



METROPOLITAN  
TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter  
101 Eighth Street  
Oakland, CA 94607-4700  
Tel: 510.464.7700  
TDD/TTY: 510.464.7769  
Fax: 510.464.7848

## *Memorandum*

TO: Partnership Technical Advisory Committee

DATE: April 21, 2008

FR: Jennifer Yeamans

W.I.:

RE: Transportation 2035 Equity Analysis: Proposed Methodology

Staff has been working closely with the Minority Citizens Advisory Committee's Transportation 2035 Equity Analysis Subcommittee since January to develop an updated and refined methodology for the RTP Equity Analysis. The Equity Analysis is designed to measure both the benefits and burdens associated with the transportation investment packages proposed for the Transportation 2035 Plan, and to make sure that minority and low-income communities share equitably in the benefits of the transportation investments without bearing a disproportionate share of the burdens. Such analyses, in varying forms and formats, have been undertaken with each RTP since 2001.

Past Equity Analyses have emphasized mobility- and accessibility-related outcomes in low-income and minority communities, derived via MTC's travel forecasting system and compared across select EIR alternatives. In the Transportation 2030 Equity Analysis completed in 2004, modeling results were disaggregated for each of the Bay Area's 44 low-income and minority communities of concern, resulting in a great deal of data that was time-consuming for staff to produce and ultimately difficult for stakeholders to interpret.

In refining the approach to the Transportation 2035 Equity Analysis, staff has taken into account feedback received from past Equity Analyses, surveyed analysis methods employed at other MPOs, and considered the availability of new regional data sources. With these considerations in mind, staff has recommended expanding the scope of the Transportation 2035 Equity Analysis methodology to include funding inputs (that is, how financial investments contained in the Plan are allocated in terms of equity), as well as equity-related policies to address outcomes that are beyond the intended scope of MTC's travel model to forecast. Model-based results would be disaggregated only for select indicators, particularly job accessibility and environmental effects, which consistently arise as key concerns in local communities and which can help inform other planning and policy initiatives.

A table summarizing staff's proposed three-part framework for the RTP Equity Analysis methodology (financial analysis, model-based analysis, policy development) is attached. Staff look forward to receiving your feedback on this approach at your April 21 meeting.

### **Transportation 2035 Equity Analysis Timeframe**

- Through May 2008: Development of Equity Analysis technical methodology
- June 2008: Draft RTP investment packages available
- July – October 2008: Quantitative evaluation and technical analysis of Plan alternatives; supplementary analysis and mapping
- November 2008: Draft Equity Analysis Report available
- Late 2008: Final equity analysis report

## Attachment A: Transportation 2035 Equity Analysis: Proposed Indicators

Type of Analysis	Answers the question(s)	Measures Used	Proposed Indicators
<b>Financial Analysis</b> (Plan investments)	Are the investments being made in T2035 projects being allocated equitably?	Dollars invested	1. Plan expenditures: a. By Income Level b. By Race/Ethnicity
<b>Outcomes Analysis</b> (Benefits and burdens)	Will T2035 projects equitably impact people's accessibility and mobility?  Will environmental impacts of the T2035 projects be distributed equitably?	Accessibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Destinations reachable within a certain time</li> <li>• Destinations reachable within a certain expenditure</li> </ul>	2. Access to jobs within 30 minutes: a. Communities of concern vs. Rest of Bay Area b. "Low-cost" transit vs. all transit vs. auto* 3. Access to essential destinations within 15 minutes: a. Communities of concern vs. Rest of Bay Area b. "Low-cost" transit vs. all transit vs. auto*
		Mobility (average travel time)	4. Average travel time: communities of concern vs. rest of Bay Area
		User benefits (average annual per-capita monetary savings)	5. User benefits a. Travel time savings: Communities of concern vs. rest of Bay Area b. Out-of-pocket savings: Communities of concern vs. rest of Bay Area
		Environmental Impacts	6. Localized pollutants (emissions): Communities of concern vs. rest of Bay Area a. Carbon Monoxide (CO) b. Coarse particulates (PM <sub>10</sub> ) c. Fine particulates (PM <sub>2.5</sub> )
<b>Policy Statements</b> (Social and economic outcomes)	What results should the T2035 projects aim for?  How can the impacts of other T2035 policies such as pricing promote equity?	Affordability objective: Combined household spending on housing and transportation	Upcoming discussions will help identify what base-year indicators could be most informative to developing equity-related policies.

\* Denotes a new indicator not included in MTC's previous RTP Equity Analysis/EJ Reports.