, low- and no-income people, immigrants and refugees, limited-English speaking populations, and people with disabilities.

Key
★ Indicates that Metro and partners must work together to implement this recommendation.

$ Indicates need for additional funding.
INVESTMENTS

Metro’s financial support for transit service, new mobility, fares, capital investments, and safety improvements

Provide additional transit service in areas with unmet need

- Prioritize geographic areas that have: high density; a high proportion of low-income people, people of color, people with disabilities, and members of limited-English speaking communities; and that have limited mid-day and evening transit service to schools, jobs, and child care centers and other ways to build wealth and opportunities. See map on page 7-4 for these priority areas.

- Adapt Metro’s adopted policies to provide for service improvements in these priority geographic areas and to provide for regular and ongoing evaluation of the unmet needs in these areas and how populations are shifting.

- Continue developing an equitable, income-based approach to fares to ensure affordability and accessibility for those who need it.

- Consider additional investments in programs such as Trailhead Direct that connect communities to other areas of open space, such as parks and farms.

Support improvements to increase safety

- Continue to make progress toward a smart phone app or other technology to provide a safe and convenient way for passengers to communicate safety information or concerns, as well as provide real-time transit information and purchase transit fare.

- Add first mile/last mile service to get low-income people, black, indigenous, and people of color, people with disabilities, and members of limited-English speaking communities, as well as youth, seniors, and LGBTQ+ people, quickly and safely to transit.

- Provide safety-enhancing features on buses, and provide safety amenities and efforts, such as lighting, real-time information signs, and informational campaigns at transit stops in areas with higher proportions of low-income people, black, indigenous, and people of color, people with disabilities, and members of limited-English speaking communities, as well as to promote greater safety for women and LGBTQ+ people. Ensure that transit stops and transfer points are designed and located in ways that promote safety. Conduct ongoing safety reviews to assess environmental health and potential safety disparities.

- Review transit emergency plans to ensure that Metro is prepared to provide safe and ongoing transportation during natural disasters, weather emergencies, or climate-related crises. Ensure Metro infrastructure and services support community resilience to climate change.

---

11 One example of a safety app is the Denver RTD Transit Watch app
Support improvements to increase speed and reliability ★$★

- To make Metro’s investments in service most successful, Metro should advocate for and support jurisdictions in implementing improvements in and near the right-of-way that increase speed and reliability for transit.

- Update adopted policies to include incentives or disincentives that result in local jurisdictions taking transit-supportive actions, such as prioritizing right-of-way for transit. Such incentives should be implemented in a way that recognizes varying staff and financial resources among jurisdictions.

- Continue advocating for state legislation to support stricter enforcement on non-bus travel in bus-only lanes.

Figure 4, “Map of Areas of Unmet Need,” indicates areas of high density; a high proportion of low-income people, people of color, people with disabilities, and members of limited-English speaking communities; and that have limited mid-day and evening transit service to schools, jobs, and child care centers and other ways to build wealth and opportunities.
Figure 4: Map of Areas of Unmet Need
SURROUNDING LAND USE

Support for dense, mixed-use neighborhoods near transit, affordable housing, and better access to transit

Increase dense, mixed-use zoning and affordable housing in urban areas near transit, while working to minimize displacement of priority populations

- Provide incentives for local jurisdictions that provide increased zoning density, affordable housing, and evaluate parking requirements along transit corridors and at transit centers.
- Work with jurisdictions to develop and adopt policies to minimize displacement near transit. Deep, collaborative engagement with low-income people, black, indigenous, and people of color, immigrants and refugees, and limited-English speaking homeowners should be central to these efforts.
- Partner with other jurisdictions and nonprofit, community-centered housing providers to coordinate approaches to zoning and affordable housing to realize more transit-oriented communities, including:
  - Develop a King County transit-oriented development policy that emphasizes community engagement and leadership.
  - Support the work of the Affordable Housing Committee of the Growth Management Policy Council, which is working to implement the recommendations of the Regional Affordable Housing Task Force.
  - Support land use approaches that accommodate families and people with multiple abilities and help mitigate weather extremes.
- Adapt Metro’s adopted policies to support additional density and affordable housing near transit corridors.
- Seek additional funding for transit to implement METRO CONNECTS and to encourage density and affordable housing.
- Expand or support partnerships to increase neighborhood transit hubs that are safe and accessible to connect to high-capacity transit, including future light rail service.

Develop station area and right-of-way guidelines to support access to transit

- Develop station area guidelines as part of Metro’s adopted policies (including its transit-oriented development policy) that prioritize passenger access and deprioritize single-occupancy vehicle access at Metro transit stops and stations. Encourage local jurisdictions and partner transit agencies to prioritize passenger access at stations they own or operate. Increase availability of ticket vending machines. Coordinate with implementation of King County’s Strategic Climate Action Plan.
Develop right-of-way guidelines that prioritize the right-of-way for transit and for access to transit by people who walk, bike, or roll. Support incentives for local jurisdictions to make improvements to the right-of-way to prioritize access to and for transit.

Use Universal Design practices to increase accessibility for Metro-designed facilities and encourage it for facilities designed by others.

Develop people-friendly street design near transit ★$★

- Partner with local jurisdictions to develop plans for transit corridors that provide safe opportunities to walk, roll, and bike safely to transit connections. Support local jurisdictions in implementing these accessibility improvements.
- Partner with local jurisdictions to design and implement traffic-calming improvements at intersections to ensure people can reach transit stops safely in daylight and at night, including signals timed to prioritize the safe movement of people who are walking, biking, or rolling, with limits to rights on red and unprotected left turns when appropriate.
- Partner with local jurisdictions to support ongoing maintenance of sidewalk and bike infrastructure to maintain accessible, smooth surfaces and to clear sidewalks, curb ramps, and transit stops promptly of ice, snow, and debris.
- Ensure that bus stops are designed and maintained to be accessible to all ages, genders, and abilities, including children, with adequate lighting at night, accessible signage, protection from the elements, seating, and setback from traffic lanes. Evaluate transit access regularly.

Meet King County’s climate goals by reducing car use, developing green infrastructure, and promoting climate justice $★$

- Provide increased transit frequency, as funding allows, to make it more convenient for people to get out of their cars. Deep and intentional investments in public transit expansion will be crucial to the success of this recommendation, and others.
- Continue to electrify Metro’s fleet and associated infrastructure to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Consider climate justice impacts of electrification and other actions (i.e., consideration of source of electricity).
- Adapt Metro’s adopted policies to prioritize investments in routes that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions, balancing ridership and climate priorities with other identified investment needs.
- Identify and act on strategies that could be taken to achieve King County’s greenhouse gas reduction goal, including more transit service, more density, demand management, parking policies, pricing, and/or vehicle electrification.
- Invest in services such as Dial-A-Ride-Transit (DART) and Community Connections that could help transport people in outlying areas to high-capacity transit. Support park-and-ride options, as well as safe and creative carpool options from large transit hubs into major corridors.
• Support efforts with employers to increase transit ridership, with a strong focus on those who are most likely to drive to work and those who may have difficulty affording transit. Prioritize small nonprofit organizations and organizations that lack the opportunities and finances to provide ORCA cards and subsidized transit options to their employees.

• Seek reduced parking rates in Metro-owned transit-oriented development. Work with jurisdictions to produce policy agreements or to promote flexibility near high frequency transit stops.
INNOVATION

Metro’s role in the regional, integrated network (new technology and services), and Metro’s role with private providers

Change Metro’s adopted policies to assert the role of innovation, address new mobility services, and support innovative, integrated, equitable, sustainable mobility

- In an integrated mobility system, innovations should:
  - Benefit the community.
  - Help Metro contribute to key outcomes (healthy communities, a thriving economy, and a sustainable environment) and align with Metro’s values and Mobility Framework Guiding Principles.
  - Serve and be accessible to everyone, not just people who can afford or already use the transit network.
  - Supplement and bring people to transit services, not take away from them.
  - Integrate seamlessly with transit and support easy transfers.
  - Solve first/last mile challenges.
  - Do more than help people commute during traditional 9-5 hours. They should assist people with diverse commute travel patterns across King County. They should make transit an appealing and competitive option for everyday activities, such as getting to school, daycare, recreation (open spaces, restaurants, etc.), healthcare, and other needs or wants.
  - Build on top of existing infrastructure to make Metro’s current system more usable and limit costs.

- Criteria for pilots:
  - Pilots should address a community-identified need, help deliver key outcomes, and align with the Mobility Framework Guiding Principles.
  - Metro should engage with community stakeholders early in the development of pilots and while deciding where and in what to invest (potentially through an Innovation Equity Cabinet).
    - Stakeholders should include, but not be limited to, parents/guardians, people with disabilities, youth, and others who may have different travel needs.
  - Pilots should work for and prioritize low- and no-income people, black, indigenous, and people of color, immigrants and refugees, people with disabilities, and limited-English speaking communities. Pilots should also accommodate the needs of parents/guardians, youth, and others who may have unique travel needs (i.e., need for car seats in first-last mile programs).
o Pilots should include a clear, pro-equity, community-focused evaluation plan and timeline that measures how a pilot addresses a community-identified need and advances key equity and sustainability outcomes. Evaluation should consider customers and workforce.

o Metro should balance the need for flexibility when developing pilot programs with a desire to minimize major changes to customers once they have grown accustomed to the program (i.e., avoid major price hikes).

o Pilots should provide Metro with rich data for improved planning, operations, and integration.

o Pilots should increase Metro’s ability to act as a mobility agency and services manager that integrates public and private services (i.e., not all services can be Metro-operated).

o Pilots may require Metro taking on additional risks in service delivery (particularly pilots delivered through new partnerships) and Metro should do so if the pilot’s value to the community outweighs the additional risk.

- Metro should update its policies to provide opportunities for incremental development of pilot programs and services and establish guidance for assessing and transitioning pilot programs into permanent services. Successful pilots should lead to deeper investments as programs become permanent, to ensure their continued success.

**Develop new mobility guidelines for how Metro partners with private providers**

- Metro should compel private providers with whom it partners with to share its values, through the contracting process and design and implementation decisions.

- Metro’s request for proposal (RFP) process for contracts with new mobility services should reward or incentivize equity and climate-focused respondents. Criteria should align with Metro’s core values, as defined by the Mobility Framework’s Guiding Principles. Specific criteria could include, but would not be limited to:
  - Willingness to have or move towards a zero-emissions fleet\(^\text{12}\)
  - Diverse hiring practices
  - Minority-owned businesses
  - High labor standards, including but not limited to living wage jobs, benefits, etc.
  - Use of wheelchair accessible vehicles
  - High safety standards

\(^{12}\) Metro should also clarify that its zero-emissions goal extends to private providers.
Demonstrated responsiveness to engagement with priority populations

Companies that employ rather than contract

Willingness to comply with requirements for data and information-sharing

**Facilitate integrated payment and planning ★**

- Metro should work with regional and private partners to facilitate the development and use of integrated, accessible payment and planning mechanisms that work across platforms and modes.

- The goal is to support customers in using one or multiple apps to plan and pay for multiple mobility services, including planning for trips during an emergency:
  - These products should be accessible for people with disabilities, limited-English speaking people, people with low-incomes, etc., and should include a non-electronic alternative.
  - They should leverage existing products and applications commonly used by customers (Google, Waze, One Bus Away, etc.).
  - An alternative for people without a smartphone or data plan and those who are unbanked should take advantage of existing products and avoid burdening users (i.e., perhaps customers could pay on a library card or ID, instead of having to get a separate card).\(^{13}\)

- Metro should provide quality control to ensure apps operated by external partners are equitable and accessible.

- Metro should also work with others to explore the concept of mobility wallets that bundle together different public and private mobility services to provide more comprehensive sets of solutions to people’s diverse mobility needs.

**Enhance communications and engagement to raise awareness about innovations\(^ {14}\)**

- Metro should develop targeted, intentional, and comprehensive communications and engagement strategies to ensure black, indigenous, and people of color, low- and no- income people, immigrants and refugees, limited-English speaking populations, people with disabilities, and others contribute to the planning of and know how to use innovative mobility pilots and services.

- Communications and engagement efforts should be sustained and resourced sufficiently.

---

\(^{13}\) The Go Lorain Bike Share Library-Parks Partnership in Lorain, Ohio is one example of successful utilization of a library card to use mobility options (bike share).

\(^{14}\) This recommendation aligns with and supplements the overarching recommendation in the “Engagement” section that Metro conduct more outreach, engagement, and targeted communications to raise awareness about all its programs and services.
Convene and support jurisdictions in developing partnerships on innovation★

- If desired by partners, Metro should play a leadership role in convening and supporting jurisdictions in developing a framework for engaging with innovative mobility services (micromobility, ride hail, etc.). This framework could include, but would not be limited to:
  - Consistent values desired in private provider partners.
  - Consistent regulations, including guidelines for allocation of space and right-of-way\(^{15}\) that prioritize pedestrian and transit needs and de-prioritize single-occupancy vehicles.\(^{16}\)
  - Opportunities to connect with private providers and other resources.

---

\(^{15}\) For more information on recommendations related to right-of-way, see “Surrounding Land Use” recommendations.

\(^{16}\) These could be like BART’s Station Access Guidelines, but for streets, or San Francisco’s Transit First Policy). Such regulations may need to be adapted to different road types and jurisdictions.
WORKFORCE

Metro’s role with current and future Metro employees and contract employees, as well as influence on the treatment of private providers’ workforce

Strategically partner with the labor community to build new “communities of ridership” (bring new riders to Metro services) while simultaneously benefitting Metro’s workforce, priority populations and the environment ★$

- Metro should establish a strategic partnership with the regional labor community that:
  - Focuses on new “communities of ridership” (i.e., previously unexplored and underserved riders) in order to reduce the use of single-occupancy vehicles and vehicle miles traveled.
  - Incorporates time and space to learn about and measure the effectiveness of innovative pilots.
  - Increases the ability of existing Metro staff and new “communities of ridership” to benefit from mobility-related professional development and apprenticeship opportunities.
  - Supports the establishment of formal public/private partnerships that advance equitable employment practices throughout the region (i.e., living wage jobs and equitable working conditions).

Utilize future transportation innovations to target new riders as potential future employees

- Target new “communities of ridership” as a source of potential employees by use of innovative feeder-to-fixed mobility products (also known as first-last mile services) tailored to specific community needs.
- Increase access to potential employment opportunities by strategically incorporating targeted workforce outreach in new and innovative services.
- Use demographic data (quantitative/qualitative) to tailor the promotion of specific job opportunities to riders on specific routes.

Use strategic and culturally-specific communication methods to build sustainable community relationships

- Purposefully enhance priority populations’ perception of Metro as an employer of choice and a culturally-responsive service provider by making clear Metro’s commitment to equity and sustainability, by:
  - Ensuring that innovative feeder-to-fixed project design, outreach, communications, and evaluation efforts are culturally specific and community-driven.
  - Utilizing culturally specific, experience-based research (quantitative and qualitative) to tailor promotions (including job opportunities to riders on specific routes/services).
• Utilize pro-equity centered perspectives to evaluate the effectiveness of marketing related to Metro services and potential for employment.
• More broadly and effectively promote and educate the public on Metro’s various software applications.

**Build infrastructure to provide pathways to mobility-related employment**

• Partner with unions, community-based organizations, state agencies, high schools, community colleges and trade schools to prepare to meet future workforce needs by:
  
  o **Establishing a mobility “School Without A School” (i.e. no brick and mortar):**
    
    • Utilize best practice research and partner with state agencies, colleges, internal King County agencies, and effective community-based organization models serving priority populations to develop a community-based employment development program that will:
      
      • Seek grant funding and pursue innovative ways to fund cost of career pathways and employee development.
      
      • Incorporate community-driven solutions and accountability for addressing community-specific barriers, including opportunities to build resilience to climate change.
      
      • Include documented career pathing (i.e., predictable and pre-identified employment progression).
      
      • Provide pre-employment career support and pre-employment training.
      
      • Incorporate general and mobility-specific employment related training.
      
      • Include targeted recruitment of priority populations and incorporate a focus on young people transitioning out of foster care and others experiencing structural barriers to employment.
      
      • Incorporate training on cross-cultural understanding.
      
      • Incorporate assistance to participants to translate life skills (i.e., resilience and overcoming societal barriers) into valuable skills and abilities in current and future labor market.
    
  o **Create an equity in mobility summer internship program**
    
    • Develop a grant-sponsored summer intern program to outreach to priority populations and build awareness of job opportunities in the field of mobility.
- Partner with community-based organizations (and community-based collectives) to identify effective recruitment methods for outreach to priority populations.
  - **Develop an approach to assist with costs associated with workforce development and employment pathways**
    - Consider establishment of a scholarship fund.
    - Consider standards for forgiveness of costs associated with pathway/internship programs.
    - Include intentional focus on child care subsidies for priority populations.
  - **Develop community-based mobility career hubs that include:**
    - Partnership with Worksource and other employment programs.
    - Strategic placement of “hubs” throughout the region, in areas easily accessible to priority communities.
    - Input of priority populations on best ways to recruit.

**Utilize strategic workforce planning to recruit and retain workers and meet current and future workforce needs**

- Utilize intentional strategic workforce planning to effectively assess and prepare for evolving current and future workforce needs including:
  - Identifying the skills needed to meet current and future workforce needs and provide necessary training.
  - Partnering with high schools, community colleges, trade schools, etc., to incorporate preparatory curriculum and programming that leads to apprenticeship opportunities.
  - Partnering with community-based organizations that target priority populations in order to develop a sustainable workforce.
  - Fostering excitement and supporting workforce retention through employee engagement activities.

**Purposefully foster a sustainable learning culture within Metro**

- Take necessary steps to ensure that Metro’s workplace culture is characterized by:
  - Existing employees having ample opportunities for professional development and growth, and opportunities to see and work with diverse leaders.
  - Front-line managers having knowledge skills and ability to effectively lead their employees with a growth and learning mindset including:
    - Development of a systematic approach to ensure support for staff professional development.
• Incorporation of career pathways and provision of education and training to support employees to plan for their professional development.

• Provision of adequate internal support and infrastructure so that people leaders can effectively support employee’s development goals.

Require the centering of equity in all Metro contracts and subcontracts

• Require the centering of equity considerations in all Metro contracts for services and whenever contracting with private sector transportation providers.\(^\text{17}\)

\(^{17}\) This recommendation aligns with one in the “Innovation” section (“develop new mobility guidelines for how partners with private providers”).
ENGAGEMENT

Metro’s policies for how it engages with the community regarding mobility investments

Strengthen communication and marketing efforts about Metro’s services

- Increase the level of communication about Metro’s services, including innovative mobility services and fare products, such as ORCA LIFT, to ensure that people from all communities know about these services and how to use them.
- Ensure communication efforts, such as marketing campaigns, signs and wayfinding, and other programs, are culturally appropriate, accessible to priority populations, provided in coordination with community-based organizations, and evaluated and upgraded regularly. Test communications and marketing efforts with real individuals before launch.
- Strengthen community-based communications, including real individuals, groups, and stories.

Build lasting relationships in communities

- Metro should take a long-term approach to engagement, building on existing relationships in communities through broader involvement prior to, or in tandem with, efforts to gather input on specific service planning and capital projects and programs.
- After building these relationships, Metro should seek input from the community to develop and implement engagement efforts for projects, programs, and plans, and compensate community-based organizations and community members for their time and expertise.
- Metro staff, including senior leadership, should participate in and attend regular community organization meetings, events, or meetings of relevant boards, committees, or commissions as appropriate, especially related to transportation, housing, education, etc. to form a deeper understanding of community history, demographics, leadership, experiences, and priorities.

Use a coordinated, cross-departmental approach to engagement

- Metro and other King County departments should coordinate on initiatives to ensure a comprehensive approach that identifies opportunities to work more effectively and efficiently, and so that community-based organizations and residents are being engaged and receiving information in a coordinated and streamlined way.
- King County Equity Cabinet should continue as a body that informs and ensures that equity and sustainability are centered in major County projects, programs, and initiatives. The Equity Cabinet should be intergenerational and focus on building a new generation of leadership in low-income communities, black, indigenous, and communities of color, immigrant and refugee
communities, limited-English speaking communities, and people with disabilities. Equity Cabinet members should be compensated for their time and expertise.

- Metro should coordinate with County Councilmembers to integrate with each other’s community engagement activities to become more familiar with low-income communities, black, indigenous, and communities of color, immigrant and refugee communities, limited-English speaking communities, disability communities, and LGBTQ+ communities in their districts and their experiences and priorities.

**Develop an equity-centered engagement framework**

- Metro’s Mobility Framework should be used to guide transit investments in an equitable way.
  - Start by listening and learning to identify biases and understand the impacts of historical and structural racism and oppression on communities Metro serves.
  - Invite diverse co-creators to the table to identify needs.
  - Conduct an equity analysis to identify modes that best meet identified needs and minimize burdens.
  - Place decision-making power in the hands of the local community.

**Develop a Community Liaison program**

- Develop a Community Liaison program to hire people, including youth and multi-lingual speakers, from the communities Metro and other County departments are engaging with to act as a conduit between Metro’s planning, programs, and projects and local communities.
- Liaisons will bring local knowledge about best engagement practices and language skills. Metro should invest in liaisons with skill development, resume building, professional development, certifications, and identifying career pathways.
- Continue evaluating and updating Metro’s approach to fare enforcement to center equity and create an ambassadors’ program focused on educating riders about Metro’s services.

**Identify metrics to measure success and continually improve**

- Adapt Metro’s adopted policies to further develop qualitative metrics to measure the effectiveness of engagement and relationship building.
- Metrics should be developed with input from the Equity Cabinet and community leaders, and by looking at best practices, with consideration for how to coordinate with other King County department engagement metrics where possible.
• Metro should regularly review and report out on engagement metrics and consider updates as necessary, including use of a dashboard to display evaluation information.
8 Next Steps

The Mobility Framework, co-created with an Equity Cabinet of community leaders, will guide updates to Metro’s adopted policies, including Metro’s Strategic Plan, long-range plan (METRO CONNECTS), and Service Guidelines, as well as the Transportation Goal Area of the Strategic Climate Action Plan. The Mobility Framework’s Recommendations will also guide the development of Metro’s 2021-2022 biennial budget proposal and ongoing regional planning efforts to fund and implement METRO CONNECTS. These policies are explained in more detail below.

Work to update Metro’s policy documents will begin during the first half of 2020 to align with the Mobility Framework’s Recommendations and to provide detailed implementation guidance for how the recommendations can be realized. Further community engagement will shape these efforts, as updates to these policy documents will benefit from input from Equity Cabinet members, elected leaders, stakeholder organizations, and communities. The policy update process will also include additional analysis to support the proposed changes to the policy documents.

Metro looks forward to working closely with elected leaders, jurisdictions and other regional partners, stakeholder groups, and community members to fund and implement the Mobility Framework’s Recommendations and move forward together toward a regional mobility system that is innovative, integrated, equitable, and sustainable.

IMPACTED POLICIES AND PROCESSES

**Strategic Plan for Public Transportation**

Metro’s Strategic Plan outlines the department’s goals, the strategies used to achieve those goals, and the measures to determine success. The Strategic Plan has eight goals: safety, human potential, economic growth and built environment, environmental sustainability, service excellence, financial stewardship, public engagement and transparency, and quality workforce.

**Service Guidelines**

Metro’s Service Guidelines direct planning of transit service. They help Metro set targets for the level of transit service to be provided in specific areas or along specific corridors based on productivity (including ridership), social equity, and geographic value. They provide measures to evaluate the performance of individual routes. And they include priorities to guide additions, reductions, or changes to service: overcrowding, schedule reliability, new service to connect activity centers, and route productivity.
**METRO CONNECTS**

Metro’s long-range plan, METRO CONNECTS, is Metro’s vision for the future. It outlines a goal of increasing service hours by 70 percent between 2015 and 2040, with a much larger network of routes around the County, higher access to frequent transit service, and capital investments to make the system operate more effectively.

As required by Motion 15252, the update to METRO CONNECTS will include new information to adjust for increased population growth, increasing regional congestion, inflation and construction costs, regional mobility needs, and innovations in transportation.

**King County Ferry District 2014-2018 Strategic Plan**

The Ferry District Strategic Plan outlined the goals for water taxi service between 2014 and 2018: provide reliable and safe service, deliver financially sustainable water taxi service, and integrate water taxi service with the broader regional transportation system and economy.

**King County 2020 Strategic Climate Action Plan**

Metro is the lead agency for the Transportation Countywide Goal Area of the King County Strategic Climate Action Plan. The 2020 Update will serve as the five-year road map for County action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, support sustainable and resilient communities, and prepare for climate change. The Mobility Framework’s Recommendations will serve as the basis for goals and priority actions for reducing car trips to support the overall countywide goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 80 percent by 2050. King County’s Strategic Climate Action plan will be transmitted to the King County Council in June 2020.

**2021-2020 Biennial Budget**

The Mobility Framework’s Recommendations will also guide the development of Metro’s two-year business plan, its 2021-2022 biennial budget proposal, and ongoing regional planning efforts to fund and implement METRO CONNECTS.
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King County Metro Mobility Framework
Mobility & Environment Materials
1 Executive Summary

The Mobility Framework positions King County Metro and the region to achieve an integrated, innovative, equitable, and sustainable mobility future. Fehr & Peers and BERK provided information on demographic and mobility trends to inform the Equity Cabinet’s understanding of where and how people are living and moving today, and how that might change in the future. That meant answering key questions, including:

- How does King County Metro better serve unmet need?
- How is population density related to accessibility indicators and outcomes?
- How do demographic variables correlate with travel patterns?
- How can King County Metro reduce transportation GHG emissions?
- How is regional growth impacting vehicle miles traveled and emissions?
- How are innovative mobility trends influencing the region and transportation?

To answer these questions, this appendix provides documentation of current trends in demographic shifts and changing travel patterns and preferences in King County with a focus on equity and sustainability. Census and travel survey data are cited in this documentation, however recommendations for the Mobility Framework must also be complemented by the context of lived experiences.

This appendix focuses on priority populations as defined by the following five population groups:

- Limited-English speakers
- Immigrants and refugees
- People with disabilities
- Low- and no-income households
- Black, indigenous, and people of color

The findings from this appendix provide context for the Mobility Framework Recommendations. Regional and national trends such as the suburbanization of poverty and the increase in vehicle miles traveled have an impact on accessibility, health and environmental outcomes, and as such King County Metro should pursue opportunities to improve equity outcomes and offset the negative impacts of these trends.
DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS

King County is experiencing rapid population growth. With this growth, the population is becoming more diverse every day. Between 2010 and 2017, 77 percent of the County’s population growth has been among residents who identify as black, indigenous, or people of color. During the same period 40 percent of population growth has been among foreign-born immigrants and at least 7 percent are residents with limited English proficiency. It is likely that many of these new residents were attracted by opportunities in King County’s growing economy. Others have different motivations, such as refugees resettling here for a better life.

Due in part to strong job growth in the technology sector, many of the County’s new residents are in higher income households. This has increased median incomes even while the number of lower income households continues to grow at a slower pace. With increasing population comes increased demand for homes. This drives up housing costs and increases pressure for redevelopment. Nearly half of the County’s population growth has occurred through infill and redevelopment in higher density urban and neighborhood centers in Seattle and Downtown Bellevue. These changes contribute to heightened displacement pressure for vulnerable communities, including no- and low-income households, people of color, persons with disability, and those with limited English proficiency.

King County’s growth and demographic change is shaping mobility needs in communities across the County. The findings in this chapter highlight the importance of providing transit service that is responsive to the needs of different populations, particularly those who are most vulnerable or face the greatest challenges in achieving access to opportunity.

TRAVEL TRENDS AND PATTERNS

This chapter focuses on the relationship between investments (such as capital projects and service additions) and surrounding land use. The investments section describes accessibility, to illustrate how changes to transit service could better meet the needs of priority populations. This information is presented geographically, illustrating that north and east King County have better access to jobs by transit as compared to south and southeast King County. Access to services (e.g., social, housing, medical) follows a similar pattern to job accessibility distribution; therefore, this appendix focuses on job accessibility as a proxy for overall accessibility. Overall, dense job centers have the best accessibility by all modes for both employment and services.

Surrounding land use is a factor outside the control of King County Metro that greatly influences travel behavior. The data show that people are traveling further (more miles) for work as documented by weekday work trip person miles traveled. This may be due to changing land use patterns in which housing has spread out into the suburbs, but many jobs remain concentrated in a handful of locations in King County. This concept is also known as the suburbanization of poverty, as people have moved further out to seek opportunities to purchase housing or have more affordable rents.
Additionally, despite a substantial increase in population and an increase in transit ridership in the past decade, per capita ridership for King County Metro has recently declined, due to several factors such as gasoline prices, vehicle ownership, emerging mobility options, and land use and travel pattern changes. King County Metro should use the findings in this section to support where to invest in service and capital projects, including in locations where basic transit service needs are currently being met but could be expanded to support a decrease in the number of vehicle-owning households, and where it could be expanded to better serve priority populations.

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SERVICE COVERAGE COMPARISON

The demographic and travel trends described in this appendix have a substantial influence on how priority populations can access jobs and services now and into the future. This chapter highlights that with priority populations moving to less-dense and less-central areas of King County, transit access becomes more difficult to provide as a service. Ideas brought forth by the Equity Cabinet for areas to target with new transit service—either through increased fixed-route transit where densities can support service or through innovative mobility services for lower density areas—can provide a model for how Metro may want to identify future transit service enhancements that specifically target priority populations. Appendix C: Analysis of Recommendations describes the outcomes and opportunities with service coverage investments in more detail.

INNOVATIVE MOBILITY OPPORTUNITY AREAS

With new mobility options emerging in King County and across the country, there are opportunities to complement existing transit service and challenges in planning and implementation to ensure that new innovative services don’t directly compete with transit. These new mobility options include micromobility (on-demand bikes and scooters), paratransit, and ride-hailing services like Uber and Lyft. These options often provide more flexibility than fixed-route transit service and can help to meet the needs of a wide range of people. These services can also help to fill the gap in first-last mile connections.

New mobility options have shifted travel patterns, with some people switching from transit or walking to using ride-hailing and micromobility services. However, there are questions about the affordability of these modes and their long-term relevancy and sustainability. Understanding how people are using these new services and where they could best complement existing transit service presents opportunities for partnerships to better serve King County residents and ensure new services align with overarching goals of equity and sustainability.
2 Demographic Trends

This section, prepared by BERK Consulting, presents data and maps about the demographic and socioeconomic composition of King County, with a focus on priority populations as defined by the following five population groups:

- Limited-English speakers
- Immigrants and refugees
- People with disabilities
- Low- and no-income households
- Black, indigenous, and people of color

The County has experienced rapid job and population growth during the past decade. This growth has contributed to rising housing costs and increased pressure on vulnerable populations who are struggling to afford the cost of living. This can lead to displacement of communities and neighborhood change. This analysis of demographic and socioeconomic trends, as well as indicators of economic and cultural displacement, illustrates the ways this growth is shaping communities across the County.

DATA SOURCES AND METHODOLOGY

Much of this analysis relies on data from the Census American Community Survey, or ACS. The Census publishes estimates based on the ACS on an annual basis. For smaller areas, like census tracts, the latest estimates are based on a survey with a sample of the population conducted over a 5-year period from 2013 to 2017. As with any survey, there is a margin of error associated with estimates.

Moreover, the findings should be interpreted with caution, since King County is growing and changing rapidly. Surveys conducted in 2013 may not accurately reflect conditions today. Nonetheless, the ACS provides the most robust quantitative estimates of population groups available for the King County area. For more detailed documentation of the data sources and methodology, see Chapter 6.

These findings should be supplemented with insights drawn from residents’ lived experience. Case studies, focus groups, and other forms of qualitative data gathering can be important ways to further develop Metro’s understanding of how demographic trends are shaping the lives of King County residents and their mobility needs.
POPULATION GROWTH

King County’s population is growing rapidly. Between 2010 and 2019 the County gained nearly 300,000 new residents.\(^1\) That is more than the combined population of Bellevue and Kent, the County’s second and third largest cities. As shown in Figure 1, over half of this growth was absorbed in Seattle and Downtown Bellevue in higher density urban centers and residential areas. This map emphasizes the intensity of growth by presenting change in total population per acre.\(^2\) It highlights the locations (often smaller census tracts) with significant amounts of new apartments and infill development.

Figure 1 Change in Population Per Acre, 2010-2018


\(^1\) Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM) Population Change and Rank for Cities and Towns, April 1, 2010 to April 1, 2019.

\(^2\) This density metric calculates the buildable area of each census tract as land acreage exclusive of parks and open space where development is very unlikely to occur.
LIMITED-ENGLISH SPEAKERS

As of 2017, an estimated 211,000 residents of King County speak English less than very well. Between 2009 and 2017 the County gained about 26,500 limited English-speaking residents. As a share of the total population, limited-English speakers have remained at a constant 11 percent during this period. A map of limited-English speakers as a percentage of the population is presented in Figure 2. It shows the International District, as well as pockets of south Seattle, much of south King County, and parts of Bellevue and Redmond as areas with the highest shares of this population.

Figure 2 Percentage of Population with Limited-English Speaking Proficiency, 2017

IMMIGRANTS AND REFUGEES

Nearly a quarter of King County’s population (464,000) was born outside of the U.S. and King County gained over 95,000 residents who are foreign born between 2010 and 2017. This accounts for 40 percent of the County’s total population growth during that period.

Some of these immigrants are refugees. Between 2006 and 2016, nearly 24,000 refugees resettled in King County. Over a third resettled in Kent, and almost three-fourths resettled in southern King County communities.

Figure 3 King County Refugee Resettlement by Jurisdiction, 2006-2016

Top Countries of Refugee Origin:
- Somalia
- Iraq
- Myanmar
- Ethiopia
- Afghanistan
- Iran
- Ukraine

Source: DSHS ACES Data Warehouse, retrieved April 2017
PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

Nearly 203,000 residents in King County—nearly 10 percent of the population—self-identify as having a disability. These include mobility challenges, vision or hearing impairment, cognitive difficulty, or challenges with self-care and independent living. Older residents are much more likely to report having a disability than younger residents, and many people develop a disability as they reach later stages of life.

Figure 4 presents a breakdown of King County’s population by age group, including projections to 2040. Older adults (65+) are projected to grow by 38 percent between 2020 and 2030, while the rest of the population is only projected to grow by 11 percent during the same period. This reflects a nationwide trend as the last of the large Baby Boomer generation reaches age 65. During this period, it can be assumed that the number of residents in King County with some type of disability will increase dramatically.

Figure 4 King County Population by Age Group: Estimated and Projected


---

NO- AND LOW-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS

Due in part to strong job growth in the technology sector, many of the County’s new residents are in higher income households. As of 2017, 212,500 King County residents (about 10 percent) lived in a household with income at or below the Federal Poverty Level (FPL). This level is set based on household size. In 2019, FPL for a four-person household is $25,750 and $12,490 for a one-person household.

King County Metro uses 200 percent of FPL, which is currently $51,500 for a family of four, as a standard for determining eligibility for its Low-Income Fare Program. About 460,000 residents have incomes at or below this level (22 percent of the population). Figure 5 shows the percentage of the population at this income level by census tract. It shows higher percentages in south King County as well as pockets in South Seattle, the University District, North Seattle, Bellevue, and Shoreline.

Figure 5 Percentage of Population at or Below 200 Percent of Federal Poverty Level

---

Figure 6 shows the percentage of the population at or below 300 percent of FPL, or about $77,000 for a family of four. This map shows a similar pattern as Figure 5, with higher percentages across most of the areas listed above, particularly south King County.

**Figure 6 Percentage of Population at or Below 300 Percent of Federal Poverty Level**

Figure 7 shows the percentage of the population at or below 400 percent of FPL, or about $103,000 for a family of four. Again, south King County shows the highest percentages while parts of Seattle and eastside communities show the lowest percentages.

Figure 7 Percentage of Population at or Below 400 Percent of Federal Poverty Level

Figure 8 shows the location of low-wage jobs (those with monthly wages of $1,250 per month or less) across King County. While many jobs are concentrated in traditional job centers like downtown Seattle, Bellevue, and Redmond, this map shows that low-wage jobs are distributed widely. Other areas with notable concentrations of low-wage jobs include Tukwila, Renton, and Kent.

Figure 8 Low Wage Jobs, 2015

BLACK, INDIGENOUS, AND PEOPLE OF COLOR

In 2017, 817,425 King County residents identified as people of color. This is 39 percent of the population, up from 34 percent in 2010. There was a gain of 183,073 people of color between 2010 and 2017, or about 77 percent of all population growth during that period. Figure 9 shows the percentage of population that identify as people of color by census tract. It shows high percentages in South Seattle, south King County, and parts of east King County, particularly Bellevue and Redmond.

Figure 9 Percentage of Population Identifying as People of Color, 2016


---

5 In this analysis we define people of color as people who identify as a racial group other than White alone or who identify as Hispanic/Latino. This includes indigenous persons, defined by the census race categories of American Indian or Alaskan Native.
Black/African American

In 2017, 130,594 residents of King County identified as Black/African American alone. Areas with the highest percentage of Black/African American residents are in central and southeast Seattle, parts of West Seattle, Skyway, Tukwila, and Federal Way, as shown in Figure 10. Some of these residents are native born while others are from immigrant communities.

Figure 10 Percentage of Population Identifying as Black/African American Alone


6 In the Census survey, residents can identify with one or more racial group. This map shows people who only identify as Black/African American.
Asian

In 2017, 350,616 residents identified as Asian. These residents include a mix of many distinct cultural backgrounds including Chinese, Indian, Vietnamese, Filipino, Korean, and Japanese, among others. This distribution of Asian population is shown in Figure 11. It shows long-standing communities in Seattle, including the International District and Beacon Hill, as well as newer communities in eastern King County, particularly Bellevue, Overlake, and Redmond.

Figure 11 Percentage of Population That are Asian Alone
Hispanic/Latinx

In 2017, 200,545 residents in King County identified as Hispanic or Latinx. Areas with higher percentage share of Hispanic or Latinx residents are mostly focused in southern King County, including pockets in Des Moines, South Park, Auburn, Federal Way, and Kent. This distribution is shown in Figure 12. These residents include distinct communities with family origins in North America, Central America, South America, and Europe.

Figure 12 Percentage of Population Identifying as Non-White and Hispanic or Latinx

Indigenous (American Indian and Alaskan Native)

King County is located on native land of the Duwamish and Suquamish tribes. Our indigenous population includes 14,276 residents who identify as American Indian or Alaskan Native. An additional 22,000 identify as American Indian or Alaskan Native and another race. Due to the smaller population of indigenous people compared to other racial and ethnic groups, reliable information about the spatial distribution of these residents across the County is not available.

People Identifying with Two or More Races

In 2017, 129,688 residents in King County identified as two or more races. The distribution of this population is shown in Figure 13. Areas with relatively higher percentage shares tend to be in South Seattle and south King County, with some exceptions such as the University of Washington and some eastside neighborhoods.

Figure 13 Percentage of Population Identifying as Two or More Races

INDICATORS OF DISPLACEMENT

As King County grows rapidly, its demographic make-up is also changing, as is the distribution of household types across the region. As high demand for homes in King County drives up housing costs and increases pressure for higher density redevelopment, many residents and policy makers are concerned about the potential for displacement. This term refers to instances where a household is forced or pressured to move from their home against their wishes. There are three kinds of displacement:

- **Physical displacement**: Displacement as a result of eviction, acquisition, rehabilitation, or demolition of property, or the expiration of covenants on rent- or income-restricted housing.
- **Economic displacement**: Displacement due to inability to afford rising rents or costs of homeownership like property taxes.
- **Cultural displacement**: Residents are compelled to move because the people and institutions that make up their cultural community have left the area.

Displacement can result in households relocating to more affordable communities further away from employment centers and the urban core. Metro and partners must consider how to adapt their services to meet the needs of these residents.

This section presents and analyzes indicators of displacement to help inform an understanding of demographic and socio-economic trends. Since appropriate data for analyzing physical displacement is not available countywide, this appendix focuses on economic and cultural displacement.

Economic Displacement

With increasing population comes increased demand for homes. When new home construction does not keep pace with job and population growth, increased competition pushes up market-rate housing costs. Even with the influx of higher income households, housing costs have increased at a faster rate than median income. This disparity between growth in housing costs and incomes is shown in Figure 14. Between 2011 and 2018, median household incomes increased by less than 40 percent, while median housing prices nearly doubled and median rents increased by over 60 percent. This shows that income growth is not keeping pace with growth in housing costs, which affects housing affordability across the income spectrum.

