

## Metropolitan Transportation Commission

**Forecast Year Alternatives Comparison: Further Information**

The forecast year alternatives comparison will analyze the differences between the year 2035 alternatives to be included in the CEQA-required Environmental Impact Report (EIR) including a year 2035 “no-project” alternative, the “project” alternative, and all other alternatives to be scoped in the coming months.

Two accessibility measures and one affordability measure are currently proposed for the alternatives comparison. Specific methods related to analyzing environmental effects will be discussed in the future.

1. Accessibility to Low-Income Jobs. This will use the AM peak period walk-only transit networks, and the AM peak period congested highway networks, to examine the number of low-income jobs within 30 minutes door-to-door travel time for transit and highway. The calculations are produced at each travel analysis zone-of-residence, then aggregated to communities of concern, weighted by the number of low income households in each zone-of-residence. The year 2035 estimate of low income jobs is produced by MTC, and is based on ABAG’s projections of low income households, and the Census 2000 data on workers-at-work by income level. This is essentially a “commute accessibility” index that will measure the distinctions between neighborhoods and between alternatives. Results from this analysis can be tabulated as well as mapped.
2. Accessibility to Non-Work Activities. This will use the midday period walk-only transit networks, and the midday highway networks, to examine the number of non-work activities within 30 minutes door-to-door travel time for both transit and highway. Again, the calculations are produced at the zone-of-residence and then aggregated to communities of concern. We propose defining non-work activities as the total number of trips going to school, shopping, medical/dental, and personal services activities. This would not include “social/recreational” trips (e.g., eating meals, recreation, entertainment, visiting), although including these trips is an option.
3. Combined Transportation and Housing Affordability is a newer, exploratory/experimental measure that was first tested in the fall 2007 Vision 2035 analysis. Typically this measure is examining the combined housing plus transportation expenditures as a share of average household income, stratified by income level. The methodology uses control total expenditure and income data from the US Bureau of Labor Statistics’ (BLS) Consumer Expenditure Survey (CEX) for 2006, and MTC forecasts of household auto ownership by income level, and MTC work trip forecasts by means of transportation by income level. The auto ownership costs, auto operating costs, and transit fare costs are calculated at each zone-of-residence, by income group, then aggregated to county and community-of-concern level. The methodology for calculating housing expenditures as a share of average household income has yet been defined or tested, but is likely to rely heavily on Census 2000 and ACS data on housing affordability. Again, this is an exploratory/experimental measure, which means we have little practical experience with how this measure can be produced and used in program evaluation. This is likely to be a very revealing statistic when evaluating the equity impacts of pricing strategies in the RTP.