RAPIDRIDE

PRIORITIZATION FRAMEWORK MEMO

Project Purpose

RapidRide is an integral part of the Puget Sound region's high-capacity transit network that improves mobility along major corridors and connects key destinations and regional growth centers. The current RapidRide network consists of seven lines in service (A-F and H) with one line under construction (G) and four in the planning and/or design stage (I, J, K, and R).

The RapidRide Expansion Program (completed in 2018) established new standards for RapidRide service and conducted evaluations of six suburban corridors included in the version of METRO CONNECTS long range plan in place at that time. The revisions to Metro Connects, adopted in 2021, included an interim service network that identified a pool of eight candidates for new or significantly modified RapidRide routes (Table 1).

Table 1 Metro Connects Interim Network RapidRide Candidates

Current Equivalent Routes	Metro Connects Corridor Number	Representative Alignment in RRPP
Route 36 and 49	1064	U. District, Beacon Hill, Othello
Route 40	1993	Northgate, Ballard, Seattle CBD, First Hill
Route 44	1012	Ballard, Wallingford, UW Hospital/Husky Stadium
Route 150	1049	Kent, Southcenter, Seattle CBD
Route 165	1056	Highline CC, Kent, Green River CC
Route 181	1052	Twin Lakes, Federal Way, Green River CC
B Line and 226	1999	Redmond, Overlake, Eastgate
B Line and 271	3101 + 1028	Crossroads, Bellevue, U. District

The ordinance adopting the 2021 Metro Connects update requires the creation of a RapidRide Prioritization Plan to determine the specific candidates to be developed as part of the interim network. This will be accomplished by developing a reasonable representative alignment for each candidate corridor and conducting (or updating) a preplanning level corridor study for each candidate corridor. These corridor studies will consider route alignment options, operations plan, capital investment needs, potential ridership, and develop planning level cost estimates for each candidate corridor.

Using information from the corridor studies, the RapidRide candidates will be evaluated in comparison to each other and prioritized to identify a high level, three-tiered program for implementation. The highest tier RapidRide candidates emerging from the prioritization process are those that will be first scheduled and budgeted for implementation and the medium tier will be the lines next to be developed if additional funding becomes available. The lowest tier will include candidate routes not prioritized for development as part of the interim network, but could be considered as RapidRide candidates in the 2050 network.

The RapidRide Prioritization Plan will be submitted to the Regional Transit Committee for review by June 2024 for acceptance by motion.

Prioritization Framework

The framework described in this memo will be used by Metro to prioritize future development of the eight candidate RapidRide lines (including two alignments for Corridor 1064). It will serve as a tool that facilitates a clear and transparent process for prioritizing RapidRide lines into three implementation tiers (high, medium, low) and providing outcomes that can be used for future planning and decision making. The framework incorporates Metro values by leading with racial and social equity and environmental sustainability.

This framework was developed, in part, to build on the corridor evaluation and prioritization process undertaken as part of the RapidRide Expansion Program in 2018. It integrates common concepts while reflecting the interim network in the updated Metro Connects (2021), the Mobility Framework, and Metro's Equitable Transit-Oriented Development policy.

Process for Selection of Draft Prioritization Measures

Development of the prioritization measures began as an iterative process prior to the corridor analysis. The project team compiled an expansive set of categories and more than 100 measures for initial consideration. These included measures used during previous Metro projects, as well as some used by other agencies (Seattle Department of Transportation, Los Angeles Metro, San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency) for similar prioritization processes. The project team subsequently condensed this list to categories and measures that were most reflective of Metro's core values of safety, equity, and sustainability, as defined in Metro Connects, as well as the guiding principles in 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 our workforce
- Align our investments with equity, sustainability, and financial responsibility
- Engage deliberately and transparently[1]

Using these values as a guide, the project team identified the following draft categories of measures for the prioritization process:

- Equity
- Environmental/Sustainability[2]
- Service
- Capital Needs
- Implementation

It should be noted the project team originally suggested Safety as an evaluation measure. However, the anticipated level of analysis that will accompany the prioritization process will not provide sufficient detail to analyze potential safety improvements for transit users or individual transportation modes.

The project team refined the list of potential evaluation measures and aligned candidate measures with the categories described above. For each measure, the evaluation methodology and data sources reflected the anticipated level of detail and available information that will be generated through the corridor analyses and prioritization process. Most measures will be assessed quantitatively to provide the greatest degree of transparency and minimize ambiguity in the evaluation process. For qualitative measures, the project team will document assumptions and considerations to provide a clear understanding of how conclusions were reached.

