

**Project Performance Assessment Working Group Meeting Summary**

Thursday, August 24, 2017 | 9:00-11:00 a.m.

**Meeting Attendees:**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| California Bicycle Coalition                  | Sacramento County Public Health                            |
| California Rural Legal Assistance             | Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District    |
| City of West Sacramento                       | University of California, Davis Center for Regional Change |
| El Dorado County Department of Transportation | Walk Sacramento  |
| El Dorado County Transportation Commission    | Yolo County Department of Transportation                   |
| Environmental Council of Sacramento           | Yolo County Transit District                               |
| Placer County Transportation Planning Agency  |  |

**Meeting Agenda:**

- Introduction
- Status Review
- Benefit-Cost Analysis Update
- Performance Outcomes Analytical Framework
- Performance Outcomes Test Results
- Performance Outcomes Mapping Tool
- Meeting Evaluation

**Meeting Summary**

Project staff gave a brief update on progress on the Benefit Cost Analysis methodology since the last working group meeting. The remainder of the meeting focused on the Performance Outcomes methodology, where the working group walked through a demo of data layers, a presentation of the method's spatial analysis, and an exploration of an evaluative framework using test project results. Due to the robust dialogue the group did not get to the planned agenda item on the Performance Outcomes evaluation rollup, which will be covered at the subsequent meeting. Finally, the working group received a demo of a draft mapping tool to support the Performance Outcomes proof of concept.

**Theme:** Land Use data and indicators in Performance Outcomes

- The working group discussed at length the various data layers in the Performance Outcomes assessment. Comments on the land use data focused on if the layers captured a mix of use beyond employment and dwelling units. The working group also raised concern about the lack of agricultural data in the first several examples; this concern was allayed when the group got to the agricultural-specific data layers. Last, the group noted that future zoning should be included as part of the land use data. The existing methodology already incorporates land use changes encompassed in the long range plan.
- Additional comments from the working group centered on how the draft accessibility measure used various land use inputs. Several members of the working group noted that the accessibility measure should include points of interest and use (such as schools,

hospitals, etc.) in addition to jobs and noted the connection to equity. The working group discussed data challenges and possibilities around a broader definition of accessibility.

- Finally, several members of the working group thought more could be done around housing, raising possible ideas for a jobs-housing fit and to look at wage levels, income levels and housing affordability. The supplemental poverty measure could be a resource to provide more detail on these measures. Likewise, the group discussed how the method considered equity. Several members suggest more could be done here, while others wanted more around the nexus of transportation and land use.

**Theme:** Transportation data and indicators in Performance Outcomes

- On the transit side, the working group discussed the usefulness of the GTFS files as a data input. A few more minor issues with this widely-used source include recent changes in how route updates are reflected in the data, and if all jurisdictions within the region have released the most recent data. Other questions focused on if the Outcomes measure looked at all transit stops or only stops being used (the measure looks at transit use) and if the method could consider transit passenger counts (while promising, data for this indicator is currently available for the largest transit operator, but not for all transit providers in the region).
- Project staff did receive a major comment that the Performance Outcomes method needs to consider more how to incorporate transit elements and how possible transit projects can demonstrate need. Project staff resolved to convene a transit-specific review to talk through issues and concerns in advance in the next full working group meeting.
- For walk and bike indicators, the working group discussed how connectivity can best be measured. The group noted that local context is paramount. For example, many cul-de-sacs have bike and pedestrian paths that improve connectivity to local uses such as schools. If the performance tool does not capture this local context, project sponsors will have the means to discuss through project design elements or a qualitative review. The purpose of the Outcomes tool is to provide a flag on how a certain project aligns with the identified priorities, and will be an iterative process.
- Project staff fielded several questions on freight measures and data, which were summarized in the freight-specific outcome.
- Finally, the working group discussed the maintenance outcome. The working group noted that it would be a large time commitment for a local agency to provide Pavement Condition Index (PCI) data for every single project moving through the Plan. Instead, the idea is to provide this information for those projects in the Plan or Funding Round that claim a maintenance need and benefit. And for the Plan, there are ways to roll up pavement conditions from single projects to a broader measure to lessen the burden on local agency staff.

**Theme:** General comments on Performance Outcomes

- Staff presented a large amount of information. Staff will provide electronic copies of the PowerPoints and data tables to the working group, and post the same material on the project website.
- The working group discussed the pros and cons of a methodology that looked at existing conditions compared to one that also incorporates changes through time.
- The working group discussed briefly the idea of weighting outcomes and indicators. This idea has been discussed several times by the working group in prior meetings as well.
- Finally, local jurisdictions raised concern about the amount of work it takes to run these methodologies, and worried if they would have to take on this analysis in Plan and Funding Round applications. Project staff reiterated that these methods would not lead to any additional work by local agency staff. SACOG would run both the Benefit Cost and Performance Outcomes analysis, which would reduce the burden on local agencies when applying the Funding Round or responding to the Plan's call for project.

## Project Performance Assessment Working Group Meeting Evaluations

August 24, 2017

<b>RANKING:</b> 1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree
<b>This meeting was well organized.</b>
Average: 4.73
<b>The length of the meeting was appropriate to get through the material.</b>
Average: 4.09
<b>I better understand the Performance Outcomes Analysis method after the presentation today.</b>
Average: 4.64
<b>The Performance Outcomes Mapping site could be a useful tool for both SACOG programs and Federal/State programs.</b>
Average: 4.55
<b>The review of test projects using the Performance Outcomes Framework was informative and useful.</b>
Average: 4.45
<b>I see value in the Performance Outcomes Analysis as an approach for examining the performance potential of transportation investments.</b>
Average: 4.14
<b>I understand the next major steps in SACOG's Project Performance Assessment.</b>
Average: 4.18
<b>What should be done next time to make the working group session more effective?</b>
Nothing. The session was well done
Additional data sources & equity analysis opportunity is an ongoing question for me.
Great Meeting!
Print or distribute PPT at meeting for note taking.
<b>Additional comments or questions not captured in the meeting:</b>
Great for streamlined review of many projects, recommend BCA available on reg. for projects w/ special considerations

I'm concerned transit may not fit into the evaluation framework very well. The framework seems based on geographical/spatial metrics, but transit capital investments like new buses or a modern control center are non-geographical. Transit improvements that are more linear or spatial, like new bus service, are often purely operational, so wouldn't be on a capital grant application.

I'm also concerned that even as nice as the Esri tool looks, that applicants won't have time to do new/additional steps for their applications or that there will be sufficient value in doing them to justify the time/effort. I think most MTP and grant decisions will continue to be based heavily on politics and I question the extent to which politics can and should be removed from the process.