2



### Purpose of Performance Report

- Track trends and progress towards goals in transportation plans
  - Countywide Transportation Plan
  - Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans
  - Congestion Management Program statute
- Identify needs for more extensive analysis
- System-level monitoring
  - Complemented by other more focused monitoring efforts (e.g. LOS monitoring, modal plans)

# Scope of Performance Report



Commute Patterns General population and employment trends Commute flows Commute mode share



Roadways Freeway delays Freeway speeds Local road pavement condition Collisions

3



Ridership Service utilization Cost-effectiveness Service interruptions & fleet age On-time performance & speed



#### **Bicycling and Walking** Collisions Counts Network/project completion from local jurisdiction summaries

Master plan completion Program participation

#### Data Sources:

Existing or publically available data Previous fiscal year (FY12/13) or most recent available plus historic trends



# Key Findings, cont.

• Freeway congestion up: Severe congestion increased by over 20% on freeways last year

5

- Local road state of repair unchanged: Average local road condition not improving greatly and 20% of roads are poor or failed
- Overall safety improvements: Roadway collisions are down over last decade
- Transit ridership climbing but challenges loom: Ridership is up overall and for most operators but aging assets, crowding, and dense urban operating conditions (for buses) pose challenges
- Walking and biking: counts are on the rise, collision rates declining, and network buildout continues











## Roadways: Freeway Delay

### Average daily freeway delay increased by 22 percent overall from FY11/12 to FY12/13

11









### Transit: Service Utilization

Most transit operators saw improvement or minimal change in service utilization in FY2012-13

- Service utilization is measured by boardings per revenue vehicle hour (RVH)
- BART saw large increase in service utilization and carries nearly 15 passengers per RVH more than in 2005
- AC Transit improved service utilization in FY2013 and has improved this metric in 3 of last 4 years

Source: National Transit Database (2005-2012) and preliminary NTD filings (2013)

Boardings per RVH Trend

5

6



Boardings per Revenue Vehicle Hour Transit Operator FY2005 FY2012 FY2013 Percent Percent Change Change vs. FY2012 vs. FY2005 BART 55.95 65.44 69.49 6% 24% ACE 34.22 38.97 39.82 2% 16% AC Transit 36.05 33.23 34.20 3% -5% LAVTA 16.93 13.86 -1% -18% 14 00 Union City 10.05 12.74 12.52 -2% 25% WETA 75.46 110.22 107.25 -3% 42%

### Transit: Other Trends

#### Cost Efficiency

• Most operators have seen increasing in cost per rider and/or cost per Revenue Vehicle Hour since 2005

#### State of Good Repair

- Frequency of service interruptions declined for all operators in FY12/13
- Fleets of most operators are in midlife on average
  - Union City Transit (relatively new fleet) and BART (very old fleet) are exceptions
  - AC Transit unveiled first shipment of new bus purchase in late FY12/13 and BART procuring new cars

#### Service Quality

• Experiences improving on-time performance were mixed

- AC Transit achieves lower on-time performance but must contend with dense, congested urban conditions
- AC Transit has seen steady decline in commercial speed (speed accounting for delays) since 2005







## Alameda CTC Performance Monitoring: What's Next?

- Explore ways to integrate data requests with Compliance Reports
- Coordinate with regional agencies on collection of land use data (e.g. development approvals) and evaluation of land use/transportation coordination measures
- Identify new performance measures as part of Goods Movement, Arterials, and Transit plans
  - System-level to Facility-level
- Evaluate investments in relation to performance

20