Because the candidate RapidRide lines will be compared relative to each other, many of the thresholds associated with scoring will be determined as part of the prioritization process. For example, the methodology for the draft measure "Transit travel time savings" will be evaluated based on the percent decrease in total end to end travel time compared to the future baseline

[1] Because this effort will have limited external engagement, the values expressed in adopted policy documents, including the Mobility Framework and Metro Connects, will serve as guidance associated with stakeholder input.

[2] It is assumed that all RapidRide fleet will operate with zero-emissions vehicles (electric trolley bus or battery electric bus). The sustainability benefits associated with conversion of the existing diesel-hybrid fleet to zero-emissions technology will not be included in the prioritization process. Additionally, given the programmatic nature of Metro's planned transition to a zero-emissions fleet, only corridor-specific capital needs, such as an extension of overhead contact system infrastructure or route specific layover charging infrastructure, will be included in the conceptual cost estimates.

travel time. Once the potential for travel time savings for each candidate corridor is calculated, the greatest percentage savings will set the upper threshold for this measure and the forecast performance for all corridors will be compared to it accordingly.

Equity Cabinet Review

The project team presented the draft equity measures, and evaluation methodologies to the Equity Cabinet for consideration in September 2023. The Equity Cabinet was asked to provide feedback for all, with a specific emphasis on the draft measures in the Equity category shown in Table 2. Suggestions from the Equity Cabinet included:

- Consider inclusion of displacement risk as a measure.
- Incorporate the presence of subsidized housing as part of the analysis. This could be incorporated via the displacement risk or included as part of the Community Asset data set noted for several measures. Senior housing should also be incorporated as part of the subsidized housing dataset.
- Measures related to Equity Prioritization score and access to jobs were supported by many Equity Cabinet members. Community assets were also noted as important considerations.
- Investigate including the share or number of households without a car as an equity measure.
- Review the King County Comprehensive Plan equity analysis and the Seattle Department of Transportation's (SDOT) equity measures for consistency with Metro's proposed prioritization framework.

Table 2. Draft RapidRide Prioritization Equity Measures Presented to the Equity Cabinet September 2023

Measure	Methodology	Rationale
Equity Prioritization Score	Calculate average Equity Prioritization score	Reflect Service Guidelines equity approach
Density of Community Assets	Calculate assets within ½ mile of the alignment	Capture community destinations along each corridor
Subsidized Housing Units	Calculate assets within ½ mile of the alignment	Reflect corridor importance for serving subsidized housing
Access to Jobs for Priority Populations	Compare improvement in access based on improved travel times and reduced waiting	Show whether corridor improvements would produce meaningful changes in job access
Route Resiliency	Compare of pre- and post-pandemic boardings to reflect essential travel	Reflect routes where transit continues to provide an essential service

In response to feedback from the Equity Cabinet, the project team concluded the following:

- Subsidized housing in King County includes some locations that are only open to seniors and the disabled. Additionally, there are senior housing providers that do not provide reduced cost housing. Thus, including a general measure associated with the presence of senior housing could either duplicate data or incorporate facilities for which transit dependency is less prevalent and the project team did not recommend its incorporation into the measures.
- Households may not have a car for a variety of reasons, including the choice to not own one. As such, the project team felt that the Equity Prioritization score, which incorporates US census data associated with household income, provided a better reflection of populations who might not own an automobile for reasons other than choice. The US Census category of "Population living 200% below the federal poverty line" comprises 30 percent of a tract's Equity Prioritization score.
- The PSRC Displacement Risk Index, King County Comprehensive Plan update, and SDOT's Transit Equity Framework all incorporate several of the other measures and/or data sets noted in the Equity Prioritization score.
    - The PSRC Displacement Risk Index ranks Census tracts as being at High, Moderate, or Low risk for displacement based on the following indicators/characteristics:
        - Socio-demographic indicators look at characteristics of current residents. These indicators include race and ethnicity, linguistic isolation, educational attainment, housing tenure, housing cost burden, and household income.
        - Transportation indicators include access to jobs by car and transit, proximity to existing transit, and proximity to future high capacity transit service.
        - Neighborhood characteristics include the proximity to services like supermarkets, restaurants, parks, and schools, and proximity to high-income areas.
        - Housing indicators include development capacity and median rental prices.
        - Civic engagement is measured by voter turnout.