---

7 Some cities collect data about instances of physical displacement. For example, the City of Seattle requires landowners to survey existing residents when applying for a demolition or renovation permit, under the Tenant Relocation Assistance Ordinance. However, this kind of data is not available in a standard format for all jurisdictions within King County. For an analysis of physical displacement in Seattle, see the [Mandatory Housing Affordability Environmental Impact Statement](###).
Not all households in King County saw their incomes rise by 40 percent during this period. Growth in median income is largely driven by growth in the number of new higher-income households moving into the County. Many of these new residents were attracted by the strong job growth in the technology sector. Figure 15 compares countywide population growth at different income levels. It shows that the number of low-income residents has grown slowly in recent years, while the number of higher-income residents is increasing much more rapidly. Between 2012 and 2017, the number of residents with incomes above 200 percent of FPL increased by 162,074 (11 percent growth), while those with incomes below 200 percent of FPL increased by only 15,450 (3.5 percent growth).
Figure 15 Change in Population at or Below 200 Percent of Federal Poverty Level, 2012 - 2017


While rents have increased significantly in all parts of King County, the changes have not been uniform. As shown in Figure 16, many of the areas with the greatest percentage of low-income households are also areas that saw some of the highest increases in monthly rents. These include much of South Seattle, Burien, White Center, Skyway, SeaTac, Tukwila, Kent, Renton, Shoreline, and Lake City. Across south King County, rents increased by more than 40 percent.
While the County overall has not seen a loss in the total number of low-income households, many households have been pushed out of their homes due to economic pressures and have relocated to other parts of the County or region. It is also possible that the economic displacement of households relocating outside of King County has been balanced by low-income households moving into the County. A closer look at the spatial distribution of change in the number of low-income households can provide indicators of where economic displacement may be occurring at the neighborhood scale.

Figure 17 shows the spatial distribution of the gain and loss of low-income population across King County. South King County has seen considerably more gains in low-income population than other areas of the County, particularly in Kent and Federal Way. However, there are pockets of gains throughout the County. There are also areas with significant losses, including some neighborhoods in South Seattle, Tukwila, Auburn, and Renton. One explanation for these losses is the economic displacement of low-income households due to rising housing costs. But there are other possible explanations as well:

- Change in the income status of existing households who saw increases in their household earnings;
• Gain or loss of income-restricted affordable housing and lower-cost apartment housing;
• In-migration of low-income households, including refugee resettlement; or
• High margins of error in some tract-level census estimates, which can result in unreliable cause “noise” and unexpected changes when comparing different survey periods. \(^8\)

Figure 17 Change in Population at or Below 200 Percent of Federal Poverty Level, from 2012 to 2017

**Cultural Displacement**

Cultural displacement is also difficult to measure directly. The approach used in this appendix is to compare the number of residents that identify with one racial or ethnic group at two points in time at the neighborhood scale. These comparisons look at a longer period, as cultural displacement can be a longer-term process that is often

---

\(^8\) These maps are based on estimates of population by income level from the American Community Survey (ACS), which only surveys a sample of the total population. When a census tract has a lower survey response rate, there is a smaller sample of population on which to base estimates about the entire population. This increases the margin of potential error in the estimate, and therefore the reliability of calculated change in low-income population from one period to the next.
prompted by economic and physical displacement but may be related to other demographic and real estate market trends as well.

Figure 18 illustrates the gain or loss of Black/African American population between 2000 and 2017 by census tract. While the spatial pattern is complex, it shows that the areas of largest losses included parts of the Central District, Downtown, Beacon Hill, and Columbia City in Seattle, as well as parts of Renton, Kent, and Federal Way. Overall, south King County communities saw the greatest increases in Black/African American residents, although parts of Shoreline, Issaquah, and North Seattle also saw notable gains.

While the displacement of black residents is undoubtedly happening and is well documented in neighborhoods such as the Central District, this indicator can be affected by the issues listed above for economic displacement, as well as:

- Increasing numbers of people who identify as bi-racial or multi-racial in census surveys can result in a decline in the number of people who identify as Black/African American alone; or
- In-migration of new residents of African descent, including refugee resettlement.

Figure 18 Change in Black/African American Population, 2000-2017

CONCLUSIONS

While the patterns of demographic and socioeconomic change are complex, there are some trends that are important to consider when evaluating current and future mobility needs in King County.

- A great deal of King County’s population growth is occurring as dense infill and redevelopment in the existing urban centers of larger cities like Seattle and Bellevue. These new households benefit from a transit network designed to serve those dense urban centers very well.

- However, rising housing costs contribute to increased displacement pressures among some vulnerable communities, including low-income residents, people of color, limited English speakers, and people with disabilities. Many of these residents are being pushed from urban centers to less expensive areas like south King County. Many of these south County communities do not currently have the same level of transit service as an urban center. This is because more dispersed and lower-density development patterns limit the opportunities to efficiently provide more extensive fixed-route transit service.

- Many low-wage jobs are dispersed throughout the County. Although some are concentrated around more traditional employment centers with greater transit service, many are not. Therefore, accessing low-wage jobs may be a challenge for many low-income residents.

- King County is also becoming increasingly diverse. With this racial, cultural, and ethnic diversity comes greater diversity in mobility needs.

The County’s current period of economic growth is not likely to continue at the same rapid pace in years to come. Nevertheless, the regional housing market and employment trends contributing to these outcomes are not expected to fundamentally change. King County must be responsive to these changing mobility needs to support equitable access to opportunity.
3 Travel Trends and Patterns

The past decade has been a period of rapid growth in King County. This section details the relationship between income level and job accessibility by transit, and how average vehicle miles traveled has decreased over time for automobile trips but increased for transit riders. The analysis shows that areas with higher population density generally have more transit service available and correspondingly higher rates of transit usage and ridership. In addition, this section describes the interaction between surrounding land use and factors such as population density, travel demand by time of day, and origin-destination patterns. Ultimately, understanding travel trends and patterns helps King County Metro anticipate future mobility needs and meet them in an equitable and sustainable manner.

GLOSSARY

This chapter refers to terms that are specific to analysis conducted for this appendix including priority populations and Priority Population Areas (PPA), typical time periods for transit analysis.

Priority Population Areas refer to Census block groups that have high prevalence of the following demographic variables from the American Community Survey (ACS) 2017 5-year estimates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household Poverty</td>
<td>200 percent of Federal Poverty Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Born Individuals</td>
<td>Anyone who is not a U.S. citizen at birth. This includes naturalized U.S. citizens, lawful permanent residents (immigrants), temporary migrants (such as foreign students), humanitarian migrants (such as refugees and asylees), and unauthorized migrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households of Color</td>
<td>All ethnicities excluding Non-Hispanic White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited English-Speaking Households</td>
<td>A household in which no member 14 years and over speaks only English or speaks a non-English language and speaks English “very well.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals with Disabilities</td>
<td>The Census Bureau reports six disability types: hearing difficulty, vision difficulty, cognitive difficulty, ambulatory difficulty, self-care difficulty, and independent living difficulty. An individual who reports any of these six disability types is considered to have a disability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This chapter speaks generally about “transit.” This includes all transit service included in the Puget Sound General Transit Feed Specification (GTFS) including bus, light rail, streetcar, commuter rail, and ferry service available within King County.\(^9\)

Transit service time periods mentioned in this chapter include the following:

- **AM Peak Period**: 6–9 AM
- **Midday Period**: 11 AM – 1 PM
- **Evening Period**: 6–9 PM

### ACCESSIBILITY AND INVESTMENTS

This section presents data on a range of travel and demographic variables related to how transit is provided and used today. This information can help King County Metro determine where and when to invest in capital and transit operations improvements.

Table 1 shows typical transit accessibility of a person living in King County. The table includes estimates of the number of jobs that can be reached by transit broken down by time period for the general population and for priority populations. Both the general and priority population have significantly lower midday job access than during the AM or Evening periods. On average, approximately 30 percent fewer jobs are within 60 minutes during the midday, as compared to the AM peak period.

Figure 19 and Figure 20 show job access by transit in the AM peak period (6-9 AM) and Midday period (11AM-1PM), respectively. As shown in Figure 19, north and east King County have better access to jobs compared to south and southeast King County. Access and distribution to other services (e.g., social, housing, medical) follow a similar pattern to the job accessibility distribution. As shown in Figure 20, the best access to jobs and services in the midday is concentrated around major employment centers. This is due in part to reduced transit service and frequency during the midday.

#### Table 1 Typical Transit Accessibility of a Person Living in King County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>General Population Weighted Job Accessibility(^{10})</th>
<th>Priority Population Weighted Job Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>363,500</td>
<td>365,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midday</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>236,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>299,000</td>
<td>326,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

\(^9\) Agencies included in the Puget Sound GTFS are King County Metro, Sound Transit, Community Transit, Pierce Transit, Everett Transit, and Intercity Transit;  
\(^{10}\) Population-weighted job accessibility is determined by calculating the average job accessibility for each census block group, weighted by the population within each individual census block group.
Figure 19 AM Peak Period Job Access by Transit (2015)

While low-income jobs (less than $1,200 per month) are more distributed across the County as compared to all jobs, good transit access to low-income jobs is concentrated near activity centers such as Downtown Seattle, Bellevue, and in Renton as shown in Figure 21, primarily because of the transit service to those job centers. Figure 22 shows the transit to auto accessibility ratio. This measures the ratio of the number of jobs within 60 minutes on transit as compared to a 60-minute drive in a car during the same AM period. Generally, transit is most competitive to
using a car within Seattle and in some portions of east King County as compared to the rest of the King County.¹¹

Figure 21 Low-Income Job Accessibility by Transit in AM Period (2015)


¹¹ Additionally, a ratio of 0.7 for job accessibility on transit as compared to driving is approximately equivalent to a ratio that is "tolerable for choice riders" as defined by the Transit Capacity and Quality of Service Manual (TCQSM).
Figure 22 Transit to Auto Accessibility Ratio in AM Period

MODE CHOICE

Figure 23 illustrates the percent of residents by census block group with zero or one vehicle. This metric helps illustrate residents who may rely on transit more. King County Metro should consider providing transit service in both locations where people are already transit users, as well as locations serving communities with access to two vehicles in effort to reduce vehicle dependence by these households. Ultimately, a reduction in vehicle ownership can help reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by single occupancy vehicles.

There is a high concentration of low-vehicle ownership in neighborhoods near Downtown Seattle. This correlates with Figure 29, which illustrates population density and the previous Figure 19 that shows a high number of jobs accessible on transit. However, other clusters of low-vehicle ownership may be explained by the correlation with low-income households.

---

12 Because average household occupancy is over two people, “low-vehicle” ownership households are typically defined as those with zero and one vehicles to denote populations without everyday access to a vehicle.
Figure 23 Zero or One Vehicle Households (2017)

Source: American Community Survey (ACS) 2017 5-Year Estimate

Figure 24 shows the percentage of households that commute to work on transit. Transit mode share is highest in north King County. However, there are also some pockets of higher transit mode share in east King County. There is generally lower transit mode share in south King County, which correlates with the lower job accessibility via transit in this part of the County, as shown previously in Figure 22.
Along with the spatial disparity in transit commuting highlighted in Figure 24, the composition of King County transit commuters by income has changed over time. Despite significant growth in transit ridership over the last decade, Figure 25 illustrates that most of this growth was due to workers earning $75,000 or more. Some of this can be explained by the disproportionate growth in higher income population in denser neighborhoods with good transit access, such as Downtown Seattle and Bellevue, and partially due to the success of the ORCA Business Passport Program. Recent efforts such as the ORCA LIFT program have been implemented to
help improve transit affordability and expand the use among lower-income individuals. It is important to note that Figure 25 is not adjusted for inflation. Although inflation was not significantly high during this period, it may contribute to the trend that ridership by higher incomes has increased more rapidly than lower incomes.

Figure 25: King County Transit Commuters by Income from 2005-2017

Source: American Community Survey (ACS) 1-Year Estimates

RIDERSHIP

As transit ridership is declining nationwide and slowing its growth in King County, some external factors such as lower fuel costs, increased teleworking, higher car ownership, and the rise of alternatives such as Uber and Lyft are contributing to this trend. Closer to King County Metro’s sphere of influence are factors of service, safety, and real time information that pose real and identified challenges to growing ridership and providing mobility to all residents of King County and the region.

In 2018 King County Metro conducted its Rider/Non-Rider survey to measure rider satisfaction with service elements such as: Level of Service, Comfort and Cleanliness, Information, Fare Payment, and Personal Safety. By conducting an analysis of overall satisfaction with Metro services, rider frequency, and satisfaction with individual
elements of service, the Rider/Non-Rider Survey Report was able to identify the
greatest barriers to transit ridership in the County. In aggregate, the services
elements with both low user satisfaction and a high strength of relationship to
ridership are: Level of Service, Transferring, and Comfort and Cleanliness. These
results indicate that King County Metro should focus on these elements to improve
rider satisfaction and overall ridership.

Among the “Level of Service” category, Availability of Service, Frequency of Service,
and Travel Time were rated as the most important customer expectations arising
from the Rider/Non-Rider Survey. From those considered “Non-Riders,” over 20
percent of respondents stated that they would use Metro bus service regularly if it
was available for their commute, and 50 percent stated that they would use it for
occasional personal trips if service was more widely available. Other high-level
barriers of use for non-riders included long travel times, a lack of flexibility in
planning their travel, and a lack of great connections between bus lines. These
responses from non-riders and infrequent riders indicate that improved service in
terms of availability, frequency, and coverage would encourage more County
residents to use transit on their commute and personal trips.

While Metro system-wide ridership continues to grow slowly, Metro is losing its
“market share” of regional trips, failing to keep up with both population and
employment growth. System-wide ridership have been buoyed by large service hour
increases, but they have obscured declines in system-wide productivity over the past
few years that are clear with more detailed study. Over the long term, productivity
decreases result in lower farebox recovery and increasing cost per boarding. System-
wide travel speeds are also declining, adding to the ridership challenge.

Overall, annual rides on Metro service (fixed-route bus, Vanpool, and Access) have
increased from 113.4 million in 2010 to almost 126.7 million by 2018. Most of this
growth occurred before 2015. Metro services realized a decrease in ridership in
2016, likely associated with the expansion of Link light rail to the University of
Washington, which realized a dramatic increase in ridership that same year. Since
2016:

- All Metro ridership has only increased 0.65 percent (816,000 annual rides)
- Metro fixed-route ridership increased 1.0 percent
- Several services (ST Express, Vanpool, and Access) had declines in ridership
While overall fixed-route ridership has increased since 2016, a slight majority (51 percent) of routes had a decline in ridership over that period. All types of routes realized ridership declines, including RapidRide, frequent and less frequent services. To understand changes affecting the leveling of Metro ridership, specifically fixed-route ridership, the analysis looked at changes in ridership by day, period of the day, and frequency of service since 2016. The analysis found ridership in off-peak periods, and particularly weekends, declined countywide.

- Saturdays, in particular, have declined by almost 2,200 average daily riders since 2016. Saturdays had ridership declines during all periods of the day. Notably, trolley routes lost significant ridership on Saturdays.
- Sundays realized a small decline in ridership. All the decreases in ridership occurred in the daytime period; ridership increased during the evening and night periods.
- Weekdays realized a small increase in ridership (0.2 percent), mostly due to the growth of 1,500 average daily trips during the PM peak period. This increase in the PM peak was partially offset by a decrease of 744 average daily trips during the midday period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Weekday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM Peak</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-1,162</td>
<td>-563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-day</td>
<td>-744</td>
<td>-527</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Peak</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>-62</td>
<td>327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-473</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Periods</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>-2,162</td>
<td>-48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: APC Database
During the off-peak periods, routes with frequent service (defined as routes scheduled every 15 minutes or less) had smaller declines in ridership since 2016 than those with less frequent service. Frequent routes on Sunday realized a 1.8 percent increase in ridership.

**Transit’s Market Share is Declining**

While transit boardings from 2010 to 2018 have grown year over year, the growth in boardings has not kept pace with population growth starting in 2015.

- King County’s population has grown considerably since 2010 with the largest annual increases in 2016, 2017, and 2018.
- Ridership per capita (including Sound Transit service) increased from 2010 to 2014 and then started to decline after 2015.
- Metro ridership per capita has fallen consistently from 2014 through 2018.

![Figure 28 Annual Ridership and Ridership per Capita](image)


Ridership has also been falling in relation to regional employment. Historically, ridership has increased at about two-thirds the rate of employment growth. However, the last few years have seen employment growth hovering at over 3 percent annually, while ridership growth has been below 1 percent for each of the last three years.

**SURROUNDING LAND USE**

Land use is a major factor generally outside the control of King County Metro that shapes how transit is provided and used in the County. This section describes how surrounding land use influences travel behavior and transit usage.
Population Density

Population density has a significant influence on the type of transit service accessible across King County. In addition to the correlation between travel behavior and transit usage, King County Metro’s Service Guidelines prioritize transit service in higher density areas due to the likelihood that routes in these areas will draw more riders. As shown in Figure 29, population density in King County is generally highest in Seattle, and in communities such as Downtown Bellevue, the Crossroads neighborhood in Bellevue, and pockets in Kirkland, Redmond, Renton, Des Moines, Kent, Federal Way, and Auburn.

Figure 29 Population Density

Source: American Community Survey (ACS) 2017 5-Year Estimate
As described in Chapter 2, the County’s population has increased dramatically in the past seven years. Unlike many other communities across the nation, transit boardings in King County have increased with population growth. However, the growth in transit use has not kept pace with population growth and total vehicle miles traveled have increased as well.

**Vehicle and Person-Miles Traveled**

As shown in Figure 30, people are traveling further (more miles) for work, across all modes, over the past 10 years. Compared to 2009, work trips by single occupancy vehicles are longer on average by about one mile.\(^{13}\) Although travelers’ average mileage in a car for non-work trips has decreased, from 8.9 miles on average to 5.6 miles on average for single occupancy vehicles, there is a slight growth in transit mileage for those trips.

A key caveat to these data is the different trip length reporting methods between 2009 and 2017. In 2009, survey respondents self-reported their trip distances, while in 2017 the distances were calculated using a shortest-path algorithm, resulting in generally lower trip distances on average due to the more precise estimation. Therefore, the fact that work trips also showed an increase even with this methodology change highlights a key trend in how work travel distances in general have increased over the past decade. Conclusions on non-work trips may not be as confident because of the trip measurement discrepancy.

Figure 31 highlights broader travel trends within King County. After several years of decline in 2011 and 2012, vehicle travel began to increase, with daily vehicle travel growing to 47 million VMT in 2017 compared to 46 million VMT in 2010. Much of the vehicle travel can be attributed to population growth, with daily vehicle travel decreasing on a per capita basis from 24 VMT in 2010 to 22 VMT in 2017.

---

\(^{13}\) Weekday Work Trip Person Miles Traveled by Mode, NHTS 2009, NHTS 2017.
Appendix A: Travel and Population Data, Trends, and Implications

Figure 30 Average Distance Traveled by Trip Purpose Per Day


Figure 31 King County VMT and VMT per Capita

Travel Demand by Time of Day

Travel demand by time of day has strong implications for transit service planning in non-peak hours. As shown in Figure 32, compared to people with higher incomes, low- and no-income people’s work travel is more spread throughout the day. As shown in Figure 33, low- or no-income households also have more midday transit use than higher income households. These travel patterns are outside the times of day at which Metro has traditionally provided the most transit service, which are the AM (6-9 AM) and PM (3-6 PM) peak periods to accommodate high commuter demand. As shown in Figure 34, ORCA bus boarding data supports a similar pattern of higher mid-day transit usage by ORCA LIFT users as compared to non-ORCA LIFT users.

Figure 32 Commute to Work Departure Hour (2017)

Source: Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Household Transportation Survey, 2017.
Figure 33 Transit All Trip Purpose Departure Time by Income

Source: Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Household Transportation Survey, 2017.
ORIGIN-DESTINATION PATTERNS

Figure 35 identifies the top 10 destination zip codes for a sample of origin zip codes selected by King County Metro Staff including representative portions of Lake City, Crossroads, Rainier Valley, and Kent. The adjacent zip codes tend to be among the highest ranked destinations for the origins selected, with some notable travel patterns not necessarily oriented to the core job centers of Downtown Seattle and Downtown Bellevue including the following:

- Demand from Lake City to Shoreline and northern Kirkland
- Demand from Crossroads to Downtown Redmond and Factoria
- Demand from Rainier Valley to destinations in Beacon Hill and the Industrial District, Central District, and Bryn Mawr-Skyway
- Demand from Kent to adjacent east-west destinations within the Kent Valley

While these origin-destination pairs may have some transit service provided today, they are examples of travel patterns that could benefit from increased transit frequencies throughout the day. As part of the service planning process, more detailed analysis and a comprehensive look at all origin-destination patterns could help identify specific corridors that could be well-served by improved fixed-route transit.
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

In 2017, King County prepared and updated the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions inventory for the County and contribution analysis of the drivers of emission changes between 2008 and 2017. The 2017 GHG emissions in King County totaled 20.1 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MgCO2e). Transportation is the second leading source of GHG emissions, making up 36 percent of the total emission landscape, much of this dominated by emissions from passenger vehicles and single-
occupancy vehicle travel (Figure 36). This inventory includes all emissions that occur within the County, plus those emissions associated with electricity used in King County even when produced elsewhere.

Overall, transportation emissions in King County have remained relatively steady since 2008 and have declined by 10% per capita over this time period from 3.4 to 3.0 MgCO2e per capita. These trends are driven by both a growing population (positive GHG emission growth), in combination of factors that have reduced per capita emissions including improved fuel standards, the adoption of electric vehicles for some drivers, and a reduction in single occupancy vehicle miles traveled (VMT).

Most transportation emissions in 2017 came from passenger vehicles (71 percent). From 2008 to 2017, reduced car trips per person resulted in a 1.1 percent reduction in total GHG emissions (225,000 MgCO2e). However, this rate in reduction of vehicle miles traveled will fall short of King County’s climate and sustainability goals without a greater reduction in single occupancy vehicle trips and more trips made on transit and HOV options.

The 2015 King County Strategic Climate Action Plan (SCAP) outlines a goal of 20 percent reduction in VMT for all travel. In addition, analysis to support the 2020 SCAP calls for a reduction of per person VMT of 50 percent by 2050 from a 2007 baseline year. Meeting these goals will require Metro to attract more riders for more of their daily trips and create a mobility environment which encourages people to take transit, bike, and walk in neighborhoods where people can live closer to where they work and play.

Figure 36 Sources of Greenhouse Gas Emissions for King County in 2017

Source: “GHG Emissions in King County: A 2017 Update”, King County
CONCLUSIONS

As shown through a variety of metrics, travel trends continue to shift within King County as population and employment increases and land use patterns change. Additional factors such as vehicle ownership rates, fuel costs, and mobility alternatives are leading towards a broad increase in vehicle miles traveled in the County while transit ridership has stagnated relative to population growth.

From an equity and sustainability perspective, travel patterns for lower income households generally are different from the County as a whole, with higher demand for transit during the midday and evening periods. Access to jobs and services during these time periods is not as extensive as during the traditional peak periods, and transit ridership for lower income commuters has generally leveled off in the past decade.

These patterns and the relative growth in the County have resulted in missed targets in vehicle use and greenhouse gas emissions reductions established through the Strategic Climate Action Plan. Evaluating current origin-destination patterns within priority population areas may help identify additional opportunities for future service investments to increase transit use and reduce vehicle ownership while integrating service investments in areas with high population density and relatively good transit connections.
4 Public Transportation Service Coverage Comparison

The previous chapters in this appendix documented some key King County demographic and travel pattern data and trends. These changes have a significant impact on who has transit service in the County and the accessibility of jobs, services (medical, social, community), and education. Some of the key population and employment data that specifically relate to transit service coverage include:

- Low income populations are increasingly located in less-dense areas of the County, particularly in portions of east King County, Renton, South Seattle, and southern King County (see Figure 17).
- Similarly, other priority populations, including black, indigenous, and people of color, immigrants, and people with limited English proficiency, are also moving to east and south King County, where transit service is generally less frequent. See Figure 9 through Figure 18 for the geographic location of different populations and Figure 19 through Figure 21 for overall transit accessibility.
- Meanwhile, a considerable amount of population growth (that is generally higher income populations) has occurred in Seattle and portions of Bellevue, areas that generally have strong transit service.
- Employment (for all incomes) continues to cluster in dense locations like Seattle, Bellevue, and Renton/Kent, although low-income jobs tend to be dispersed in locations throughout the County.

The above changes in demographics and land use patterns have occurred amidst a backdrop of additional transit frequency in a few key areas (RapidRide investments, expanded light rail, more frequency in dense areas like Seattle). However, there have been only modest changes in transit service through most of east and south King County, where priority populations are growing the fastest but where land use patterns present new challenges and opportunities for Metro to provide additional productive fixed-route service. An important conclusion of these shifts is that without providing more transit service to the areas where priority populations are moving, their transit coverage can diminish over time, even as transit service improves in the densest parts of the County.

To highlight some of the challenges of providing equitable transit access to increasingly dispersed priority populations, a pair of “composite” maps were developed. Figure 37 evaluates areas with concentrations of low-income households
and households with limited vehicle availability that also have low overall transit accessibility. In other words, Figure 37 highlights areas with a concentration of people who may be more reliant on transit and who also live in areas with relatively poor transit service. The areas highlighted on Figure 37 with the most vulnerable populations include a large area of south King County, with the cities of Kent, Auburn, and Federal Way particularly prominent. Note that these same areas have high concentrations of other priority populations as well.

Figure 38 combines households of color and low vehicle ownership households with areas that have poor transit access to healthcare, community services, and housing services. The distribution shown in Figure 38 is similar to what was shown in Figure 37, except that more locations in east King County (East Bellevue, Redmond) emerge that have high concentrations of recent immigrants.
Figure 37 Limited Transit Access Composite: Low-Income Households, Low Transit Accessibility, and Low Vehicle Ownership Households

Source: American Community Survey (ACS) 2017 5-Year Estimate, King County Metro 2019.
Both Figure 37 and Figure 38 highlight areas where there are people who are more likely to take transit, but where transit accessibility is not strong. The composite scores shown on these figures mirror the overall demographic patterns described at the beginning of this chapter.

One way to improve transit accessibility in the areas highlighted in the previous figures would be to increase transit frequencies and potentially coverage in areas with high concentrations of priority populations. The increase in frequency/coverage
would be particularly beneficial during off-peak periods and to facilitate east-west travel. This transit service investment strategy was highlighted and suggested by the Equity Cabinet during the development of the Mobility Framework. As noted in Chapter 3, transit coverage is fairly robust during the AM and PM peak periods—particularly to major centers like Downtown Seattle, the University District, and Downtown Bellevue—but traveling to other areas via transit is less convenient, particularly between the communities in south King County or between south and north King County.

To target potential areas that would benefit from additional transit services to improve accessibility for priority populations, two additional composite maps (Figure 39 and Figure 40) were created that include higher proportions of priority populations, areas of low off-peak transit access, and moderate population densities\(^\text{14}\) that could support enhanced fixed-route bus service or low to moderate densities that would be better served by alternative service (see Chapter 5 for more details).

Figure 39 identifies some areas of Federal Way, Kent, and Auburn that may have high enough population densities to support additional bus service, while increasing access for priority populations. Connections between these cities would also leverage the future RapidRide route between Auburn and Renton. Another area of concentration is between Burien and areas of West Seattle, which are generally along the future RapidRide H line.

\(^{14}\) Moderate densities refer to more than 15 persons per acre, which is at the level where fixed route transit generally is a viable type of transit service based on typical standards by transit agencies.
Figure 39 Transit Service Enhancement Composite: High Concentrations of Priority Populations, Low Off-Peak Access, Population Density Above 15 People per Acre

Source: American Community Survey (ACS) 2017 5-Year Estimate, King County Metro 2019.

Figure 40 highlights large areas in south King County—including many areas west of Interstate 5 from West Seattle to Federal Way and east of State Route 167 between Renton and Auburn—as well as more isolated pockets throughout King County that may not have high enough densities to support new or increased fixed-route bus service, but could benefit from alternative service delivery discussed in more detail in Chapter 5.
Figure 40 Alternative Service Opportunities Composite: High Concentrations of Priority Populations, Low Off-Peak Access, Population Density Between 4 and 15 People per Acre

Source: American Community Survey (ACS) 2017 5-Year Estimate, King County Metro 2019.
CONCLUSIONS

As priority populations continue to move to lower density, less transit-rich parts of the County, improving midday and off-peak transit services could help to ensure that residents in these areas who rely on transit are not unduly isolated from employment or services. Ultimately, new mobility strategies outside of the framework of traditional fixed-route service will be needed to connect people to productive and frequent routes. King County Metro must balance these needs with its equity and sustainability goals.
5 Innovative Mobility Opportunity Areas

Transportation choices are changing rapidly, and transit riders’ travel patterns and expectations are changing just as quickly. The addition of ride-hailing services such as Uber and Lyft, flexible on-demand transit such as Via, and micromobility options such as bike and scooter share have given people new ways to get to the jobs and services they need. Understanding how these new travel options are changing people’s travel behavior, where these services could be most effective, and the equity and sustainability implications of innovative mobility services will help Metro develop an approach to partnerships and leverage the benefits of new mobility options.

SHifting Travel Behavior

A Pew Research Center survey in 2015 found that respondents who used ride hailing on a daily or weekly basis were much more likely to also use other non-single-occupancy-vehicle transportation modes regularly, including both traditional modes like walking and transit, and new mobility services like bike sharing and car sharing. In a 2016 study, it was found that people who use shared modes (ride hailing, car sharing, and bike sharing) are more likely to use transit frequently and own fewer cars.15 Where these mobility options exist, people have an array of transportation choices. While these new services can complement existing transit in some ways, there is also data that shows these services may be taking riders from traditional transit modes, particularly for shorter trips and during times of the day when transit is less frequent.

In recent years, multiple studies have examined how people use ride-hailing services and whether they are replacing driving trips or transit and active modes. A 2018 study was not able to conclude whether ride hailing use impacted transit ridership.16 The study authors did determine that shorter travel times and wait times, as well as availability of service in terms of the location of stops and time of day, were some of the most important reasons that transit customers substituted ride hailing for transit.

---


One study found a six percent reduction in overall transit use as a result of ride-hailing services, with a six percent reduction in bus service, a three percent reduction in light rail, and a three percent increase in commuter rail service. Overall, it concluded that 49 percent to 61 percent of ride-hailing trips would not have been made at all or would have been made by walking, biking, or transit.

The average distance of a ride-hailing trip is relatively short, ranging from two to four miles in the studies cited previously. The Federal Transit Administration identifies a half-mile radius around a transit stop as a reasonable walkshed and a three-mile radius as a reasonable bikeshed. Therefore, a portion of ride-hailing trips could have been a walking or biking trip instead.

A review of six recent studies found that, overall, a large percentage of ride hailing trips are shifting from transit or active modes.

A 2019 study found that not only does ride hailing immediately decrease transit ridership, but it continues to affect it every year after the introduction of ride-hailing services in a city. It calculated that ride hailing results in a 1.7 percent reduction in bus ridership per year and a 1.3 percent reduction in heavy rail ridership per year.

The study also examined bike share in connection with transit ridership. It found that bike sharing increases light rail ridership by 4.2 percent but reduces bus ridership by 1.8 percent. An analysis of bike-sharing systems in New York City found that every

---


thousand bike sharing docks along a bus route is associated with a 2.4 percent decline in daily unlinked bus trips on routes in Manhattan and Brooklyn. A second model that also controls for the expansion of bike lanes during this time suggests that the decrease in bus ridership attributable to bike-sharing infrastructure alone may be smaller (a 1.7 percent decline in daily unlinked bus trips).

A recent four-month e-scooter pilot program in Portland, Oregon found that 34 percent of Portland riders and 48 percent of visitors took an e-scooter instead of driving a personal car or taking a taxi or ride-hailing service. Interestingly, 74 percent of local scooter riders had not used the Portland bike-share system, so e-scooters were largely capturing a separate market of travelers. Two-thirds of Portlanders used the scooters to get to a destination—compared to one-third that used them for recreation or exercise—and there were clear evening commute and weekend afternoon peaks. There is not currently data available to describe how scooters in Portland have impacted transit ridership, but it seems probable that scooters, like bikes, might increase ridership on core frequent routes that connect longer-distance destinations while reducing demand on less-frequent local routes.

People now have more ways than ever before to meet their transportation needs, many of which can decrease transit ridership but also provide needed connections to transit or provide transportation options where transit is sparse. Most of the new mobility options are used to make short trips for recreational purposes, which could be a good complement to commuter transit service. However, there are notable equity considerations from these new mobility options in terms of both price and availability that are discussed later in this chapter.

OPPORTUNITY AREAS FOR ALTERNATIVE SERVICE DELIVERY

This section identifies opportunities for alternative service models such as ride-hailing and bike- or scooter-share that could help address first-last mile connections to Metro’s fixed-route transit service.

Lower Ridership Routes in Areas with Lower Density

While urban centers often have the population density to support frequent transit service, it is often less financially feasible to provide the same level of service or coverage of routes in suburban and rural areas. Ride-hailing services can help to meet people’s travel needs in these areas without establishing fixed-route service. The Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority (PSTA) in Pinellas, FL saves $70,000 annually with its first/last mile pilot program, which provides ride-hailing subsidies in two areas where the agency eliminated fixed-route service. The program has been in operation since 2016 and has expanded from its original two stops to serve 24 stops.

Metro has had mixed results with two recent pilot projects offering first/last mile connections within relatively lower density areas to bus transit centers in Eastgate and between areas of West Seattle and the Water Taxi in West Seattle. The first/last mile service did not replace a specific transit route but was put in place as an alternative to the frequency and coverage provided by existing fixed-route services. West Seattle has averaged just under one rider per vehicle per hour while Eastgate has averaged just over two riders per vehicle per hour, reflecting an average cost per rider just over $80 and $35, respectively. While costs have been high, recent surveys of riders and trips has revealed some successes, including the facts that over 50 percent of the riders used to drive either to the transit center or to their final destination and rider wait-times have routinely been well under the program target of 10 minutes, with an average just below five minutes.

## Late Night and Off-Peak Service

There is a consensus among researchers that ride hailing is more commonly used for recreational trips than for everyday commuting. When asked the days and times of the week that they most commonly use different travel modes, survey respondents in eight major US cities reported the highest ride-hailing use on the weekends and in the evenings. Ride-hailing use peaks between 10 PM and 4 AM, with weekday peak-hour trips making up only 20 percent to 27 percent of total ride-hailing trips for the week. Figure 42 illustrates these results.

**Figure 42 Mode Preference by Time of Day and Day of Week**

![Mode Preference by Time of Day and Day of Week](image_url)

Source: Feigon and Murphy, 2016.

Clewlow and Mishra found that the most common use of ride hailing is going to bars and parties (38 percent), with 33 percent of respondents citing the desire to avoid driving when having alcohol (13 percent). This ride hailing activity can fulfill people’s travel needs during evenings and weekends when transit runs less-frequently and when it is more difficult to provide productive fixed-route service due to a broader distribution of travel demand.
Paratransit Service

Paratransit provides door-to-door transit service for qualifying riders. Paratransit is much more expensive to operate than traditional fixed-route transit service; King County Metro’s operating expenses for ACCESS paratransit are $74.79 per trip versus $5.15 per trip for fixed-route bus trip.\(^{20}\) Transit agencies are required by federal law to provide paratransit service in areas served by fixed-route transit. Agencies also have the option to provide supplemental same-day service, but this is not a federal requirement. The optional service can be provided by a greater range of providers than traditional paratransit, often at lower cost.

The Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) currently has a partnership with Lyft and Uber where riders pay the first $2 for an accessible ride and MBTA pays up to $40 of the remainder. In 2015, the average trip on its standard paratransit service, “The Ride,” cost MBTA $45, while the average Uber/Lyft ride cost the agency $9. Trip duration was also reduced to an average of 25 minutes on Uber/Lyft compared to 59 minutes on The Ride. The agency was able to provide 28 percent more rides while reducing the total cost by 6 percent.\(^ {21}\)

The largest barrier to using ride-hailing services for a greater proportion of supplemental same-day paratransit trips is the availability of wheelchair accessible vehicles. Since most ride-hailing providers use a driver’s personal vehicle, further integration of ride hailing with paratransit may require accommodations. These could include transit agencies purchasing accessible vehicles or incentivizing drivers to provide accessible trips, as these vehicles can cost more to maintain, and it takes more driver time to provide these trips.

The transit agency must also ensure that accessible service is provided at the same level—in the same areas and at the same times of day—as non-accessible service to meet ADA and federal regulations for equitable service. This includes having accessible vehicles available, charging the same fare for accessible service as non-accessible service, and having equivalent response times for riders with disabilities. Other needs would be the integration of voice-interactive applications (for people with visual impairments) and the ability to call-in to make reservations.

First/Last Mile Connections

Ride hailing can play a role in providing first/last mile connections to transit. Multiple studies have considered the role ride-hailing companies currently play in passenger pick-ups and drops-offs at major transit stations, and pilot studies have examined the effectiveness of ride-hailing company partnerships with transit agencies. Using these partnerships to encourage ride sharing can help to increase transit use and decrease vehicle miles traveled. They can also be used to provide additional capacity during temporary spikes in demand due to major events in the area.


A recent and relatively successful pilot project for Metro has been the “Via to Transit” program, connecting riders within the Rainier Valley and Tukwila International Boulevard Station areas to light rail using on-demand service provider Via. The program is serving almost four riders per vehicle per hour and average cost per passenger is just over $10, a cost on-par with lower productivity routes in the system. In addition, the service has shown that it can reach lower-income riders, with the percent of reduced fare-eligible riders using the service varying between 23 and 32 percent. While the service has not yet operated for six months, early signs show it to be an effective opportunity to improve connections to light rail service, with almost 90 percent of users transferring to light rail, and an additional 6 percent transferring to other transit services.

Go Centennial was a pilot study in Centennial, Colorado, a suburb of Denver, where Lyft and the City of Centennial collaborated to offer fully subsidized first/last mile connections in a 3.75 square mile service area around the Dry Creek light rail station if the trip either started or ended at the station. The fully subsidized rides were only available on Lyft Line to encourage higher vehicle occupancy, and there was a wheelchair accessible van available for riders with a disability. Ridership at the Dry Creek station increased by 11.6 percent over the six-month study period, which was a larger increase than the nearby stations. While park-and-ride use also increased, it was at a much lower rate than nearby stations. There was also a 95 percent decrease in passenger wait time from booking with the available Call-n-Ride service to using Lyft, and a 78 percent reduction in total cost (user fee plus subsidy) when compared to paratransit.22

The Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority (PSTA) in Pinellas County, Florida ran a successful six-month pilot in 2016 called Direct Connect that subsidized $3 of every on-demand trip to or from certain bus stations; the pilot has since been extended and the program now subsidizes $5 of every qualifying trip and $25 for wheelchair transport trips. The original pilot only subsidized trips that started or ended at two local bus stations where bus routes had been removed and has now expanded to 24 transit stops. The partnership includes both Uber and United Taxi, with United Taxi accepting cash payments and call-ahead reservations to give riders a range of options. Wheelchair transport is also available through phone reservation. PSTA found that the original pilot provided a similar number of rides as the two bus routes it replaced, but at a savings of around $70,000 annually. The expanded program continues to operate, and they have now launched an additional service offering free late night on-demand rides to workers, described in more detail below.

Some private companies and event venues have formed temporary partnerships with ride-hailing companies to help manage peak demand. San Diego partnered with Uber to give discounts on shared rides for people traveling to the All-Star Baseball game and Comic-Con International to reduce parking demand and congestion. A coupon code was valid for rides on UberPOOL to and from select transit centers.

EQUITY AND SUSTAINABILITY CONSIDERATIONS

New mobility services can provide a greater range of travel options to current and potential transit riders. However, they must also be evaluated on how well they provide equitable service to vulnerable populations such as low-income people, neighborhoods with a high percentage of black, indigenous, and people of color, and riders with disabilities.

Partnerships between transit agencies and ride-hailing companies can help to provide access to jobs and services that would otherwise be impractical or impossible to serve with fixed-route transit. After their initial pilot study, Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority (PSTA) in Pinellas County launched a program called Transportation Disadvantaged (TD) Late Night in partnership with Uber. The program provides low-income residents with 25 free rides per month between the hours of 9 PM and 6 AM to help third-shift workers find a safe ride to and from their jobs. Other programs, such as Freedom in Motion in Gainesville, Florida, adjusted the proportion of the ride cost that senior residents were responsible for based on their income. These services can be cost competitive with fixed-route transit service while providing transportation options to people that need it most.

On-demand service has the potential to increase access to jobs and services, but there are aspects of the current ride-hailing business model that would need to be addressed to ensure equitable access to these services. To book a ride with most ride-hailing providers, a person must have both a smartphone and a credit/debit card. These requirements can exclude demographic groups such as seniors, of which only 27 percent own a smartphone, or low-income riders, who may be unbanked or lack access to a credit card. A Pew Research Center survey found that 10 percent of Americans with an annual household income of less than $30,000 have used ride-hailing services compared with 26 percent of those living in households making $75,000 or more. The Pew study found that there were no substantial differences in ride-hailing use among people of different races.

