

CAWG Themes Summary on Performance Measures

February 3, 2011

The following summarizes common themes across three discussion groups held at the February 3rd, 2011 meeting of the Community Advisory Working Group for the Alameda Countywide Transportation Plan/Transportation Expenditure Plan (CWTP-TEP). Comments by group are attached. The groups discussed the proposed performance measures to evaluate system-wide impacts of CWTP investment scenarios and the following common themes were identified.

1. It is important to provide measures in the Plans that address social equity impacts.

- a. Accessible, affordable, and equitable are separate concepts and they should be broken out.
- b. Consider additional analysis of proposed metrics to show equity impacts. For example, break out travel time, delay, or accessibility metrics by income group.

2. Performance measures should address access issues from a number of perspectives including affordability and geography.

- a. In defining the accessibility metric, consider access to:
 - Jobs
 - Senior centers, hospitals
 - Frequent transit service/ routes (operating at least every 20 minutes)
 - Trails and other facilities dedicated to walking and bicycling meant not only for recreational but also for commuting purposes
- b. Consider the affordability component of access – e.g. number of households with access to job centers within a certain travel distance and affordable transit fares.
- c. Look at access issues for sub-areas of the county.

3. The performance measures need to capture more detail on safety.

- a. Consider presenting bicycle and pedestrian collisions separate from other collisions.
- b. Consider how to include measures of personal security (e.g. on transit and at bus stops) in addition to safety.

4. More direct measures of multi-modality need to be considered.

- a. Consider including bicycle, pedestrian, transit mode share under “multi-modal” goal.

5. Identify measures that will capture impacts on goods movement or add measures to address goods movement.

6. Other suggestions:

- a. Additional measures to consider: open space preservation; transit reliability; transit wait time; percent of transit operating shortfall filled.
- b. Note that transit ridership / revenue hours of service metric should be accompanied by increasing transit ridership. Otherwise the metric could improve if service cuts are made.

Several suggestions were made relating to incorporating considerations in project-level analysis, such as considering additional cost-effectiveness measures, whether the project fills a gap; or whether the project leverages private funding sources. These comments will be taken into consideration as the project-level evaluation methodology is developed.

Group A

Performance Measures

1. What do we mean by equity (e.g., geographic, economic, social)?
 - Gaps between groups should be reduced so that lower income quartiles get more/better benefit than upper.
 - Bring everyone toward some basic standard before providing new services. Consider existing conditions.
 - We ignore social equity at our peril. It needs to be addressed early and head on in order to pass the Transportation Expenditure Plan.
 - For the Plans, we need to identify where there has been value provided. Identify where we have not done a good job at discussing equity and respond to that
2. What is the performance measure getting at to increase biking & walking?
 - low income people could have long trips now for which they have no other alternative that are washed out by many new shorter trips created by land use changes
3. For number 7 delete “age and” from “age and condition of multi-use pathways. A pathway can be old and well-maintained.
4. To number 2 or 9 add “share of households within biking and walking distance of trail or other dedicated facilities.”
5. Breakout accessible, affordable and equitable as separate performance measures as they are separate concepts.
6. Number 5 – What is average per trip travel time getting at?
7. Number 8: Safety – note – pedestrian and bicycle injuries and fatalities are often under reported.
8. Is number 8 a reliable measure? Can we do a better job of estimating collisions that are under reported?
 - Add security as in lighting and safe and secure pathways are important to be included
 - If you can’t include security at least document it as missing
9. Number 3 – What does “local decision making” mean? In general, reword to:
 - Include the concept of place making. We need to go beyond transit accessibility and measure the whole concept. If it has to be quantified, you could try things like: reduce need for vehicle, reduce need for parking).
 - Apply LEED and ND to measure the integration of land use.

- Encourage connectivity and access
- Think about accessibility for seniors (as in aging in place measures). Note that there was caution expressed about putting seniors in a separate class unnecessarily.
- Don't reward bad land use practices, provide incentives to encourage good ones.

10. Consider measures that protect open space.

Group B

1. Multi modal - Accessible affordable equitable –
 - Break these out separately to not to lose the importance of each one
 - Equity – potentially incorporate throughout all other goals (i.e. how do the lowest income fair as compared to highest income)
 - Accessible – potential share of households within x minutes of transit + add cost factor for that trip
 - look at share of low medium + high income levels
 - Evaluate looking at transit trip as a reliable trip (look at on-time performance of transit lines)
2. Integrated – look at using MTC's measures for this
 - Restate increase in transit ridership + revenue hours of service
3. Connected/Connecting + Rehabilitation
 - Capture wait time: show for transit (rail + bus) and vehicle
 - Look at per capita increase in transit use
4. Cost Effective (developing methodology)
 - use system-wide cost effective measures
 - cost/rider and cost/new rider
5. Maintenance – percent of operating shortfalls of transit budgets filled
 - How do we measure transition to clean vehicles
6. Safe
 - Try to breakout by bike + pedestrian
 - How do we deal with personal safety?
7. Clean + healthy
 - High density has more volume of movement + associated emissions (noise, GHG. etc.)

8. Tie all to race + income

Group C

- Access issues need to be geographically specific (not just countywide averages)
- Reliability for transit is key
- Accessibility for jobs is key
- Percent trips taken by non-SOV modes (transit, walking, biking)
- Need a complete street measure → does this project provide benefit to all non-auto modes?
- Impacts (positive or negative) on communities of concern
- Projects that generate revenue to help pay for themselves or provide leverage (public-private partnership)
- Does the project fill a gap?
- Percent of population within walking distance to a transit route/stop operating at least every 20 minutes until at least 10 p.m.
- Accessibility to key community jobs + destinations like senior centers, hospitals, etc.
- Need a Goods Movement measure