      Metro's established values and policies emphasize the importance of investing transit services where needs are greatest. The inclusion of proximity to high capacity transit as a factor in determining displacement risk, in combination with other indicators that contribute to Metro's definition of areas of greatest needs, presents a potential conflict with Metro's values.
    - The scope of work for the King County Comprehensive Plan update, underway concurrent with the RapidRide Prioritization Process, notes that the 2024 update will include Pro-Equity as one of three focus areas. Scoping topics include:

Reducing housing and business displacement and advancing equity, Integrating a pro-equity and anti-racist policy framework into the Comprehensive Plan, and Improving health equity outcomes in communities with the greatest and most acute needs.

- The SDOT Transportation Equity Framework identifies eight equity strategy drivers (Safety, Mobility and Transportation Options, Transit Access, Infrastructure, Planning and Maintenance, Land Use, Housing and Displacement, Economic Development, Transportation Justice).

Given the overlap with other draft RapidRide prioritization measures, including characteristics that are used to determine the Equity Prioritization score, it was determined that incorporation of these measures would result in a "double counting" across some data sets, potentially impacting the overall prioritization score for some routes. Should there be a desire to evaluate prioritization outcomes associated with proving additional emphasis on equity, the project team can do so using the sensitivity testing process described below.

Although Displacement Risk was not incorporated as a prioritization measure, this information can inform Metro's on-going coordination activities with partner jurisdictions and identify locations where cities may wish to modify existing policies or programs to help minimize the potential for displacement.

Table 3 summarizes the preliminary measures that will be used for the prioritization process.