Riders with disabilities may not be able to use the standard web interface of most ride-hailing platforms, so having a call-in service and voice-adaptive application would help to serve those customers. A study also found that 8 percent of households in the country do not have a bank account— the ability to accept cash or other payment methods is necessary to ensure equitable service. For people whose first language is not English, applications and information in multiple languages can increase their ability to use ride-hailing services.

There have been other equity concerns raised about ride-hailing services, such as ensuring there are enough available drivers in low-income neighborhoods to provide reasonable and equitable wait times across the service area. There have also been reports of driver profiling of riders based on the customer’s name.

---

A study of Lyft trips in Los Angeles found that coverage was fairly equal throughout the city and that riders in low-income neighborhoods took 36 percent more trips per month than people in high-income neighborhoods. These rides were more often shared trips, suggesting that providing lower-cost options is an important aspect of equitable service. Brown found that while black riders in LA waited six to 15 minutes longer for a taxi than white riders, ride-hailing nearly eliminated differences in service quality.

In Portland’s recent e-scooter pilot program, only 43 riders were enrolled in the low-income plan, and only one company complied with requirements to site at least 100 scooters in East Portland communities that have been historically underserved by the transportation system. There were also issues with scooters improperly parked on the sidewalk and impeding access for people who use mobility devices. Stronger enforcement of more equitable policies to benefit priority populations is needed in future deployments.

New mobility services not only have equity impacts but can also have environmental impacts. While there is still some debate, ride-hailing services have generally been shown to increase per capita vehicle miles traveled and the associated greenhouse-gas emissions. If these vehicle trips are replacing walking, biking, and transit trips then there are clear implications for environmental sustainability.

Dash on Demand is a ride-hailing pilot program in the Itasca, Illinois community near Chicago that uses Innova EV electric vehicles. It serves workers traveling to the commuter rail station and Hamilton Lakes business park. Riders pay a flat fee of $5 per ride, and the program is subsidized by advertisements on the vehicles. Electric vehicles have low or no greenhouse gas emissions and are quieter than non-electric vehicles, both of which reduce the environmental and health impacts of vehicle trips.

However, electric vehicles may limit who can drive for the program since vehicle charging typically requires a private parking space with an electric outlet, which are uncommon in many apartment buildings or multi-family properties.

New services can help connect people with transit options or provide more flexibility than fixed-route transit in some service areas, but close attention should be paid to ensure that the service models are equitable and sustainable.

**CONCLUSIONS**

New mobility services offer a range of travel benefits and options to customers. They provide flexibility and can meet many different needs and travel patterns, especially for priority population areas identified in Figure 39 and Figure 40. Understanding how people are using these new services and where they could best complement fixed-route transit service—while further developing the mechanisms needed to ensure equitable access and service—presents opportunities for partnerships to better serve King County residents.
6 Resources and References

This chapter details resources and references where more information can be found on the best practice examples and case studies included in this appendix.

DEMOGRAPHIC TRENDS

- Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Displacement Risk Analysis.
- U.S. Census Longitudinal Employer Household Dynamics (LEHD), 2015.

TRAVEL TRENDS AND PATTERNS

- American Community Survey (ACS) 2017 5-Year Estimate.
- American Community Survey (ACS) 1-Year Estimates.
- APC Database, Sound Transit, Community Transit, Pierce Transit.
- Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Household Transportation Survey, 2017.
- “GHG Emissions in King County: A 2017 Update,” King County.

INNOVATIVE MOBILITY OPPORTUNITY AREAS

- Feigon, S. and C. Murphy. 2018. Broadening Understanding of the Interplay Between Public Transit, Shared Mobility, and Personal Automobiles. Pre-
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1 Introduction

The best practices element of the Mobility Framework was shaped by King County Metro’s staff topic leads and the Equity Cabinet. This work examines Metro’s current conditions and practices, national and international best practices, and opportunities and implications for Metro to identify how Metro’s policies, services, programs, and investment strategies:

1. Do or do not contribute to equitable mobility, and how they could be designed to better advance equitable outcomes; and

2. Do or do not contribute to sustainable mobility, in terms of reducing regional greenhouse gas emissions from transportation, and what opportunities there are to advance goals to reduce emissions.

This work included the following components, which are described in greater detail in the chapters of this appendix:

- **Metro Topic Area Assessments Overview**: a summary of work by Metro staff to review impacts of the agency’s practices and policies on equity and sustainability outcomes;

- **Best Practices Research**: approach to and findings from research on national and international best practices related to the provision of equitable and sustainable mobility services, including a high-level impact analysis for each best practice;

- **Metro’s Current Practices**: a summary of Metro’s actions and practices in each of the research areas identifying what the department is currently doing to advance equity and sustainability;

- **Next Steps**: an approach to policy updates to move Metro toward a more integrated, innovative, equitable, and sustainable future and additional research needed to support this effort; and

- **Resources and References**: a list of resources for more information on the best practices and case studies included in this appendix.
2 Metro Topic Area Assessments

BACKGROUND

In preparation for the Mobility Framework, Metro completed assessments across topic areas covering many of Metro’s business practices, including those identified by Motion 15253 (emerging technologies, potential implications for Metro and opportunities to coordinate mobility innovations with fixed-route and other services, outreach and engagement, policies for the allocation of public space, and workforce trends). These assessments focused on the extent to which Metro’s practices, policies, and investments advance or impede the Mobility Framework goals of centering Metro’s work in equity and sustainability. Through the assessments, Metro answered the following questions:

- **Equity**: How does Metro’s current state advance equitable mobility (using King County’s definition of equity, including leading with racial justice)? How does it contribute to persistent inequities? Do partnerships impact Metro’s ability to advance equity, and if so, how?

- **Sustainability**: How does Metro’s current state support or impede the reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from transportation? Do partnerships impact Metro’s ability to reach its GHG emissions goals, and if so, how?

Topic areas for the assessment process are shown in Figure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Area</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Services</td>
<td>Marine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Program</td>
<td>Services/Service Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Communications</td>
<td>Outreach and Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging Technologies and Innovative Mobility</td>
<td>Policies for the Allocation of Public Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Integration to Support Transfers</td>
<td>RapidRide Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fares</td>
<td>Workforce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Several themes emerged through the 14 topic area assessments. Many of these themes, and other staff ideas, are reflected in the Mobility Framework Recommendations:

- Service and capital planning could be better aligned to community and prospective rider needs, rather than maintaining the current network.
- Adequate time and additional resources for community engagement, as well as clarity on how engagement meaningfully shapes program or project budgets, planning, and decision-making, would support more equitable planning and implementation across project areas.
- Metro needs an overarching strategy for partnering with jurisdictions with varying resources in a way that advances equity.
- Current decisions are often driven by cost, schedule, and partnerships. Metro has work to do in terms of integrating equity and climate (to a lesser degree) considerations into decision making.
- Metro could better use its influence to encourage actions that benefit transit and the overall mobility system, equity, and sustainability.
POTENTIAL ACTIONS

Metro saw great potential for better advancing equity and addressing climate change through three kinds of actions:

1. **Adopted policy changes** through updates to Metro’s Strategic Plan and Service Guidelines (and others)

2. **Changes requiring partner action**, including areas in which Metro does not have authority, such as land use, but that have significant implications for Metro’s ability to provide service

3. **Internal process changes**, some of which could be done more quickly than others

To support the work of the King County Metro Equity Cabinet and ensure timely transmittal of the Mobility Framework to the King County Council, most of the best practices work focused on ideas related to adopted policy changes and partner actions. Initial ideas from the assessments across all three areas are summarized below. These ideas, in addition to others, are reflected in the Mobility Framework Recommendations, developed in partnership with the Equity Cabinet.

**Adopted Policy Changes**

- The Mobility Framework will lead to substantial updates to the Strategic Plan, Service Guidelines, METRO CONNECTS, Strategic Climate Action Plan, and potentially other adopted policy documents.
- Staff initially assumed that policy changes may include:
  - More clearly prioritizing equity within the Service Guidelines
  - Better aligning the Service Guidelines with the METRO CONNECTS network
  - Adapting policies to consider rider needs as well as system needs and clarify meaning of and expectations for “partnerships”
  - Updating speed and reliability investment criteria, transit facilities guidelines, and/or other guidelines around capital investment to better prioritize equity and climate

**Changes Requiring Partner Action**

- Transit-supportive, equitable land use and zoning policies.
- Partnerships with jurisdictions to prioritize right-of-way use for transit, develop a unified strategy for working with new mobility providers, implement capital improvements, and more.
- Partnerships with colleges, labor, and others to recruit workers and prepare the workforce for a changing industry.
Internal Process Changes

- Better aligning public engagement so it meaningfully influences all levels of decision-making.
- Improving marketing to make programs and services more accessible to priority populations (low- and no-income people, black, indigenous, and people of color, immigrants and refugees, people with disabilities, and limited-English speaking communities).
- Ensuring current programs and services are as equitable and accessible as possible.
- Updating internal policies to prioritize equity in contracting and internal workforce development.
3 Best Practices Research

PURPOSE AND METHODS

To support the Equity Cabinet’s development of Mobility Framework Recommendations, the consultant team conducted best practices research into how other transit agencies, cities, and regions work to improve equity and sustainability outcomes. As discussed in the Mobility Framework document, the Equity Cabinet began by establishing Guiding Principles. The 10 Guiding Principles were then grouped into themes based on Equity Cabinet priorities to focus the best practices research.

Each theme—Investments, Surrounding Land Use, Innovation, Workforce, and Engagement—included questions considered by Equity Cabinet members in developing the Recommendations. These recommendations-focused questions were supported by project team research questions to direct the best practices areas of inquiry. The research touched on the topic areas required by Motion 15253 and most of the Metro staff assessment topic areas.

BEST PRACTICES BOOKLET

The Best Practices booklet was created to share the team’s research and inform the Equity Cabinet’s work. It is organized by theme and includes the Guiding Principles, Equity Cabinet questions, and research questions associated with each theme. Within each theme, a table of best practice examples is grouped by research area and includes a high-level impact assessment of the practice’s potential to meaningfully affect equity and/or sustainability outcomes for King County residents. Each theme’s summary table is followed by detailed descriptions of select best practice examples.

The Equity Cabinet used the Best Practices booklet, along with other resources, to inform their Mobility Framework Recommendations.
**Themes**

The best practices in this booklet are organized by themes related to the Mobility Framework’s Guiding Principles. Each theme is introduced by its Guiding Principles, questions informing the Equity Cabinet’s work, and the project team’s research questions.

**Impact**

Each best practice has been assigned a qualitative score describing its potential to make mobility in King County more equitable and/or sustainable. Scores are based on measurable outcomes or impacts of the practice in another location with an eye toward programs and policies already in place in King County.

Metro’s focus on priority populations is grounded in the concept of targeted universalism, which uses targeted strategies to achieve the department’s larger goals. For example, increasing transit ridership and reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions benefits everyone in the county but requires a focus on changing our systems to support priority populations.

**IMPACT SCORE**

Potential of best practice to make mobility in King County more equitable and/or sustainable

- **Mobility Equity Outcomes**
  - For low- and no-income people, black, indigenous, and people of color, immigrants and refugees, people with disabilities, and limited-English speaking communities

- **Emissions and Vehicle Trips**
  - Improvements to the overall mobility system that could encourage people to get out of their cars and thereby reduce emissions from single occupancy and high emissions vehicle trips

**Less Impact**

- **LOW**
  - Limited Improvements
  - Low Reduction

**Medium Impact**

- **MEDIUM**
  - Moderate Improvements
  - Moderate Reduction

**Greater Impact**

- **HIGH**
  - Meaningful Improvements
  - Meaningful Reduction
INVESTMENTS

Relevant Guiding Principles

- Invest where needs are greatest
- Ensure safety
- Align our investments with equity, sustainability, and financial responsibility

Equity Cabinet Questions

- Where and when is transit service needed, particularly for low- and no-income people, people of color and indigenous people, immigrants and refugees, people with disabilities, and limited-English speaking communities? What types of service would best meet those needs?
  - What’s the right mix of traditional and innovative mobility services?
  - How can Metro adjust its adopted policies to address these needs?
  - What changes can Metro make, or what can Metro recommend that partners do, to support a safe experience on and accessing transit?
- What are the amenities and supports that make transit and accessing transit feel safe? How can Metro work with partners to make such improvements, especially to benefit the populations mentioned above?
- Can we define “affordable” (i.e., a percentage of someone’s budget spent on transit)? How can Metro prioritize investments and align policy guidance to support using its fares program to benefit people for whom the price of the fare is a barrier?

Best Practices Research Questions

- What types of services, capital investments, or rider programs are agencies using to meet a broader set of traveler needs?
- Are there transit agencies actively investing—whether service or capital investments—in traditionally underserved or underrepresented communities? How are they doing it?
- Who is using prioritization or investment frameworks that express their values through their budgets and what do those frameworks entail?
## Relevant Best Practices & Preliminary Impact Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best Practice</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services, capital investments, rider programs that meet broad traveler needs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure M Transportation Funding Ordinance (Los Angeles, CA)</td>
<td>Voter-approved transportation funding measure built with strong community leadership. Measure design reflects diverse traveler needs across LA County.</td>
<td>✔️️️️️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) Late Night Bus Service (Boston, MA)</td>
<td>Pilot program to offer late-night service (until 3:00 a.m.) to support workers with non-traditional schedules will transition to permanent service additions (until 1:00 a.m.) in summer 2019.</td>
<td>✔️️️️️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TriMet Service Guidelines (Portland, OR)</td>
<td>TriMet’s service guidelines detail the planning, engagement, and implementation process for bus and rail service changes. The agency’s annual service plans assess the network on an ongoing basis and prioritize recommended investments.</td>
<td>✔️️️️️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Department of Transportation DASH Free Student Fares Pilot (Los Angeles, CA)</td>
<td>Funding one-year pilot program (through Low Carbon Transit Operations Program) that provides DASH (Los Angeles city transit service) free for all students from kindergarten through college.</td>
<td>✔️️️️️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Late Night Transportation Working Group (San Francisco, CA)</td>
<td>Working group of local transportation providers, representatives from late-night and early-morning businesses, nightlife advocates, labor unions, and other stakeholders conducted a two-phase process of developing recommendations and next steps for improving public transportation options for late night and early morning workers.</td>
<td>✔️️️️️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Transit Authority Fare Policy (Salt Lake City, UT)</td>
<td>Provides free fixed-route service to ADA paratransit-eligible riders. Began tracking such rides in 2011 to evaluate ridership trends for ADA-eligible riders on paratransit service vs. fixed-route service.</td>
<td>✔️️️️️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Note: Impact assessment is based on the potential effectiveness and implementation of the best practices.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best Practice</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orange County Transportation Authority Safe Transit Stops (Orange County, CA)</td>
<td>Competitive grant program for communities to improve passenger amenities at bus stops.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments in underserved/underrepresented communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Transit Equity Approach for Transit Shelters (Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN)</td>
<td>2014-15 initiative adding 150-200 new or replacement bus shelters, the majority of which are within racially concentrated areas of poverty.</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIA Metropolitan Transit Next-Gen Bus Stop Improvement Program (San Antonio, TX)</td>
<td>Built 1,000 new/improved bus shelters in three years, providing shelters for 95% of system boardings. 73% of the work done was by DBE/SBE companies.</td>
<td>✓✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values-based prioritization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland Department of Transportation Goal-Aligned Budgeting Process (Oakland, CA)</td>
<td>Aligning city budget with goals: equitable jobs and housing, holistic community safety, vibrant sustainable infrastructure, and responsive trustworthy government.</td>
<td>✓✓✓✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Bureau of Transportation - 2035 Transportation System Plan Evaluation Criteria (Portland, OR)</td>
<td>Developed a new Major Project Evaluation scoring system that incorporates safety, neighborhood access, opportunity access, health, equity, and climate.</td>
<td>✓✓✓✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlighted best practices are described in greater detail in this document.
Engagement with local Councils of Governments (COGs) from the beginning of the process was essential to equitably represent their interests in the measure, particularly for smaller, historically underrepresented communities. Metro also provided tools to assist stakeholders and COGs in identifying projects for the measure, including a mobility matrix, project-specific benefits, project cost estimates, a project priority submittal form, and optimal growth targets for each sub-region.

Lessons Learned

Engagement with local Councils of Governments (COGs) from the beginning of the process was essential to equitably represent their interests in the measure, particularly for smaller, historically underrepresented communities. Metro also provided tools to assist stakeholders and COGs in identifying projects for the measure, including a mobility matrix, project-specific benefits, project cost estimates, a project priority submittal form, and optimal growth targets for each sub-region.

Measurable Results and Impacts

Metro allowed the communities to build their own list of projects based on one of four targets: current population, future population, current employment or future employment. This flexibility encouraged local jurisdictions to think holistically and allowed a more diverse range of projects—meeting the needs of different groups of people—to be included into the project funding list.

To support ongoing community input and oversight, Measure M features an Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee, which is responsible for reviewing the proposed expenditures and Comprehensive Program Assessment of the Expenditure Plan. This provides a level of accountability with representation from communities impacted by Measure M to ensure that expenditures align with the established priorities. It also enables communities and local jurisdictions to continue their involvement and engagement with transportation improvements across the county, rather than establishing a project list and removing themselves from the process.

Applicability to KCM

Measure M is a model approach for addressing the unique transportation needs of individual communities, which could be translated to King County. The measure also provides direct funding to LA Metro’s LIFE Program, which provides discounted fares to people with no or low incomes, people with disabilities, and older adults and youth. The Measure M engagement process and prioritized project list reflect goals that are closely aligned with King County Metro’s goals.
MBTA Late-Night Bus Service
Boston, MA (2018)

In 2018, the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) ran a pilot of overnight bus service for early morning and late-night shift commuters. Starting in September 2018, the MBTA expanded bus service on select routes from 10:00 p.m. to 3:00 a.m. every night, at a cost of $1.2 million over the 10-month pilot. The expansion featured additional evening trips on existing overcrowded routes, later trips, and “late night spine” route variations that included stops in areas where service was most needed. The pilot was intended to provide service in areas with high late-night demand and to meet the needs of low-income workers, typically those in the hospitality and food service industries and those with shifted hours.

In June 2019, the MBTA board voted to make some of these changes permanent. The MBTA determined that ridership was not sufficient to justify the costs required to operate the service after 1:00 a.m., but the agency made service permanent on select routes between 10:00 p.m. and 12:30 a.m.

Lessons Learned

The 2018 pilot is the MBTA’s second attempt at investing in late night service within the past five years. The agency operated a similar pilot between 2014 and 2016, extending subway service until 2:00 a.m., before ultimately eliminating the service extension due to high costs and an internal budget deficit.

The MBTA’s iterative use of pilot programs enables the agency to test what is and is not working and incrementally add service to meet demand. While the 2014 pilot program did not result in a permanent subway service extension, it provided additional context necessary for the agency to attempt a bus service extension in a different area. These pilot programs enable agencies to explore multiple options for addressing unmet demand and to identify the appropriate level of service to meet demand with limited financial resources.

Measurable Results and Impacts

The late-night spine trips offered between 1:00 a.m. and 3:00 a.m. did not draw sufficiently high ridership as other trips in the pilot project. As a result, the MBTA subsidy per trip was more than $16, more than triple that of the other late-night service categories.

About 120 trips are being added to existing routes between 10:00 p.m. and 12:00 a.m. and another 30 to 40 trips will continue operating into the early morning hours. While most of the late-night trips had fewer than 10 people riding, two routes, including a 2:30 a.m. trip between Logan International Airport and Dudley Square carried over 15 passengers. This ridership indicates there may be additional unmet demand for late-night service that could be addressed in a future pilot program.

Applicability to KCM

Like MBTA, King County Metro uses pilot programs to test and evaluate potential service changes. Metro could develop a late-night service pilot to supplement existing Night Owl service based on the needs of a specific group, such as shift workers, and use pilot results to determine the best path forward for future service changes.
TriMet's 2015 service guidelines detail the planning, engagement, and implementation process for bus and rail service changes in the network. A major component of the service guidelines is an Annual Service Plan, which assesses the transit network and prioritizes recommended investments. The Annual Service Plan organizes service investments into three categories: maintain, optimize and restore, and increase.

**Measurable Results and Impacts**

Generally, TriMet prioritizes service investments necessary to maintain service, then to optimize underperforming services, and lastly to increase services as the budget allows. Each of these investment categories use different performance measurements and considerations.

**Maintain:** Service investments in capacity and reliability, such as schedule adjustments and frequency changes, help to maintain performance levels. The primary measurements for these service changes are overcrowding (peak passenger loads) and service predictability (on-time performance).

**Optimize and Restore:** Investments in route restructuring optimize performance of existing services and restore service to greater levels. The primary measurement is productivity (boardings per vehicle hour). Any route or segment with fewer than 15 boardings per hour is evaluated for potential restructuring and optimization.

**Increase:** Investments in new and reconfigured routes improve frequency (how often the bus or train arrives) or service span (the hours that service is provided).

These improvements do not have existing performance data; instead, they are assessed based on their ability to meet the equity, demand, productivity, connectivity, and growth priorities for the agency. Each year, when budget is available, TriMet will increase service using these considerations to meet the highest needs and priorities of the system.

The 2019 Annual Service Plan recommends capacity improvements, earlier service, increased service frequency, and route restructures on 10 routes as well as two new bus routes to provide connections along 82nd Avenue between Burnside Street and Portland International Airport and between Clackamas Town Center and Oregon City Transit Center. A Title VI analysis estimated that these routes would provide new service to over 32,000 jobs, 16 supermarkets, and three employment and housing resource centers.

**Applicability to KCM**

Both TriMet and King County Metro use an annual approach to service updates that allows the agencies to respond to changing demographics, service needs, performance, and budget restrictions. Keeping established priorities and service guidelines at the forefront of service evaluation in the Annual Service Plan ensures that investments continue to align with agency goals.

King County Metro’s service guidelines use metrics similar to TriMet, assessing corridor productivity, social equity, and geographic value as the primary measurable factors for transit investment. Metro could consider changes to the geographic value metric or other metrics in its current guidelines to provide an ability to focus resources in areas where they are most needed.

In conjunction with the Annual Service Plan and Service Guidelines, TriMet divided the service area into five geographic regions to concentrate service enhancements based on the unique needs of each area. (Image courtesy of OregonLive)
OakDOT Goal-Aligned Budgeting Process
Oakland, CA (2018)

A stated priority in the Oakland Department of Transportation (OakDOT) budget is to accelerate investment in transportation and infrastructure improvements across the city using an equity framework that considers communities of color, household income, and other social indicators. In 2018, OakDOT developed a new scorecard for the capital improvement projects (CIP) prioritization process. This scorecard considers equity by identifying projects that address disparities within the criteria for health and safety, economy, environment, improvement, and collaboration.

OakDOT also developed analysis tools to support project prioritization, including for the 311 system. Now residents' requests are scored based on factors that include an equity analysis, with requests in communities of concern receiving greater priority than those in other areas of the city.

Lessons Learned

The city spent a full year and a half developing, revising, and vetting the new equity-based scorecard. The concept originated with Oakland’s Department of Race and Equity and was finalized by the Capital Improvement Program Workgroup along with members of the community. The group held four large meetings, 24 community-specific meetings, and conducted a survey that reached 1,350 residents. The focus on community engagement early and often during the scorecard development ensured that priorities were heard, particularly from traditionally underserved and underrepresented communities.

Measurable Results and Impacts

In addition to the new scoring criteria, the city has also changed the process for making funding requests. Rather than city staff compiling projects from other departments, Oakland residents can now submit proposals directly to the city. In October 2018, residents had a 30-day window to file a project request; during this period, community members submitted 285 proposals.

As a result of this focus on equity in prioritizing projects, the proposed three-year paving plan prioritizes funding for neighborhoods that have both the highest percentage of poor roads and the highest percentage of underserved residents. Similarly, the OAK311 report-a-problem service is now prioritizing repairs in traditionally underserved areas.

Applicability to KCM

Metro has a large service area, including jurisdictions with diverse needs and interests. Developing an equity- and sustainability-based scorecard and prioritization framework can increase transparency and streamline project development. It could also enhance engagement with traditionally underserved communities and ensure that their needs feature in Metro’s priorities.

Impact:

OakDOT collaborated with community-based organizations to identify and refine design strategies to create an equitable bike plan, building on the equity framework, which identified the most vulnerable groups. (Image courtesy of OakDOT)

OAK311 aggregates equity scores to ensure that response prioritization incorporates equity factors. (Image courtesy of OakDOT)
Portand 2035 Transportation System Plan Evaluation Criteria

Portland, OR (2018)

To provide a more transparent, inclusive, objective, and effective project prioritization process for the 2035 Transportation System Plan (TSP), the Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) developed new evaluation criteria in late 2018. The 11 criteria emphasize outcomes, better align with the department’s policy goals, and ensure that projects of all sizes can be competitive during grant applications. The evaluation criteria include safety, neighborhood access, health, equity, and climate, among others.

Lessons Learned

The process of developing new evaluation criteria resulted in several lessons:

• Limit criteria to the priority issues that matter most. Including too many criteria can minimize the impacts to key areas and result in a failure to identify projects that align with priorities.

• Be aware of similar or overlapping criteria across multiple factors to avoid “double counting” criteria and to accurately represent needs that address multiple values and goals.

• Criteria should be readily available or easy to calculate. Complex analyses may take significant resources and have little impact on the outcome of the selection compared to a simpler calculation.

Measurable Results and Impacts

Projects are scored for the equity criteria using a “vulnerability” analysis. That analysis uses demographic data and assigns each Census tract a score from 0 to 6 based on whether the tract’s population met a threshold for six displacement risk factors. Of these six factors, four were used to rank projects in the evaluation criteria: communities of color, households at or below 80% median family income, population age 17 and under, and population age 65 and older.

In addition to the TSP’s evaluation criteria, the plan also includes a Transit Equity Policy to maintain and expand high-quality, frequent transit service to all Town Centers, Civic Corridors, Neighborhood Centers, and Neighborhood Corridors, and to improve service to areas with high concentrations of poverty and historically underserved and underrepresented communities.

Applicability to KCM

Metro is expanding its service, fleet, and capital facilities. Developing evaluation criteria that encourage equitable distribution of services and a transparent prioritization process can build community support and ensure that investments are focused in areas of greatest need.

Similarly to PBOT’s evaluation criteria, Metro currently uses the Equity Impact Review tool to identify, evaluate, and communicate the potential impacts of projects, policies, and programs on equity.
Relevant Guiding Principles

• Address the climate crisis and environmental justice
• Encourage dense, affordable housing near transit
• Improve access to mobility

Equity Cabinet Questions

• What could make the biggest impact in making transit and other mobility services a more appealing choice than single occupancy vehicles, therefore reducing greenhouse gas emissions from vehicles?
• How do we encourage transit or non-motorized options to get people out of single-occupancy vehicles?
• How do we prioritize communities that face the worst environmental health impacts?
• What is Metro’s role related to affordable housing?
• How can Metro use its influence to increase housing affordability and minimize displacement near transit?
• How can Metro support the efforts of community-based organizations and other efforts to develop dense, affordable housing?
• How can Metro influence allocation of public space in ways that support access to mobility services?
• What would be most helpful in increasing access to mobility services?

Best Practices Research Questions

• How are transit agencies partnering with cities to incentivize/encourage transit-supportive development?
• Who is leading in creating denser, mixed-use, more walkable communities and how are they doing it?
• Who is leading in the creation of transit-oriented communities and how are they doing it?
• What agencies are working closely with cities to build affordability and measures to avoid displacement into transit/mobility projects or Transit Oriented Developments/Transit Oriented Communities and how are they doing it?
• Which transit agencies have strong access to transit guidelines, especially those that help agencies encourage jurisdictions to make investments, and what are those guidelines?
• How are agencies and cities working together to make the right-of-way more supportive for transit? How can an agency encourage a city to make the investment it needs (e.g., offer more service, make capital investments to support the city’s investment)?
## Relevant Best Practices & Preliminary Impact Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best Practice</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnerships to support dense, transit-supportive development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Senate Bill 375 Sustainable Communities Strategy and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets (CA)</td>
<td>SB 375 directs the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to set regional Greenhouse Gas (GHG) reduction targets. Regional planning agencies (MPOs) develop a &quot;Sustainable Communities Strategy&quot; (SCS) in the regional transportation plan that demonstrates how the region will meet the GHG reduction targets. Transportation funding allocation must be consistent with the SCS. Additionally, SB 375 coordinates the regional housing needs allocation process with the regional transportation process.</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and County of Honolulu Transit Oriented Development Special District Guidelines (Honolulu, HI)</td>
<td>City-sponsored Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) design guidance developed in preparation for light rail that allows design flexibility to accommodate diverse community types and needs; density bonuses allowed in exchange for provision of community benefits such as affordable housing and public space.</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans Regional Transportation Authority Strategic Mobility Plan (New Orleans, LA)</td>
<td>By 2018, the agency was to begin working with local governments and partners to increase affordable housing units and community services in areas along High-Capacity Transit lines.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordability and displacement prevention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Oriented Denver (Denver, CO)</td>
<td>Denver’s Transit Oriented Development Strategic Plan is heavily focused on affordability and partnerships with RTD, the regional transit provider.</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransLink Transit-Oriented Communities (Vancouver, BC)</td>
<td>TransLink’s Transit-Oriented Communities (TOC) policy provides design guidelines and other resources to help municipalities create more livable places around transit in Metro Vancouver. TransLink developed these resources in coordination with municipalities to ensure unique local context and affordability challenges are accounted for and to foster relationships and encourage partnerships with organizations that have land use jurisdiction.</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Practice</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Metro Transit Oriented Development Program and Strategic Plan (Portland, OR)</td>
<td>Strategic Plan designed to guide future investments by the Metro TOD Program, in order to ensure the program maximizes the opportunities for catalyzing transit-oriented development throughout the region, balances affordability and displacement risk, and effectively leverages additional resources to comprehensively advance TOD in all station areas and frequent bus corridors.</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Association of Governments Regional Transit Oriented Development Strategy (San Diego, CA)</td>
<td>Overarching strategy to focus housing and job growth in the urbanized areas where there is existing and planned infrastructure; protect sensitive habitat and open space; invest in a network that gives residents and workers transportation options that reduce GHG emissions; promote equity for all; and implement the plan through incentives and collaboration.</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Access to transit**

| LA Metro Transit-Oriented Communities (Los Angeles, CA) | Systemwide Design Policy to provide a safe, accessible, and comfortable experience; connect stations to the greater regional network; and orient stations to neighborhood destinations and pedestrian routes. | ✔️ ✔️ ✔️ |
| BART Station Access Guidelines (San Francisco Bay Area, CA) | Prioritizes funding for walk, bike, and vehicle access to BART stations based on agency and community goals and values. | ✔️ ✔️ ✔️ |

**Right-of-way management and investment**

| San Francisco’s Transit-First Policy (San Francisco, CA) | City charter (Section 8A) that prioritizes transit, bicycles, and walking/rolling over individual automobiles regarding decisions on use of right-of-way. | ✔️ ✔️ ✔️ |
| Sound Transit System Access Fund (Seattle, WA) | $100 million fund included in voter-approved ST3 measure for projects such as safe sidewalks, protected bike lanes, shared use paths, improved bus-rail integration, and new pick-up and drop-off areas. | ✔️ ✔️ |

---
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California Senate Bill 375
Sustainable Communities Strategy and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets
California (2008)

In 2008, the California Legislature passed Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act. SB 375 directs each of California’s Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to include a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) in their long-range transportation plans. The SCS is used to identify strategies to reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions in accordance with regional targets established by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

Lessons Learned

Initial indications suggest that while California has established appropriate long-range greenhouse gas emissions reductions targets and regional growth and investment plans, the results are falling significantly short of the SB 375 targets.

The 2018 Progress Report from CARB indicates several priority challenges and opportunities for meeting established greenhouse gas reductions—such as better aligning transportation, land use, and housing policies. Despite an increase in funding allocated for clean transportation options, vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita is increasing and public transit ridership is decreasing.

Unless changes in authority, mandates, and incentives for these policy outcomes are made, this disconnect will continue to impede progress to attaining the SB 375 targets.

Measurable Results and Impacts

Statewide, current strategies plan for a 9.6% reduction in per-capita passenger vehicle CO2 emissions by 2020 and an 18% reduction by 2035 compared to 2005 levels. Preliminary data show a 2% decrease in per capita CO2 emissions, but a 2% increase in per capita VMT, well short of the target.

Housing production in the state is also falling far short of demand and of the levels identified in the Sustainable Community Strategies. As a result, housing is becoming less affordable, and California’s low-income residents are relocating to suburban and exurban areas at greater rates than the rest of the state’s population. People earning less than $25,000 per year are relocating at a rate of about 18% higher than those earning more. This trend of displacement and relocation forces more people into a built environment that is more auto-dependent and provides fewer choices for public transit or active transportation.

Applicability to KCM

While King County Metro has established its own emissions reductions targets related to bus operations, there is a complex relationship between transportation, land use, and housing in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. One of the key takeaways from SB 375 is that allocating additional funding to public transportation is not sufficient to significantly reduce drive-alone rates or greenhouse gas emissions. Instead, Metro should continue to work with regional partners to encourage dense, affordable housing near transit to provide additional transportation alternatives to more communities. Metro should strengthen relations with state partners in addition to regional partners to push for stronger sustainability and land use regulations at higher levels of government.

Measurable Results and Impacts

Although CO2 per capita was 2% lower in 2015 than 2005, it has been increasing along with VMT per capita in recent years and is not on track to meet Sustainable Community Strategies (SCS) targets by 2020 or 2055. (Image courtesy of CARB)
Transit-Oriented Denver

Denver, CO (2014)

The City of Denver is taking a holistic approach to implement transit-oriented development (TOD) and transit-oriented communities (TOCs) through its 2014 Transit Oriented Denver Strategic Plan. The plan provides a foundation to guide public and private investment at rail stations by:

- Creating an implementation action plan through research and analysis of the existing state of transit-oriented development;
- Providing citywide, high-level policy recommendations and on the ground, station-level action items with the intent to foster implementation of TOD at rail stations; and
- Establishing a system to track and monitor Denver’s success so the city can continue to refine and improve its strategic moves in the future.

TODs and high-density development are often associated with gentrification. To prevent potential gentrification and displacement associated with the opening of new rail lines, the City of Denver, Enterprise Bank, and other Denver area partners launched the Denver Regional TOD Fund. The fund allows affordable housing and community developers to acquire and hold strategic transit-accessible properties for preservation or future development. This fund was identified as a priority in the Transit Oriented Denver Action Plan.

Measurable Results and Impacts

The fund has made 15 loans since its inception, deploying $24.7 million in capital for acquisition of land or operating properties near public transit in the Denver Metro area. To date, 11 of the loans have been repaid, which provides resources toward future acquisitions. The loans have created a pipeline of 1,300 affordable homes, a new public library, and well over 100,000 square feet of supportive commercial and non-profit space, all near public transit.

Applicability to KCM

Housing costs in King County are continuing to increase. Encouraging dense, transit-oriented development is critical to achieving the County’s greenhouse gas reduction goals, but such development may further increase the cost of housing. King County could explore a public-private partnership similar to the Denver Regional TOD Fund to encourage TOD and TOC development while maintaining housing affordability, allowing more people to choose transit and other options for travel that do not require driving alone.

Lessons Learned

A successful TOD policy must have affordability at its core and must include a mechanism to dictate opportunities for affordable housing. Without this type of mechanism, affordable housing developers are generally reactive, purchasing high value property to develop after new light rail stations are operational and limiting the number of affordable units they are able to provide. However, programs like the Denver TOD Fund allow developers to take a more proactive approach by purchasing relatively inexpensive property before new light rail stations are operating. This process allows affordable housing developers to focus on their core mission of providing affordable housing and reducing displacement and gentrification.

Impact:

The Mariposa District in Denver is an equitable TOC surrounding the 10th and Osage light rail station. (Image courtesy of Enterprise Community)

The FasTracks light rail expansion has created the opportunity for TODs throughout the Denver metropolitan region. (Image courtesy of RTD)
TransLink Transit-Oriented Communities
Vancouver, BC (2012)

TransLink is working with Metro Vancouver, the region’s municipalities, and other stakeholders to better coordinate and integrate land use and transportation investments. Regionally, the two key guiding documents for coordinating land use and transportation are Metro Vancouver’s Regional Growth Strategy and TransLink’s Transport 2040.

To develop the TOC policy, TransLink worked directly with municipalities and provided supportive tools and resources. These included the 2012 TOC Design Guidelines, Transit Passenger Facility Design Guidelines, and the TOC Primer on Key Concepts, which provide technical design guidelines for municipalities as well as high-level policies and information on TOCs. A mutual understanding of TOC core concepts, including upzoning and land value capture, fosters a better working relationship with the municipalities and encourages partnerships.

Lessons Learned

Land use decisions are primarily controlled locally, thus the greatest opportunities to influence and shape land use rest with Metro Vancouver’s municipalities. In order to maximize leverage over these processes, TransLink works with municipal partners to foster land use and transportation coordination through ongoing dialogue and collaborative planning processes. Rather than establishing guidelines and leaving them for municipalities to interpret, this active, collaborative approach creates more buy in at the local level and provides additional insight into the municipal processes for TransLink.

Measurable Results and Impacts

By focusing growth and upzoning within transit-oriented communities, often in urban centers and along the region’s frequent transit network, municipalities can create the critical mass for efficient transit service. TransLink measures the effectiveness of their TOC policy by identifying the percent of jobs and dwelling units within the urban core and along the frequent transit network and increasing the mode share of transit trips in the region.

Between 1994 and 2011, the mode share of transit trips increased from 10% of all trips to 14% of all trips. Additionally, 43% of all housing growth in the region has occurred in designated urban centers between 2006 and 2016. While TransLink has not determined the extent to which these impacts are directly related to the TOC policy, they are continuing to monitor them.

Applicability to KCM

Creating a transit-oriented community requires coordination and action at all levels of government. Working with various jurisdiction partners to better coordinate land use and transportation is critical for King County Metro, especially related to the agency’s equity and climate goals. Developing a common understanding of and guidance for TOCs, including upzoning benefits and land value capture for municipalities, could be an important role for Metro to play in encouraging transit-supportive development and greater use of transit as a result.

Impact: 🌟🌟🌟

The Main Street - Science World Station was the focus of a recent transit and pedestrian corridor plan in accordance with TransLink’s Transit-Oriented Communities policy. (Image courtesy of TransLink)

The Newton Town Centre TOD in the City of Surrey is currently being studied for implementation. (Image courtesy of the Daily Hive)
BART Station Access Guidelines
San Francisco Bay Area, CA (2016)

Understanding that every station exists in a unique operating environment, the BART Station Access Guidelines establish the minimum and maximum recommended standards for planning pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and vehicular access within BART station areas. These guidelines include four investment framework categories: primary investments, secondary investments, accommodated, and not encouraged. These design guidelines, adopted in 2016, place people at the center of every access decision. By prioritizing people, the guidelines seek to minimize conflicts between modes. Similarly, parking management is a secondary investment only at stations with parking. This policy makes a concerted effort to reduce vehicle dependency at most stations, with the exception of station areas that have been categorized as auto-dependent. BART’s Access Policy is working to shift passengers to greener modes, with targets of 52% active transportation, 32% shared mobility, and 15% drive and park. Meeting these targets is expected to reduce GHG emissions associated with passenger access to the station by 24%.

Lessons Learned

A key component of the Station Access Guidelines was developing a clear hierarchy to resolve competing demands for funding and physical space, while emphasizing low-cost, high capacity modes. Rather than establishing a policy to prioritize specific access modes, this hierarchy establishes investment categories to specifically provide funding for only certain access modes at specific station areas. Tying funding mechanisms to station access design ensures a consistent approach across stations in the agency and aligns funding with agency values.

Measurable Results and Impacts

Between 2008 and 2015, the share of station access by drive and park decreased from 34% to 27%, the share of active transportation increased from 35% to 44%, and the share of shared mobility access decreased slightly from 31% to 29% of passengers. These station access mode shift figures indicate that BART is making progress toward the goals stated in the Access Policy by reducing driving and parking and increasing walking and bicycling access.

Applicability to KCM

Metro owns and operates several large transit centers and provides connecting service to Sound Transit rail stations. These station areas are located in a range of built environments with different connectivity needs. Metro currently uses their own transit facility design and access guidelines. Following the BART approach to primary and secondary investment as a way to prioritize funding toward pedestrian- and bicycle-focused connectivity could improve station accessibility for all. While BART’s Station Access Guidelines do not directly encourage other jurisdictions to make investments that support transit access, they do provide an additional layer of transparency and accountability for the agency’s station access planning and design.

