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)
**Demand for travel on the rise:** Alameda County had the largest percentage increase in population in California in 2013 and saw job growth for third consecutive year.

**Uneven employment recovery:** Alameda County employment rate lags the overall Bay Area.

**Regionally essential:** More than 25% of all Bay Area commuters touch Alameda County.

**More regional commute patterns:** Alameda County residents increasingly work in other counties; Alameda County workers increasingly commute from other counties.

**Balanced commute modes:** 36% of Alameda County workers use transit, walking, biking, telecommute, or carpool, while 64% drive alone.

**More multimodal:** Share of Alameda County workers using transit, walking, biking, and telecommuting up 5% since 2000.
Key Findings, cont.

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

Commuter Patterns: Population and Jobs

Population and job recovery both continued in 2013

- Alameda County employment rate lags region

Source: Department of Finance Estimates, Bureau of Labor Statistics Local Area Employment data
Commute Patterns: Worker Flows

Alameda County plays critical role supporting regional commute travel.

Commutes within, to, from, or through the Bay Area Region

- 3,160,000 Commutes within, to, from, or through the Bay Area Region
- 1,159,000 Commutes within, to, from, or through Alameda County

- 80% Not Involving Alameda County (73%)
- 20% Involving Alameda County (27%)

Source: Census Bureau Longitudinal Employment-Household Dynamics data

Commute Patterns: Worker Flows

Alameda County commutes became more regional in nature over last decade.

Origin-Destination pairs of workers who live or work in Alameda County

- 2002:
  - 36% Live and work within Alameda County
  - 30% Live in Alameda County, work in another county
  - 33% Live in another county, work in Alameda County

- 2011:
  - 31% Live and work within Alameda County
  - 34% Live in Alameda County, work in another county
  - 35% Live in another county, work in Alameda County
Workers living in Alameda County use a diverse mix of transportation modes to commute to work. 

Commuting Patterns: Journey-to-work Mode Share 

Alameda County commutes became more multimodal over last decade. 

- Combined share of solo-driving and carpooling dropped by 5 percent. 
- Working from home is fastest-growing mode. 
- Public transit, walking, and biking mode share all increased. 
- Biking mode share nearly doubled. 

Roadways: Freeway Delay

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

Note: chart shows “severe” delay (excess travel time from speeds below 35 mph)

Source: INRIX, Inc. Analytics Suite

Roadways: Pavement Condition Index

Average PCI declined slightly and is flat over last 5 years; one in five roads is “failed” or “poor”

Source: MTC StreetSaver Database
Roadways: Collisions

Collisions continued a long-term downward trend in 2011; injury and fatal collisions down 32 percent since 2002.

Transit: Ridership

Total annual boardings in Alameda County increased by 4 percent in FY12/13 over FY11/12

- BART accounted for two-thirds of ridership growth
- Bus boardings up after declining in four of five previous years amid major service cuts
- Ferry boardings increased while commuter rail declined
- Long-term shift from bus to BART
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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Operator</th>
<th>FY2005</th>
<th>FY2012</th>
<th>FY2013</th>
<th>Percent Change FY2013 vs. FY2012</th>
<th>Percent Change FY2013 vs. FY2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BART</td>
<td>55.95</td>
<td>65.44</td>
<td>69.49</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>34.22</td>
<td>38.97</td>
<td>39.82</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Transit</td>
<td>36.05</td>
<td>33.23</td>
<td>34.20</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAVTA</td>
<td>16.93</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>13.86</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Cty</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>12.52</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WETA</td>
<td>75.46</td>
<td>110.22</td>
<td>107.25</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
Data collected through the Alameda CTC bicycle and pedestrian count program suggest that levels of cycling and walking are growing and that the diversity of cyclists is increasing.

**Bicycling and Walking: Counts**

**Number of Bicyclists Counted**

(9 long-term monitoring locations)

**Number of Pedestrians Counted**

(6 long-term monitoring locations)

Sources: Alameda CTC Bicycle and Pedestrian Count Program

**Bicycling and Walking: Collisions**

Collisions involving bicyclists have increased, however bicycle counts have increased faster.

Collisions involving pedestrians have declined even as counts of pedestrians have increased.

**Changes from 2002 to 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Injury/Fatal Collisions</th>
<th>Counts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biking</td>
<td>+21%</td>
<td>+75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>+47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Statewide Integrated Traffic Reporting System, Alameda CTC Bicycle and Pedestrian Count Program
Bicycling and Walking: Network Completion

Jurisdictions reported installing more than 25 miles of bikeways and completing more than 30 major pedestrian capital projects FY12/13.

Alameda CTC Performance Monitoring: What’s Next?

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