Table 3. Proposed RapidRide Prioritization Measures

Measure Category	Type of Measure	Methodology/Measure Description	Data Source(s)	Rationale
Equity	Equity Prioritization Score	Determine the average area of need score for census block groups within a 1/2 mile walkshed of assumed stations	Metro Area of Need Score as described in the King County Metro Service Guidelines (November 2021)	Reflect Service Guidelines equity approach
	Density of community assets near the corridor	Number of assets per square mile of area within 1/2 mile walkshed of assumed stations	King County datasets including 1) Common Points of Interest	Capture community destinations along each corridor
	Density of subsidized housing near the corridor	Number of assets per square mile of area within 1/2 mile of assumed stations	King County Department of Community and Human Services; Regional Affordable housing Dashboard https://kingcounty.gov/depts/community-human-services/housing/affordable-housing-committee/data.aspx	Reflect corridor importance for serving subsidized housing
	Improved access to low wage jobs for priority populations via transit	Comparative improvement in access to existing low wage jobs based on improved travel time and reduced waiting time with BRT implementation	PSRC land use forecast data and GTFS dataset	Show whether corridor improvements would produce meaningful changes in access to low wage jobs for priority populations
	Route resiliency	Develop a ratio of existing boardings (~2021 or 2022) compared to 2019 to speak to those corridors with more resilient ridership during the pandemic and therefore speaking to the higher value those corridors have in providing essential travel	King County Metro ridership reports	Reflect routes where transit continues to provide an essential service
Environmental/ Sustainability	Forecast household and employment growth	Comparative change of households and jobs within 1/2 mile walkshed of assumed stations	PSRC land use forecast data	Understand the forecast relative changes in land use along each corridor; this reflects that corridors have different existing and forecast land use densities
	Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reductions	Apply average trip lengths from ST model to ridership gains/growth to calculate mode shift; apply a factor associated with estimated GHG per mile	Sound Transit Ridership model outputs: -Average trip lengths -Net new riders by corridor	Show how the conversion to RapidRide service would result in a reduction in GHG emissions based on changes in ridership, including a shift from automobile travel to transit use
Service	Existing speed	Existing transit speed as a percent of the posted speed limit	Existing conditions as reported from Metro OBS data	Understand how existing routes perform based on transit travel speed to help inform comparisons of forecast performance
	Existing on-time performance	Percent of trips that arrive late for each RapidRide corridor's equivalent existing route	Metro Service Evaluation Reports	Understand on time performance to help inform comparisons of forecast performance
	Transit travel time savings	Percent decrease in total end to end travel time compared to future baseline (no build)	Forecast transit speed improvements based on transit operational analysis (Synchro)	Demonstrate how potential investments can improve transit travel times and how effective they would be in achieving the RapidRide standard
	Corridor transit travel speed	Comparison of average corridor transit travel speed to RapidRide standard	Forecast corridor length travel speed; RapidRide standards	Demonstrate how potential investments can improve transit travel speed and how effective they would be in achieving the RapidRide standard
	Impacts to general purpose travel time	Calculate estimated impacts to general purpose travel resulting from transit priority treatments	Existing traffic operations data and forecast operations (Synchro) for approach delays at key intersections	Understand the magnitude of impacts to general purpose traffic resulting from the potential transit performance investments
	Benefits/impacts to other transit routes	Identify how many other transit vehicle trips in a peak hour would benefit or be negatively impacted by the assumed capital improvements on a RapidRide corridor	Metro Connects 2050 network	Reflect the potential cumulative benefits or negative impacts of investments in RapidRide corridors
	Total Ridership	Forecast future ridership	Sound Transit Ridership Model	Show the total forecast ridership increases resulting from the RapidRide investments
	Ridership gains	Percentage rider increase compared to existing	Sound Transit Ridership Model for Link light rail and existing ridership	Show the relative forecast ridership increases resulting from the RapidRide investments; this helps to distinguish the potential value of investments in each corridor, reflecting that corridors have different existing and forecast land use densities
	Corridor Productivity	Ridership per platform mile or hour	Sound Transit Ridership Model for Link light rail and forecast platform miles or hours	Understand the efficiency of the corridor after the potential investments
	Improved transit network	Future connections to the regional HCT system	Metro Connects 2050 network	Reflect the mobility improvements associated with improved connections to HCT service
Capital Needs	Total project cost	Comparison of costs based on thresholds (TBD)	Unit bid tabs, cost estimating methodology, standard cost estimating procedures	Capture total cost of potential investments for each corridor
Implementation	Risk/Schedule	Likelihood of completion by 2035	Professional estimate based on project complexity	Understand how likely it would be that RapidRide service could begin by 2035
	Transit supportive land uses	Planned land use densities within 1/2 mile walkshed of route alignment	Jurisdictional comprehensive plans; FTA definitions for transit supportive densities	Assess the established support for transit supportive uses and densities in the communities served by the corridor
	Support for transit operations	Review local plans to determine supportive policies for transit operations (curb space, signals, priority) and nonmotorized access to transit	Jurisdiction comprehensive and/or transportation plans	Assess the established support for transit operations in the communities served by the corridor
	Value of investment	Total project cost divided by ridership gains	Sound Transit Ridership Model for Link light rail and estimated project capital costs	Understand the value of investment relative to ridership increases
	Funding competitiveness	Competitiveness for federal funding	FTA funding guidance	Evaluate the potential for securing federal funding to support development of RapidRide service in the corridor
	Operational efficiency	Cost per platform mile or per hour	Estimated project capital costs and forecast platform miles or hours	Understand the value of investment relative to operational needs

Evaluation and Sensitivity Testing

The corridor prioritization process is expected to be an iterative and/or multi-step process in which preliminary results inform potential revisions to evaluation measures, methodologies, or data sources. There is a possibility that one or more of the preliminary final measures may not provide enough differentiation between corridors and modifications are needed to capture the value or intent of the measure.

Additionally, the team will conduct a sensitivity test(s) to evaluate the impact of weighting different measures. Weighting can be used for a number of reasons, including to provide balance among categories that have a large discrepancy in the number of measures, or to provide additional emphasis on specific categories or measures that are among Metro's highest priorities. For example, Metro currently applies weighting to three factors when determining bus service growth needs across its network. Each factor is determined based on one or more measures. As described in Metro's Service Guidelines, the factors are weighted at:

- Land Use = 50 percent
- Equity = 25 percent
- Geographic Value = 25 percent

The sensitivity test(s) results can be used to validate the initial prioritization outcomes, identify adjustments needed to provide better alignment with Metro's Core Values, and inform decision-makers about how emphases within the prioritization framework impact results. Table 4 displays several different options for how weighting could be undertaken using the draft prioritization at the category level. The same number of measures are assumed for each option, with each measure evaluated on a 3-point scale for illustrative purposes.