The BART Station Access Hierarchy prioritizes pedestrian, bicycle, and transit accessibility over automobiles. (Image courtesy of BART)
San Francisco’s Transit-First Policy
San Francisco, CA (1973)
The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA or Muni) is governed by Charter Section 8A, which includes the Transit-First Policy. The Transit-First Policy directs the agency to prioritize transit, pedestrian, and bicycle improvements and enhancements in the limited public right-of-way available in San Francisco. The policy states:

Decisions regarding the use of limited public street and sidewalk space shall encourage the use of public rights-of-way by pedestrians, bicyclists, and public transit, and shall strive to reduce traffic and improve public health and safety.

The policy, which has been in place for over 45 years, adopted in 1973 and reaffirmed in 1999, 2007, and 2014, is designed to keep people moving throughout the city and reduce greenhouse gas emissions by prioritizing more space-efficient and low-emission transportation modes.

Lessons Learned
Despite the expansion of transit, pedestrian, and bicycle infrastructure since the policy’s adoption, there is currently no standard approach to identify and prioritize transportation capital improvement projects in San Francisco. This has led to the policy being used as guidance rather than required direction in some cases, resulting in a continued emphasis on automobile-oriented infrastructure in some corridors.

While the policy has generally been successful and resulted in significant improvements to transit and walkability, developing a strategy to identify and prioritize key pedestrian, bicycle, and transit corridors would provide transparency and accountability in the decision-making process.

Measurable Results and Impacts
The Transit-First Policy has led to additional transit prioritization programs, including the Muni Forward program and the Rapid Network, which reduces wait times on Muni’s busiest routes that carry nearly 70% of riders. The agency has seen ridership on the Rapid Network increase by 18% over the past two years as a result of the transit-first measures included in the program.

In addition to improving transit service reliability, the Transit-First Policy has coincided with an increase in transit and bicycling and a decrease in automobile trips. Since 2013, the share of automobile trips in the city has shrunk from 62% to 43% of daily trips. People make an estimated 720,000 transit trips each weekday and daily bicycle trips in the city have more than doubled since 2006, reaching an estimated 82,000 trips each day.

Applicability to KCM
A key difference between SFMTA and King County Metro is that SFMTA is housed within the city and county government of San Francisco, placing the agency within the body responsible for land use and transportation infrastructure decisions. King County Metro, on the other hand, must work with individual municipalities to achieve transit-supportive right-of-way, infrastructure, and policy goals. While a Transit-First Policy would certainly benefit King County Metro’s goals, Metro would need to partner with the county’s many jurisdictions to adopt and implement this type of policy.

Impact:

According to the Transit-First policy, innovative solutions to meet public transportation needs, such as Bay Wheels bike share, are encouraged so long as they do not adversely affect Muni service. (Image courtesy of Bay Wheels)
Following the voter-approved ST2 measure, Sound Transit identified a need to leverage community development opportunities to spur compact growth and provide technical support to local partners. This led to the inclusion of TOD staff working with local partners and the System Access Fund in ST3, which passed in 2016.

Partnerships, both technical and financial, are needed to develop multimodal, multi-jurisdictional connections to transit. Developing a targeted grant program between agencies, cities, and counties to enhance transit, bicycle, and pedestrian connectivity provides benefits for the jurisdictions and the travelers.

The fund allocates $20 million to each of Sound Transit's five subareas, which does not account for different levels of need across the Sound Transit district.

**Sound Transit System Access Fund**
**Seattle, WA (2016)**

The Sound Transit System Access Fund is a $100 million fund allocated equally among the five Sound Transit subareas for projects that include safe sidewalks, protected bike lanes, shared-use paths, improved bus-rail integration, and new pick-up and drop-off areas. Using a call for projects, the System Access Fund allows cities, counties, and transit agencies to apply for funds to help implement projects that improve connections to stations.

**Lessons Learned**

Following the voter-approved ST2 measure, Sound Transit identified a need to leverage community development opportunities to spur compact growth and provide technical support to local partners. This led to the inclusion of TOD staff working with local partners and the System Access Fund in ST3, which passed in 2016.

Partnerships, both technical and financial, are needed to develop multimodal, multi-jurisdictional connections to transit. Developing a targeted grant program between agencies, cities, and counties to enhance transit, bicycle, and pedestrian connectivity provides benefits for the jurisdictions and the travelers.

The fund allocates $20 million to each of Sound Transit's five subareas, which does not account for different levels of need across the Sound Transit district.

**Measurable Results and Impacts**

While the Sound Transit System Access Fund was passed along with ST3 in 2016, funds have not yet been awarded to any agencies or municipalities. Successful applicants will receive funds between 2019 and 2025. Since no projects have been funded by this program yet, there are no measurable impacts. However, eligible projects that may have impacts after receiving funding include:

- Capital projects that have advanced to the design/engineering or construction phase such as safe sidewalks, protected bike lanes, shared-use paths, improved bus-rail integration, and new pick-up and drop-off areas;
- Certain non-capital projects such as operating, technology, and transportation demand management (TDM) programs; and
- Projects that demonstrate a clear nexus with a Sound Transit-served facility.

**Applicability to KCM**

King County Metro, located within the Sound Transit service area, is eligible to seek funding through this program. Aside from direct participation, Metro could consider developing a similar program to encourage the jurisdictions it serves to implement transit connectivity projects. Using this type of funding mechanism is an effective way to partner with local jurisdictions and encourage them to make investments that support access to transit.
**ADDITIONAL LAND USE & CLIMATE STRATEGIES**

Land use is among the most important factors for successful public transportation investments. High-density land use and transit-oriented development (TOD) directly correlate with higher transit ridership and reduced dependence on motor vehicles. In King County, the largest source of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are from fossil fuels used in transportation. To meet King County’s GHG reduction targets, we must increase the mode share of transit and non-motorized transportation, reduce vehicle miles travelled (VMT), and encourage high-density development.

Reducing GHG emissions and combating climate change requires an integrated suite of strategies. Transit-supportive land use can be enhanced by the application of transportation demand management (TDM), parking, and pricing strategies. Together, these strategies can create an environment that is conducive to the use of non-driving options that reduce transportation’s contribution to GHG emissions.

### Demand Management Strategies

TDM strategies encourage people to shift their transportation choices from drive-alone travel to other modes, including transit, walking, biking, and ridesharing. Through a combination of incentive programs, transportation services, and marketing efforts, a TDM program can greatly reduce auto trips to and from a site or area—as well as the congestion and environmental impacts associated with auto use. TDM measures typically work in combination with land use plans and transportation network investments to support and encourage non-drive-alone travel within, to, and from specific locations.

TDM is not a one-size-fits-all solution. The most successful TDM programs reduce auto trips through a robust package of complementary measures designed to meet the unique needs of a given site or area. Furthermore, effective TDM programs are iterative—successful measures receive continued support or are enhanced, while unsuccessful measures are phased out. Cooperation between developers (in the case of a TDM program for a development site), public agencies, and area stakeholders can leverage local resources and expertise to maximize the effectiveness of bicycling, walking, transit, driving, parking, and programming strategies to achieve vehicle trip reduction targets. Effective, evidenced-based demand management strategies include:

- **Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) Programs:** Enacted by the Washington State legislature in 1991, the CTR law requires workplaces with 100 or more full-time employees to develop and manage their own programs based on locally-adopted goals for reducing vehicle trips and VMT.
- **Subsidized Transit Passes:** Free or reduced transit passes are a common feature of CTR programs. Subsidized passes provide a direct incentive for people to use transit, rather than driving, by allowing them to ride at a free or reduced rate.
- **Flexible Work Schedules:** A flexible work schedule is an alternative to the traditional 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., 40-hour work week. Flexible schedules allow employees to shift their arrival and departure times earlier or later, alter the number of days per week that they work, and often include telecommuting or work-from-home options, reducing the number of people traveling during peak commute hours.
- **Vanpool and Carpool Programs:** Vanpool and carpool programs are typically self-selected groups who share a similar commute and are often members of the same household or co-workers traveling to work from the same neighborhood.
- **Onsite Commute Coordinators:** Onsite commute coordinators work directly with a company’s or site’s employees to discuss alternative commute options to driving alone. Commute coordinators can help to match employees into vanpools and carpools, identify safe and comfortable bicycling routes, or plan transit trips for employees who are unfamiliar with the transit network.
CLARK COUNTY COMMUTE TRIP REDUCTION MATERIALS

You are not alone. Stop acting like it. Find a better way to commute.

Source: Clark County Commute

Source: Commute Seattle
Parking Strategies

Parking is an expensive and limited resource that can impact the success of all other trip reduction strategies. Requiring too much parking can squeeze out land uses that could generate activity, make projects less appealing to developers, and make housing less affordable.

Achieving a balance between parking supply and development is critical to creating transit-supportive and transit-oriented communities.

Effective strategies to reduce and manage parking are described below.

- **Unbundled Parking:** Unbundled parking programs require off-street parking spaces to be leased separately from housing rentals, home purchases, or employment contracts, creating a financial incentive to actively evaluate the cost of parking alongside alternative travel modes.

- **Parking Cash-Out:** Parking cash-out programs allow employees to convert parking benefits to other rewards or travel benefits. For example, in parking cash-out programs, employers may offer a parking space, a cash incentive, or a pre-paid transit pass, and employees may choose one of these benefits.

- **Shared Parking:** Shared parking agreements allow multiple groups to use the same parking facility based on different demand patterns, reducing the total amount of parking that would be needed if each group used exclusive parking facilities. For example, an office building, which needs parking during the day on weekdays, may share parking with a residential building, which generally needs parking during weekday evenings and on weekends. Successful shared parking programs are based on when and where parking is needed, provide a convenient and enjoyable pedestrian experience, and provide a clear management structure to enforce agreements.

- **Parking Minimums and Maximums:** Development regulations in many jurisdictions commonly include parking minimums, which require a certain number of parking spaces for specific land uses. This often leads to an oversupply of parking, which encourages driving and uses valuable land for vehicle storage. Limiting the overall supply of on-site parking by establishing a maximum number of parking spots can encourage alternative travel modes. Transitioning from parking minimums to parking maximums is a strategy for rightsizing the supply of parking at a given development and encouraging the use of transit or non-motorized transportation.
Pricing Strategies

Pricing strategies are based on the concept that vehicle trips come with high costs to society and individuals in the form of air and climate pollution, traffic collisions, and lost productivity due to slower commute times. When vehicle trips are priced—especially when based on demand, with increasing fees at times when more people are driving—some people make changes to some of their trips.

While pricing strategies may be effective for reducing GHG emissions and VMT, they can also exacerbate the inequalities of the existing transportation system if they are not planned and designed with equity in mind. When implemented without a clear focus on racial and social equity, pricing strategies can burden low-income people with new costs.

Pricing strategies that have been shown to reduce vehicle trips are described below. King County Metro has limited ability to implement these strategies on its own, but can support jurisdictional partners in implementation.

- **Congestion Pricing**: Congestion pricing is a pricing strategy that charges drivers traveling to or through a congested area. Costs vary based on the time of day, with a goal of disincentivizing driving during peak periods. Congestion pricing can be applied as cordon pricing, which charges vehicles crossing a boundary into a pricing zone, or as area pricing, which charges vehicles crossing a boundary and driving within a pricing zone. Congestion pricing has been implemented in many European and Asian countries, but it has not yet been used in North America (although many cities, including Seattle, are currently studying potential congestion pricing programs).

- **Tolling**: Toll roads and bridges are relatively common pricing strategies that charge drivers a fee to access a specific road or bridge. These fees may be flat, distance-based, or congestion-based. Tolling is currently being used in King County on the SR 520 bridge and the I-405 High Occupancy Toll lanes. Tolling can also be implemented on non-highway, arterial roads, which as been done in Singapore and studied in Tampa, FL.

- **Parking Pricing**: Pricing strategies for parking may pertain to on-street and off-street parking. Parking pricing strategies generally use smart parking meters to adjust the price in specific areas based on time, location, and day of week. Prices are usually increased during high-demand periods and decreased during low-demand periods.

- **Road User or VMT Charging**: Road user or VMT charges are directly tied to road use and charge drivers a flat fee per mile driven. Washington State has recently completed a pilot program to test the feasibility of implementing a VMT charge as a replacement for the gas tax; however, this type of pricing can also be used to manage congestion or reduce overall VMT.

- **Fleet Pricing**: Fleet, or vehicle class, pricing is a strategy that charges specific vehicle types entering a specific zone, typically ride-hailing or commercial vehicles. Because this strategy is limited to specific vehicle types, its ability to reduce VMT is more limited than other pricing strategies. However, pricing high-emissions vehicles—as has been done in London and Milan—can help to reduce GHG as well as VMT.
INNOVATION

Relevant Guiding Principles

- Innovate equitably and sustainably
- Provide fast, reliable, integrated mobility services

Equity Cabinet Questions

- What types of new transportation services and technologies would improve our overall mobility system, especially for the populations mentioned?
- How can we implement these services equitably and sustainably?
- How will we measure success and failure?
- How can Metro influence partners to help deliver excellent, integrated services?
- How can Metro partner with jurisdictions with fewer resources (recognizing that partnerships may not be solely financial)?
- What is the right mix of services?
- What types of services should be prioritized?

Best Practices Research Questions

- What agencies or cities are partnering effectively (or at least trying) with new mobility companies and services and how are they doing it?
- How are agencies or cities managing and shaping innovation through the levers they can control? How does government direct what private companies do versus sit in a reactive position?
- What agencies are doing a great job of integrating transit and other services? Who is really thinking about mobility holistically and what are they doing?
- How are transit agencies (and cities) preparing for a future that looks very different? What are they doing to get ready for autonomous vehicles?
## Relevant Best Practices & Preliminary Impact Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best Practice</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New mobility provider partnerships</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority - Transit Dependent Late Shift (Pinellas County, FL)</td>
<td>Provide low-income mobility options when fixed-route bus service is not available via monthly on-demand ride vouchers.</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority On-Demand Paratransit Pilot Project (Boston, MA)</td>
<td>Offer discounted trips on Uber, Lyft, and Curb services to supplement agency-operated paratransit service.</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Metro’s Pickup Service (Austin, TX)</td>
<td>Combining paratransit and on-demand microtransit services with a pilot-turned semi-permanent microtransit service known as PICKUP.</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go Lorain Bike Share Library-Parks Partnership (Lorain, OH)</td>
<td>Partnership between public library and county health and parks departments to allow those with a library card to borrow bike share bikes, helmets, and locks from the library at no cost.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit and new mobility integration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Metro Office of Extraordinary Innovation (Los Angeles, CA)</td>
<td>The Office of Extraordinary Innovation (OEI) was established to explore new ways to move LA by finding and testing innovative ideas that have potential to improve mobility for the people in the region. From public-private capital partnerships to cutting-edge technologies, OEI is tasked with identifying, evaluating, developing, and implementing these new approaches. These efforts may be undertaken by LA Metro on its own or jointly in collaboration with private sector firms through public-private partnership agreements.</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlighted best practices are described in greater detail in this document.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best Practice</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TriMet New Mobility Strategy Assessment (Portland, OR)</td>
<td>TriMet has begun exploring strategies to evolve and proactively incorporate new mobility services into its business model. This includes deploying a Mobility Manager Model that places TriMet at the center of meeting customers’ door-to-door mobility needs.</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit and Bike Share Integration Pilot (Pittsburgh, PA)</td>
<td>Allegheny County Port Authority and Pittsburg Bike Share partnered to offer free access to bike share for trips lasting 15 minutes or less for transit pass holders.</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility as a Service: Whim Mobile Application (Helsinki, Finland)</td>
<td>The Wim Mobile Application, first launched in Helsinki, Finland, allows customers to plan, access, and pay for all modes of public and private transportation services on one platform.</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Mobility Collider (Miami-Dade County, FL)</td>
<td>Miami-Dade County produced the Urban Mobility Collider Open Backend Integration Playbook to ensure new technologies and business models can assist in creating a more integrated transportation system that spans many sectors and industries.</td>
<td>✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive management and coordination</td>
<td>Two San Francisco transportation agencies developed a framework of ten guiding principles to manage and evaluate innovative mobility options, identify ways to meet city goals, and shape future policies, programs, and areas of study. They conducted an evaluation based on the guiding principles that led to policy recommendations, strategies, and additional research needed to ensure that emerging mobility serves the city’s goals.</td>
<td>✔ ✔ ✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Practice</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Department of Transportation New Mobility Playbook (Seattle, WA)</td>
<td>The New Mobility Playbook is a set of actions, policies, and strategies that will position Seattle to foster new mobility options while prioritizing safety, equity, affordability, and sustainability in their transportation system.</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TriMet Mobility Hub Geofencing (Portland, OR)</td>
<td>TriMet is examining ways to geofence their properties for data ownership leverage. This is currently on the drawing board and not implemented.</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparing for the future of mobility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Department of Transportation Technology Action Plan (Los Angeles, CA)</td>
<td>The Technology Action Plan invites developers, planners, and academics to build and innovate with the department. The plan serves as a guide for how LADOT uses new technologies to provide transportation safety, happiness, sustainability, and equitable access for all.</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Smart Mobility Roadmap (Austin, TX)</td>
<td>Austin’s approach to shared, electric, and autonomous vehicle technologies to ensure a future that is equitable, affordable, prosperous and data-driven. Includes five key areas: Shared-Use Mobility; Electric Vehicles and Infrastructure; Autonomous Vehicles; Data and Technology; and Land Use and Infrastructure.</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous Vehicles and the Future of Transit (Nelson\Nygaard and Perkins&amp;Will)</td>
<td>Proposes a strategy for cities and transit agencies to partner to take advantage of opportunities that Autonomous Vehicles (AV) will provide to reduce the cost and increase the attractiveness of public transportation as a mobility option.</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MBTA On-Demand Paratransit Pilot Program
Boston, MA (2016)

The Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) developed a pilot program partnership with transportation network companies (TNCs) Uber, Lyft, and Curb to offer on-demand transit service to The RIDE customers beginning in 2016. The RIDE is MBTA’s door-to-door, shared-ride paratransit service. A customer signs-up with one company and pays the first $2 for a trip, and the rest is covered by MBTA with a $40 maximum subsidy per trip. Uber and Lyft cover all of The RIDE’s regular service area, while Curb covers select cities in the service area. The pilot has been extended through March 2020.

The on-demand program has offered the following benefits to MBTA paratransit riders:

- Reduced fares from previous The RIDE fares
- Lower wait times
- Faster trips without the need to share rides
- Same-day booking

Measurable Results and Impacts

- The MBTA On-Demand Paratransit Pilot Program is still ongoing, thus, any result or impacts are preliminary.
- The initial pilot program was limited to 400 people in a restricted service area. After delivering 10,000 successful rides to paratransit passengers through the initial pilot, MBTA expanded the partnership to every customer of The RIDE.
- Passengers who participated in the pilot saved an average of 34 minutes on every trip, while the MBTA saved 71% on the cost of each trip.
- Between October 2016 and February 2017, the MBTA reduced the overall cost of The RIDE program by 6% while increasing the number of rides taken.

Applicability to KCM

King County’s new Access paratransit contract, which will go into effect in late 2019, will include flexibility for the contractor to provide some trips through TNCs. King County should work closely with its contractor to develop program requirements that help to contain costs. Workforce issues and ADA compliance are also important aspects to monitor and measure.

Impact:

Governor Baker introduced the pilot program in September 2016 stating, “This initiative represents the MBTA’s efforts to increase accessibility in a more cost-effective and efficient way that also delivers more convenient service for its paratransit customers.” (Image courtesy of Medium)
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) established the Office of Extraordinary Innovation (OEI) in 2015 to explore unprecedented transportation innovation opportunities. OEI is tasked with identifying, evaluating, developing, and implementing new approaches such as public-private capital partnerships and cutting-edge new technologies. To carry out this work, OEI has prioritized three tools:

1. **Unsolicited Proposals:** This tool allows private-sector companies working on transportation innovations to present new ideas directly to Metro for review and evaluation, jump-starting the traditional public procurement process. The most exciting proposals could lead to a demonstration, a pilot project, or, in the most successful cases, full deployment across Metro’s system.

2. **Metro Vision 2028:** Metro Vision 2028 is the result of more than 17 months of research, discussion, and outreach by OEI. It provides a big-picture plan for what the public can expect in terms of improved mobility over the next 10 years. The intent of this plan is to align creativity, resources, and political will to shape the city’s mobility future.

3. **Internal Consulting:** OEI, acting as an internal consultant to Metro, can flexibly and strategically engage in Metro initiatives. OEI can provide capacity and support or innovative and collaborative approaches to develop and implement ideas that will positively impact Metro and the region.

### Lessons Learned
As the change agent within a large, established agency, the OEI group has faced challenges with internal buy-in on new programs and ideas. Strong support at the executive level of the organization has helped to move select programs and projects forward.

### Measurable Results and Impacts
The unsolicited proposal tool has had the greatest impact to date, although OEI does not have the resources to evaluate (or advance) the majority of the proposals received. Metro has received 113 unsolicited proposals, and only 13 of those have advanced to proof of concept or implementation. The Dodger Stadium gondola, which will be open by 2022, was the result of an unsolicited proposal.

### Applicability to KCM
King County Metro could use unsolicited proposals as a tool to generate ideas for new types of products and services. Incorporating equity and sustainability-centered performance metrics in the evaluation of proposals would support Metro’s goals and encourage proposals that address the needs of traditionally underserved and underrepresented communities.

Metro is designing a new demand-responsive service to improve the experience of its customers. The new service will be on-demand, connecting more people and places to the existing system. (Image courtesy of FASTLinkDTLA)
TriMet New Mobility Strategy Assessment

Portland, OR (2018)

Tri-Metropolitan Transportation District (TriMet) provides bus, light rail, and commuter rail service to residents in the Portland region. TriMet’s recent New Mobility Strategy Assessment (June 2018) states, “New mobility tools and techniques offer a unique opportunity to broaden TriMet’s ability to deliver on its vision, mission, and values in ways beyond simply providing direct bus and light rail service.”

To that end, TriMet has begun exploring strategies to evolve and proactively incorporate new mobility services into its business model. The agency is using a “Mobility Manager Model,” which means that TriMet will play an integral role in evolving with new product offerings and changing customer expectations. TriMet will own and support customer experience from traveler origin to their destination, even if they are not the service provider for all parts of the trip. TriMet will work to make its principles meaningful through three efforts: grow services, leverage assets, and influence policy.

TriMet will play Partner/Information Provider, Broker, and Mobility Service Provider within the Mobility Manager Model.

Lessons Learned

Findings from the New Mobility Strategy Assessment Services report suggest that TriMet should develop its program structure and priorities in the following three areas:

- **Grow Services:** TriMet has a strong, established bus and rail system that will continue to serve as the backbone of Portland’s transportation network. To further improve mobility for residents, TriMet can extend the reach of its existing transportation system by incorporating multimodal services.

- **Leverage Assets:** While new mobility companies have an advantage in their nimble ability to attract new people to their services, TriMet has the advantage of owning and operating transit centers, park-and-ride locations, and dedicated right-of-way. TriMet can leverage its ownership of these spaces by requiring new mobility services to connect to their facilities.

- **Influence Policy:** TriMet can address legal and legislative questions by sharing information around new mobility services.

Measurable Results and Impacts

To further advance its new mobility efforts, TriMet recently released a multimodal trip planner that incorporates new mobility service providers such as car2go, Lyft, and Uber. The trip planner uses open source technology and data so that other transit agencies can easily adjust the platform for their systems. TriMet intends to track improvements from other agencies and incorporate them into their own system.

Applicability to KCM

King County Metro is transitioning from a transit agency to a mobility agency and reorganizing its internal operations accordingly. Metro could continue shifting its focus by taking a stronger multimodal role, particularly in integrating mobility products and services.
Transit and Bike Share Integration Pilot

Pittsburgh, PA (2017)

In late 2017, Pittsburgh Bike Share partnered with the Port Authority of Allegheny County, the transit provider for the greater Pittsburgh region, to pilot expanded bike share access to all Port Authority ConnectCard pass holders. During the pilot, ConnectCard pass holders received free access to bikeshare for trips lasting 15 minutes or less. Pittsburgh Bike Share took the following steps to ensure the pilot program was a success and that the Port Authority would be on board:

- Execute a six-month pilot program and evaluate upon completion
- Use existing Port Authority ConnectCard RFID reader technology
- Do not require any accounting integration between partners

To support broad participation in the program, people who are unbanked can purchase a ConnectCard with cash at any of the Port Authority’s automated payment machines or retail partners. Once a person has a transit pass, they can link it with Pittsburgh Bike Share and automatically receive unlimited free 15-minute trips.

Lessons Learned

Pittsburgh Bike Share and the Port Authority developed a messaging strategy to inform transit riders that this benefit was available. The strategy included bus ads, radio, digital, a campaign website, outreach events, and earned media. However, a stronger transit agency partnership will be required for ongoing success. For example, the bike share benefit is not currently listed on the ConnectCard website; information is only available on the Pittsburgh Bike Share site. Integration with Pittsburgh’s ConnectCard system made bikeshare use easy and intuitive for transit riders without additional steps.

There is demand for bike share and transit integration, and bike share is a logical first/last mile solution. Bike share and transit can be mutually supportive and are more competitive with other modes when they are packaged seamlessly. Locating bike share stations near frequent transit routes could support greater integration of the services.

Measurable Results and Impacts

Pittsburgh Bike Share used quantitative and qualitative measures to evaluate the program: total bike share trips, number of registered users, revenue impact of free ride time for all ConnectCard users, awareness of the bike share system and benefits of the program.

The pilot performed well on these measures and was expanded into a permanent program in 2018. Results from the pilot included the following:

- Almost 20% of all bike share trips were taken by ConnectCard transit pass holders during the pilot program.
- The first three months of the pilot saw a 16.5% increase in new bike share riders and a 4.3% increase in bike share trips.

Impact:

Metro can work with municipal and private partners to develop creative first/last mile solutions, such as providing free, short-duration bicycle rides to ORCA card holders. While Pittsburgh uses a 15-minute or less ride duration, Metro would need to work with its partners to determine a suitable duration to ensure rides are primarily used for transit access.
Mobility as a Service: Whim Mobile Application
Helsinki, Finland (2016)

Mobility as a Service (MaaS) is an approach to providing mobility services by integrating planning and payment into a single platform, typically accessed through a mobile phone application. The app allows customers to plan a trip using different modes of transportation and to pay for these services all in the same place.

Since 2016, the Whim mobile app has helped Helsinki residents plan, access, and pay for all modes of public and private transportation within the city. This includes travel with local public transportation agencies, taxi companies, and carshare and bikeshare operators. Whim subscribers choose between three options: all-inclusive service for €499 per month (about $560), unlimited bus service and short bike trips for €49 per month (about $55), and a pay-per-ride option with no monthly cost.

Lessons Learned
The Whim application works particularly well in Helsinki because the city has:
- An expansive and high-quality transit system
- Limited space for vehicle travel and parking
- Legislative support for mobility services

The Finnish Government's 2017 Act on Transport Services requires transportation providers to make all pass products and fare categories available to third parties. This legislation cleared a major hurdle for Whim and other mobility apps—Whim initially required customers to purchase individual trip tickets but now can offer the full discounts available for monthly and daily transit passes.

Measurable Results and Impacts
In its first year of operation in Helsinki, Whim users made over 2.5 million multimodal trips. Of these trips, about 120,000 were taken on Helsinki City Bike bikeshare, and about 100,000 were made using taxi reservations managed through the app. Whim also helps to bridge the first-last-mile challenge of connecting to and from transit stops and stations. For example, 12% of bike trips are taken within 30 minutes before a transit trip, and an additional 30% of bike trips are taken within 90 minutes after a transit trip.

Applicability to KCM
Integrated trip planning and payment apps have been introduced in cities throughout Europe and are gaining momentum in North America, with recent pilot projects in Los Angeles and Denver. An app similar to Whim could be successful in King County given the strong transit network, dense urban core in Seattle, and availability of on-demand transportation services including Jump, Lime, Lyft, Uber, and Car2Go.

While Metro could lead the exploration of an integrated app, public and private partnerships would be needed. The Seattle Department of Transportation’s New Mobility Program, developed in coordination with King County Metro, establishes plans and policies related to mobility as a service. Collaboration between the City of Seattle and King County Metro would be a logical approach to explore pilot programs for MaaS companies and ensure an approach focused on equity and sustainability.

Impact:

HSL, the transit provider in Helsinki, provides over 375 million transit trips per year and is integrated with the Whim mobile application. (Image courtesy of CityLab)

The Whim mobile application allows customers to plan, access, and pay for all private and public transportation services available in the city of Helsinki in one platform. (Image Courtesy of New Mobility News)

Impact:

✔️ ✔️
Emerging Mobility Evaluation

San Francisco, CA (2017)

In June 2017, the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) and San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) adopted 10 guiding principles to serve as a framework for evaluating emerging mobility services and pilot programs: Safety, Transit, Equitable Access, Disabled Access, Sustainability, Congestion, Accountability, Labor, Financial Impact, and Collaboration.

SFCTA and SFMTA collaborated with the emerging mobility industry and community stakeholders to develop a process for evaluating how emerging mobility services were helping the City to meet its goals. They began by developing evaluation metrics for each guiding principle, including objective measures that assess how well an emerging mobility service is aligned with and helps to achieve a Guiding Principle. The evaluation metrics were used to score all emerging mobility services operating in San Francisco.

Lessons Learned

- **Pilots and Permits:** Pilots provide data that helps inform development of permit systems, leading to better performance.
- **Inadequate Data:** Though valuable information can be gleaned from pilots, in general, the City of San Francisco does not have adequate data from emerging mobility companies. Traveler trip data and surveys can help explain people’s travel behavior.
- **Opportunities for Equitable Access:** Many emerging mobility services operate during late-night hours, on weekends, and in areas that aren’t as well served by transit; therefore, they can provide opportunity to increase mobility for those underserved by public transit.

Conflicts with Public Transit: While San Francisco is a transit-first city, the availability of data makes it difficult to understand how the emerging mobility sector is impacting transit ridership.

**Safety Impacts:** Training is not consistent among emerging mobility services, and that can decrease road safety for everyone.

**Congestion:** The modes that people choose for travel and the resulting congestion impacts are not fully understood. San Francisco’s TNCs Today study found that ride-hailing trips (such as Uber and Lyft) are concentrated during heavy traffic hours and in areas where traffic is most congested.

Measurable Results and Impacts

The emerging mobility evaluation process led to recommendations for policy updates, implementation strategies, and additional research and pilots to better align services with the City’s goals:

- Proactively partner
- Collect emerging mobility data and conduct research
- Regulate and recover costs
- Bridge mobility and access gaps
- Support and prioritize public transit
- Enforce safe streets
- Manage congestion on city roadways and at curbs

Applicability to KCM

SFCTA and SFMTA’s evaluation framework could be used as a model for Metro and for jurisdictions within King County to evaluate emerging mobility service providers and potential pilot projects or partnerships. King County Metro could partner with jurisdictions and the mobility service providers to design emerging mobility programs that are consistent with the Mobility Framework’s Guiding Principles.

Sustainability: Emerging Mobility Services and Technologies must support sustainability, including helping to meet the city's greenhouse gas emissions reduction goals, promote use of all non-auto modes, and support efforts to increase the resiliency of the transportation system.

Equitable Access: Emerging Mobility Services and Technologies must promote equitable access to services. All people, regardless of age, race, color, gender, sexual orientation and identity, national origin, religion, or any other protected category, should benefit from Emerging Mobility Services and Technologies, and groups who have historically lacked access to mobility benefits must be prioritized and should benefit most.

SFCTA and SFMTA’s Guiding Principles assist in the evaluation of new mobility projects. Equitable Access and Sustainability are closely related to the King County Metro Mobility Framework.
Seattle’s New Mobility Playbook

Seattle, WA (2017)

In September 2017, the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) published a New Mobility Playbook that established the city’s strategic direction and rules of engagement for public, private, and emerging mobility innovations. The Playbook outlines policies and strategies to foster new mobility options while prioritizing safety, equity, affordability, and sustainability within the city’s transportation system.

The Playbook includes 20 First Moves that represent foundational and strategic actions to help Seattle address new and emerging mobility over the long-term, including:

- Develop integrated shared mobility hubs to seamlessly connect people to and between mobility services. (Strategy 1.6)
- Ensure shared mobility initiatives promote equity by using the City’s Racial Equity Toolkit. (Strategy 3.1)
- Better understand challenges and opportunities by hosting conversations with transportation advocates, social justice-oriented community-based organizations, and community members. (Strategy 3.3)

Lessons Learned

Clarify Expectations: The Playbook established clear expectations for private mobility interests and rooted innovative mobility partnerships in Seattle’s values and principles.

Convey the Challenges: The Playbook positions new mobility technologies along a spectrum of outcomes from significant benefits to severe risks for cities and the people that navigate them.

Coordinate with Public Interest Partners: Successful development of new services requires collaboration with community organizations, cities that manage the right-of-way, and public transit agencies.

Establish Metrics for Project and Pilot Evaluation: SDOT took a “wait-and-see” approach to developing metrics that define and measure success. While the Playbook does not include key metrics, SDOT, King County Metro, and Sound Transit developed a joint innovative mobility pilot scorecard with a racial equity lens.

Measurable Results and Impacts

The Playbook has guided several programs and pilots:

- Partnering with King County Metro and Sound Transit to develop a microtransit policy framework, which led to a collaborative first/last mile pilot between Via and the three public agencies.
- Electric vehicle charging in the public right-of-way pilot program, including strategically siting fast-charging infrastructure at shared mobility hubs to support electric shared mobility.
- Bike share permit program that established service requirements and expectations in exchange for access to the public right-of-way.

Applicability to KCM

Developing a playbook or guidance document could help to articulate Metro’s goals for new mobility services and pilot programs. This type of document would help Metro establish rules of engagement for private partners and jurisdictions with whom Metro might develop programs.

Impact:
Austin Smart Mobility Roadmap

Austin, TX (2017)

Austin is home to some of the earliest autonomous mobility testing in the nation. To respond to this testing, the City of Austin and the Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Capital Metro) developed a roadmap in 2017 to direct smart mobility technologies and services for the Austin region. The roadmap focuses on the outcomes the technologies can provide to their constituents, not just the technologies alone, and covers five areas:

- Shared-Use Mobility
- Electric Vehicles (EV)
- Autonomous Vehicles
- Data and Technology
- Land Use and Infrastructure

The roadmap contains actions related to each of the five areas with a timeline for implementation.

Lessons Learned

Focus on Test-Ready Technologies: Austin is looking at the convergence of autonomous, electric, and shared fleets. In the short term, shared mobility can have the biggest immediate impact.

Establish a Policy Framework Early: To avoid congestion and sprawl, Austin linked policy areas to shape shared, electric, and autonomous fleets.

Focus on Outcomes: Instead of technology, the roadmap focuses on outcomes the technologies provide, such as safety, mobility, access, affordability, and equity.

Build Partnerships: Collaborating with partners, such as universities, cities, or other agencies, can help produce better results.

Establish Data Needs: There is a large gap between the public and private sectors when it comes to data and technology.

Measurable Results and Impacts

The Smart Mobility Roadmap has been implemented, however, early results are primarily adopted policies rather than technological outcomes.

- Austin’s public agencies are working together to plan for the future of mobility. Austin City Council has adopted several policies and plans that intersect with the new mobility roadmap such as Imagine Austin and Vision Zero.
- The roadmap has set the stage for the development of coordinated mobility metrics across city planning efforts.
- The public sector must change to keep pace with the private sector, and the roadmap outlines an approach to shared, electric, and autonomous vehicle technologies for the City of Austin.

Applicability to KCM

The Austin Smart Mobility Roadmap is a good example of agency partnerships to prepare for future technologies. King County Metro could work with key partner agencies and jurisdictions to focus on one or more of the five key areas for collaboration.
As cities and regions continue to grow and transform, the need for innovative transportation solutions has never been greater. New tools and approaches are continually being tested to make it easier for people to use a variety of mobility services that best meet their needs. Mobility innovation encompasses the ways people travel, the services they use, how people connect with and understand their travel options and how agencies test new mobility services and technologies.

Mobility as a Service

Mobility as a Service (MaaS) represents a shift in how people consume mobility trips--from transit, car share, taxi and transportation network company (TNC) services such as Uber, Lyft, and Moovn, to bike share and microtransit services-- based on consumer preferences and real-time availability instead of buying the means of transportation.

This consumer-centric transportation model allows people to plan, book, and pay for trips on public and/or private transportation services using a service provider’s mobile application or an integrated mobile application with a service “stack.”

In its ideal form, MaaS provides end-to-end trip integration, enabling a person to enter their trip start and end location, choose from all available transportation options, book, and pay for the service or combination of services that best meets their needs.

If carefully implemented, MaaS has the potential to advance transportation equity by expanding mobility options that don’t require car ownership and providing customers with information on those options, including modes and services that are faster and/or cheaper than what they are already using. Additionally, by making public transportation more accessible and allowing people to decrease their reliance on personal vehicles, MaaS has the potential to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

Cities around the world have begun to explore the potential benefits of MaaS through the implementation of pilot programs such as moovel and UbiGo, which are described below.

- **moovel (Germany):** moovel is a MaaS application that allows people to search, book, and pay for rail, carshare, public bus, bikeshare, and taxi rides all within one mobile application. The moovel application serves residents in German cities such as Hamburg, Stuttgart, and Karlsruhe and is being tested in Boston and Portland. The application is free to download and can be paired with various payment options including PayPal, Google, and Apple Pay.

- **UbiGo (Stockholm, Sweden):** UbiGo is a MaaS application that combines public transportation, car-sharing, rental car services, and taxi services. UbiGo operates on a monthly subscription that can be shared among multiple members of a household and allows any excess funds to roll over into the following month.
Mobility Hubs

A mobility hub is a single location that is home to a suite of transportation options including walking, biking, public transportation, and new mobility services (e.g., carshare, bikeshare, and ride-hailing services). Mobility hubs, typically designed around transit centers, allow people to choose the mode that works best for their specific travel needs. In addition to providing a wide array of transportation options, mobility hubs often include services and amenities such as package delivery lockers, retail kiosks, public space, and food trucks.

For a mobility hub to function properly, partnerships are essential. Mobility hubs should provide easy-to-use wayfinding and real-time transit information that make transfers from one mode to another as seamless as possible. Additionally, mobility hub services should be clearly communicated and easily accessible to the public. Examples of cities that have explored opportunities for mobility hubs, including King County Metro’s partnership with the City of Bellevue, are described below.

- **Bellevue, WA:** King County Metro and the City of Bellevue have partnered to develop a vision for integrated mobility options at the Eastgate Park & Ride. The goal is to transform Eastgate from a vehicle-focused facility into a mobility hub that offers a variety of first/last mile options to connect people to public transit service. The vision for the Eastgate Mobility Hub includes on-demand first/last mile shuttle services, micromobility options such as bike and scooter share, an improved pedestrian environment, and parking management systems, including real-time parking availability information.

- **Los Angeles, CA:** Los Angeles Department of Transportation (LADOT)’s Mobility Hubs Program envisions mobility hubs as a physical and digital connection between public and private transportation options, including secure bike parking, bike share, personal electric vehicle charging stations, and connections to carshare and public transit options. Interactive kiosks and smartphone applications will be used to ensure easy customer access.

- **Austin, TX:** Austin’s mobility hub program includes three different hub types: gateway, anchor, and neighborhood hubs. Gateway hubs are centrally located within the regional transportation network and have the highest density of mobility options on site. Anchor hubs are important transfer points and terminus locations where riders can make seamless connections to various travel modes. Neighborhood hubs are critical access points for the regional transportation network where most trips within the network begin and end.

**PLANNED MOBILITY HUB IN AUSTIN, TX**

Source: CapMetro
Supportive Integrations and Partnerships

For innovative transportation solutions such as Mobility as a Service and Mobility Hubs to be effective, they must be properly introduced and communicated to their intended audiences. Programs that are making it easier for people to use such services include TransitScreen, Transit GO Ticket, and transit agency and ride-hailing partnerships.

- **TransitScreen** is a location-specific software that displays surrounding mobility options including carshare, ride-hailing (Uber/Lyft/taxis), and bikeshare information in real time. Viewers can see arrival times for buses, walk times to transit stations, nearby bikeshare and carshare availability, and other community information including neighborhood coffee shops, restaurants, and other amenities.

- **Transit Go Ticket**, currently used by King County Metro, is a mobile application that allows people to purchase bus, rail, and water taxi tickets with their smartphones. Similar to tickets and fares purchased with cash, Transit GO Tickets can be used to transfer to and from any Metro service for up to two hours after ticket activation.

