



METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
TEL 510.817.5700
TDD/TTY 510.817.5769
FAX 510.817.5848
E-MAIL info@mtc.ca.gov
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

Memorandum

TO: Minority Citizens Advisory Committee –
Transportation 2035 Equity Analysis Subcommittee

DATE: April 9, 2008

FR: Jennifer Yeamans

W.I. 1114

RE: Transportation 2035 Equity Analysis: Further Discussion

At your April 1 meeting, you received a handout (see Attachment A) with sample equity indicators illustrated with data from the Transportation 2030 Equity Analysis. These examples are illustrative aids to show how data can be presented to address certain equity-related issues. This memo summarizes some of the context in which these examples will be discussed at your April 15 meeting, highlights areas where staff would like input from subcommittee members to further refine the analysis, and presents a recommendation for what model-based measures to be included in the Equity Analysis Report.

The sample indicators illustrate for discussion purposes how model-based measures we have discussed at past meetings (accessibility, mobility, user benefits, environmental effects) can be analyzed and presented. The overarching theme for these illustrative indicators is that they reveal two comparisons at once:

1. Indicator data comparing communities of concern to the remainder of the Bay Area
2. Indicator data across different forecast-year Plan alternatives

Information about the Plan alternatives under consideration was also handed out at your last meeting (see Attachment B). For your reference, following are brief explanations of each Plan alternative that is captured by the sample indicators:

- No Project: This alternative projects what would happen in the forecast year if the RTP is not implemented. It is a “business as usual” forecast — sometimes referred to as a “baseline” forecast — that only accounts for impacts of transportation projects which are now in advanced planning stages with full funding commitments. In plain terms, this amounts to a “do nothing” scenario, where the region’s population and employment continue to rise through the forecast year, but no RTP projects are implemented.
- Financially Constrained: This alternative projects only the RTP projects and programs that would be funded under existing revenue sources, or those expected to be available within the RTP’s 25-year horizon. This package is crafted during MTC’s trade-off discussions, which are slated to take place in May and June. In plain terms, this is a “what we’ll have” alternative.

- Project Alternative: This alternative includes the Financially Constrained projects plus “Vision” elements. The vision elements include those investments which currently do not have any dedicated revenue or are only partially funded, but nevertheless form a long-range strategic investment plan for the region. In plain terms, this is a “**what we want**” alternative.

What about the Base Year?

Today’s existing conditions (sometimes referred to as the Base Year) are a vital element of why equity and environmental justice are concerns of many Bay Area residents, and represent a complex set of factors. At your April 15 meeting, staff hope to discuss and get your feedback about how to incorporate assessment of today’s conditions into the Equity Analysis Report.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Equity Analysis’s model-based indicators focus on presenting comparisons between the Financially Constrained alternative and the No Project alternative. This approach would emphasize equity in terms of the RTP’s most likely implementation scenario (the Financially Constrained alternative) relative to what would happen in the forecast year if the plan were not implemented (the No Project scenario).

To make the model-based component of the Equity Analysis simpler and more straightforward, staff recommends streamlining the model-based analysis and including the following measures in the Equity Analysis Report:

1. Accessibility to lower-wage employment opportunities (including accessibility for those with limited ability to pay for transportation)
2. Accessibility to other activities
3. Environmental effects (localized emissions)
4. An affordability test measure