- No weighting: All measures are given equal weight and, with 10 measures, the Service category would represent the greatest percentage of total points.
- Equal balance among categories: All categories are given equal weight, regardless of the number of measures. The single Capital Needs measure would be allocated the highest weighting, whereas no measures in the Service category would receive additional weighting.
- 2X weighting for Equity category: When a 2X weighting is applied to each Equity measure and no additional weighting is applied to other measures, the Equity category represents approximately one-third of the maximum total score, equal to the Service category.
- 4X weighting for Equity category: When a 4X weighting is applied to each Equity measure and no additional weighting is applied to other measures, the Equity category represents more than half of the maximum total score.
- 2X weighting for Equity and Environmental/Sustainability category: When a 2X weighting is applied to each Equity and Environmental/Sustainability measure and no additional

weighting is applied to other measures, their combined total score represents almost half of the maximum total score.

Table 5 summarizes two different options for how weighting could be undertaken using the draft prioritization at the measure level. Similar to Table 4, the examples assume the same number of measures are assumed for each option, with each measure evaluated on a 3-point scale for illustrative purposes.

- Equity, Sustainability, Ridership: In this scenario, a 2X weighting is applied to each Equity and Sustainability measure, as well as 4 additional measures that are directly related to ridership (Total ridership and Ridership gains) or incorporate ridership as part of their calculation (Corridor productivity and Value of investment). The result is the weighted measures represent approximately 55 percent of the maximum score.
- Cost and Transit Performance: In this scenario, a 2X weighting is applied to each Service and Capital Needs measure, as well as three measures that incorporate cost as part of their calculation (Value of investment, Funding competitiveness, and Operational Efficiency). The weighted measures represent approximately 70 percent of the maximum score, primarily due to the relatively high number of measures in the Service Category.

The number of measures for which weighting is applied influences their magnitude, as the total maximum score changes accordingly.

Table 4. Possible Weighting Options for Prioritization by Category

Category	No Weighting		Equal Balance Among Categories		2X Weighting for Equity		4X Weighting for Equity		2X Weighting for Equity and Sustainability	
	Weighting Maximum Points[1]	Percent of Maximum Total Points	Weighting Maximum Points[1]	Percent of Maximum Total Points	Weighting Maximum Points[1]	Percent of Maximum Total Points	Weighting Maximum Points[1]	Percent of Maximum Total Points	Weighting Maximum Points[1]	Percent of Maximum Total Points
Equity 5 measures	X 1 15 points	21%	X 2 30 points	20%	X 2 30 points	34%	X 4 60 points	51%	X 2 30 points	32%
Environmental/ Sustainability 2 measures	X 1 6 points	8%	X 5 30 points	20%	X 1 6 points	7%	X 1 6 points	5%	X 2 12 points	13%
Service 10 measures	X 1 30 points	42%	X 1 30 points	20%	X 1 30 points	34%	X 1 30 points	26%	X 1 30 points	32%
Capital Needs 1 measure	X 1 3 points	4%	X 10 30 points	20%	X 1 3 points	3%	X 1 3 points	3%	X 1 3 points	3%
Implementation 6 measures	X 1 18 points	25%	X 1.67 30 points	20%	X 1 18 points	21%	X 1 18 points	15%	X 1 18 points	19%
Total Maximum Score	**72**	**100%**	**150**	**100%**	**87**	**100%**	**117**	**100%**	**93**	**100%**

Notes:

1. Assumes a maximum score of 3 points per measure

Table 5. Possible Weighting Options for Prioritization by Measure

		Equity, Sustainability, Ridership			Cost and Transit Performance		
Measure Category	**Type of Measure**	**Weighting**	**Maximum Points**	**Percent of Maximum Total Points**	**Weighting**	**Maximum Points**	**Percent of Maximum Total Points**
Equity	Equity Prioritization Score	2	6	6%	1	3	3%
	Density of community assets near the corridor	2	6	6%	1	3	3%
	Density of subsidized housing near the corridor	2	6	6%	1	3	3%
	Improved access to low wage jobs for priority populations via transit	2	6	6%	1	3	3%
	Route resiliency	2	6	6%	1	3	3%
Environmental/ Sustainability	Forecast household and employment growth	2	6	6%	1	3	3%
	Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reductions	2	6	6%	1	3	3%
Service	Existing speed	1	3	3%	2	6	5%
	Existing on-time performance	1	3	3%	2	6	5%
	Transit travel time savings	1	3	3%	2	6	5%
	Corridor transit travel speed	1	3	3%	2	6	5%
	Impacts to general purpose travel time	1	3	3%	2	6	5%
	Benefits/impacts to other transit routes	1	3	3%	2	6	5%
	Total Ridership	2	6	6%	2	6	5%
	Ridership gains	2	6	6%	2	6	5%
	Corridor Productivity	2	6	6%	2	6	5%
	Improved transit network	1	3	3%	2	6	5%
Capital Needs	Total project cost	1	3	3%	2	6	5%
Implementation	Risk/Schedule	1	3	3%	1	3	3%
	Transit supportive land uses	1	3	3%	1	3	3%
	Support for transit operations	1	3	3%	1	3	3%
	Value of investment	2	6	6%	2	6	5%
	Funding competitiveness	1	3	3%	2	6	5%
	Operational efficiency	1	3	3%	2	6	5%
	Total		**105**	**100%**		**114**	**100%**