- **Transit Agency and Ride-Hailing Partnerships** help to address a significant challenge in accessing public transit, which is making the connection from one’s home or job to the bus or train. These challenges are often greatest in suburban areas that are typically designed for vehicle-owning households. Dallas Area Rapid Transit (DART) has partnered with ride-hailing companies Uber and Lyft to help address first and final mile connection issues and expand the reach of public transit services. The agency now includes a trip-planning feature within their mobile application, allowing customers to book an Uber or Lyft ride from the transit app.
WORKFORCE

Relevant Guiding Principles

• Support our workforce

Equity Cabinet Questions

• How can Metro support career paths in a way that makes the workplace more inclusive?
• How can Metro contract for services in a way that advances equity?
• How do we help our workforce prepare for technological and transportation-related advancements?
• How can we reach priority populations for job recruitment and retention?
• What kind of guidelines should Metro have in place when contracting with private providers?

Best Practices Research Questions

• What transit agencies, cities, or other public entities are leading in creating more inclusive workplaces and how are they doing it?
  How are agencies providing pathways to growth and promotional opportunities, especially from blue collar to white collar jobs?
• What are agencies and cities doing to set parameters for how workers are treated? Is anyone having success moving Uber/Lyft/others into providing living wages or other workforce supports?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best Practice</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recruitment, training, retention, and inclusive workplaces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Regional Transportation District Workforce Initiative Now Program</td>
<td>Denver Regional Transportation District developed the Workforce Initiative Now (WIN) program to increase recruitment for employment opportunities in underserved communities, providing pre-employment, training and placement, and career and supportive services.</td>
<td>✔️️️️️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Denver, CO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles Vision Zero: Dignity-Infused Community Engagement Strategy</td>
<td>Recruitment strategy for engagement “Street Teams” includes creating paid opportunities for young people transitioning out of foster care, survivors of gender-based violence, aging adults, and those experiencing other barriers to employment.</td>
<td>✔️️️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Los Angeles, CA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Vermont Agency of Transportation (VTrans) Youth Program</td>
<td>VTrans promotes year-round youth outreach to expose students to careers in the transportation industry, including the agency’s participation in numerous career fairs, panels, and conferences; serving as a host site for students engaged in Community Based Learning or short-term job shadows; and providing an annual two week residential program for high school students each summer as part of FHWA’s National Summer Transportation Institute.</td>
<td>✔️️️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Metro Transportation School</td>
<td>LA Metro is in the process of establishing a public boarding school in South Los Angeles with a STEAM curriculum focused on science, technology, engineering, art, and math. The Transportation School is intended to engage the local community and underserved youth while introducing career pathways in the global transportation industry.</td>
<td>✔️️️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Los Angeles, CA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto Regional Immigrant Employment Council Mentorship Program</td>
<td>Founded in 2002, Toronto Regional Immigrant Employment Council (TRIEC) is a Canadian nonprofit that works to better integrate immigrants into the greater Toronto area labor market. TRIEC programs build cross-cultural understanding through diversity and inclusion training for employers and assist newcomers in finding ways to apply their skills in the labor market through mentoring, education, and connection to services.</td>
<td>✔️️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Toronto, ON)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlighted best practices are described in greater detail in this document.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best Practice</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generation USA Retail Career Advancement Program (Multiple Cities)</td>
<td>The Retail Career Advancement (RCA) program offers a six-week training program designed to help retail employees advance in their field and includes a career coach, mentor, and case manager who create plans for advancement and follow up throughout the program and after completion.</td>
<td>☑️ ☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duwamish Valley Youth Corps (Seattle, WA)</td>
<td>The Duwamish Valley Youth Corps (DVYC) is a program founded in 2014 by the Duwamish River Cleanup Coalition, which engages youth in the South Park and Georgetown neighborhoods of Seattle to provide education, community service, and job training in the environmental, sustainability, and green infrastructure fields.</td>
<td>☑️ ☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Hospitality Association Education Foundation’s Incumbent Worker Training Program (Washington State)</td>
<td>The Incumbent Worker Training (IWT) program was implemented in a five-county area of Washington state, including Grays Harbor, Lewis, Mason, Pacific, and Thurston counties. The program provided the opportunity for workers in the hospitality industry to take free skills improvement courses to advance their careers within the industry and catered to both entry-level and mid-level employees.</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTS Transportation YOU (Multiple Cities)</td>
<td>The Women’s Transportation Seminar (WTS) provides youth programs through their Transportation YOU program that provide education, training, and exposure to the transportation industry for high school, undergraduate, and graduate students.</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linkedin Diversity &amp; Inclusion Strategy (Sunnyvale, CA)</td>
<td>LinkedIn, an employment-oriented social networking site with over 500 million users, has been publicly reporting on workplace diversity since 2014. The strategy has focused on increasing gender diversity at LinkedIn, with notable success.</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlighted best practices are described in greater detail in this document.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best Practice</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans Regional Transportation Authority Strategic Mobility Plan (New Orleans, LA)</td>
<td>By 2022, the agency is to create a Career Pathways program for employees and ensure competitive pay and benefits. They will explore a partnership with area colleges to create an apprenticeship program.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameters for treatment of workers</td>
<td>Establish minimum wage standards for employees working within Seattle city limits. The ordinance set different minimum wage levels for employers based on the number of total employees, medical benefits, and whether employees earn tips.</td>
<td>☑️ ☑️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlighted best practices are described in greater detail in this document.
Denver Regional Transportation District Workforce Initiative Now Program

Denver, CO (2011)

Denver’s FasTracks project—an ambitious expansion of commuter rail, light rail, and bus rapid transit (BRT)—posed a workforce recruitment, training, and retention challenge for the Regional Transportation District (RTD). In 2011 RTD developed and secured a Federal Transit Agency (FTA) Ladders of Opportunity grant for the Workforce Initiative Now (WIN) program to expand its workforce and increase recruitment for employment opportunities in underserved communities. WIN’s model was to partner with a coordinated network of community service providers to offer three types of services: pre-employment, training and placement, and career and supportive services. WIN provided training opportunities for workers to support the construction of FasTracks projects and fill maintenance positions for RTD’s expanding bus and rail service and operations.

To reach underserved communities, WIN was advertised by the Urban League and other community partners. Specific communities and neighborhoods were identified as good candidates for program recruitment due to high unemployment and foreclosure rates; educational attainment and a higher population of communities of color were also factors in identifying communities that might benefit from the program.

Lessons Learned

- RTD representatives indicated that word of mouth from participants who successfully completed training and placement was the most effective advertising for the program.
- Partnering with local employers was a critical component to maximize the number of job placements and leverage partner expertise on workforce needs, experience, and relationships.
- Federal contracting and grant requirements were challenging for the program to meet.

Measurable Results and Impacts

The WIN program strengthened the relationship between RTD and the community and helped educate people about the many jobs—beyond transit vehicle operators—required to build and provide transit service. Between 2011 and 2014, WIN served 791 community members and placed nearly half of WIN participants in jobs with RTD or RTD partner organizations.

Applicability to KCM

RTD’s WIN provides an example of a transit agency that coordinated a network of community partnerships to improve recruitment and training opportunities spurred by capital investment in transit facilities. Metro could use a similar strategy to establish a more diverse workforce and improve its relationships with the communities it serves.

Impact:
LA Metro Transportation School
Los Angeles, CA (2018)

In June 2018, LA Metro announced their Transportation School, which will prepare Los Angeles County youth for career and college pathways in the transportation industry. The public boarding school’s curriculum will teach students transferrable industry skills focused on science, technology, engineering, arts, and math (STEAM). With over 50% of the transportation industry workforce eligible for retirement in the next 10 years, the school will help Metro begin to train and hire a workforce to fill the jobs that these retirements will create.

The Transportation School is the centerpiece of a larger workforce development initiative that Metro has created to address the transportation industry’s need for a skilled employee pool. The program expands Metro’s existing career pathway programs to include more high-school-aged youth, particularly from underserved communities. The school will be part of a larger mixed-use development in the Vermont/Manchester area of South Los Angeles, intended to improve quality of life, increase safety, and improve community amenities and diverse workforce development.

Lessons Learned

The Transportation School is projected to open in fall 2020, so there are limited lessons learned related to student enrollment, achievement, and impacts to Metro’s workforce. However, the Transportation School development site was specifically identified for its capacity to serve a diverse student population, including the high percentage of at-risk youth living in South Los Angeles. While the effectiveness of this decision is still unknown, Metro has taken an active approach to identify underserved communities that may benefit most from this type of investment.

Measurable Results and Impacts

The Transportation School is not yet open, so there are no results related to student achievement available.

Metro has established several quantitative evaluation measures for the Transportation School, including reserving at least 20% of seats for youth from the local community and 30% of seats for youth who are currently receiving services from, or are at risk of entering, the County’s child welfare system, probation department/ juvenile justice system, or homeless services.

Additionally, the proposed Transportation School site is intended to spark community economic development by anchoring a new mixed-use retail development. The goal of selecting this site is to return more opportunities to the community through future investment.

Applicability to KCM

While King County Metro may not choose to open a public boarding school, LA Metro’s targeted outreach and engagement efforts in underserved communities and to at-risk youth is a model King County Metro can follow to foster a more diverse and inclusive workforce. Providing wealth-creation opportunities for residents of underserved communities—through investment in education and training—is a model for King County Metro’s current efforts regarding workforce development.

Impact: ☑️
In a review of their participation in the program, the City of Toronto found that allowing mentors to use some work time to participate in the mentorship program has been a key to success. The City is one of the top two employer partners for both matches and mentors. The City provides opportunities for mentors to share the positive impact of their partnership, including recognition events.

**Measurable Results and Impacts**

Since the program began in 2002:

- Over 17,000 immigrants have received mentorship
- 77% of mentees find employment
- 96% of mentors say that they are better able to coach and lead after mentoring

The City of Toronto found that participating in the program yielded positive results:

- It has helped to diversify their workforce and fill positions that were historically difficult to staff.
- Over 500 mentors have participated in the program, providing an opportunity for professional development.

**Applicability to KCM**

Metro could work with partners to create or participate in an existing mentorship program to support its goals related to recruitment, staff development, community partnerships, and cultural-sensitivity training. Mentees would receive guidance and experience that could help them prepare for and navigate a career with Metro, and mentors could benefit from professional development and relationships with a diverse pool of potential employees. The program would not have to be specific to immigrants, although 24% of King County residents are foreign born, representing an important segment of the future King County Metro workforce.
Generation USA Retail Career Advancement Program

Multiple Cities (2016)

Generation USA is a non-profit organization dedicated to moving youth into self-sustaining careers. The program initially operated in Dallas, TX and Jacksonville, FL but has expanded to include Miami, San Francisco, Atlanta, and Las Vegas. In 2016, Generation USA launched the Retail Career Advancement (RCA) program designed to help retail employees and unemployed youth advance in their field.

RCA offers a six-week training program, 60% of which can be completed online, that includes access to a career coach, mentor, and a case manager who creates advancement plans and follows up with each participant during and after completing the program. The RCA program focuses on both unemployed youth looking for entry-level positions and entry-level employees seeking the skills necessary for career advancement.

Lessons Learned

Program leaders identified recruitment as a primary challenge for enrollment. Much of RCA’s success is due to partnerships with employers who are invested in employee advancement, actively advocate for employees, assist in developing the curriculum, and encourage their existing employees to participate. However, employers may not want employees to attend training scheduled during their regular shifts, and programs may need to be no or low-cost to employers to gain initial buy-in. Increasing engagement with employers and potential partners is crucial for long-term success in recruiting students and ensuring the curriculum stays current.

Measurable Results and Impacts

Following completion of the program, 71% of employers reported that RCA graduates were among their best performing employees, and 86% of graduates were considered team players and eager to learn. Additionally, 90% of program graduates were placed into a job within 180 days and 83% retained that job a year after placement; promotion and advancement rate information was not available. The number of program participants was not publicly available.

Applicability to KCM

King County Metro employs a wide range of specialized positions from vehicle operators and maintenance mechanics to administrators, planners, and engineers. Each of these positions requires particular skills and has its own placement criteria and advancement potential. Metro could leverage its existing relationships with community-based organizations (CBOs) to establish a similar workforce development partnership led by one or more CBOs. Such a partnership could be designed to assist in career placement and identify career advancement opportunities to meet the department’s future workforce needs. It could also engage the local community and introduce young people to potential careers in transportation.

Impact:

Walmart, an employer partner of the RCA program, provided a $4.8 million grant to continue and expand the program in Jacksonville, FL. (Image courtesy of Generation USA)

Generation USA also organizes a banking and finance career advancement and youth training program through a partnership with the Wilmington Leaders Alliance in Wilmington, DE. (Image courtesy of Generation USA)
Duwamish Valley Youth Corps

Seattle, WA (2014)

The Duwamish Valley Youth Corps (DVYC), founded in 2014, is led by the Duwamish River Cleanup Coalition (DRCC). The Youth Corps engages primarily low-income youth of color in education, health, equity, community service, and environmental justice by offering paid training and meaningful work experience in ecology, community organizing, public and environmental policy, and green infrastructure. Participants in the DVYC range from 13 to 18 years old and are residents of Seattle’s South Park and Georgetown communities, which are within or adjacent to the Lower Duwamish Waterway Superfund site.

Program participants meet three times a week for 12 weeks and follow a curriculum that includes a public health impact assessment, social and environmental justice programs, and an emphasis on community involvement and making a difference. The program has grown and gained new partnerships since it began, including meeting with Washington Governor Jay Inslee and a partnership with the Port of Seattle. The partnership with the Port, announced in 2019, will provide additional on-the-job training resources in the environmental, sustainability, and green infrastructure fields.

Measurable Results and Impacts

In addition to community service projects—including picking up litter, tree planting, and leading community outreach—the DVYC also played a role in developing the “Hey Duwamish” interactive tool. Community members use the tool to request improvements, projects, and amenities or report hazards within the Lower Duwamish Valley.

In 2015, the program served 55 participants through three cohorts. Two participants were appointed as student Sustainability Ambassadors for the City of Seattle. Eight participants were offered employment with the City of Seattle or King County and have rejoined DVYC as mentors.

Applicability to KCM

Graduates of the DVYC program have gone on to work for both the City of Seattle and King County. By investing in a more structured partnership with DVYC, including support for programming, Metro could introduce transportation topics to accompany the existing environmental and sustainability emphasis. This local initiative could provide an opportunity for Metro to engage with diverse Seattle-area youth and introduce them to career opportunities in transportation.

The March 2016 Cohort of the Duwamish Valley Youth Corps cleans up trash and litter throughout the South Park and Georgetown neighborhoods. (Image courtesy of The Seattle Globalist)

The Hey Duwamish! online tool is a grassroots, community-led effort to monitor pollution and improve environmental health in the Duwamish Valley. (Image courtesy of Hey Duwamish!)

Impact:

The March 2016 Cohort of the Duwamish Valley Youth Corps cleans up trash and litter throughout the South Park and Georgetown neighborhoods. (Image courtesy of The Seattle Globalist)
LinkedIn Diversity and Inclusion Strategy

San Francisco, CA (2014)

The tech industry faces a growing need for highly-skilled employees and suffers from a lack of gender and racial diversity in both management and the overall workforce. LinkedIn, an employment-oriented social networking site with over 500 million subscribers, has been publicly reporting on workplace diversity since 2014. The company’s diversity and inclusion strategy has had notable success, particularly in gender inclusion.

Starting in 2018, LinkedIn focused on a three-pillar strategy:

1. **Hire and grow diverse talent.**
   LinkedIn has several initiatives to increase recruitment and promotion of underrepresented populations, including the Black Inclusion Group, working to close the opportunity gap for black/African American people in the technology industry, and EnableIn, which generates awareness, fosters inclusion, and supports hiring of people with disabilities.

2. **Invest in creating an inclusive environment.** In 2018, LinkedIn created companywide learning programs to educate its employees on race, gender, and disabilities.

3. **Create a broader cultural change in the tech industry.** LinkedIn’s core business supports the company’s ability to lead and influence recruitment across the tech industry. Their Gender Insights product helps recruiters measure gender discrepancies in response to job and candidate outreach.

**Measurable Results and Impacts**

- Women now represent 40% of company leadership, a 50% increase in four years. The percentage of women in technical leadership roles has increased 193% in four years.
- The impact of LinkedIn’s efforts to hire and retain people of color has been more limited. From 2014 to 2018, black/African American employees have increased from 2% of the company’s U.S. employees to 3.3% and Latinx employees have increased from 4% to 5.7% of U.S. employees.
- LinkedIn does not externally report employee demographics or diversity beyond gender and race.

**Applicability to KCM**

King County Metro could develop a strategy to supplement the countywide Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action Plan and address unique challenges facing the department. For example, Metro could set a goal to hire and retain more women and people of color in maintenance jobs or transit supervisor roles. Developing an approach like LinkedIn’s Employee Resource Groups and using a tool similar to Gender Insights to inform hiring outreach and decisions could be valuable next step.

**Impact:**

LinkedIn’s Diversity and Inclusion Strategy focuses on diversity, inclusion, and belonging both internally and across the larger technology industry.

(Image courtesy of LinkedIn)
Despite being controversial, a city-specific minimum wage is a tool to provide a living wage in cities with higher costs of living. Currently, companies with more than 500 employees must pay $16.00 hourly, which is the highest minimum wage in any U.S. city. For companies with fewer than 500 employees, the minimum wage is $15.75 for jobs without health benefits or tips and $12.00 for jobs with benefits or tips. This two-tiered structure balances the goal of increasing earnings for minimum-wage employees with reducing the financial burden on small- and family-operated businesses.

Lessons Learned

- Despite being controversial, a city-specific minimum wage is a tool to provide a living wage in cities with higher costs of living.
- Along with cities such as San Francisco, San Jose, and Chicago, Seattle's minimum wage is well beyond that of the state's minimum (which is $12.00 in Washington).
- Labor dynamics are complex—wages are one factor among many that employers must consider when hiring workers—and a minimum wage ordinance can have different impacts across different sectors. However, with equity as a City priority, the City of Seattle established its ordinance with ongoing evaluation of impacts, making changes as needed to address unforeseen issues.

Measurable Results and Impacts

Some studies have found that an increase in the minimum wage increases disposable income for people in lower-paid jobs with little to no reduction in employment. In Seattle, for every 10% increase in the city's minimum wage, there was a 2.3% increase in workers' pay in the fast-food sector.

A minimum wage increase does not necessarily lead to higher priced products or services. A two-year evaluation of Seattle's minimum wage ordinance found that the initial increase from $13.50 to $15.00 had no impact on local supermarket food prices.

The Seattle minimum wage ordinance increased disposable income for workers making less than the minimum wage and also those making slightly above minimum wage. This suggests that the ordinance is benefiting a larger group of employees (beyond those in minimum-wage jobs).

Applicability to KCM

King County Metro employees are covered by Seattle's minimum wage ordinance, and most Metro jobs pay above minimum wage. King County also requires contractors (and their subcontractors) awarded a contract valued $100,000 or more to comply with Seattle's minimum wage standards. Metro could consider extending this requirement to contracts of lower value.

Seattle's minimum wage depends on size of employer and other benefits provided, but will be aligned for all workers by 2025. (Image courtesy of City of Seattle)

The minimum wage ordinance came after a series of protests surrounding affordability issues and low wages in the city. (Image courtesy of MSNBC)
Relevant Guiding Principles
- Engage deliberately and transparently

Equity Cabinet Questions
- What strategies should Metro use to improve our engagement practices?
- How can we demonstrate openness to shared decision-making and co-creation?
- How can we reach people with greatest barriers to access?

Best Practices Research Questions
- What transit agencies and cities are pushing new models for shared decision making, co-creation, and engagement, and what are those models?
- What agencies and cities (and others) are using tools and techniques that help to invite new voices to the conversation? What are people doing to reach a broad audience?
## Relevant Best Practices & Preliminary Impact Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best Practice</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared decision making and co-creation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Metro Equity Platform (Los Angeles, CA)</td>
<td>Framework to shape analyses and actions of the agency that centers work on early and continuous community engagement. Seeks to use transportation as a lever to enable access to opportunity and address historical and current inequities in access.</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Equity Framework (Greenlining Institute)</td>
<td>Framework designed to address structural inequities through an adaptable, customizable process for the community, advocates, and transportation decision-makers, and to elevate values of social equity and community power in transportation planning and decision-making.</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity-Centered Community Design Field Guide (Creative Reaction Lab)</strong></td>
<td>Best practice for addressing power dynamics in engagement.</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Transit Transit Assistance Program (Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN)</td>
<td>Invest in community liaisons within neighborhoods to raise awareness and trust in the program.</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seattle Public Outreach Liaison Program (Seattle, WA)</td>
<td>Community liaisons are embedded community leaders from a variety of immigrant and refugee communities, communities of color, and communities of seniors, youth, and people with disabilities. Community Liaisons bring deep expertise on their communities’ needs and concerns, trusted relationships with community members, and an ability to build bridges between city government and community interests.</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlighted best practices are described in greater detail in this document.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best Practice</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tools and techniques</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement Toolkit (Public Health Seattle-King County, Futurewise, OneAmerica, El Centro De La Raza)</td>
<td>Best practice for defining purpose of engagement effort and how the agency will use information gathered from the public to implement results; provides a range of engagement tools that are effective for different points along the spectrum for levels of engagement (International Association for Public Participation).</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Transportation Equity Program (Seattle, WA)</td>
<td>Program that provides safe, environmentally sustainable, accessible, and affordable transportation options that support communities of color, low-income communities, immigrant and refugee communities, people with disabilities, people experiencing homelessness or housing insecurity, LGBTQ people, women and girls, youth, and seniors to thrive in place in vibrant and healthy communities, and mitigate racial disparities and the effects of displacement.</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Social Impacts Partnerships (San Francisco, CA)</td>
<td>Within Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for projects over $5 million, applicants are asked to meet a community benefits criteria, which allocates money toward an improvement for communities who are affected by the proposed project.</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Transit/Porchlight (Community Based Organization) Partnership (Madison, WI)</td>
<td>Metro Transit and Porchlight work with non-profits, city departments, and downtown business groups to ensure a coordinated approach to working with people experiencing homelessness.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Pennsylvania Public Transportation Authority/Project HOME (Community Based Organization) Partnership (Philadelphia, PA)</td>
<td>Project HOME, a Philadelphia non-profit homelessness organization, has partnered with SEPTA on a variety of initiatives, including establishing a walk-in outreach center at SEPTA’s largest rail center called “Hub of Hope,” which provides social and health services to individuals experiencing homelessness.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility ATX Online Voting Tool (Austin, TX)</td>
<td>Online public engagement tool that allows the public to “upvote” each others’ ideas.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LA Metro Equity Platform
Los Angeles, CA (2018)

In February 2018, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LA Metro) Board approved an Equity Platform aimed at achieving “equality of outcome” versus equal treatment. The four pillars of the framework include the following:

1. **Define and Measure**: Define a common basis and language for talking about equity, inequity, and how to measure improvements or changes over time.

2. **Listen and Learn**: Create forums for open conversation about how efforts to achieve equity have historically been problematic and gather input about where partnerships and relationships can be improved and strengthened to advance equitable outcomes going forward.

3. **Focus and Deliver**: The 2020-2050 Long Range Transportation Plan will focus on equity in terms of 1) Metro-led planning, investments and operations, and 2) partner-based activities beyond Metro’s core transportation responsibilities (e.g., land use, housing, social and economic security).

4. **Train and Grow**: Train staff at all levels within Metro to learn methodologies to evaluate equity and how to effectively communicate with communities in a way that recognizes and respects equity issues.

This framework is intended to shape specific analyses and actions attached to Metro initiatives and report progress to the Metro Board.

**Lessons Learned**

Since approving this policy, LA Metro has found that dedicated staff will be required to ensure the framework is applied across all of Metro’s work. Community conversations and forums may produce difficult and uncomfortable feelings among community members and staff and may require professional facilitation.

**Measurable Results and Impacts**

In 2018, with the support of the Alliance for Community Transit-Los Angeles, the Metro Board adopted a new Transit-Oriented Communities policy to protect transportation access for low-income residents by increasing affordable housing around bus stops and rail stations.

In January 2019, Metro launched *Reimagining LA County: Mobility, Equity, and the Environment* to study traffic management tools that can alleviate traffic congestion and simultaneously generate additional transportation revenue. This initiative can prioritize serving high-need communities, including low-income drivers.

**Applicability to KCM**

King County Metro has a role similar to LA Metro, with a focus on transit service and capital project delivery as well as community partnerships. Developing an Equity Platform could support Metro’s planning and implementation, guiding specific investments and policies in plan delivery over the coming decades, especially in the form of dedicated equity staff and strategic partnerships.

**Impact:**

LA Metro has determined that dedicated outreach staff and specialized initiatives will be necessary to successfully carry out and apply the Equity Platform. (Image courtesy of LA Metro)
Mobility Equity Framework
Greenlining Institute (2018)

The Greenlining Institute’s Mobility Equity Framework was created in spring 2018 to encourage transportation systems that benefit all people, especially communities of color and low-income neighborhoods. The framework is designed for use by planners and community advocates across the country, and offers guidance and tools to define equity, measure impacts and benefits, and apply a three-step framework to identify needs, analyze mobility strategies to address needs, and give decision-making power to the local community.

The framework approach includes:

1. Identify the mobility needs of a specific low-income community of color.
2. Conduct the mobility equity analysis to prioritize transportation modes that best meet those needs while maximizing benefits and minimizing burdens.
3. Place decision-making power in the hands of the local community.

While the framework is relatively new, it has been referenced as a potential tool to inform policies at the local and national levels, including Baltimore’s Complete Streets bill, the Green New Deal, and future bridge connections across the San Francisco Bay.

Lessons Learned
A key strategy to place decision-making power in the hands of the local community is participatory budgeting. While several cities have introduced participatory budgeting into their transportation planning processes (Oakland, Seattle, New York City), Porto Alegre in Brazil—the birthplace of participatory budgeting—saw the approach fall apart when the political climate changed. Funding that did not require participation discouraged the approach, illustrating the importance of policy in holding agencies accountable to practicing community-led investment.

Measurable Results and Impacts
In spring 2018, the San Francisco County Transportation Authority worked with Reflex Design Collective to support transportation improvements in District 10, a rapidly gentrifying area of San Francisco. Reflex adopted the Mobility Equity Framework to expand the project goals to include access to opportunity/employment, public safety, improved air quality, and building community power. They also “co-designed” the decision-making process, including more low-income and long-term residents in small discussions in familiar settings versus large public workshops. Finally, they partnered with local community-based organizations to translate materials and build agency staff awareness of local history, power dynamics, and distrust in government. Ultimately, 150 residents were involved as paid co-designers throughout the planning process.

Applicability to KCM
This framework could be applied to both internal agency initiatives and policies, such as workforce development, as well as customer- and partner-facing initiatives. For example, planning processes can begin by identifying local community-based organizations and their constituents as partners to co-design the engagement approach, foster more information exchange between King County Metro and residents, and create community-driven recommendations.
Equity-Centered Community Design Field Guide

Creative Reaction Lab (2018)

Creative Reaction Lab is a non-profit organization in the St. Louis region that developed Equity-Centered Community Design (ECCD) in 2018 as a creative problem-solving process that illuminates power structures in decision making. It begins by identifying current/past decision-makers, unpacks history, and facilitates healing. Steps in the process include:

- **Inviting Diverse Co-Creators:** Bring people with different identities, perspectives, and backgrounds into problem-solving processes and implementation.
- **Building Humility and Empathy:** Recognize the influence of biases and perspectives in understanding another person’s emotions, experiences, and actions, and actively attempt to understand their perspective.
- **History and Healing:** Recognize that the media, education and social interactions each person has with their family, friends, and colleagues is taught within the context of structural oppression that has erased certain stories and identities and requires unlearning.
- **Defining and Assessing the Topic/Community Needs:** Understand community needs and explore the root causes of why they are not being met.

**Lessons Learned**

The ECCD Field Guide does not provide a linear process or policy recommendations, but instead focuses on shifting mindsets by building self-awareness and prompting reflection. Agencies seeking to use the guide to inform community engagement work should recognize that its intended use is to facilitate ongoing learning, unlearning, and relearning.

**Measurable Results and Impacts**

In 2019, Creative Reaction Lab worked on Mobility For All By All, a grant-funded interdisciplinary collaboration to ensure new public transit investments in St. Louis would serve equity and quality of life interests. The project created a metrics system that emphasizes improvements in equity (e.g., growing access to jobs for people in low-income communities) rather than economic development (e.g., creating more jobs), engaged residents around three proposed Metrolink station locations in historically disinvested neighborhoods, and developed site-specific community projects with residents.

**Applicability to KCM**

As King County Metro works to build its institutional awareness about equity in transportation planning and service delivery, the ECCD Field Guide can serve as a resource to shift cultural norms and mindsets within the agency. As it applies to specific projects, plans, and policies, King County Metro can practice the Field Guide’s suggested approach to community engagement.
Creating a Transportation Equity Program is not enough to achieve equity, race, and social justice goals. Beyond the activities listed above, a key program objective and responsibility of the Transportation Equity Workgroup is to create an Equity Agenda: a framework for transportation goals and priorities. This agenda will be developed with community-guided suggestions and in partnership with key city agencies.

Measurable Results and Impacts

Since creating the Transportation Equity Program, SDOT has formed an Equity Workgroup of 10 community members from the communities listed above to inform recommendations for the Equity Agenda. The program has also prompted SDOT to be more intentional and explicit about community engagement goals to reach its specific focus communities and identities and evaluate impacts of plans and policies.

For example, during a bike share pilot, SDOT required operators to ensure at least 10% of all bikes were available in equity-focused neighborhoods, and dedicated 1,500 bike parking spaces to improve sidewalk access. It has slowed hasty action to allow e-scooters on city streets without fully evaluating the health, safety, equity, and financial risks. Dedicated program staff have also helped elevate equity considerations in other SDOT studies and policies, such as managing congestion.

Applicability to KCM

King County Metro could replicate the Transportation Equity Program’s model of dedicated staff and compensated community members to foster more inclusive representation focused on activities to provide safe, affordable, accessible, and environmentally sustainable transportation options across King County. Several programs already exist within King County Metro to serve low-income individuals and seniors and could be included within a broader program to affect agency-wide changes and define equity goals and metrics.

Lessons Learned

Creating a Transportation Equity Program is not enough to achieve equity, race, and social justice goals. Beyond the activities listed above, a key program objective and responsibility of the Transportation Equity Workgroup is to create an Equity Agenda: a framework for transportation goals and priorities. This agenda will be developed with community-guided suggestions and in partnership with key city agencies.

The Seattle Transportation Equity Program distributes Youth ORCA cards to high school and income-qualified middle school students enrolled in Seattle Public Schools. (Image courtesy of King County Metro)
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4 Metro’s Current Practices

This chapter summarizes Metro’s current state compared to the best practices identified through the Mobility Framework. It is organized by the themes used to develop Mobility Framework Recommendations and provides context for the Recommendations as well as the policy updates and other changes that will help to implement those Recommendations.

THEME 1 – INVESTMENTS

Services, Capital Investments, Rider Programs that Meet Broad Traveler Needs

METRO CONNECTS represents the vision for King County Metro through 2040 and calls for a 70 percent increase in service (2.5 million service hours) dedicated to making transit trips faster, more frequent, and more reliable. The plan also prioritizes capital improvements, including enhanced amenities at passenger facilities, transit centers, and bus stops, purchasing 625 new buses, expanding layover space by 50 percent, and investing in new maintenance and operating bases to support the system’s expanding fleet.

METRO CONNECTS recognizes that King County residents have a range of traveler needs and prioritizes improving accessibility to more modes of transportation. The plan encourages the development of new service options like community vans, ridesharing apps, and agency partnerships with carsharing services, as well as accessibility improvements like new and improved sidewalks and bike lanes, dedicated carpool and drop-off spaces, and context-sensitive parking for cars and bikes.
Investments in Underserved/Underrepresented Communities

A stated priority in the METRO CONNECTS plan is to create more opportunities for all residents in the County. Currently, one in four people in King County live at or near the poverty level. Metro plans to expand access to opportunities by offering frequent, all-day service to jobs, education, and services. A direct outcome of these planned service improvements would be providing frequent transit service near 77 percent of residents of color and 87 percent of low-income residents. In addition to prioritizing investments in underserved communities, Metro is continuing to explore innovations like the ORCA LIFT low-income fare program to reduce or eliminate the financial burden associated with mobility.

ORCA LIFT low-income fare program offers reduced rates for qualifying households
Source: Sound Transit

Values-Based Prioritization

Metro’s Service Guidelines call for annual reviews of the transit network to evaluate, design, and modify transit services to meet changing needs and to deliver efficient, high-quality service. Metro assesses service levels for each corridor based on corridor productivity, geographic value, and social equity.

Corridor productivity is measured by accessibility to housing, employment, and education, evaluating the number of housing units, jobs, and college/university enrollment within a quarter-mile walk of each stop in the corridor. Areas with higher
housing and/or employment density within a quarter mile of bus stops receive a higher corridor productivity score.

Geographic value assesses the value of connections made between different “centers” in the transit network. Connections between Regional Growth Centers, Manufacturing/Industrial Centers, and Transit Activity Centers are evaluated based on ridership and travel times. These factors help to determine which corridor a typical rider would choose when traveling between two centers. Faster, higher-ridership corridors have a higher geographic value.

Social equity indicators show how well a corridor serves areas with concentrations of people of color and low-income populations. This is done by comparing boardings in these areas against the systemwide average of all corridor boardings within census tracts that are comprised of predominately people with lower incomes or people of color. Metro assigns the highest value to corridors with concentrations of boardings in census tracts that have a higher than average representation of low-income households or people of color.

This social equity component makes up 25 percent of the total evaluation score. Of the remaining evaluation score, 25 percent is devoted to geographic value indicators, and 50 percent is devoted to corridor productivity.

THEME 2 — SURROUNDING LAND USE

Partnerships to Support Dense, Transit-Supportive Development

King County’s Strategic Plan establishes a goal of encouraging a growing and diverse economy and vibrant, thriving, and sustainable communities, in part through transit-oriented development (TOD). King County has completed or provided input on five major TODs within the County: Thornton Place at Northgate, Metropolitan Place in Renton, the Village at Overlake Station, downtown Redmond, and Burien.

In some cases, like Northgate, King County Metro owns property near major transit centers and can work directly with the municipality and developers to encourage TOD. Where Metro does not own the property near transit, the agency must work more closely with municipalities to encourage TOD. There is currently no department-wide policy for partnering with municipalities on TOD; Metro’s approach is on a project-by-project basis.

Affordability and Displacement Prevention

Metro will continue to prioritize service in low-income communities, but the agency does not have authority over decisions to encourage dense land uses and affordability measures. Though not related to land use and housing affordability, the ORCA LIFT low-income transit pass program provides 50 percent discounts on fares for people under 200 percent of the federal poverty level. This program is intended to reduce the financial burden of transit for low-income residents who may be at risk of displacement. At the direction of the King County Council, Metro is also working
with stakeholders to develop an income-based approach for fares, focusing on providing a further discounted product to individuals for whom ORCA LIFT remains too expensive.

In 2017, the Regional Affordable Housing Task Force brought together representatives from King County, City of Seattle, and other cities to develop a regional plan to address King County’s affordable housing crisis.

**Regional Affordable Housing Task Force**

*Five Year Action Plan*

Representatives from King County, City of Seattle, and Sound Cities Association worked together over 18 months to develop the Regional Affordable Housing Five Year Action Plan. The plan includes goals, strategies, and actions to ensure adequate housing supply countywide to meet the needs of low-income individuals and families who are cost burdened. The Action Plan includes the following goals:

- Create and support an ongoing structure for regional collaboration
- Increase construction and preservation of affordable homes for households earning less than 50 percent area median income
- Prioritize affordability accessible within a half mile walkshed of existing and planned frequent transit service, with a particular priority for high-capacity transit stations
- Preserve access to affordable homes for renters by supporting tenant protections to increase housing stability and reduce risk of homelessness
- Protect existing communities of color and low-income communities from displacement in gentrifying communities
- Promote greater housing growth and diversity to achieve a variety of housing types at a range of affordability and improve jobs/housing connections throughout King County
- Better engage local communities and other partners in addressing the urgent need for and benefits of affordable housing

**Access to Transit**

While Metro’s capital program is focused on improving shelters and investing in accessible bus stops and stations, investing in transit-supportive infrastructure is generally the responsibility of local municipalities. Well-resourced jurisdictions are typically better equipped to make these investments than smaller cities and unincorporated areas of the County. Jurisdictions with a larger tax base may be able to afford engineers and planners with the expertise required to plan, design, and implement transit-supportive investments. Metro does not currently have an agency-wide policy for engaging with local jurisdictions regularly and does so on a project-by-project basis.

Metro’s Mobility Division has an Access to Transit program that includes programs and projects to enhance access to the fixed-route transit network, including park-and-ride and parking management, mobility hubs, and innovative mobility services (covered in Theme 3 – Innovation).
Right-of-Way Management and Investment

Local municipalities manage most of the right-of-way in which King County Metro operates. There is no agency-wide policy for partnering with municipalities to incentivize transit-supportive right-of-way management and investment. Instead, right-of-way improvements are made on a project-by-project basis.

THEME 3 – INNOVATION

Transit and New Mobility Integration and Partnerships

King County Metro’s Innovative Mobility Program leverages emerging mobility services and new technologies to give people more transportation options through strategic research initiatives and service pilots. Metro is exploring approaches including shared mobility, mobility as a service, autonomous vehicles, and smart cities and infrastructure. Key partnerships with new mobility providers include Via to Transit, Ride2 On-Demand Shuttle Service, and the Car Share Parking Program evaluation.

Via to Transit is a pilot on-demand service that connects riders to and from five transit hubs in southeast Seattle and Tukwila. People who live, work, or go to school within the service areas can request a ride from Via to Transit to reach the Mount Baker, Columbia City, Othello, Rainier Beach, or Tukwila International Boulevard transit hubs, where they can access Link light rail or one of 14 bus routes.
Ride2 is a similar program currently being piloted in West Seattle and Eastgate (Bellevue). Residents, employees, and visitors can use an app to request a ride on a Ride2 shuttle vehicles to travel to or from transit hubs at the Alaska Junction or Seacrest Doc in West Seattle or the Eastgate Park-and-Ride in Bellevue.

Metro is also piloting a program to reserve parking spaces for carshare vehicles such as Car2Go at the Northgate Park & Ride with the goal of increasing the ways people can get to the busy transit hub.

Additionally, King County Metro’s Community Connections program is an outreach effort through which Metro works with local governments and community partners to develop innovative and cost-efficient transportation solutions in areas that lack the infrastructure, density, or land use to support fixed-route transit service. This program has resulted in the implementation of new types of services, such as Community Vans, which are Metro-owned vehicles that can be used for local group trips like shopping or attending a performance. This and other services build upon innovative ideas, unique partnerships, and emerging technology.

**Proactive Management and Coordination**

King County Metro has generally approached new mobility and innovation through service integration partnerships and pilot projects to test new programs and ideas. The agency has not developed specific policies for actively approaching new mobility initiatives. However, the Seattle Department of Transportation’s New Mobility Playbook establishes this type of policy, with active input from King County Metro as a member of the interagency project team. The playbook sets the city’s strategic direction and rules of engagement for public, private, and emerging mobility innovations. It also outlines policies and strategies to foster new mobility options while prioritizing safety, equity, affordability, and sustainability.

**Preparing for the Future of Mobility**

King County Metro, in partnership with the Seattle Department of Transportation, developed the Shared Mobility Technical Report, which summarizes the potential impacts of shared mobility services for the region and identifies policy considerations related to these impacts. The report defines shared mobility as any transportation mode where people pay for an individual trip or for the temporary use of a vehicle. This includes continuous use among multiple passengers (buses and trains) and shared use among individual people at distinct times (taxis, car share, and bike share).

The report assesses the potential impacts of shared mobility—including transit, vanpool, taxis, ridesharing, car sharing, bike sharing, microtransit, and private shuttles—on the transportation network and potential changes in travel behaviors in Seattle and the Puget Sound region. Impacts specifically related to transit include identifying low-ridership bus trips that may be replaced by new mobility options, determining where fixed-route transit service is the most cost effective, and identifying ways to seamlessly integrate fare payment for transit and other shared-mobility services.
THEME 4 – WORKFORCE

Recruitment, Training, Retention, and Inclusive Workplaces

King County Metro is working to become an employer of choice for all people and to hire the best qualified people, including those who have struggled with unemployment or underemployment. To do this, Metro is exploring partnerships with community colleges, secondary schools, training programs, labor unions, military bases, and jails.

