



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 –
Equity Analysis Subcommittee

DATE: June 11, 2009

FR: Jennifer Yeamans

RE: Snapshot Analysis: Recommended Measures

Background

At your April 30 meeting, Subcommittee members refined the list of priority key questions to be addressed by the Snapshot Analysis. With that feedback, I have updated and refined the preliminary draft matrix that had been distributed at earlier meetings with additional detail about how the Snapshot Analysis will proceed, specifying what metrics will be produced. This memo explains the contents of the Summary of Metrics shown in Attachment A, what key questions they address, and what potential answers to those questions the analysis can produce.

Recommended Measures

The matrix in Attachment A shows a list of recommended metrics based on what staff has heard so far from discussions with Subcommittee members, input from MTC's Planning Committee, and other stakeholders. The attachment describes the following:

- Theme: To which overall transportation-related theme do the metrics apply?
- Data availability: A check mark indicates data is at the ready and can be updated at regular intervals.
- Measure: What the metric is measuring specifically.
- Key questions posed: Which of the key questions prioritized by Subcommittee members does the metric inform? In some cases these have been edited slightly to reflect the data available to address them, or changed from a "yes or no" question (which requires subjective interpretation to answer definitively) to a "how much" question (which produces a more concrete answer).
- Answer produced: What staff expects to produce in order to answer the question.
- Other population subgroup(s): In addition to producing results for communities of concern, if there is another population subgroup for whom this measure is especially relevant regardless of geography, these groups are listed here.
- Timeframe for possible updates: Indicates how frequently staff expects to have updated data available to update each metric.

(over)

Criteria for Including Metrics

The metrics shown in Attachment A are included because they meet the following criteria:

- Applicability to overall goals of analysis.
- Most directly address key questions as developed by staff and MCAC members.
- Availability of data and ability to be updated regularly to track changes over time.

“Embedded” Data

Some data that Subcommittee members have identified as particularly relevant to transit users and residents of communities of concern are “embedded” in the metrics shown in Attachment A, rather than listed out separately. For example, availability of transit service at night or on weekends is embedded in the “Transit Frequency/Capacity” metric; access to social services destinations would be embedded in the “Access to Essential Destinations” metric along with others.

The idea of embedding these data into “index” types of measures is to try to tell as complete a story as possible following the Themes with the fewest number of metrics. Such embedded data points would still be available for examination on their own if desired.

Data Sources

More detailed information describing the data sources to be used as well as the transit service metrics will be sent separately for review prior to your meeting.

Discussion

Potential issues to discuss at your June 18 meeting include:

- Do you think the metrics as presented support the proposed goal “*to better understand transportation-related differences between and recent changes in communities of concern and for transportation-disadvantaged populations*”?
- Funding metric: One key question that has been raised which is not addressed in this matrix is “How much of the region’s funding is spent on communities of concern compared to other communities?” Staff believes this question requires more in-depth discussion before recommending an analytical approach to this Subcommittee. Such a discussion would need to address how data produced would inform a definition of an equitable distribution of investments. To date no such definition has been generally agreed upon or resolved from past analyses of regional funding.
- Other questions raised but not addressed: As part of the summary of the analysis, I will plan to include the questions that this Subcommittee raised but which could not readily be answered due to lack of regionally available data. Such a list could provide helpful direction for future data-gathering efforts.

Recommendation

Approve proposed list of measures to be included in the Snapshot Analysis.