Notes:

1. Assumes a maximum score of 3 points per measure

Figure 1 provides an example of comparing corridor scoring results from four different weighting approaches, which helps underscore that the top performing corridors are largely the same regardless of weighting scheme.

Figure 1 Example of Sensitivity Test Results (Nelson\Nygaard Connect SF Project)

Concept				Unweighted	Equity	Environmental Sustainability & Livability	Economy & Transit Performance
ID	Description and Representative Extent/Alignment	Mode and Profile Modeled		Score			
1D	16th Subway (Church – 3rd)	LRT	Subway	3.2	3.2	3.4	3.1
3A	Oakdale/Palou-Bayshore-24th BRT (Hunters Point - 24th & Mission BART)	BRT	At-Grade	2.5	2.8	2.1	2.5
4B	Geary (Salesforce TC - 48th)	LRT	At-Grade / Subway	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.3
6B	N-Judah with Sunset Tunnel Extensions (Church & Duboce–9th)	LRT	At-Grade / Subway	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6
8	Muni Metro System Optimization (all lines except T Third)	LRT	At-Grade / Subway	2.3	2.0	2.0	2.2
8E	Muni Metro M-Line Subway Extension, West Portal-Parkmerced	LRT	Subway	2.3	2.7	2.3	2.4
8DT1	Muni Metro Downtown Subway, Division-Howard (Church-Salesforce TC)	LRT	Subway	3.2	3.3	3.4	3.3
8DT2	Muni Metro Downtown Subway, Division-King (Church – 4th/King)	LRT	Subway	1.5	1.4	1.7	1.6
9A	San Bruno-Bayshore-Potrero via 9th/10th-Market (Visitacion Valley-Downtown)	BRT	At-Grade	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.2
10A	Central Subway Extension, T Third Phase 3 (Chinatown-North Beach-Van Ness)	LRT	Subway	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.2
11A	19th/Park Presidio (Daly City BART-Golden Gate Toll Plaza/Presidio TC)	BRT	At-Grade	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.1
12A	3rd, T Third Subway Extension and Surface Optimization (Bayshore-4th & King)	LRT	At-Grade / Subway	3.5	4.1	3.4	3.5
14A1	Downtown SF-Geary-19th via Richmond District (East Bay - Colma BART)	Regional Rail (BART or Standard-Gauge)	Subway	4.2	4.3	4.5	4.2
14A2	Downtown SF-Geary-19th via Haight (East Bay - Colma BART)		Subway	4.2	4.3	4.5	4.2
14B1	Mission Bay-Downtown SF-Geary-19th via Richmond District (East Bay – Colma)		Subway	4.2	4.4	4.6	4.3
14B2	Mission Bay-Downtown SF-Geary-19th via Haight (East Bay – Colma BART)		Subway	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.2
14C	Transbay Regional Rail (East Bay-Downtown SF-Peninsula)		Subway	3.2	3.2	3.0	3.6
14D	Bayview Caltrain Station and Local Frequency	Regional Rail	Grade-Separated	2.4	2.4	2.1	2.6
14E	Regional Bus Network	Regional Bus	At-Grade	2.8	2.7	2.9	2.4

Upon completion of the preliminary evaluation and the sensitivity test(s), the project team will determine if any of the following modifications are needed to provide additional differentiation among candidate corridors.

- Revise existing measure(s)
- Add new measure(s)
- Apply revised methodology(ies)
- Identify new data source(s)
- Modify weighting

Final prioritization will then be completed upon identification of any revised measures or desired weighting.