King County’s “Investing in YOU” initiative includes explicit goals for creating a workplace that embraces talent and passion for public service, provides competitive pay and benefits, promotes racial diversity, cares about employee health and safety (both at and outside of work), and offers equitable development and advancement opportunities. The Investing in YOU program has five priority areas:

- **Learning and Growth**: Providing training and advancement opportunities to help employees plot a career path with the support and resources necessary to get them where their talent and passion lead them.
- **Health, Safety, and Wellbeing**: Providing comprehensive medical coverage and activities and programs to support health.
- **Racially Diverse and Culturally Responsive at All Levels**: Bringing an equity and social justice lens to everything the agency does so every person in the workplace has a fair shot at success and Metro can reflect the diversity of the people they serve at all levels of the organization.
- **Total Compensation**: Recognizing the value of employees through competitive pay and a unique package of flexible employee benefits.
- **Business Systems and Operations**: Continuously improving the connectivity of business processes, data, policies, and contracts to ensure a seamless personnel management experience.
Metro has recently advanced its Workforce Development efforts through leadership development programming; this includes creating an Aspiring Leaders Mentoring program and investing in apprenticeship programs.

**Parameters for Treatment of Workers**

King County has many workforce policies that ensure employees are treated fairly. For example, the Fair and Just Principle of the Equity and Social Justice Plan includes focus areas and support for the development of policies and actions that improve fairness and opportunity in County government organizational practices, including all employment practices such as hiring, training, retention, and promotion. The Equity and Social Justice Toolkit also recommends actions and practices that can be used to ensure that hiring processes are as fair, open, and inclusive as possible.

King County Metro employees are covered by the City of Seattle’s minimum wage ordinance, which is aimed at providing a living wage for all workers in Seattle. King County also requires contractors (and their subcontractors) awarded a contract valued $100,000 or more to comply with Seattle’s minimum wage standards.

**THEME 5 – ENGAGEMENT**

**Shared Decision Making and Co-Creation**

King County Metro has engaged in shared decision making with community and stakeholder-based working groups, such as Sounding Boards and Mobility Boards (e.g., the North Link Mobility Board), and through appointed groups of King County residents, such as the Transit Advisory Commission.

The Transit Advisory Commission works to improve transit services, planning, and programs by advising Metro’s staff members, general manager, the King County Executive, the King County Council, local jurisdictions, and subarea transportation boards about transit policy issues. Commission members include residents, business representatives, and other stakeholders concerned with transit service in the County. Most are bus riders and all live in King County and collectively reflect the County’s diversity. At least half of the commission members are people who have disabilities, older adults, or people who work with priority populations.

King County has also used an equity cabinet model, including the Open Space Equity Cabinet and the Metro Mobility Framework Equity Cabinet, composed of community leaders and community-based organization staff representing communities and riders countywide, including low- and no-income communities, black, indigenous, and people of color, immigrants and refugees, limited-English speaking people, and people with disabilities. These cabinets provide direction to King County and policy makers on embedding an equity-based approach into the County’s processes.

**Tools and Techniques**

Metro’s current approach to public engagement is a continuum that reflects the level of engagement required for the decision, whether it is regarding services, programs, or policies. This continuum includes:
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- **Inform** — Metro initiates an effort and coordinates internally and externally, using a variety of channels, to inform the community about its actions. This type of outreach is typically used for service changes, short-term service impacts, service alerts, and cancellations after or as decisions are made.

- **Consult** — Metro gathers information from the community to inform Metro-led interventions. This type of outreach is typically used for capital projects or instances where Metro must change its service because of another jurisdiction’s road construction. These projects are characterized by a small set of choices that might mitigate adverse impacts to riders or the community where most of the decisions have already been made.

- **Engage in Dialogue** — Metro engages community members to shape priorities and plans. This level of engagement is typically used for bus service restructures or realignments. Often these changes are initiated by a big investment in the community, such as Light Rail, where Metro is directed by policy to consider how it change its service to complement that investment.

- **Work Together** — Metro and the community share in decision-making to co-create solutions together. This level of engagement is typically used for larger development programs like long-range plans, Community Connections (in which Metro is often designing completely new services), and METRO CONNECTS.

- **Community Directs Action** — Community initiates and directs strategy and action with participation and technical assistance from Metro. This level of engagement is typically used for working groups or task forces, like Sounding Boards or the King County Transit Advisory Commission.

Additional information about Metro’s community engagement practices can be found in **Appendix D: Community Engagement**.
5 Next Steps

**POLICY UPDATES**

The Mobility Framework includes detailed Recommendations from the Equity Cabinet that will inform policy updates to further advance equity and sustainability and help Metro achieve an innovative, integrated, equitable, and sustainable mobility future. These updates will take place over the coming year and will be informed by additional best practices research and further analysis of Metro’s existing practices. Examples of potential policy updates include changes to Metro’s Service Guidelines to more clearly define “need” and prioritize equity; updates to the Strategic Plan to reflect the Mobility Framework’s Guiding Principles; and the identification of new strategies, such as new land use or pricing tools, to support reaching King County’s greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets.

The specific elements of the policy updates will be directed by the Regional Transit Committee and King County Council and shaped through ongoing engagement with the Equity Cabinet. Examples of research that may be needed to support this work are provided in the following section.

**ADDITIONAL RESEARCH**

As discussed above, the Metro staff topic area assessments included key questions to help center Metro’s practices, policies, and investments in equity and sustainability. The best practices research described in Chapter 3 of this appendix addressed some of the topic area key questions, but left others unanswered.

Moving forward, Metro will continue to work with the Equity Cabinet, stakeholders, and staff to address topic area key questions through updates to policies, partnership programs, and internal practices. Examples of these questions include the following:

- **Capital Program**: What are appropriate metrics to measure equity of Metro’s existing capital assets?
- **Services**: There is a point at which bus service can be negative for greenhouse gas emissions reductions. What is the breakpoint of ridership on fixed-route service that results in greenhouse gas emissions reduction (e.g., how many riders)?
- **Access to Transit**: What are the GHG trade-offs of concentrating transit access in low-density environments with a park-and-ride versus using the land for other purposes?
6 Resources and References

This chapter details resources and references where more information can be found on the best practice examples and case studies included in this appendix.

THEME 1 – INVESTMENTS

Measure M Transportation Funding Ordinance (Los Angeles, CA)
- \texttt{http://theplan.metro.net/}

Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) Late Night Bus Service (Boston, MA)
- \texttt{https://www.mbta.com/projects/early-morning-and-late-night-bus-service-pilots}

TriMet Service Guidelines (Portland, OR)
- \texttt{https://trimet.org/pdfs/tip/serviceguidelines.pdf}

Los Angeles Department of Transportation DASH Free Student Fares Pilot (Los Angeles, CA)
- \texttt{https://www.lamayor.org/mayor-garcetti-announces-program-provide-free-dash-bus-passes-students}

San Francisco Late Night Transportation Working Group (San Francisco, CA)
- \texttt{http://nightlifesf.org/getting-around-at-night/san-francisco-late-night-transportation-working-group/}

Utah Transit Authority Fare Policy (Salt Lake City, UT)
Orange County Transportation Authority Safe Transit Stops (Orange County, CA)
  • https://www.octa.net/Projects-and-Programs/Plans-and-Studies/Funding-Programs/Call-for-Projects/CTFP-Calls-for-Projects/Safe-Transit-Stops/

Metro Transit Equity Approach for Transit Shelters (Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN)

VIA Metropolitan Transit Next-Gen Bus Stop Improvement Program (San Antonio, TX)
  • https://www.viainfo.net/nextgen-shelters/

Oakland Department of Transportation Goal-Aligned Budgeting Process (Oakland, CA)
  • https://www.oaklandca.gov/resources/department-of-transportation-a-strategic-plan

Portland Bureau of Transportation - 2035 Transportation System Plan Evaluation Criteria (Portland, OR)
  • https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/article/658506

**THEME 2 – SURROUNDING LAND USE**

California Senate Bill 375 Sustainable Communities Strategy and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets (California)
  • http://www.ca-ilg.org/post/basics-sb-375

City and County of Honolulu Transit Oriented Development Special District Guidelines (Honolulu, HI)

New Orleans Regional Transportation Authority Strategic Mobility Plan (New Orleans, LA)
Transit Oriented Denver (Denver, CO)
  - [https://www.denvergov.org/content/denvergov/en/transit-oriented-development.html](https://www.denvergov.org/content/denvergov/en/transit-oriented-development.html)

Portland Metro Transit Oriented Development Program and Strategic Plan (Portland, OR)
  - [http://ctod.org/portal/Portland-Metros-TOD-Strategic-Plan](http://ctod.org/portal/Portland-Metros-TOD-Strategic-Plan)

San Diego Association of Governments Regional Transit Oriented Development Strategy (San Diego, CA)

LA Metro Transit-Oriented Communities (Los Angeles, CA)
  - [https://www.metro.net/projects/station-design-projects/](https://www.metro.net/projects/station-design-projects/)

Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Station Access Guidelines (San Francisco Bay Area, CA)
  - [https://www.bart.gov/about/planning/access](https://www.bart.gov/about/planning/access)

San Francisco’s Transit-First Policy (San Francisco, CA)
  - [https://www.sfmta.com/transit-first-policy](https://www.sfmta.com/transit-first-policy)

Sound Transit System Access Fund (Seattle, WA)
  - [https://www.soundtransit.org/system-expansion/creating-vibrant-stations/connecting-to-stations/system-access-fund](https://www.soundtransit.org/system-expansion/creating-vibrant-stations/connecting-to-stations/system-access-fund)

THEME 3 – INNOVATION

Pinellas Suncoast Transit Authority - Transit Dependent Late Shift (Pinellas County, FL)
  - [https://www.psta.net/programs/td-transportation-disadvantaged/](https://www.psta.net/programs/td-transportation-disadvantaged/)

Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority On-Demand Paratransit Pilot Project (Boston, MA)
  - [https://www.mbta.com/accessibility/the-ride/on-demand-pilot](https://www.mbta.com/accessibility/the-ride/on-demand-pilot)
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Capital Metro’s Pickup Service (Austin, TX)
- [https://capmetro.org/metrolink/](https://capmetro.org/metrolink/)

Go Lorain Bike Share Library Parks Partnership (Lorain, OH)

LA Metro Office of Extraordinary Innovation (Los Angeles, CA)
- [https://www.metro.net/projects/oei/](https://www.metro.net/projects/oei/)

TriMet New Mobility Strategy Assessment (Portland, OR)
- [https://www.bendoregon.gov/home/showdocument?id=40579](https://www.bendoregon.gov/home/showdocument?id=40579)
- [https://trimet.org/mod/](https://trimet.org/mod/)

Transit and Bike Share Integration Pilot (Pittsburgh, PA)
- [https://healthyridepgh.com/connectcard/](https://healthyridepgh.com/connectcard/)

Mobility as a Service: Whim Mobile Application (Helsinki, Finland)

Urban Mobility Collider (Miami-Dade County, FL)
- [https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B-u0ZNzhdVjudGZQb09uTDhYdVk/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B-u0ZNzhdVjudGZQb09uTDhYdVk/view)
- [https://cloudblogs.microsoft.com/industry-blog/government/2016/12/13/microsoft-helping-miami-dade-county-achieve-mobility/](https://cloudblogs.microsoft.com/industry-blog/government/2016/12/13/microsoft-helping-miami-dade-county-achieve-mobility/)

Emerging Mobility Evaluation (San Francisco, CA)
Seattle Department of Transportation New Mobility Playbook (Seattle, WA)

TriMet Mobility Hub Geofencing (Portland, OR)
  - https://www.bendoregon.gov/home/showdocument?id=40579

Los Angeles Department of Transportation Technology Action Plan (Los Angeles, CA)

Austin Smart Mobility Roadmap (Austin, TX)

Autonomous Vehicles and the Future of Transit (Nelson\Nygaard and Perkins&Will)

**THEME 4 – WORKFORCE**

Denver Regional Transportation District Workforce Investment Now Program (Denver, CO)
  - https://work-now.org/
Los Angeles Vision Zero: Dignity-Infused Community Engagement Strategy (Los Angeles, CA)

- http://visionzero.lacity.org/tag/dr-destiny-thomas/
- https://vimeo.com/33889154

State of Vermont Agency of Transportation Youth Programs (Vermont)

- https://vtrans.vermont.gov/civil-rights/education/youth-programs

LA Metro Transportation School (Los Angeles, CA)


Toronto Regional Immigrant Employment Council Mentorship Program (Toronto, Canada)

- http://www.mentoringpartnership.ca/about-us/

Generation USA - Retail Career Advancement Program

- https://www.generation.org/usa-retail-career/

Duwamish Valley Youth Corps (Seattle, WA)


Washington Hospitality Association Education Foundation's Incumbent Worker Training Program (Washington)


WTS (Advancing Women in Transportation) Transportation YOU

- https://www.wtsinternational.org/wts-foundation/transportation-you/
LinkedIn Diversity & Inclusion Strategy (Sunnyvale, CA)
- https://blog.linkedin.com/2016/10/10/creating-a-culture-where-everyone-feels-they-belong-linkedin-diversity
- https://blog.linkedin.com/2016/10/10/creating-a-culture-where-everyone-feels-they-belong-linkedin-diversity

New Orleans Regional Transportation Authority Strategic Mobility Plan (New Orleans, LA)

City of Seattle $15 Minimum Wage (Seattle, WA)

**THEME 5 – ENGAGEMENT**

LA Metro Equity Platform (Los Angeles, CA)
- https://boardagendas.metro.net/board-report/2017-0912/
- https://investinginplace.org/2019/03/13/how-we-rise/
Mobility Equity Framework (Greenlining Institute)

Metro Transit Transit Assistance Program (Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN)
- https://www.metrotransit.org/tap-riders

Community Engagement Toolkit (Public Health Seattle-King County, Futurewise, OneAmerica, El Centro De La Raza)
- http://www.futurewise.org/assets/reports/CET.pdf

Equity-Centered Community Design Field Guide (Creative Reaction Lab)
- http://www.creativereactionlab.com/eccd-field-guide
- https://static1.squarespace.com/static/55737465e4b048703924b9b5/t/5a9eeca053450a4352677984/1520348865673/ECCD+FIELD+GUIDE+FINAL+-+2018+DOWNLOAD.pdf
- https://indd.adobe.com/view/b1351bd8-5d75-4dfa-8f7c-cbff9a4c1eae
- https://www.mobilityforallbyall.com/team

Seattle Transportation Equity Program (Seattle, WA)
- https://www.seattle.gov/neighborhoods/community-liaisons
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Social Impacts Partnerships (San Francisco, CA)

Metro Transit/Porchlight (Community Based Organization) Partnership (Madison, WI)
  ▪ http://legistar.cityofmadison.com/attachments/5749.doc

Southeast Pennsylvania Public Transportation Authority/Project HOME (Community Based Organization) Partnership (Philadelphia, PA)

Mobility ATX Online Voting Tool (Austin, TX)
  ▪ https://mobilityatx.com/
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1 Introduction

The information presented in this appendix was developed to support the Equity Cabinet’s review and confirmation of the Mobility Framework Recommendations. It is a high-level analysis that focuses on the equity and sustainability benefits of select Recommendations. The analysis helps to identify areas where the Recommendations—and subsequent policy updates—have the potential to improve mobility for all King County residents, with a focus on priority populations:

- Limited-English speakers
- Immigrants and refugees
- People with disabilities
- Low- and no-income households
- Black, indigenous, and people of color

The analysis also points to areas where Recommendations could be further strengthened or implemented to have a greater benefit.

The consultant team developed a quantitative approach to evaluating select Recommendations, with a goal of understanding the relative benefit to job accessibility for priority populations and overall transit ridership provided by each recommendation. The quantitative analysis focuses on Recommendations within the investment, land use, and innovation themes.

To support the quantitative analysis, the team used a qualitative analysis based on the best practices framework presented in Appendix B to consider the potential impact of Recommendations that are not yet specific enough for quantitative analysis. The qualitative analysis is used across all five themes and indicates the potential benefits of Recommendations that incorporate national and international best practices.

This analysis is necessarily conceptual and limited in scope based on available data and the level of specificity included in the Recommendations. More detailed modeling and scenario analysis of the final Mobility Framework Recommendations will be conducted in late 2019 and early 2020 as part of updates to Metro’s policy documents described in the Mobility Framework.
2 Methodology and Assumptions

This chapter describes the methodology and assumptions used in the quantitative analysis of the proposed Recommendations for the Mobility Framework.

The consultant team reviewed the proposed Recommendations and determined which could be tested through quantitative analysis. Chapter 3 details the quantitative analysis of the subset of Recommendations while Chapter 4 details the qualitative analysis of all categories of Recommendations.

Two key metrics were used to compare Recommendations: impacts to job accessibility for priority populations and increases in overall ridership (to represent a decrease in greenhouse gas emissions). Job accessibility measures the number of jobs reachable from any given point on transit within 60 minutes, including average wait times, walk times, in-vehicle travel times, and transfer times. Priority populations include the following five population groups:

- Limited-English speakers
- Immigrants and refugees
- People with disabilities
- Low- and no-income households
- Black, indigenous, and people of color

Recommendations that could be tested through quantitative analysis were those focused on changes to the route characteristics or service within priority population areas. For purposes of this analysis alone, “priority routes” were identified by selecting those routes that had the highest proportion of priority populations within their service areas. Routes that ranked in the top 40th percentile of all routes (approximately 60 routes) were deemed “priority routes” to support the analysis of Mobility Framework Recommendations. The priority routes are shown in Figure 1 and are listed in Figure 2.

The project team used a relatively similar investment level (in annual operating or annualized capital expense) across Recommendations to ensure a consistent comparison of each Recommendation’s benefits. Aligned with the Recommendation themes, the team tested four types of investments: frequency increases, speed and reliability improvements, first-last mile services, and facility improvements (both non-motorized and station areas).

---

1 The term non-motorized is traditionally meant to represent all non-vehicle access modes, including walk, bike, e-bike, scooters, wheelchairs, motorized assistive devices, and other forms of transportation that are not a personal vehicle.
FREQUENCY INVESTMENTS

Frequency investments are Recommendations to direct funding toward additional transit service on priority routes to address unmet needs. For the purpose of this analysis, the investment level was determined by estimating the service hours needed to double the midday\(^2\) frequency for all priority routes. This investment level is roughly equivalent to 200,000 annual service hours, which would cost approximately $30 million per year based on the average operating cost of $161 per hour used in METRO CONNECTS.

The change in job accessibility was calculated by conducting the job accessibility analysis with the headways of the priority routes reduced in half—equivalent to doubling the frequency—to determine the relative change in midday and evening job accessibility for priority populations compared to current service. The change in daily ridership was calculated by applying the existing off-peak period riders per hour\(^3\) for each priority route and estimating the additional riders based on the per-route service hour investment.

SPEED AND RELIABILITY INVESTMENTS

Investments to speed and reliability help riders arrive at their destination in less time and on schedule. Using cost estimates from METRO CONNECTS for speed and reliability investments,\(^4\) the project team determined that an annual investment of $30 million\(^5\) over 15 years would equate to speed improvements of roughly 5 percent to 10 percent if the investments were applied to all priority routes.

The change in accessibility was calculated by running the job accessibility analysis with the speed and reliability improvements applied to the priority routes. And the change in ridership was calculated by applying an elasticity\(^6\) of 3.5 percent additional riders for every 10 percent increase in speed for the priority routes.

FIRST-LAST MILE INVESTMENTS

Investments in services to provide better first-last mile connections can help improve access to high frequency transit. These investments are typically not fixed-route transit services and can provide an innovative way to improve coverage of the transit system. For the purposes of the Recommendations analysis, implementation of first-last mile services was assumed at 10 transit hubs.\(^7\) The transit hubs selected for

---

\(^2\) The accessibility analysis model measures average job accessibility using transit frequencies during the 11AM-1PM period. However, for purposes of cost estimation, midday frequencies were assumed to be improved throughout the midday time period (10AM-3PM).

\(^3\) Factored down by 20 percent to account for the fact that the additional hours likely are not as productive as current hours.

\(^4\) The average cost per mile was approximately $800,000 per mile for a 5 percent to 10 percent speed increase based on the investments described (e.g., queue jumps, transit signal priority).

\(^5\) The $30 million annual investment is a comparable amount used for the midday frequency improvement Recommendation.


\(^7\) Ten hubs were determined based on an assumed cost of $15 per rider and the relative service available using an equivalent investment to match other Recommendations’ investment levels.
analysis are those with the highest relative proportion of priority populations within a one-mile radius. These include:

- Angle Lake Light Rail Station
- Renton Transit Center
- Auburn Station
- Federal Way Transit Center
- Starlake Park & Ride
- Tukwila International Boulevard Station
- Kent Transit Center
- Highline Community Center
- Green River College
- State Route 515 and Carr Road

The change in accessibility was calculated by updating the transportation network within the accessibility model to include drive-access links to the transit hubs. An assumed average 7.5-minute wait time was included in drive-access network links. The change in ridership was calculated by determining the ridership potential with an annual investment of $30 million and a cost of $15 per rider using cost estimates from current Metro pilot projects.

**FACILITY INVESTMENTS**

Investments to facilities, such as non-motorized access to transit and station-area amenities like improved shelters and real-time signage, can both improve the customer experience and increase ridership. Using cost estimates from Metro’s 2013 Non-Motorized Connectivity Study, the project team determined an average cost of $35 per new rider based on a sample of non-motorized investments from the study. A change in accessibility could not be quantitatively established; however, the relative change in ridership was calculated by applying the average cost per rider to an assumed annual investment of $30 million.

Research on the ridership impact of station-area amenities is less robust than research on non-motorized investments. However, the Transportation Research Board provides relative elasticities for certain station-area investments typically found in Bus Rapid Transit projects.

---

8 The $30 million investment is a comparable amount used for the midday frequency improvement Recommendation.

9 VIA and Ride2 costs have ranged from $10 to more than $50 per rider. This analysis assumes a slightly conservative amount.

3 Quantitative Results

This section details the results of the quantitative analysis described in Chapter 2. A summary of the Recommendations analysis results is provided in the table below (Figure 3) and in the figures referenced in the table.

Recommendations that provide additional transit service through doubling transit frequency have the highest relative benefit to job accessibility for priority populations, with an increase of 20 percent to 30 percent in the number of jobs accessible during the respective time periods. Figure 4 shows the change in AM (6-9 AM) peak period job accessibility with frequency doubled on priority routes, while Figure 5 and Figure 6 display the change in midday (11 AM-1 PM) and evening (7-9 PM) accessibility, respectively. Accessibility generally improves the most in South King County and portions of East King County, with higher percent improvements in areas outside of the regional transit lines (Sounder, Link), such as Southeast King County.

Increasing density, zoning for mixed uses, and constructing affordable housing in urban areas near transit have the strongest sustainability outcomes, generating a 7 percent increase in daily ridership.

While speed and reliability investments for this conceptual analysis show a relatively lower benefit to equity and sustainability outcomes based on an assumed improvement in average speeds, this does not mean that these investments have little effect. The Recommendations were tested by distributing speed and reliability investments across all the priority routes. Many of these routes travel along roadways that do not have substantial congestion; therefore, the investment of funds across many routes decreases the impact of that investment.

Additionally, speed and reliability investments impact not just average travel times, but the reliability of those travel times. Reliability can have a substantial effect on customer experience and the ability for travelers to use transit for trips that are time-sensitive, such as work schedules, childcare, and other appointments. A subsequent and more detailed analysis could target speed and reliability investments on a smaller subset of routes to more accurately measure the true ridership and accessibility impacts. Figure 7 shows the AM peak period job accessibility with transit speed and reliability investments, with overall lower relative change compared to the frequency improvements. However, areas within South King County see a more concentrated benefit.

First-last mile solutions, while not as impactful as frequency improvements, can increase access and coverage of the system where traditional fixed-route service may not be practical. Figure 8 shows the AM peak period job accessibility with the evaluated first-last mile investments at the 10 transit hubs listed in Chapter 2. As expected, the largest benefit is focused around those areas, with benefits less pronounced countywide compared to benefits associated with frequency improvements.
Similarly, there are additional benefits beyond job accessibility and ridership that other investments, such as non-motorized access and passenger amenities, can provide, including improved safety, customer experience, and reliability. For example, providing a safe street to walk to the bus stop and a safe, well-lit shelter to wait for the bus may not have a direct impact on ridership but does improve overall perception of safety and how riders experience the transit system.

This high-level, conceptual analysis provides an initial perspective on the relative benefits to job accessibility for priority populations and overall system ridership and mobility to support the review of Recommendations. A more detailed analysis would highlight additional benefits and more accurately depict the relative change in the outcomes.
## Figure 3  Recommendations Analysis Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Tested</th>
<th>Description of Recommendation Tested</th>
<th>Equity Outcomes</th>
<th>Sustainability Outcomes</th>
<th>Figure #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide Additional Transit Service in Areas with Unmet Needs</td>
<td>Double Midday and/or Evening Transit Frequency</td>
<td>Increase the frequency for all priority routes* during the midday and evening periods to improve connections during off-peak hours. This would decrease the average time a rider needs to wait for the bus.</td>
<td>20 to 25% increase in job accessibility</td>
<td>2 to 3% increase in daily ridership</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Improvements to Increase Speed and Reliability</td>
<td>Transit Speed and Reliability Investments</td>
<td>Increase the average speed for all priority routes* by a rate of 5-10 percent. This speed increase is based on an estimate of what improvements could be constructed using an investment similar to other Recommendations.</td>
<td>Up to 5% increase in job accessibility</td>
<td>&lt;1% increase in daily ridership</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Metro’s Adopted Policies to Assert the Role of Innovation, Address New Mobility Services, and Support Innovative, Integrated, Equitable, Sustainable Mobility</td>
<td>First-Last Mile On-Demand Connections Throughout the Day</td>
<td>Implement a first-last mile pilot, expanding on the current Via pilot by providing on-demand connections to ten priority transit centers that are located within areas with high priority populations and relatively poor bus access to the transit center.</td>
<td>3-5% increase in job accessibility</td>
<td>1 to 2% increase in daily ridership</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet King County’s Climate Goals by Reducing Car Use</td>
<td>Double Peak Period Transit Frequency</td>
<td>Increase the frequency for all priority routes during the AM and PM peak periods to improve connections during peak hours. This would decrease the average time a rider needs to wait for the bus.</td>
<td>30% increase in job accessibility</td>
<td>3 to 5% increase in daily ridership</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Dense, Mixed Use Zoning and Affordable Housing in Urban Areas Near Transit</td>
<td>Transit-Focused Land Use Scenario</td>
<td>Analysis is based on draft results from the PSRC 2050 Vision DEIS. Assumes an increase in density and land use growth particularly in areas well-served by high frequency transit</td>
<td>Up to 10% increase in job accessibility</td>
<td>7% increase in daily ridership</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop People-Friendly Street Design near Transit</td>
<td>Increased Non-Motorized Access to Transit Investments within Priority Population Areas</td>
<td>Construct non-motorized access to transit projects using an investment amount similar to other recommendations</td>
<td>Not analyzed</td>
<td>&lt; 1% increase in daily ridership</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Investments to Increase Safety</td>
<td>Increased Investments in Stop-based Amenities within Priority Population Areas</td>
<td>Increase the amount of real-time signage and shelters available at stops. Assumes an investment in amenities at a cost similar to other recommendations.</td>
<td>Not analyzed</td>
<td>&lt; 1% increase in daily ridership</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4  Change in AM (6 AM-9 AM) Job Accessibility with Doubled Morning Frequencies on Priority Routes
Figure 5  Change in Midday (11 AM-1 PM) Job Accessibility with Doubled Midday Frequencies on Priority Routes
Figure 6  Change in Evening (7-9 PM) Job Accessibility with Doubled Evening Frequencies on Priority Routes
Figure 7  Change in AM (6-9 AM) Job Accessibility with Speed and Reliability Improvements on Priority Routes
Figure 8  Change in AM (6-9 AM) Job Accessibility with First-Last Mile Investments at Priority Transit Hubs
4 Qualitative Assessment

Many of the Mobility Framework Recommendations are necessarily general and do not yet have the level of detail necessary for a quantitative analysis. In many cases, the Recommendations are not attached to a specific geography or timeline, which makes quantitative analysis more challenging.

However, it is possible to provide an initial assessment of the potential equity and sustainability/climate outcomes of each category of Recommendations using a qualitative approach. The project team followed the impact analysis method from the best practices work presented in Appendix B and shown in Figure 9 to consider Recommendations that relate to the national and international best practices reviewed through the Mobility Framework and other leading industry practices. This approach reflects the potential for the Recommendations to impact the overall mobility system, particularly related to reducing emissions and vehicle trips, as well the potential to improve equity outcomes for King County’s priority populations.

Figure 9  Qualitative Assessment Approach

**INVESTMENTS**

The categories of Recommendations in the investments theme are anticipated to have meaningful impacts on equity and sustainability, as shown in Figure 10. By providing additional service in areas of greatest need, Metro could increase people’s access to jobs, education, and services and reduce the need to use a car to reach those destinations. Improving safety at transit stops and stations could encourage more people to ride...
transit and improve the experience for all customers, providing moderate benefits in both categories. And investments in speed and reliability improvements would provide priority populations (and all County residents) with better access to the destinations they need to reach, improving equitable outcomes and encouraging people to travel by transit instead of driving alone.

Table 10  Qualitative Assessment of Investment Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Equity Outcomes</th>
<th>Sustainability Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide Additional Transit Service in Areas with Unmet Needs</td>
<td>✅✅✅ Meaningful</td>
<td>✅✅✅ Meaningful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Improvements to Increase Safety</td>
<td>✅✅ Moderate</td>
<td>✅✅ Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Improvements to Increase Speed and Reliability</td>
<td>✅✅✅ Meaningful</td>
<td>✅✅✅ Meaningful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SURROUNDING LAND USE

If fully implemented—which would require significant partnerships—the Recommendations in the surrounding land use theme would have the most meaningful impact on sustainability and climate outcomes, including the potential for significant reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. These Recommendations, shown in Figure 11, are critical to King County’s ability to meet its aggressive climate action goals.

Because the impacts of climate change are felt most significantly by communities of color and low-income populations, Recommendations that could have meaningful sustainability outcomes would also have meaningful equity outcomes. Additionally, the opportunity to live in a walkable transit-oriented community—with access to parks and open space as well as frequent transit service—could improve people’s quality of life. Transit-oriented communities also increase connections to jobs and services, which would benefit priority populations as well as all King County residents.
### Figure 11 Qualitative Assessment of Surrounding Land Use Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Equity Outcomes</th>
<th>Sustainability Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase Dense, Mixed-Use Zoning and Affordable Housing in Urban Areas Near Transit</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="✓✓✓ Meaningful" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="✓✓✓ Meaningful" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Station Area and Right-of-Way Guidelines to Support Access to Transit</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="✓✓✓ Meaningful" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="✓✓✓ Meaningful" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop People-Friendly Street Design Near Transit</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="✓✓ Moderate" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="✓✓ Moderate" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet King County’s Climate Goals by Reducing Car Use</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="✓✓✓ Meaningful" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="✓✓✓ Meaningful" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The development of people-friendly street design would have moderate equity outcomes depending on the jurisdictions and areas of the County in which they are implemented. In more suburban or unincorporated areas of King County where pedestrian infrastructure is incomplete or missing, such as SeaTac, Skyway, or White Center, making investments in sidewalks and safe crossings could have a significant positive benefit to priority populations. In other areas of the County where the pedestrian network is more complete, such as downtown Renton, benefits might be less significant but still increase connectivity and access to transit.

### INNOVATIONS

Revising Metro’s policies to focus on equity and sustainability in innovations—including asserting the role of innovation, addressing new mobility services, and supporting innovative, integrated, equitable, sustainable mobility—presents an important opportunity for Metro to use pilots and advance mobility options in ways that truly center equity and sustainability and have meaningful outcomes. For example, pilot programs such as Via to Transit are focused on transit hubs that serve priority populations, which is one approach to centering equity in the design of pilot programs. Enhancing communications about innovations would also have a meaningful impact in both categories of outcomes, as shown in Figure 12.

Similarly, guidelines to shape partnerships between Metro and private providers—such as those developed in San Francisco—could support meaningful equity outcomes and provide opportunities for more sustainable mobility innovations. Metro’s support for jurisdictional partnerships may have more moderate equity and sustainability outcomes, as the implementation would likely vary by jurisdiction. For example, some jurisdictions may have specific geographic areas of focus for partnerships based on land uses and development patterns; these areas may not overlap with areas with high concentrations of priority populations.
Figure 12  Qualitative Assessment of Innovations Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Equity Outcomes</th>
<th>Sustainability Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change Metro’s Adopted Policies to Assert the Role of Innovation, Address New Mobility Services, and Support Innovative, Integrated, Equitable, Sustainable Mobility</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ Meaningful</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ Meaningful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop New Mobility Guidelines for How Metro Partners with Private Providers</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ Meaningful</td>
<td>✔️ Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Communications and Engagement to Raise Awareness About Innovations</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ ✔️ Meaningful</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ Meaningful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convene and Support Jurisdictions in Developing Partnerships on Innovation</td>
<td>✔️ ✔️ Moderate</td>
<td>✔️ Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WORKFORCE

Many of the Recommendations in the workforce theme have the potential for meaningful equity outcomes as shown in Figure 13, including establishing opportunities for wealth creation among priority populations. By strengthening Metro’s approach to hiring and training new generations of workers—including creating pathways to growth for current employees—Recommendations that incorporate mobility innovations and youth training can support meaningful equity outcomes in the community by increasing the number of people eligible to fill these positions.

While the sustainability outcomes within the workforce theme are expected to be low to moderate, the level of impact would certainly depend on the types of training and development programs that were provided. For example, a transportation “school” that also focuses on sustainability could change the way young people approach jobs in mobility, with new employees who help to enhance Metro’s focus on services and programs that reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
### Qualitative Assessment of Workforce Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Equity Outcomes</th>
<th>Sustainability Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategically Partner with the Labor Community to Build New “Communities of</td>
<td>![Meaningful]</td>
<td>![Meaningful]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridership” While Simultaneously Benefitting Metro’s Workforce, Priority</td>
<td>![Meaningful]</td>
<td>![Meaningful]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populations, and the Environment</td>
<td>![Meaningful]</td>
<td>![Meaningful]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize Future Transportation Innovations to Target New Riders as Potential</td>
<td>![Meaningful]</td>
<td>![Low]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Employees</td>
<td>![Meaningful]</td>
<td>![Low]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Strategic and Culturally Specific Communication Methods to Build</td>
<td>![Meaningful]</td>
<td>![Moderate]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Community Relationships</td>
<td>![Meaningful]</td>
<td>![Moderate]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build Infrastructure to Provide Pathways to Mobility-Related Employment</td>
<td>![Moderate]</td>
<td>![Meaningful]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize Strategic Workforce Planning to Meet Current and Future Workforce</td>
<td>![Limited]</td>
<td>![Low]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs</td>
<td>![Limited]</td>
<td>![Low]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposefully Foster a Sustainable Learning Culture within the Metro</td>
<td>![Moderate]</td>
<td>![Low]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>![Moderate]</td>
<td>![Low]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require the Centering of Equity in All Metro Contracts and Subcontracts</td>
<td>![Meaningful]</td>
<td>![Low]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ENGAGEMENT

With a focus on centering equity in Metro’s community engagement practices, the Recommendations in the engagement theme would have moderate to meaningful equity outcomes (see Figure 14). Using co-creation approaches to develop Metro’s programs, policies, and practices—such as working with the Mobility Framework Equity Cabinet—provides an opportunity to reshape outreach and engagement with equity (and sustainability) at the forefront.

Outreach practices that strengthen communication efforts about Metro’s services and build lasting relationships in communities are anticipated to have the most meaningful sustainability outcomes. These Recommendations provide opportunities build awareness and get more people riding transit, which could help to reduce climate impacts.
## Figure 14 Qualitative Assessment of Engagement Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Equity Outcomes</th>
<th>Sustainability Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen Communication Efforts about Metro’s Services</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Meaningful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build Lasting Relationships in Communities</td>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>Meaningful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a Coordinated, Cross-Departmental Approach to Engagement</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an Equity-Centered Engagement Framework</td>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a Community Liaison Program</td>
<td>Meaningful</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify Metrics to Measure Success and Continually Improve</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 Conclusion and Next Steps

The high-level analysis of select Recommendations presented in this appendix was developed to support the Equity Cabinet’s work to finalize their draft Recommendations. The quantitative and qualitative analyses help to explain the relative impact of select Recommendations related to equity and sustainability. As previously discussed, because the focus of the quantitative analysis only identified the relative impact to a limited set of evaluation metrics (job accessibility and ridership) discussions on the merits of the different Recommendations must also consider other potential benefits (e.g., safety, customer experience).

When the Recommendations are finalized and the Mobility Framework is adopted, Metro will begin working with the Equity Cabinet to develop updates to several of the department’s guiding policies and plans. Through this work, the Recommendations will gain specificity, which will present additional opportunities for analysis. The focus on equity and sustainability outcomes will continue through this work, and scenarios may be developed to test various approaches.
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# 1 Introduction

King County Metro (Metro) is developing a Mobility Framework to help the agency adapt to a changing transportation system in an equitable and environmentally sustainable way. Orienting Metro’s work towards equity and environmental sustainability requires guidance from community members and leaders who understand these issues first-hand.

In response to Motion 15253, Metro and the Nelson\Nygaard consultant team worked to implement a four-part approach for soliciting guidance and feedback from members of the public. Triangle Associates facilitated the community engagement work with guidance and support from the Environmental Coalition of South Seattle (ECOSS), Diverse City, the Greenlining Institute, and Nelson\Nygaard. Below is a summary of the community engagement approach for the Mobility Framework (see Chapter 2 for more details from the Metro Mobility Framework Engagement Plan).

## FOUR-PART COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT APPROACH

1. **Convene and partner with a group of community leaders (known as the Equity Cabinet)** to authentically embed an equity- and sustainability-based approach into how Metro provides mobility services. See Chapter 2 for more details on the Equity Cabinet.

2. **Solicit input from community-based organizations (CBOs), community members and other stakeholders** to inform the Equity Cabinet’s work and the Mobility Framework Recommendations. Metro, ECOSS, and Triangle Associates conducted multilingual engagement via tabling at festivals, engagement booths at transit centers, presentations at classes, interviews with CBOs, stakeholder briefings, and an online survey. See Chapter 3 for details regarding the outcomes of these engagement activities.
3. **Assess Metro’s existing community engagement practices** to understand how the department might better meet its equity goals. Triangle Associates and Diverse City conducted an assessment with Metro’s internal leadership and external community partners to better comprehend the efficacy and equity of the agency’s current community engagement practices. The consultants synthesized the outcomes of these interviews to recommend ways that Metro might better incorporate community-led engagement into its work. See Chapter 4 for more details on the community engagement assessment.

4. **Explore best practices in community engagement from around the country** to understand how others approach engagement. Triangle Associates examined the engagement practices of other public agencies, which are summarized in Appendix B: Best Practices.

The community engagement work connected with several hundred community members, leaders, and stakeholders. These results helped the Equity Cabinet and Metro develop the Mobility Framework and will continue to guide Metro as it implements the Mobility Framework recommendations through updates to its plans, policies, budgets, and programs/projects.

This appendix details the full engagement approach used to develop the Mobility Framework. Section B4 of King County Council Motion 15253 requires that the Framework should include information on: “Outreach and engagement with regional partners, transit riders and local communities, including but not limited to low-income populations, communities of color, immigrants and refugees, and limited English-speaking populations.” Consistent with direction in Motion 15253 and the King County Strategic Plan for Equity and Social Justice, Metro prioritized engaging low- and no-income populations, black, indigenous, and people of color, immigrants and refugees, limited English-speaking populations, and people with disabilities. The chapters below describe how Metro conducted these activities with a focus on the populations and groups listed in the motion, as well as the results of the engagement.
2 Mobility Framework Engagement Plan and Activities

Metro developed a Mobility Framework Engagement Plan to guide public engagement associated with this project. Below is an overview of the Engagement Plan; Chapter 3 provides details about how the plan was implemented and the outcomes of this work.

GOALS

The Engagement Plan laid out the following goals:

- **Define Guiding Principles** for equitable and sustainable mobility in King County led by the Equity Cabinet that represents communities and riders countywide, including “priority populations” across King County, defined as people with low- or no-income, black, indigenous, and people of color, limited-English speaking people, immigrants and refugees, and people with disabilities. The Equity Cabinet also included individuals with identities outside these priority populations.

- **Develop Recommendations** for Metro and partners that align with those principles and give direction for future policy updates.

- **Build new relationships and improve existing relationships** with communities that have been traditionally underrepresented in County decision-making.

- **Engage stakeholders, partners, transit riders, Metro employees, and the general public** to inform them about the Mobility Framework process, and to gather feedback to provide to the Equity Cabinet for consideration as they co-create the Mobility Framework with Metro.

EQUITY CABINET

The Engagement Plan described how Metro would co-create the Mobility Framework with an Equity Cabinet to practice equitable decision-making and how to authentically embed an equity- and sustainability-based approach into how Metro provides mobility services.

The Equity Cabinet was originally convened to advise the King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks in 2018, and many of the same members returned to
participate in the Equity Cabinet to advise Metro. The Equity Cabinet that advised Metro is comprised of 22 community leaders who represent riders and communities countywide, including people with low- or no-income, black, indigenous, and people of color, limited-English speaking people, immigrants and refugees, and people with disabilities.

The Equity Cabinet met approximately twice per month from May to September 2019, and Cabinet members received compensation for their time. Metro invited the Equity Cabinet to continue engaging with Metro throughout the policy update process (into 2020).

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

The Engagement Plan provided an overview of a two-phase approach for conducting community outreach. Phase 1 focused on informing the Guiding Principles and Phase 2 focused on informing the Recommendations. See Chapter 3 for how the Engagement Plan was implemented and the resulting outcomes.

Phase 1 Engagement: Guiding Principles (May to July 2019)

Metro worked closely with the Equity Cabinet and held stakeholder briefings to refine and finalize the following Guiding Principles that serve as the foundation for the Mobility Framework:

- Invest where needs are greatest
- Address the climate crisis and environmental justice
- Innovate equitably and sustainably
- Ensure safety
- Encourage dense, affordable housing in urban areas near transit
- Improve access to mobility
- Provide fast, reliable, integrated mobility services
- Support Metro’s workforce
- Align Metro’s investments with equity, sustainability, and financial responsibility
- Engage deliberately and transparently

To inform the development of these Guiding Principles, Metro held briefings and conducted workshops with established nonprofit organizations, educational institutions, as well as governmental committees, commissions, and boards. See Chapter 3 for the detailed list of entities that Metro engaged.

Phase 2 Engagement: Recommendations (July to August 2019)

During Phase 2 Engagement, Metro and the Equity Cabinet wanted to inform Recommendations related to the following themes:
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- **Investments**: Financial support for transit service, new mobility, fares, and capital projects
- **Surrounding land use**: Support for dense, mixed-use neighborhoods near transit, affordable housing, and better access to transit
- **Innovation**: Approaches to developing a regional, integrated network (new technology and services) and the role of/with private providers
- **Workforce**: Metro’s role with both its own employees and contractor employees and its influence on treatment of private providers’ workforces
- **Community engagement**: Policies that guide how Metro engages with the community regarding mobility investments

Metro prioritized engagement with the following populations:
- Black, indigenous, and people of color
- Low- and no-income populations
- Immigrants and refugees
- Limited-English speaking populations
- People with disabilities

In addition, Metro wanted to hear from other key stakeholders and regional partners:
- Transit riders
- General public
- Metro employees
- Jurisdictional and other regional partners

Chapter 3 provides information on the methods that Metro, Triangle, and ECOSS used to reach these populations.

**INCORPORATING COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT FINDINGS**

The *Engagement Plan* explained how Metro intended to incorporate community engagement outcomes into its work. Specifically, community engagement was designed to help the Equity Cabinet develop the Mobility Framework’s Guiding Principles and Recommendations, which in turn shaped the Mobility Framework Report, and in turn will influence subsequent policy updates (see Figure 1).

Metro, Triangle Associates, and ECOSS implemented the majority of the Community Engagement Plan. See Chapter 3 for detailed information about the findings of community engagement.
3 Community Engagement Methods and Findings

ENGAGEMENT POPULATIONS

Triangle Associates and ECOSS worked with Metro to design and implement a multifaceted engagement strategy for south King County, where a higher percentage of priority populations (people with low- or no-income, black, indigenous, and people of color, limited-English speaking people, immigrants and refugees, and people with disabilities) live relative to the County as a whole. Figure 2 on the following page summarizes the engagement techniques used to reach priority populations in south King County, as well as other key demographics.
The Equity Cabinet recommended that Metro deliberately engage the LGBTQIA+ community and youth as part of the community engagement strategy. ECOSS engaged youth as part of the Back to School Resource Fair in SeaTac. Metro will work with the consultant team to intentionally engage the LGBTQIA+ community as the department implements the Mobility Framework into policies, plans, and projects.

**ENGAGEMENT METHODS: PHASE 1**

To inform the development of Guiding Principles, Phase 1 Engagement consisted of briefings to and workshops with the following entities:

- Eastside Easy Rider Collaborative
- King County Mobility Coalition
- North King County Mobility Coalition
- South King County Mobility Coalition
- Seattle Colleges
- Sound Cities Association
- Seashore
- Eastside Transportation Partnership
- Regional Transit Committee
- King County Council Mobility & Environment Committee

---

**Figure 2 Engagement Methods by Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Populations for Intentional Focus</th>
<th>Tabling at Festivals</th>
<th>Tabling at Transit Centers</th>
<th>Surveys During Classes</th>
<th>Interviews with CBOs</th>
<th>Stakeholder Briefings</th>
<th>Online Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black, indigenous, people of color</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with low/no incomes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrants and refugees</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited-English populations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit riders</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdictional partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General public</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Equity Cabinet recommended that Metro deliberately engage the LGBTQIA+ community and youth as part of the community engagement strategy. ECOSS engaged youth as part of the Back to School Resource Fair in SeaTac. Metro will work with the consultant team to intentionally engage the LGBTQIA+ community as the department implements the Mobility Framework into policies, plans, and projects.
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- Transportation Choices Coalition
- Forth
- Transit Riders Union
- The Wilderness Society
- National Federation of the Blind
- Climate Solutions
- People for Climate Action
- Clean Energy Transition Institute
- Sound Transit
- Hopelink
- South King County Transportation Options
- Puget Sound Energy
- Sound Generations
- South County Area Transportation Board
- METRO CONNECTS Technical Advisory Commission (King County jurisdictions)
- KC Transit Advisory Commission
- King County Metro Mobility Futures Cabinet
- Internal Metro staff and management
- City of Tukwila
- City of Issaquah
- City of Kirkland
- City of Shoreline

ENGAGEMENT METHODS: PHASE 2

Metro, Triangle, and ECOSS used the methods listed below to reach different populations to inform recommendations related to investments, surrounding land use, innovation, workforce, and community engagement.

- **Method 1 – Tabling at Festivals and Transit Centers:** Triangle Associates and ECOSS set up tables at the Skyway Community Festival, SeaTac Back-to-School Fair, Federal Way Transit Center, and Kent Transit Center. At these locations, ECOSS and Triangle asked participants the question, “Imagine you have $10 to invest in Metro’s work. How would you divide up $10 based on what matters to you?” To indicate participants’ preferences, ECOSS and Triangle gave participants 10 coins to represent $10 and asked them to place their coins in buckets with the following labels:
  - Make buses come more frequently during rush hour
  - Increase the parts of King County served by transit
  - Make buses run more often during non-rush-hour times of day
  - Provide new types of services to help connect to transit and meet people’s needs
• Make buses welcoming and safe for customers
• Increase transit stop and station amenities

ECOSS and Triangle then asked participants, "**How do you like to learn about Metro’s services, changes to the bus routes you use, and/or employment opportunities?**" ECOSS and Triangle had a list of communication methods and gave participants three stickers to indicate their preferred communication methods.

Lastly, ECOSS and Triangle asked participants, "**Which of the following methods should Metro use to involve you in its projects, plans, and policies?**" ECOSS and Triangle had a list of engagement methods and gave participants three stickers to indicate their preferred engagement methods.

ECOSS transcreated these activities into Spanish, Vietnamese, Somali, Chinese, and Bhutanese. At all events, participants were compensated with an ORCA card valued for four transit trips. See the “Engagement Findings” section below for the outcomes of this engagement. ECOSS and Triangle conducted these activities at four locations and engaged over 200 people:

**Community Festival Booths**
- SeaTac Back-to-School Fair at Valley Ridge Park (89)
- Skyway Community Festival (82)

**Transit Center Booths**
- Kent Transit Center (30)
- Federal Way Transit Center (28)

**Method 2 – Survey Distribution at Classes:** To inform the recommendations, ECOSS and Triangle distributed surveys with the same questions as the tabling exercise. ECOSS and Triangle handed out these surveys at a Spanish-language computer class, a Spanish-language Promotoras (community health workers) class, a Vietnamese church in the Rainier Valley, a Bhutanese community gathering, and an English Language Learner (ELL) class at the Auburn Library. ECOSS transcreated the survey into Spanish, Vietnamese, Somali, Chinese, and
Bhutanese. ECOSS and Triangle compensated students for their time and input with a Safeway gift card. See the “Engagement Findings” section below for the outcomes of this outreach.

ECOSS and Triangle presented at five classes and gatherings and engaged approximately 75 people:

**Classes and Community Gatherings**
- SPIARC Technology and Computer class; South Park, Seattle (14)
- SPIARC mujeres promotoras meeting; South Park, Seattle (8)
- Auburn Public Library English as a Second Language (ESL) class; Auburn (9)
- Hoi Thanh Tin Lanh Hy Vong, Vietnamese class; Rainier Valley, Seattle (31)
- Pre-hiking Bhutanese meeting; Kent, Tukwila, SeaTac, and Burien (18)

Survey distribution at classes in Vietnamese and Spanish-speaking communities
Source: ECOSS

- **Method 3 – CBO Interviews and Stakeholder Briefings:**
  Metro, Triangle, and ECOSS provided CBOs and stakeholders with a presentation highlighting findings from the travel trends analyses and best practices research. Following the presentation, the team posed the following 16 questions to the CBOs and stakeholders related to the five key themes listed below.

  **Investments**
  1. How can Metro and its partners address the unmet mobility needs?
  2. Where are mobility services needed, and at what time of day?
  3. How can we ensure these mobility services are accessible and safe for everyone?

  **Innovation**
  4. Do you see opportunities for new mobility services to help address equity gaps?
  5. What do you think Metro’s role should be versus the private sector’s role?
  6. How can we partner to ensure that new mobility services are integrated with public transit and are safe and accessible for all?

  **Land Use**
  7. How can Metro use its own resources and work with partners to encourage dense, affordable development near transit?
8. How can Metro work with partners to influence how streets, sidewalks, curbs, and bike lanes are built to improve multi-modal access to transit?
9. What else should be considered to reduce car trips and address climate change?

Workforce
10. How can Metro support career paths in a way that makes the workplace more inclusive?
11. How can we contract for services to advance equity?
12. How do we help our workforce prepare for technological and transportation-related advancements?
13. How can we reach priority populations for job recruitment and retention?

Engagement
14. What strategies should Metro use to improve our engagement practices?
15. How can we demonstrate openness to shared decision-making and co-creation?
16. How can we reach people with greatest barriers to access?

Below are the groups that participated in interviews or stakeholder briefings:

- Access Task Force
- American Institute of Architects (AIA) Seattle
- Asian Counseling and Referral Service (ACRS)
- Casa Latina
- Challenge Seattle
- Chinese Information and Service Center (CISC)
- Clean Energy Transition Institute
- Climate Solutions
- Cowlitz Tribal Health Services
- Eastside Easy Riders Collaborative
- Forth
- King County-Cities Climate Collaboration (K4C)
  - City of Issaquah
  - City of Kirkland
  - City of Shoreline
  - City of Snoqualmie
  - Sound Transit
- King County Mobility Coalition
- King County Transit Advisory Commission
- Lighthouse for the Blind
- Metro Connects Technical Advisory Committee (all 39 jurisdictions and WSDOT, PSRC, and King County Council staff were invited; the following people attended)
  - Cecile Malik, Auburn
  - Sherman Goong, Bothell
  - Franz Lowenherz, Bellevue
  - Lacey Jane Wolfe, Bellevue
  - Thara Johnson, Burien
  - Amber Kellison, Covington
  - Bob Lindskov, Covington
  - Leila Willoughby-Oakes, Federal Way
  - Rick Perez, Federal Way
  - Ryan Medina, Federal Way
  - Steven Padua, Issaquah
  - April Delchamps, Kent
  - Terra Rose, King County Council
  - Kim Scrivner, Kirkland
  - Sarah Gatschow, PSRC
  - Peter Dane, Redmond
  - Jim Seitz, Renton
  - David Tomorowski, SeaTac
  - Jim Hammond, Shoreline
  - Eric Chipps, Sound Transit
  - Jamie Reavis, Tukwila
  - Zack Howard, WSDOT

- Mobility Futures Cabinet
  - Boston Consulting Group
  - City of Auburn
  - City of Bellevue
  - King County Council Staff
  - Port of Seattle
  - Puget Sound Regional Council
  - Seattle Children’s Hospital
  - Seattle Dept. of Transportation
  - Sound Cities Association
  - Sound Transit
  - Transportation Choices Coalition
  - Washington State Ferries
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- Mother Africa
- National Federation of the Blind
- North King County Mobility Coalition
  - Lake Forest Park Citizen’s Committee
  - North Seattle College
  - Snohomish County Transportation Coalition (SNOTRAC)
- People for Climate Action
- Seattle Colleges
- South King County Mobility Coalition
  - City of Tukwila Department of Human and Social Services
  - Hopelink
  - Puget Sound Energy
  - Sound Generations
- The Wilderness Society
- Transit Riders Union
- Transportation Choices Coalition

**Method 4 – Online Survey:** Metro disseminated an online survey regarding investments, reducing pollution through surrounding land use, innovation, workforce, and community engagement. The survey was available in Vietnamese, Somali, Chinese and Spanish in addition to English. The survey reached 579 participants in approximately four weeks.

**ENGAGEMENT FINDINGS**

**Findings: Festivals, Transit Centers, and Language-Based Classes**

ECOSS and Triangle communicated with approximately 300 people through festival booths, transit center booths, and language-based classes. ECOSS and Triangle focused their efforts in south King County where there is a higher concentration of priority populations compared to other parts of the County, Figure 3 shows the residential ZIP codes of these participants. The team did not ask for specific demographic information due to an inability to guarantee anonymity with this sensitive data given the in-person nature of these engagement methods.

Figure 3  ZIP Codes of Participants

Below is a summary of the percentage of participants who live in the corresponding ZIP codes in south King County:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZIP Code</th>
<th>Percentage of Participants</th>
<th>Primary Neighborhood within ZIP Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98188</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>SeaTac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98178</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Skyway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98198</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Des Moines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98031</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Kent (north)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98002</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Auburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98032</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Kent (west)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98023</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Federal Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98168</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Boulevard Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98030</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Kent (central)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98003</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Federal Way (east)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Various cities throughout south King County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 presents the results of how participants believed Metro should invest its resources. There was not an overwhelming preference for how Metro should invest its resources, with just a 7 percent spread between the most favored and least favored investment options. This indicates that there is not strong public support for one form of investment over another.

**Figure 4  Investment Preferences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Option</th>
<th>Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make buses come more frequently during rush hour</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the parts of King County served by transit</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make buses run more often during non-rush-hour times of day</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide new types of services to help connect to transit and meet people’s needs</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make buses welcoming and safe for customers</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase transit stop and station amenities</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5 summarizes people’s preferences for how Metro should communicate with the public regarding service changes and employment opportunities. The four most preferred communication methods were a mix of digital communication methods (social media and text messages) and physical communication methods (signage at bus stops and ads on buses). This indicates that Metro should continue using both digital and physical communication methods, even though digital engagement can often be more cost-effective.
### Figure 5  Communication Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Method</th>
<th>Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs at bus stops</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text message</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ads on buses</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tv commercials</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailings</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio commercials</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters/blogs</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community liaisons</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-language newspapers</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-person conversations</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet commercials</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And Figure 6 summarizes people’s preferences for how Metro should engage community members to shape its projects, plans, and policies. The feedback received via festivals, transit centers, and classes indicated that online surveys were the most preferred engagement method while working with trusted organizations fell to the middle of the options. This feedback is different from that received during CBO Interviews, in which all interviewees felt strongly that working with trusted organizations is critical.

### Figure 6  Engagement Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement Method</th>
<th>Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online surveys</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tables at transit centers</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-person large public meetings</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online public meetings</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with organizations I trust</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus groups</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small working groups</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings I already attend</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings: Interviews and Stakeholder Briefings

Below is a summary of the input received on these topics.

Investments

Across the interviews and briefings, participants expressed a need for **transit service that can be used for multiple purposes and to reach many destinations**, including those beyond the traditional commute trips. People expressed a desire to better serve older adults and people with disabilities, those who work non-traditional hours, areas not currently served by fixed-route transit, job centers outside of Seattle, health care centers and specialized medical services, school campuses (e.g., high school, college, vocational programs), suburbs, and major activity centers. There was particular interest in improving mobility options throughout South King County.

Stakeholders also expressed an interest in **investing in technology and infrastructure**. Some suggested prioritizing electric bus routes in low-income areas, incentivizing and expediting electric vehicle investments, and working with utility companies to support electric-vehicle infrastructure, such as charging stations.

Many stakeholders emphasized the importance of **improving transit accessibility across different populations**. Examples of the specific ideas that were shared include the following:

- **People with Disabilities**: Reconsider the design of buses so people in wheelchairs and people with strollers do not need to compete for space. Educate bus operators on supporting riders with disabilities.
- **Limited English-Speaking People**: Ensure multilingual accessibility with ORCA card machines. Educate bus operators on supporting limited English-speaking riders.
- **People with Low- or No-Income**: To avoid requiring people to purchase multiple fares, allow Metro paper transfers to be used with Sound Transit, and extend the time bus transfers are valid for those with long commutes. Ensure there are options for accessing services and information that do not require smart phones.
- **American Indian/Alaskan Natives (AIAN)**: Members of the AIAN community often prefer to use traditional and culturally-sensitive medical and social service providers. These providers may not be the healthcare centers closest to where they live. Metro could partner with tribes to identify mobility solutions that prioritize tribal healthcare access.
- **General**: Improve safety considerations to make everyone feel safer riding transit. This could mean better lighting near transit stops or working with local jurisdictions to provide community-centered policing near transit stops.
Surrounding Land Use

Stakeholders recommended that Metro—or, in many cases, Metro’s jurisdictional partners—update zoning to allow greater density. In particular, Metro could work with other King County departments to upzone unincorporated urban areas such as White Center and South Hill, which have existing bus service.

There was also broad support for encouraging dense, affordable, transit-oriented development (TOD). Metro could support efforts to build affordable and/or workforce housing along high-ridership corridors. Stakeholders recommended that TOD projects include units specifically for individuals who rely on transit due to disabilities or other factors.

Another common theme was the need to update parking policies. Stakeholders supported the idea of dedicated parking for carshare, bikeshare, and electric vehicles. Some people suggested that Metro move away from building new park-and-ride lots to discourage people from driving alone. Other ideas included implementing dynamic parking rates, adding more neighborhood parking districts, and reducing parking requirements for new developments.

Stakeholders had many suggestions regarding improving multimodal access and connections. These improvements would require action from Metro’s partner municipalities and could include upgraded bike infrastructure (e.g., bike lanes, parking, signals), additional dedicated bus lanes, new transit signal priority features, more street and sidewalk lighting near transit stops, Accessible Pedestrian Signals (APS) at intersections, and other measures to create complete streets. Another idea was to implement congestion pricing in downtown Seattle to make space for more non-auto forms of transportation.

While Metro does not have authority to implement the majority of these suggestions, the department could seek opportunities to partner with the public and private sectors.

Innovation

Stakeholders suggested innovative services, which could include an emergency ride home program for low-income riders, community-run carshare programs, ride-sharing programs for youth, micromobility options (e.g., scooters), and, eventually, automated vehicles. However, people cautioned against launching too many new or pilot services at the same time and recommended that Metro focus resources on a few innovative models.

Stakeholders recommended that Metro better integrate technology into its services. For example, Metro could encourage data-sharing between the private and public sectors to ensure real-time apps are reliable and integrated into Google Maps, Waze, OneBusAway, and other services. In addition, Metro could implement more technological solutions as part of the King County Human Services Bus Ticket Program (e.g., distributing tickets electronically).
To innovate effectively, people suggested a focus on **data-driven decisions**. Metro could collect data on why people do not choose transit, employers’ perspectives on what transportation services are needed, and future transportation needs based on gentrification and displacement pressures.

**Workforce**

Stakeholders recommended **hiring students through job apprenticeship programs**, such as at the Lake Washington Institute of Technology, which has a Bachelor of Science in Transportation, Logistics, and Supply Chain Management and School of Transportation Technology.

A diverse and talented workforce requires **inclusive recruitment**. Stakeholders recommended tailoring job descriptions to attract younger people, people with low- or no-income, black, indigenous and people of color, immigrants, refugees, and people with disabilities. It was suggested that Metro work with community-based organizations, social service agencies, and employment counselors to post multilingual job opportunities. For example, the Port of Seattle currently sends job openings to immigrant and refugee organizations. Furthermore, Metro could work with organizations that promote disability rights to identify positions within Metro that could be filled by individuals with certain kinds of disabilities.

Participants also suggested that Metro should **continue working toward being an inclusive and inviting workplace**. This could mean facilitating mentorships to improve access to professional networks, strengthening the livable wage ordinance, promoting from within the agency when possible, and partnering with the BlueGreen Alliance, which is a coalition of labor and environmental organizations.

Stakeholders also provided suggestions related to **opportunities for career advancement** for operators and other technicians, including training on new transportation technologies, education on transit terminology for employees who do not speak English as their primary language, and job shadowing of transportation planners and engineers.

Stakeholders also identified an opportunity for Metro to **support smaller contractors** by providing proactive, tailored communication to ensure that contracting opportunities are available to minority- and women-owned businesses.

**Engagement**

Stakeholder recommendations for engagement fell into two groups: 1) ensuring transit information and decisions are accessible to all; and 2) building relationships and trust.

To **ensure transit information and decisions are accessible**, stakeholders recommended providing materials and signs in multiple languages, conducting more outreach to students about the ORCA LIFT program, “game-ifying” engagement, ensuring outreach and online information is accessible for those with visual impairments and other disabilities, educating communities on innovative mobility options as they become available, providing childcare and food at meetings, improving social media engagement, ensuring meeting locations are
accessible by transit, integrating people with disabilities into broad-reaching transit issues (as opposed to just the ACCESS service), partnering with houses of worship to engage communities, providing information at ethnic grocery stores, and coordinating with other agencies collecting feedback (e.g., The Puget Sound Regional Council and Puget Sound Clean Air Agency).

To **build relationships and trust**, people suggested that Metro should reconnect with community members to explain how their feedback was or was not used, have CBOs and/or Tribal agencies lead engagement, acknowledge history and harm the agency may have caused, be transparent with how data is used, invest in long-term relationships (rather than one-off outreach), and ask more qualitative questions during engagement activities. To strengthen partnerships with CBOs and Tribal agencies, stakeholders recommended that Metro compensate these organizations for their time and provide them with translated materials when multilingual outreach is needed.

**Findings: Online Survey**

Metro conducted an online survey to gather feedback from members of the public about their priorities for meeting the needs of a growing County in a way that addresses equity and climate change and serves all King County residents. The survey was open from August 16 through September 11, 2019 and generated 579 responses.
Q1: As Metro considers future investments that advance equity and sustainability, we want to hear about your priorities.

In this question, respondents were asked to prioritize up to four of the response options. Over three-quarters of the respondents identified addressing areas in the County where transit gaps exist and increasing bus frequency during both rush and non-rush hours as actions that Metro should consider.

- Add service to areas of King County where transit gaps exist: 83%
- Make rush-hour buses come more frequently (every 15 minutes rather than every 30 minutes): 81%
- Make buses run more often during non-rush-hour times of day, like early morning, midday, and late at night: 78%
- Offer new services to help people connect to transit and meet other transportation needs. Services could include shuttles that pick you up when you request a ride and take you to a transit center or other destination: 69%
- Increase amenities like bus shelters, lighting, benches, and information at transit stops and stations: 69%
- Make buses welcoming and safe for all customers by helping people learn how to use the bus system and providing information in more languages: 66%
Q2: Metro could encourage and partner with local jurisdictions to give higher priority to transit, bicycles, walking and rolling, and lower priority to single-occupant cars when building streets, sidewalks, and other public infrastructure. How strongly do you support this approach?

A majority of respondents (75 percent) support the approach of partnering and encouraging local jurisdictions to prioritize transit, biking, and walking over single occupancy cars when building public infrastructure.

In addition to supporting Metro’s engagement with local jurisdictions to give higher priority to transit, bicycles, walking, and rolling, participants shared additional feedback through 163 open-ended comments, which included the following themes:

- **Improving and prioritizing transit:** Many of the comments supported prioritizing and promoting transit. More than 15 comments addressed the need for expansion of bus lanes, frequency, and number of buses. Commenters also cited the need for transit-only lane enforcement and an increase in the number of express trips with fewer stops during rush hours.

- **Restrict single occupancy vehicles:** Comments addressed the need to restrict and deprioritize single occupancy vehicles, including preventing cars from blocking bus-only lanes during rush hours.

- **Protected bike lanes:** Providing more protected bike lanes was a popular theme in the comments. Commenters expressed the need to have a comprehensive bike network that connects the suburbs to Link light rail and provides protected bike trails along all major arterials. Some commenters noted the need for biking amenities like increased bike lockers at park-and-rides, safe bicycle parking near bus stops, and proper maintenance of bike facilities. Some comments suggested the need to develop incentives that promote drivers making more trips by bike, potentially by subsidizing the cost of bikes and providing tax breaks.
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- **Safe walking and rolling routes:** Connected sidewalks were another common theme. People expressed the need for sidewalks on both sides of the road and curb cuts at intersections. Some commenters stressed the importance of informational signs and other wayfinding.

- **Separate motorized and non-motorized transportation:** Many comments suggested that certain modes be restricted on busy roads or restricting downtown roads to buses and carpools only.

- **Expansion of light rail:** Some commenters stated the need for an expanded light rail system that connects to more lower-income neighborhoods.

**Q3. How strongly do you support Metro encouraging and partnering with local jurisdictions and developers to build affordable housing, shopping, community services, and recreation near transit stations?**

Eight of ten of respondents (80 percent) agree or strongly agree that Metro should promote and partner with local jurisdictions to develop affordable housing, shopping, and other recreational amenities near transit stations. Although a small portion of the respondents did not agree, their comments addressed concerns regarding an increase in bus fares if Metro was involved in housing projects.

In addition to supporting Metro’s engagement with local jurisdictions to give higher priority to build affordable housing, shopping, community services, and recreation near transit stations, participants also expressed their views through 60 open-ended comments, which have been organized into the following themes.

- **Support for promoting but not funding:** Many comments expressed a great deal of support for Metro encouraging transit-oriented services but less support for Metro being involved in partnerships or funding for development. Some comments also expressed concerns about transit funds being used for community development.
• **Land use:** Commenters stressed promoting land uses consistent with transit plans rather than being automobile-focused and creating more equity-focused communities. A few comments also focused on adding high-density housing around light rail.

**Q4. What do you think is most important for Metro to consider as we develop new types of services or partner with private companies like Uber and Lyft?**

Respondents indicated that ensuring safety and security, reducing congestion and pollution, improving accessibility to transit, and transportation equity are the top priorities that Metro should consider while developing new services and partnerships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure the safety and security of riders, drivers, and the public</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce congestion and pollution</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give priority to service that connects people to bus and light rail</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be accessible to everyone, including people with low incomes, people without smart phones, immigrants and refugees, limited-English-speaking people, and people with disabilities</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet fair pay and labor standards for drivers</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage with communities early to find out how the new service can best meet their needs</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require private companies to share information that enables evaluation of how well services are meeting objectives like those listed above</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5. Rate how important the following priorities are for Metro’s hiring and workforce practices.

Survey respondents’ top priorities for Metro’s hiring and workforce practices are to create guidelines for fair employment practices of contractors and to create an inclusive work environment.

In addition to rating how important the priorities are for Metro’s hiring and workforce practices, participants also expressed their views through 38 open-ended comments. Most of the comments focused on hiring qualified, competent, and customer service-oriented employees. Comments also reflected a need to have a diverse workforce to reflect the community.
Q6. As Metro works with communities to decide how to invest and provide services that advance equity and sustainability, how important are the following community engagement strategies?

According to respondents, Metro should prioritize measuring and tracking engagement outcomes and engaging with communities to build lasting relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure and track engagement outcomes so we can report results, learn,</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and improve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro staff spend time in communities to listen, learn, act as a resource, and build ongoing relationships, not just when a project is happening</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-design engagement processes with community organizations at the beginning of a project</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire people from communities with concentrations of people with low incomes, people of color, immigrants and refugees, limited-English speakers, and people with disabilities to gather input from communities and serve as liaisons with transit experts.</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a participatory budgeting process in which communities decide how resources are spent in their neighborhoods based on their priorities</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7. How else can Metro work with communities to participate in decision-making?

In response to this question, participants expressed their views through 49 open-ended comments, which reflected the following themes:

- **Engage thoughtfully with community/neighborhood organizations:** A number of commenters noted that community-based organizations should be just one element of an engagement strategy.
- **Engage with all groups, not a select few:** Many comments stressed the importance of reaching out to all groups, including youth and young adults, teens, parents, refugees, older adults, and people of all income levels.
Respondent Demographics

- **Age:** More than half (53 percent) of the respondents are between the ages of 26 and 45 years old. Seniors (65+) and young adults (18-25) make up 14 percent of respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your age?</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percent of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-75</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Household income:** A significant proportion of respondents declined to answer this question. Of those who responded, annual household income was distributed among all income categories, but higher-income groups made up a larger proportion of respondents than lower-income groups. More than half of the respondents have an annual household income of $75,000 or more.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your annual household income?</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percent of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $7,500</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,500 to $15,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,001 to $25,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,001 to $35,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,001 to $45,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,001 to $55,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$55,001 to $65,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$65,001 to $75,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,001 to $100,000</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,001 to $140,000</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $140,000</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Race/Ethnicity:** A significant proportion of respondents declined to answer this question. Of those who responded, more than three-quarters (78 percent) identified as white or Caucasian, 12 percent identified as multiple ethnicities, 5 percent identified as Asian American (including South and Southeast Asian), 2 percent identified as black, African, or African American,
2 percent identified as Latino/Latina/Latinx or Hispanic, and 1 percent identified as American Indian or Alaska Native.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your race/ethnicity?</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percent of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American (including South and Southeast Asian)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, African, or African American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Latina/Latinx or Hispanic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple ethnicities</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Home ZIP Code:** A large portion (81 percent) of the respondents live within King County with most respondents (78 percent) in the Seattle neighborhoods of West Seattle, Delridge, Georgetown, Capitol Hill, Wedgwood, and Fremont. Residents of Redmond, Renton, Kent, Lynnwood, Tacoma, Federal Way, and other areas of King County were also represented.

- **Gender:** More than half of the respondents (54 percent) identify as female.

- **Primary Language:** The majority of respondents (95 percent) identified English as the primary language spoken at home.

- **Disability:** While most respondents (80 percent) indicated having none of the listed disabilities, 8 percent indicated having a condition that substantially limits one or more basic physical activities and 6 percent indicated a physical, mental, or emotional condition that limits learning, remembering, or concentrating. Other disabilities cited include visual impairments (1 percent), hearing impairments (1 percent), and limited ability to care for oneself (1 percent).

The tables on the next page summarize survey responses for key questions by respondent race/ethnicity and household income. The complete survey data set, including all open-ended responses, is available upon request.
Q1: As Metro considers future investments that advance equity and sustainability, we want to hear about your priorities. [top priority by respondent’s race/ethnicity]

The low number of respondents in all groups except white/Caucasian makes it difficult to draw conclusions about the differences in priorities between racial/ethnic groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>American Indian or Alaska Native</th>
<th>Asian American</th>
<th>Black, African, or African American</th>
<th>Latino/Latina/Latinx or Hispanic</th>
<th>Multiple ethnicities</th>
<th>White or Caucasian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Did not specify race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add service to areas of King County where transit gaps exist.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make rush-hour buses come more frequently (every 15 minutes rather than every 30 minutes).</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make buses run more often during non-rush-hour times of day, like early morning, midday, and late at night.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer new services to help people connect to transit and meet other transportation needs. Services could include shuttles that pick you up when you request a ride and take you to a transit center or other destination.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase amenities like bus shelters, lighting, benches, and information at transit stops and stations.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make buses welcoming and safe for all customers by helping people learn how to use the bus system and providing information in more languages.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1: As Metro considers future investments that advance equity and sustainability, we want to hear about your priorities. [top priority by respondent’s household income]

The relatively low number of respondents in each income category makes it difficult to draw conclusions about differences in priorities for those in different income groups. Generally, those in the lowest income groups placed greater priority than those with higher incomes on services that help people connect to transit and meet other transportation needs and on increasing amenities like bus shelters, lighting, benches, and information at bus stops.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>$15,000 or less</th>
<th>$15,001 to $35,000</th>
<th>$35,001 to $55,000</th>
<th>$55,001 to $75,000</th>
<th>$75,001 to $100,000</th>
<th>$100,001 to $140,000</th>
<th>More than $140,000</th>
<th>Did not specify income</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add service to areas of King County where transit gaps exist.</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make rush-hour buses come more frequently (every 15 minutes rather than every 30 minutes).</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make buses run more often during non-rush-hour times of day, like early morning, midday, and late at night.</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer new services to help people connect to transit and meet other transportation needs. Services could include shuttles that pick you up when you request a ride and take you to a transit center or other destination.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase amenities like bus shelters, lighting, benches, and information at transit stops and stations.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make buses welcoming and safe for all customers by helping people learn how to use the bus system and providing information in more languages.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4. What do you think is most important for Metro to consider as we develop new types of services or partner with private companies like Uber and Lyft? [top priority by respondent’s race/ethnicity]

The low number of respondents in all groups except white/Caucasian makes it difficult to draw conclusions about the differences in priorities among racial/ethnic groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>American Indian or Alaska Native</th>
<th>Asian American</th>
<th>Black, African, or African American</th>
<th>Latino/Latina/Latinx or Hispanic</th>
<th>Multiple ethnicities</th>
<th>White or Caucasian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Did not specify race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of respondents:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure the safety and security of riders, drivers, and the public</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give priority to service that connects people to bus and light rail</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce congestion and pollution</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be accessible to everyone, including people with low incomes, people without smart phones, immigrants and refugees, limited-English-speaking people, and people with disabilities</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet fair pay and labor standards for drivers</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage with communities early to find out how the new service can best meet their needs</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require private companies to share information that enables evaluation of how well services are meeting objectives like those listed above</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q4. What do you think is most important for Metro to consider as we develop new types of services or partner with private companies like Uber and Lyft? [top priority by respondent’s household income]

The relatively low number of respondents in each income category makes it difficult to draw conclusions about differences in priorities for those in different income groups. Generally, those with the lowest incomes placed greater emphasis than those with higher incomes on accessibility of services for people with low incomes, people without smartphones, immigrants and refugees, limited-English-speaking people, and people with disabilities. Respondents with higher incomes placed greater emphasis on reducing congestion and pollution than those with lower incomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>$15,000 or less</th>
<th>$15,001 to $35,000</th>
<th>$35,001 to $55,000</th>
<th>$55,001 to $75,000</th>
<th>$75,001 to $100,000</th>
<th>$100,001 to $140,000</th>
<th>More than $140,000</th>
<th>Did not specify income</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ensure the safety and security of riders, drivers, and the public</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give priority to service that connects people to bus and light rail</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce congestion and pollution</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be accessible to everyone, including people with low incomes, people without smart phones, immigrants and refugees, limited-English-speaking people, and people with disabilities</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet fair pay and labor standards for drivers</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage with communities early to find out how the new service can best meet their needs</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require private companies to share information that enables evaluation of how well services are meeting objectives like those listed above</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Community Engagement Assessment

Metro understands that working with partners to achieve the Mobility Framework’s goals requires listening to the perspectives of community members and CBOs. To improve Metro’s engagement practices, the consultant team, acting as a neutral third-party, conducted assessment interviews of 10 individuals representing Metro staff and CBOs that have worked with Metro in the past. The consultants provided CBOs with compensation for their time.

ASSESSMENT FINDINGS: SWOT ANALYSIS

Triangle Associates and Diverse City summarized the assessment outcomes in a Strengths/Weaknesses/Opportunities/Threats analysis. This SWOT is a synopsis of what Triangle and Diverse City heard in their interviews.

Internal Strengths

According to the assessment interviews, below are Metro’s key internal strengths related to its community engagement practices (in no particular order):

- Commitment by Metro’s leadership to community engagement across the department’s various programs/projects
- Willingness to make change and be responsive to community feedback, exemplified by Metro pausing its ACCESS RFP process to rethink the program’s needs with a community advisory group
- Willingness to compensate community members with stipends for their time and expertise
- Commitment to transcreation and multilingual communication

Internal Weaknesses

Based on the assessment interviews, below are Metro’s key internal weaknesses related to community engagement practices (in no particular order):

- The Division-to-Department transition has resulted in some challenges related to organizational structures and how Community Engagement Planners are integrated into the agency
- Demand for community engagement staff exceeds capacity
• Perception that Metro’s employees, especially the planning and community engagement staff, don’t always reflect marginalized communities, resulting in power imbalances between staff and community members
• Lack of feedback loops in communications with communities after Metro collects input, resulting in community members who don’t understand how their input was used or not used
• Reluctance to share control, power, and information with advisory groups, resulting in advisory group members feeling frustrated at times

**External Opportunities**

Below are the key external opportunities regarding Metro’s community engagement practices gleaned from the assessment interviews (in no particular order):

• Metro can leverage its great reputation among many community organizations to continue seeking guidance on its policies, plans, and projects
• The ACCESS RFP community engagement work set a new standard that Metro should consider replicating
• Infrastructure and capital projects can have multiple purposes and positively impact communities if they are engaged from the onset (e.g., public meeting rooms in bases, WiFi access on buses, warming shelters for people experiencing homelessness)

**External Threats**

The assessment interviews indicated the following key external threats related to Metro’s community engagement practices (in no particular order):

• Under-resourced and overextended CBOs cannot always meet Metro’s requests on short timelines
• Lack of public input coordination among partner agencies, including King County Metro, Sound Transit, Seattle Department of Transportation, Pierce Transit, Community Transit, and the Washington State Department of Transportation
• In-person public comments at Council hearings might have influence that outweighs input gathered by surveys, interviews, or other community engagement efforts
• Lack of awareness about how to use transit and what Metro offers, especially with specialized services like ACCESS
5 Consultant Team Recommendations

The consultant team developed the following recommendations to reflect the feedback shared during festival and transit center tabling, English Language Learners’ class presentations, CBO interviews, stakeholder briefings, the online survey, assessment interviews, feedback from the Equity Cabinet, and best practices research. These recommendations are starting points for Metro staff to build upon the department’s existing engagement strengths.

**Recommendation #1: Develop Consistency and Equity in Compensation for Community Members/CBOs**

Community members and CBOs that participated in the Mobility Framework engagement appreciated that Metro compensated them for their time and expertise. However, there is inconsistency in Metro’s compensation policies related to various engagement tasks, such as filling out surveys, participating in interviews or focus groups, distributing surveys, being a member of an advisory group, helping to convene listening sessions, and other tasks.

For example, a Community Connections project provided CBOs with a $50 donation (assuming an hour-long interview), while the Mobility Framework provided CBO interviewees with a $225 donation (assuming 1.5 hours of preparation and 1.5 hours of interview time). Metro should develop a list of compensation amounts for engagement tasks to avoid confusion or bias with compensation. As an additional equity consideration, Metro could adjust compensation amounts depending on the geographic region of the County since there are some well-resourced areas that might not require the same levels of compensation as less-resourced areas.

**Recommendation #2: Formalize Systems for Working with CBOs**

Community members and CBOs lauded Metro’s commitment to engaging with CBOs. However, Metro has an opportunity to create more predictability and transparency around CBO engagement. The department could create a CBO roster with low barriers to entry to provide CBOs with predictable engagement opportunities and consistent compensation agreements. The roster could intentionally solicit involvement by high- and low-resource CBOs that serve a range of demographics. A more formalized roster system would allow Metro to examine if there are gaps in relationships with CBOs.
Appendix D: Community Engagement

Recommendation #3: View “Time” as a Social Equity Issue
Many public agencies focus their energy on the “how” of community engagement, or the methods they use. But what is often just as important is the “when” of community engagement, which includes the duration of engagement efforts to allow time for authentic co-creation. The timing of community engagement is frequently dictated by service planning, political, and funding deadlines. However, rushing community engagement efforts to meet these deadlines can perpetuate the perception that the decisions are already made, and community involvement is an afterthought. Additionally, rushed community engagement privileges those who have the resources and ability to quickly respond to requests. As Metro centers social equity in its work, the timing of community engagement should shape the political, planning, and funding timelines. In instances where time is limited, Metro should develop internal policies that identify when it would be better not to engage community members if engagement would be rushed and transactional.

Recommendation #4: Recognize and Acknowledge Agency History
A key part of equitable civic engagement is restorative justice work. For public agencies, this means truth-telling campaigns that recognize their history of exclusionary and harmful policies. In practice, it means owning and sharing this history with a public apology. It means starting new projects by researching the history of the agency in the region and acknowledging specific wrongdoings if applicable. It means agency leadership viewing this retrospection not as an admission of fault, but as a positive step toward more authentic relationships. And it means Community Engagement Planners acknowledging their social position in respect to the community with whom they are working, especially if the Planner is not from that community. It means embracing cultural humility across the department to continuously learn and continuously strive to be more equitable in its actions and policies.

Recommendation #5: Create Lasting Benefits for Community Members
Metro is committed to making meaningful and long-term investments in communities. This can be done by investing in ongoing relationships with CBOs (see recommendation #2), but it can also happen through investing in the physical environment of a place through Community Benefit Agreements (CBA).

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) embedded environmental justice principles into their mission, prioritized the hiring of local labor, and created a program to develop "social impact partnerships."

---

1 See similar efforts underway in Evanston, IL, and at the Maryland Institute College of Art in MD
Within Requests for Proposals (RFPs) for projects over $5 million, applicants are asked to meet a community benefits criterion, which allocates money toward an improvement for communities who are affected by the proposed project. Another example of a CBA focused on ensuring both affordable housing and transit-oriented development comes from Minneapolis. An agreement between the Longfellow Community Council (a community participation group) and the developer Capital Growth Real Estate established a mixed-use affordable complex called Longfellow Station.

**Recommendation #6: Develop a Focused Approach for No-Income People/Unhoused People**

The Mobility Framework’s engagement efforts were focused on priority populations, including low- and no-income individuals. The consultant team observed that engagement strategies for no-income individuals who are unhoused must be different from engagement strategies for low-income individuals. Metro could follow the approach used by other transit agencies to partner with social service agencies that work with the unhoused people who rely on Metro.

For example, the transit agency in Madison, Wisconsin (also called Metro Transit) developed a partnership with Porchlight, a nonprofit organization that serves as a coordinating group for homelessness-related issues. Both agencies work with other nonprofits, city departments, and downtown business groups to ensure that homelessness is addressed, and that safety and security issues are a focus area. Another example of a transit agency working to address the homelessness crisis is the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority (SEPTA). Project HOME, a Philadelphia nonprofit homelessness organization, has partnered with SEPTA on a variety of initiatives, including establishing a walk-in outreach center at SEPTA’s largest rail center called “Hub of Hope,” which provides social and health services to individuals experiencing homelessness.

**Recommendation #7: If Faced with Conflicting Input, Just Ask!**

Metro often receives conflicting information about the best ways to engage with community members countywide. For example, the feedback received via festivals, transit centers, and classes indicated that online surveys were the most preferred engagement method. However, CBO interviews indicated that working with trusted organizations is preferable to surveys. The likelihood of conflicting information increases when working across King County, as is the case during policy development. However, implementing projects and investments typically occurs in sub-areas, which may have very specific engagement needs. Before Metro embarks on a new project in a smaller geographic area, the department should simply ask the affected populations how they would like to be involved.
The consultant team presented these recommendations to a core team of Metro staff in September 2019. Metro will consider implementing these recommendations in the coming months to continue their efforts to meaningfully engage with those who work, live, learn, and play in King County.
6 Next Steps

The Equity Cabinet and Metro used the outcomes of community engagement to finalize the Mobility Framework. Metro invited the Equity Cabinet to continue working with Metro staff to make policy updates that help to implement the Recommendations of the Mobility Framework. The Equity Cabinet and Metro will refer back to the community engagement outcomes as they update Metro’s Strategic Plan for Public Transportation, Service Guidelines, METRO CONNECTS long-range vision, the Pro-Equity Transportation & Mobility Policy Agenda for the Equity and Social Justice Strategic Plan, the Transportation Goal Area for the Strategic Climate Action Plan, the Marine Strategic Plan, and potentially others. Metro will continue to create new opportunities for community engagement as policy updates continue.
Proposed No. 2018-0543.2
Sponsors Balducci and Kohl-Welles

A MOTION outlining a process to develop a regional mobility framework that will ensure that innovations in mobility put people first, use public space equitably and efficiently and are coordinated with transit policies and regional funding strategies.

WHEREAS, in addition to an increasing reliance on public transit, the region's residents are turning to mobility and technology options as an alternative to single occupancy vehicles, including: walking; bicycling; telecommuting; ordering online; using taxis, transportation network companies, carpoolls, vanpools and ride share options; and experimenting with new technologies and opportunities, including bike-share companies and passenger information applications, and

WHEREAS, in response to the growth in new mobility options, in September 2014 the King County council adopted Ordinance 17892, which set new regulations for for-hire transportation, including taxicabs, for-hire vehicles, for-hire drivers and transportation network companies, and

WHEREAS, to outline a shared vision in which all people have equitable opportunities to thrive, in 2016, King County developed an equity and social justice strategic plan, 2016-2022, and

WHEREAS, in June 2016, the King County council adopted Ordinance 18301,
which adopted updates to the Strategic Plan for Public Transportation 2011-2021 and the King County Metro Service Guidelines, which identify the criteria of corridor productivity, social equity and geographic value in setting transit service levels, and

WHEREAS, in January 2017, the King County council adopted Ordinance 18449, which adopted METRO CONNECTS, a long-range transit service and capital plan that outlines a vision for a seventy percent increase in bus service hours by 2040, accompanied by significant capital investments in fleet, operating base capacity, passenger access and facilities, transit pathways and other needs, and

WHEREAS, in August 2018, the King County council adopted Ordinance 18777, which established the King County Metro transit department, and

WHEREAS, King County Metro has expressed the goal of delivering more and better mobility solutions by making transit easy to use and available to all, building necessary transit infrastructure, partnering with cities and other stakeholders, and enabling Metro employees to do top quality work, and

WHEREAS, King County Metro has expressed the goal of embracing and leading on innovations in the transportation market by facilitating new mobility partnerships, and

WHEREAS, King County has stated its commitment to increasing equity in mobility by planning, developing and delivering mobility solutions that provide access to opportunities for people with low or no incomes, people of color, seniors, people with limited English proficiency, people with disabilities and those who commute during non-peak travel periods or live or work in rural areas, and

WHEREAS, jurisdictions and transit agencies must develop policies around mobility innovations in the context of quickly emerging technologies, and
WHEREAS, as these mobility policies are developed, it is essential that jurisdictions and transit agencies learn from the lessons of the past, so that innovations in mobility are implemented with intention, in ways that put people first and use public space efficiently and equitably;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT MOVED by the Council of King County:

A. The Metro transit department, under the leadership of the executive and working in coordination with the council, should begin a planning effort during 2019 to develop a framework for the equitable implementation of innovations in transit service and mobility.

B. The framework should include, but is not limited to:

1. A review of emerging technologies and local and national best practices;
2. Analysis of potential implications for the Metro transit department and opportunities to coordinate mobility innovations with fixed-route and other services;
3. Coordination with the regional planning, coordination and funding efforts to address the implementation of METRO CONNECTS, consistent with the strategy identified in Motion XXXX (Proposed Motion 2018-0542);
4. Outreach and engagement with regional partners, transit riders and local communities, including but not limited to low-income populations, communities of color, immigrants and refugees, and limited English speaking populations;
5. A review of potential policies for the allocation of public space, including streets, sidewalks, transit stops and station areas, focused on efficiency and equity of use;
6. A review of industry-wide workforce trends, including the potential implications of new mobility options on labor needs, career opportunities, recruitment,
training and economic prospects of transportation workers;

7. Guiding principles that will inform the framework development work, including putting people first; and

8. Potential revisions and updates to countywide public transit documents including but not limited to the Strategic Plan for Public Transportation, the King County Metro service guidelines and the METRO CONNECTS long-range plan.

C. Metro Transit should develop a scoping document outlining the proposed coordination with the regional planning effort outlined in Motion XXXX (Proposed Motion 2018-0542), as well as the timeline, expected work tasks and budget to develop the mobility framework, and should file this scoping document by April 18, 2019, in the form of a paper original and an electronic copy with the clerk of the council, who shall retain the original and provide an electronic copy to all councilmembers, the council chief
of staff and the lead staff for the regional transit committee and the lead staff of the mobility committee, or its successor.

Motion 15253 was introduced on 11/5/2018 and passed by the Metropolitan King County Council on 11/13/2018, by the following vote:

Yes: 9 - Mr. von Reichbauer, Mr. Gossett, Ms. Lambert, Mr. Dunn, Mr. McDermott, Mr. Dembowski, Mr. Upthegrove, Ms. Kohl-Welles and Ms. Balducci
No: 0
Excused: 0

KING COUNTY COUNCIL
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

J. Joseph McDermott, Chair

ATTEST:

Melani Pedroza, Clerk of the Council

Attachments: None
### Crosswalk to Requirements of Motion 15253

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>How Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>...begin a planning effort during 2019 to develop a framework for the equitable implementation of innovations in transit service and mobility</td>
<td>Innovations recommendations address potential options to equitably implement innovations. Overarching focus of Framework is on increasing equity in mobility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>A review of emerging technologies and local and national best practices</td>
<td>Best Practices Appendix includes a section on innovative mobility services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>Analysis of potential implications for the Metro transit department and opportunities to coordinate mobility innovations with fixed-route and other services</td>
<td>Innovations recommendations indicate that Metro will update its Service Guidelines to include criteria for how to pilot and evaluate innovative mobility services, as well as how to integrate these within Metro’s fixed-route service network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.3</td>
<td>Coordination with the regional planning, coordination and funding efforts to address the implementation of METRO CONNECTS, consistent with the strategy identified in Motion 15252</td>
<td>Investments recommendations note the need for additional funding to implement additional service, including to achieve the METRO CONNECTS network. Next Steps section discusses regional planning efforts and the upcoming process to update and implement METRO CONNECTS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.4</td>
<td>Outreach and engagement with regional partners, transit riders and local communities, including but not limited to low-income populations, communities of color, immigrants and refugees, and limited English speaking populations</td>
<td>Engagement Appendix describes Metro’s outreach and engagement efforts with the named communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.5</td>
<td>A review of potential policies for the allocation of public space, including streets, sidewalks, transit stops and station areas, focused on efficiency and equity of use</td>
<td>Surrounding Land use recommendations address the need for guidelines for station areas and right-of-way to increase access to transit, make streets and transit stops more accessible, and ensure efficiency and equity. Best Practices Appendix includes descriptions of station area access guidelines, as well as guiding principles for new mobility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td>How Addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.6</td>
<td>A review of industry-wide workforce trends, including the potential implications of new mobility options on labor needs, career opportunities, recruitment, training and economic prospects of transportation workers</td>
<td>Workforce recommendations address recruitment, training, advancement, and issues related to the workforces of Metro contractors and private providers. Best Practices Appendix includes a section on best practices related to the transportation workforce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.7</td>
<td>Guiding principles that will inform the framework development work, including putting people first</td>
<td>Guiding Principles section includes 10 guiding principles developed by the Equity Cabinet, and informed by the Greenlining Institute’s Mobility Equity Framework, as well as Metro’s adopted Strategic Plan for Public Transportation. The Guiding Principles include language on putting people first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.8</td>
<td>Potential revisions and updates to countywide public transit documents including but not limited to the Strategic Plan for Public Transportation, the King County Metro service guidelines and the METRO CONNECTS long-range plan</td>
<td>Next Steps section describes the process that will be used to update these policies for transmittal to the Council during 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Metro Transit should develop a scoping document... file by April 18, 2019</td>
<td>Transmitted 2019-RPT0061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

King County Metro Mobility Framework
# Equity Cabinet Members and Affiliation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equity Cabinet Member</th>
<th>Affiliation and Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paulina López, Co-Chair</td>
<td>Duwamish River Cleanup Coalition, Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony To, Co-Chair</td>
<td>HomeSight, Director Emeritus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyliaanna Allala</td>
<td>Community Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leda Chahim</td>
<td>Community Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita Green</td>
<td>NAACP Youth Coalition, Education Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellany Kayce</td>
<td>Nakani Native Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munira Mohamed</td>
<td>East African Community Services, Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linwood Robinson</td>
<td>King County Transit Advisory Commission, Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Smith</td>
<td>United Indians of All Tribes Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Benetua</td>
<td>Seattle Parks Foundation, Community Partnerships &amp; Planning Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamieko Cook</td>
<td>Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 587, Recording Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozart Guerrier</td>
<td>21Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavanya Madhusudan</td>
<td>Got Green, Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pah-tu Pitt</td>
<td>Community Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sili Savusa</td>
<td>White Center Community Development Association, Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalisa Thompson</td>
<td>University of Washington Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niesha Brooks</td>
<td>Community Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarneshea Evans</td>
<td>Friends of Waterfront Seattle, Outreach &amp; Partnerships Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Herrera-Páramo</td>
<td>Para los Niños</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Mayo</td>
<td>Community Activist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Ramirez</td>
<td>Puget Sound Sage, Director of Community Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Segovia</td>
<td>Ingersoll Gender Center, Economic Justice Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Zivarts</td>
<td>Rooted in Rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Names, affiliations, and titles pulled from full Mobility Framework Report (2019-RPT0156), page 1-3
SUBJECT

WaterWorks water quality grant award recommendations proposed by the Executive.

SUMMARY

Since the adoption of Ordinances 18031 and 18261 established a formal review process and new eligibility criteria for water quality grant awards under the county’s WaterWorks Grant program, the County Council has approved three rounds of grant awards recommended by the WaterWorks Grants Ranking Committee, supported by the WaterWorks Program of the Wastewater Treatment Division. Proposed Ordinance 2019-0444 represents Round 4 of the proposed WaterWorks water quality grant recommendations. This round provides for the allocation of $2.139 million to 28 water quality-related projects in the service area of the regional wastewater system.

BACKGROUND

In May of 2015, the County Council adopted Ordinance 18031, amended in 2016 by Ordinance 18261, establishing a new review process and eligibility criteria for WaterWorks grants. To be eligible for a grant, a project must:

- Create a benefit to or improvement of water quality within the County Wastewater Treatment Division’s (WTD) service area and benefit its ratepayers; and
- Demonstrate that water quality benefits are related to WTD’s regional water quality responsibilities.

Non-profit groups, cities, counties, special purpose districts, and tribes, as well as entities such as private businesses that are partnered with an otherwise-eligible entity, are eligible to receive funding, following a competitive review process.

The Council may annually adopt a motion establishing priorities for the subsequent grant application cycle; the Council is to seek comments from the Regional Water Quality Committee (RWQC) on such a proposed motion.

---

1 Ordinances 18324 approved the Round 1 grant recommendations; Ordinance 18460 approved Round 2 recommendations; Ordinance 18735 approved Round 3 recommendations.
The review process is conducted by the WaterWorks Grant Ranking Committee, staffed by the Wastewater Treatment Division. The Committee includes one technical specialist, three positions representing the Metropolitan Water Pollution Abatement Advisory Committee (“MWPAAC”), and nine positions representing Council districts, recommended to the Executive by Councilmembers. Committee members are appointed by the Executive and confirmed by Council. The Grant Ranking Committee reviews, ranks and recommends projects. Recommendations are to be based upon the above-specified criteria, the ability of the project to demonstrate water quality benefits, and implementation strength.

Following development of recommendations, the County Executive is to confirm recommendations or adjust the project list, and transmit to Council for consideration.

Through a separate process, County Council members also identify water quality grant projects that receive funding through sewer rate revenues; the WaterWorks program provides administrative support for management of those projects. Council authorization for those projects has historically been managed through the Council’s budget process.

**ANALYSIS**

The WaterWorks Grant Ranking Committee held a series of meetings to review applications and recommend proposals for water quality project funding. The Executive has transmitted Proposed Ordinance 2019-0444, which would approve the fourth round of recommendations by the Grant Ranking Committee. The transmittal includes a memorandum that lists the projects, including applicant, project amount, project title, proposed funding, project ranking, short project description and water quality benefit.

Recommended projects include:

- **Environmental Coalition of South Seattle**
  - Spill Kit Incentive Program for Small and Multicultural Businesses--$85,000

- **Nature Vision**
  - Youth Watershed Education, Stewardship, and Citizen Science Project--$54,823

- **InterIm CDA**
  - Danny Woo Rainwater Harvesting Project--$70,000

- **Kent Meridian High School**
  - Kent Meridian High School’s Rain Garden Project--$25,000

- **Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust**
  - Greenway Education Program--$45,000

- **Puget Soundkeeper**
  - Lost Urban Creeks Community Education and Revitalization Project--$80,000
• Environmental Science Center at Seahurst Park
  o Salmon Heroes: Watershed Education and Water Quality Monitoring for Underserved Students--$75,000

• Sustainable Seattle
  o Green Duwamish Watershed—Curriculum Design Lab--$84,400

• Beavers Northwest
  o Seattle Parks and Recreation Beaver Management Plan--$39,000

• City of Redmond
  o NE 40th Street Stormwater Treatment Retrofit --$150,000

• Mini Mart City Park
  o Green Stormwater Infrastructure at Mini Mart City Park--$100,000

• Stewardship Partners
  o Equitable Green Stormwater Infrastructure Incentives for King County--$150,000

• Sno-King Watershed Council
  o Sno-King Watershed Council volunteer water monitoring, outreach, education--$25,000

• Woodland Park Zoo
  o Woodland Park Zoo Stormwater Reuse Feasibility and Design Project with Water Quality Education--$100,000

• City of Issaquah
  o Lower Issaquah Creek Stream and Riparian Habitat Restoration Project--$170,000

• City of Maple Valley
  o Stormwater Facility Water Quality Retrofit--$45,000

• Central Area Collaborative
  o Lake Washington Watershed Internship Program--$97,381

• Puget Soundkeeper
  o Place-keeping with Environmental Justice--$75,000

• Lake Advocates
  o Water Quality Protection of King County Lakes Using Outreach and Education for Diverse Communities--$38,360

• Whale Scout
  o Saving Orcas One Drop at a Time, One Tree at a Time--$31,740
• Pacific Marine Research
  o Marine Science Afloat Field Trip Scholarship Program--$40,000

• Vashon Nature Center
  o Vashon Community Waters: Stormwater Education, Engagement and Stream Monitoring--$55,000

• University of Washington College of the Environment
  o Floating Treatment Wetlands Reduce Contaminants and Nutrients in Urban Stormwater Runoff--$100,000

• City of Seattle, Seattle Public Utilities
  o Protect Our Pipes Phase 2 Outreach--$100,000

• Washington Water Trust
  o Recycled Water: A Tool for Sustainable Agricultural Water Use--$115,000

• Cascadia College
  o Student Led Implementations for Stormwater Management--$24,500

• Pacific Science Center
  o Lake Washington Watershed Internship Program

• Parkview Services
  o Riverton Cascade Affordable Homes

• Drain Games: Apps for Water Quality Education--$100,000

**Total - Round 4** $2,139,500

A fuller summary of each project is provided in Attachment 4, the WaterWorks Grant Recommendations Memorandum.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Proposed Ordinance 2019-0444
2. Transmittal letter, dated October 9, 2019
3. Fiscal Note
4. WaterWorks Grant Recommendations Memorandum

**INVITED**

1. Elizabeth Loudon, WaterWorks Program Manager, Wastewater Treatment Division
AN ORDINANCE approving the grant funding allocation
for the projects funded through the WaterWorks grant
program, Round 4, in accordance with the 2019-2020
Biennial Budget Ordinance, Ordinance 18835, Section 108,
and Ordinance 18261.

STATEMENT OF FACTS:

1. Ordinance 18031, Section 1, as amended by Ordinance 18261, Section
1, established the grant award criteria and process for the WaterWorks
grant program in accordance with the 2015/2016 Biennial Budget
Ordinance, Ordinance 17941, Section 110, Proviso P2.

2. The 2019-2020 Biennial Budget Ordinance, Ordinance 18835, Section
108, appropriated funding for the WaterWorks grant program.

3. Attachment A to Ordinance 18261 contains the implementation
guidelines for the WaterWorks grant program, including the project
criteria, eligibility, project selection process and administration of grants.
The implementation guidelines provide for a grant ranking committee to
review, rank and recommend projects for funding and for the wastewater
treatment division of the department of natural resources and parks to
administer and staff the program.
4. As described in Attachment A to Ordinance 18261, projects approved for funding must meet eligibility criteria for water quality improvements, and the grant ranking committee is to review, rank and recommend to the King County executive the projects to be approved for funding, based upon the eligibility criteria and ability of the applicants to demonstrate water quality benefits and implementation strength.

5. The grant ranking committee convened eight times in 2019 to review and rank grant proposals and has recommended funding for the projects listed in section 1 of this ordinance, based upon the eligibility criteria, water quality benefits and implementation strength.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF KING COUNTY:

SECTION 1. The King County council authorizes the funding of WaterWorks projects for Round 4, 2019, totaling $2,139,500, as follows:

A. Environmental Coalition of South Seattle: $85,000 for "Spill Kit Incentive Program for Small and Multicultural Businesses";


C. InterIm CDA: $70,000 for "Danny Woo Rainwater Harvesting Project";

D. Kent Meridian High School: $25,000 for "Kent Meridian High School's Rain Garden Project";

E. Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust: $45,000 for "Greenway Education Program";

F. Puget Soundkeeper: $80,000 for "Lost Urban Creeks Community Education"
G. Environmental Science Center at Seahurst Park: $75,000 for "Salmon Heroes: Watershed Education and Water Quality Monitoring for Underserved Students";

H. Sustainable Seattle: $84,400 for "Green Duwamish Watershed - Curriculum Design Lab";

I. Beavers Northwest: $39,000 for "Seattle Parks and Recreation Beaver Management Plan";

J. City of Redmond: $150,000 for "NE 40th Street Stormwater Treatment Retrofit";

K. Mini Mart City Park: $100,000 for "Green Stormwater Infrastructure at Mini Mart City Park";

L. Stewardship Partners: $150,000 for "Equitable GSI Incentives for King County";

M. Sno-King Watershed Council: $25,000 for "Sno-King Watershed Council volunteer water monitoring, outreach and education";

N. Woodland Park Zoo: $100,000 for "Woodland Park Zoo Stormwater Reuse Feasibility and Design Project with Water Quality Education";

O. City of Issaquah: $170,000 for "Lower Issaquah Creek Stream and Riparian Habitat Restoration Project";

P. City of Maple Valley: $45,000 for "Stormwater Facility Water Quality Retrofit";

Q. Central Area Collaborative: $75,000 for "Place-keeping with Environmental Justice";
R. Lake Advocates: $38,360 for "Water Quality Protection of King County Lakes Using Outreach and Education for Diverse Communities";

S. Whale Scout: $31,740 for "Saving the Orcas One Drop at a Time, One Tree at a Time";

T. Pacific Marine Research: $40,000 for "Marine Science Afloat Field Trip Scholarship Program";

U. Vashon Nature Center: $55,000 for "Vashon Community Waters: Stormwater Education, Engagement, and Stream Monitoring";

V. University of Washington, College of the Environment: $100,000 for "Floating Treatment Wetlands Reduce Contaminants and Nutrients in Urban Stormwater Runoff";

W. City of Seattle, Seattle Public Utilities: $100,000 for "Protect Our Pipes Phase 2 Outreach";

X. Washington Water Trust: $115,000 for "Recycled Water: A Tool for Sustainable Agricultural Water Use";

Y. Cascadia College: $24,500 for "Student Led Implementations for Stormwater Management";

Z. Pacific Science Center: $50,000 for "The Lake Washington Watershed Internship Program";

AA. Parkview Services: $111,677 for "Riverton Cascade Affordable Homes"; and
BB. University of Washington: $100,000 for "Drain Games: Apps for Water Quality Education."

KING COUNTY COUNCIL
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

________________________________________
Rod Dembowski, Chair

ATTEST:

________________________________________
Melani Pedroza, Clerk of the Council

APPROVED this _____ day of _______________, ______.

________________________________________
Dow Constantine, County Executive

Attachments: None
October 9, 2019

The Honorable Rod Dembowski
Chair, King County Council
Room 1200
COURTHOUSE

Dear Councilmember Dembowski:

This letter transmits a proposed ordinance that, if enacted, provides grant funding allocations for projects funded through the King County WaterWorks grant program. These grants enable King County to protect and improve water quality in our region and foster environmental stewardship.

The legislation provides funding for projects selected through the WaterWorks competitive grant program that enable non-profits, local governments, and schools to engage in projects, programs, and activities beneficial to water quality in the service area of the Wastewater Treatment Division (WTD) of the Department of Natural Resources and Parks. These projects will leverage or complement the water quality mission for King County’s regional wastewater system.

Specifically, the ordinance will accomplish the following:

- Fund 28 projects totaling $2,139,500 throughout King County and south Snohomish County;
- Promote a variety of activities and approaches, including research, restoration, stormwater retrofits, education, community engagement, stewardship, and green stormwater infrastructure that will improve water quality and benefit its ratepayers;
- Leverage funding and other resources, such as volunteer engagement, which strengthens the grant recipient’s ability to implement the project; and,
- Foster environmental stewardship.

The legislation furthers the goals of key King County plans and initiatives as follows:

- Furthers the King County Strategic Plan goal of a healthy environment by protecting water quality through reducing pollution at its source, and by promotion and
implementing low-impact development practices, stormwater management, and habitat restoration

- Furthers the King County Equity and Social Justice Initiative goal of creating healthy built and natural environments by protecting and restoring waterways, and educating and engaging community members on water quality issues; and,
- Furthers the Strategic Climate Action Plan goal of preparing for climate change impact by promoting green stormwater infrastructure, reducing the risk of flooding, planting trees, and building resilience at the local level.

In developing the legislation, the Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP) engaged non-profits, local governments, schools, and tribes through workshops, outreach, and grant solicitation. DNRP worked to incorporate the input into the legislation, and the WaterWorks Grant Ranking Committee has indicated that it supports the legislation. A memorandum from the WaterWorks Grant Ranking Committee which includes its recommended project funding list is attached for reference.

Thank you for your consideration of this proposed ordinance. This important legislation will help King County residents protect and improve water quality and positively impact communities.

If your staff have any questions, please feel free to contact Mark Isaacson, Wastewater Treatment Division Director, at 206-477-4601.

Sincerely,

Dow Constantine
King County Executive

Enclosures

cc: King County Councilmembers
    ATTN: Carolyn Busch, Chief of Staff
    Melani Pedroza, Clerk of the Council
    Dwight Dively, Director, Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget
    Christie True, Director, Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)
    Mark Isaacson, Division Director, Wastewater Treatment Division, DNRP
2019/2020 FISCAL NOTE

Ordinance/Motion: 2019-XXXX
Title: WaterWorks Grants Round 4 Authorization
Affected Agency and/or Agencies: Wastewater Treatment Division (WTD), Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP)
Note Prepared By: Phillip Kwon, Financial Services Administrator, WTD, DNRP
Date Prepared: 9/9/2019
Note Reviewed By: Hiedi Popchock, Finance & Administration Section Manager, WTD, DNRP
Date Reviewed: 9/9/2019

Description of request:
This ordinance approves the project list for Round 4 of the WaterWorks competitive grant program for non-profits, local governments, and schools to engage in projects, programs, and activities that will benefit water quality in WTD's service area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DNRP/WTD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,602,666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2019/2020</th>
<th>2021/2022</th>
<th>2023/2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,602,666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,602,666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2019/2020</th>
<th>2021/2022</th>
<th>2023/2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,602,666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenditures by Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019/2020</th>
<th>2021/2022</th>
<th>2023/2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative costs</td>
<td>602,666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Award</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2019/2020</th>
<th>2021/2022</th>
<th>2023/2024</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,602,666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does this legislation require a budget supplemental? No

Notes and Assumptions: No. The 2019/2020 Biennial Budget includes $2,000,000 for projects in the attached list WaterWorks Grants Round 4. An additional $6,000 not shown above is included in the recommended funding total (making the total grant award $2,006,000). The $6,000 is from unexpended funds from a closed project from the 2015/2016 cycle. $602,666 is included for administrative costs. Budget was adopted for the WaterWorks Grant Program in the 2019/2020 Biennial Budget.
September 26, 2019

TO: The Honorable Dow Constantine, King County Executive

FM: WaterWorks Grant Ranking Committee
   David Bain, District 1 Representative
   A. William Way, District 3 Representative
   Kintea Bryant, District 4 Representative
   Debbie Natelson, District 5 Representative
   Bobbi Wallace, District 6 Representative
   Kathy Minsch, MWPAAC Representative, City of Seattle
   Pam Carter, MWPAAC Representative, Valley View Sewer District
   Bob Elwell, MWPAAC Representative, City of Auburn
   Nathan Karres, Water Quality Technical Specialist

RE: WaterWorks Grant Recommendations - Round 4

We would like to thank you for the opportunity to be involved in the review and ranking process for the fourth round of the WaterWorks grants. Our committee had a series of eight meetings to discuss the criteria, eligibility, water quality benefits, implementation strengths, equity and social justice aspects, and community involvement of the projects.

WaterWorks uses a two-step application process: letters of intent and full applications. Out of the original 73 proposals, 41 were invited to submit full applications, 40 submitted full applications, and 28 are recommended for funding. We are pleased to see many diverse and innovative proposals to improve water quality in the King County Wastewater Treatment Division (WTD) service area. We carefully considered our recommended project list to ensure diversity not only in approach and geographic distribution, but also in target populations. We are confident these projects will enhance the work of WTD and benefit WTD’s service area and ratepayers.

Because we strongly support this program, we may make some recommendations in advance of the next grant cycle to improve the process. We believe the diversity and quality of proposals are directly related to the outreach and excellent staff support from WTD. We would also like to acknowledge the work of internal reviewers from WTD and King County’s Water and Land Resources Division (WLRD) whose analyses furthered our understanding of the submitted projects.

Included, on the following pages, is our recommended project funding for the WaterWorks Grant Program - Round 4. This original recommendation list was endorsed unanimously by the WaterWorks Grant Ranking Committee. One of the originally selected projects received funding
for their project from another source and Parkview Services was then chosen for funding. Later in the process an additional $133,500 became available to use for funding due to a change in how administrative costs were categorized. This allowed the funding of University of Washington Drain Games and an increase in funding for the Woodland Park Zoo and Parkview Services. The WaterWorks Grant Ranking Committee approved these changes. The projects are listed by rank with proposed funding amounts and summary descriptions of how the project meets the selection criteria as directed by the adopted Implementation Guidelines.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Applicant</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Project Description and Benefits to Water Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Coalition of South Seattle</td>
<td>Spill Kit Incentive Program for Small and Multicultural Businesses</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>This project will provide spill response training to small businesses, supporting local jurisdictions with local source control outreach. The focus will be businesses that are owned and/or managed by immigrants, refugees, and people of color. This will benefit water quality by ensuring all small businesses are equitably equipped to prevent and handle spills, thereby preventing non-point source pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Vision</td>
<td>Youth Watershed Education, Stewardship, and Citizen Science</td>
<td>$54,823</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>This project will provide custom water quality and wastewater education programs, including field trips with small scale restoration projects and science for residents, with a focus on serving low-income schools that serve a majority of students of color, as well as immigrant and refugee populations. This will benefit water quality by providing students with project based learning and water quality education, to become better informed residents and stewards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InterIm CDA</td>
<td>Danny Woo Rainwater Harvesting Project</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>This project will capture and clean rainwater while educating the community in the Chinatown-International District on water health and reuse. This will benefit water quality by reducing stormwater runoff, pollution loading, combined sewer overflows, and erosion; educating community members, and creating water stewards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent Meridian High School</td>
<td>Kent Meridian High School's Rain Garden Project</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>This project will install a rain garden at a public high school with over 80 percent people of color and significant refugee and immigrant populations; and engage students through education and maintenance. This will benefit water quality by reducing the amount of polluted runoff going into local streams and rivers, and educating and engaging youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grant Applicant</strong></td>
<td><strong>Project Title</strong></td>
<td><strong>Funding</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rank</strong></td>
<td><strong>Project Description and Benefits to Water Quality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountains to Sound Greenway Trust</td>
<td>Greenway Education Program</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>This project will educate students on water and ecosystem topics, including a field investigation and service-learning stewardship event. This will benefit water quality by educating the next generation about the importance of water quality and ecosystem health, and empowering them to make informed choices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puget Soundkeeper</td>
<td>Lost Urban Creeks Community Education and Revitalization Project</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>This project will partner with Unleash the Brilliance, a youth-mentorship organization that serves people of color, to revitalize Springbrook Creek through community based education, outreach, and stewardship. This will benefit water quality by empowering youth, increasing stewardship, restoration, and pollution prevention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science Center at Seahurst Park</td>
<td>Salmon Heroes: Watershed Education and Water Quality Monitoring for Underserved Students</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>This project will increase knowledge of watershed and water quality issues and improve stewardship attitudes through an education and stewardship program. This will benefit water quality by teaching youth the importance of water quality for our ecosystem, and making the connection between everyday actions and water pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Seattle</td>
<td>Green Duwamish Watershed – Curriculum Design Lab</td>
<td>$84,400</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>This project will expand a teacher fellows program to create and sustain problem-based curricula connecting to local water quality issues and plans; pilot and map adopt-a-site projects; and engage equity advocacy high school interns. This will benefit water quality by improving students’ understanding of their role in improving watershed and water quality conditions, and connecting them to applied learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beavers Northwest</td>
<td>Seattle Parks and Recreation Beaver Management Plan</td>
<td>$39,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>This project will provide beaver population surveys, development of a comprehensive beaver management plan, and implement non-lethal beaver management and outreach in partnership with Seattle Parks and Recreation. This will benefit water quality by creating, restoring, and retaining beaver wetland and pond complexes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Applicant</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Project Description and Benefits to Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Redmond</td>
<td>NE 40th Street Stormwater Treatment Retrofit</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>This project will retrofit highway and arterial roads with stormwater runoff treatment, in partnership with Sound Transit and Microsoft Corporation. This will benefit water quality by removing water pollutants before they reach Lake Sammamish and beyond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini Mart City Park</td>
<td>Green Stormwater Infrastructure at Mini Mart City Park</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>This project will install green stormwater infrastructure including bio-retention planters, permeable paving, and a green roof; provide public education components; and work in partnership with DIRT Corps and Duwamish Valley Youth Corps, both groups that serve youth of color and low-income communities. This will benefit water quality by capturing and/or filtering 100 percent of annual rainfall; creating green job pathways for youth of color; and offering educational programs and activities at this demonstration site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewardship Partners</td>
<td>Equitable Green Stormwater Infrastructure (GSI) Incentives for King County</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>This project will build on a successful pilot to offer financial resources to fund voluntary green stormwater infrastructure retrofit projects, accelerating adoption of GSI and increasing the equity of access. This will benefit water quality by preventing, managing, and treating stormwater pollution on private land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sno-King Watershed Council</td>
<td>Sno-King Watershed Council volunteer water monitoring, outreach and education</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>This project will support and enhance an existing volunteer water monitoring program. This project will benefit water quality by promoting awareness of local streams and water quality issues, fostering stewardship, providing public outreach and education, and partnering with local organizations and schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland Park Zoo</td>
<td>Woodland Park Zoo Stormwater Reuse Feasibility and Design Project with Water Quality Education</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>This project will conduct a feasibility study to identify water reuse alternatives and develop a design, including an educational component. This will benefit water quality by diverting stormwater run-off from entering the combined sewer, by filtering run-off to reduce pollutants before it enters surface and groundwater, and through education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Applicant</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Project Description and Benefits to Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Issaquah</td>
<td>Lower Issaquah Creek Stream and Riparian Habitat Restoration Project</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>This project will restore in-stream and riparian habitat, providing revegetation, additional floodplain, and increasing channel complexity. This will benefit water quality by lowering water temperatures and increasing dissolved oxygen by increasing shade; and also by removing sediment and pollutants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Maple Valley</td>
<td>Stormwater Facility Water Quality Retrofit</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>This project will rehabilitate eight stormwater ponds that do not meet current requirements; and also involve and educate community members. This will benefit water quality by reducing pollutant load prior to infiltration or discharge to local water bodies, performing outreach to encourage positive behavior; and providing education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Area Collaborative</td>
<td>Place-keeping with Environmental Justice</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>This project will conduct community outreach, get input on priority sites, install a rain garden or other green stormwater feature, and train stewards on maintenance requirements. This will benefit water quality by identifying flooding hotspots, educating the community on impacts of stormwater runoff, and reducing polluted runoff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Advocates</td>
<td>Water Quality Protection of King County Lakes Using Outreach and Education for Diverse Communities</td>
<td>$38,360</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>This project will produce videos on water quality, shoreline development, invasive species, and lake management in partnership with University of Washington Bothell and King County’s Water and Land Resources Division. This will benefit water quality by providing accessible information in several languages; educating lake users; and improving stewardship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whale Scout</td>
<td>Saving the Orcas One Drop at a Time, One Tree at a Time</td>
<td>$31,740</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>This project will harness the public fascination with killer whales, channeling it towards restoration and stewardship actions at home. This will benefit water quality by increasing stewardship activities such as pollution prevention, water conservation, and restoration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Applicant</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Project Description and Benefits to Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Marine Research</td>
<td>Marine Science Afloat Field Trip Scholarship Program</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>This project will provide approximately 600 students a hands-on environmental education aboard a research vessel through direct interactions with sea life and water quality testing. Low-income schools will be included through field trip scholarships. This will benefit water quality by creating future stewards through instilling in students a sense of ownership and belonging, and discussions on threats to Puget Sound as well as solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vashon Nature Center</td>
<td>Vashon Community Waters: Stormwater Education, Engagement, and Stream Monitoring</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>This project will build on recent community science monitoring and upcoming rain garden installations in downtown Vashon; and create a model of community-based stormwater reduction. This will benefit water quality by getting residents actively engaged in learning about water quality impacts, and inspiring them to change habits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington, College of the Environment</td>
<td>Floating Treatment Wetlands Reduce Contaminants and Nutrients in Urban Stormwater Runoff</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>This project will determine which species perform best in floating wetlands in reducing contaminants; test whether harvesting plant material will assist in removing contaminants, and examine the fate of contaminants. This will benefit water quality by determining the best phytoremediative species and biomedia for use in Floating Treatment Wetlands to be used to treat stormwater within urban streams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seattle, Seattle Public Utilities</td>
<td>Protect Our Pipes Phase 2 Outreach</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>This project will expand on previous work that found that young adults tend to use more “flushable” products, and piloted outreach campaigns at the University of Washington. This follow-up project will expand outreach to multiple colleges as well as residents of multi-family buildings that house large low-income, refugee, and immigrant populations; educate communities on what can and cannot be flushed and measure results. This will benefit water quality by reducing the amount of trash going into wastewater systems, and reducing impacts on the combined sewer systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Applicant</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Project Description and Benefits to Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Water Trust</td>
<td>Recycled Water: A Tool for Sustainable Agricultural Water Use</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>This project will increase consumer demand for recycled water through developing a demonstration garden, testing results, and engaging in targeted outreach and social marketing. This will benefit water quality by promoting the use of recycled water, which can help lower river temperatures and provide a safe alternative to irrigation water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascadia College</td>
<td>Student Led Implementations for Stormwater Management</td>
<td>$24,500</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>This project will build on previous work to install best management practices for stormwater on campus, engaging students and tracking before and after results. This will benefit water quality by reducing bacteria and nutrient levels in North Creek, and leverage the service of University of Washington Bothell and Cascadia facilities teams, and developing over time a comprehensive water quality management system for the campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Science Center</td>
<td>The Lake Washington Watershed Internship Program</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>This project will enable high school students to become informed stewards of the local ecosystem through hands-on learning, mentoring of local elementary students, ecosystem restoration, and monthly stream monitoring. This will benefit water quality by providing interns with a sense of place and belonging, training as environmental scientists, and forming an environmental identity that builds on and aligns with cultural values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkview Services</td>
<td>Riverton Cascade Affordable Homes</td>
<td>$111,677</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>This project will implement green stormwater infrastructure in the development of 13 affordable homes for low-income families and persons with disabilities, in partnership with Homestead Community Land Trust. This will benefit water quality by managing the impact of development on water quality and ecosystems, filtering and reducing pollutants at the source, slowing flows, and creating an exemplary green and affordable housing model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Applicant</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Project Description and Benefits to Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>Drain Games: Apps for Water Quality Education</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>This project will create an educational, digital game (app) in collaboration with King County’s Wastewater Treatment Division. This will benefit water quality by teaching water concepts through a medium that is popular and widely accessible, and ensure that the next generation understands water infrastructure issues and solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,139,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cc: Mark Isaacson, Division Director, Wastewater Treatment Division, Department of Natural Resources and Parks