



**MEMO**

**To: Minority Citizens Advisory Committee**

**Re: Comments on Proposed Measures for Snap Shot Analysis**

**Date: June 17, 2009**

---

After reviewing the materials for your upcoming Snap Shot Analysis Subcommittee meeting (June 18, 2009), we would like to make the following recommendations for your discussion of the Proposed Measures for the Analysis (described in Attachment A). Generally speaking, we were pleased with many of the measures and key questions included in staff proposal. That said, some of the measures remain unclear and require additional detail before we can offer a full evaluation.

**Attachment A: Proposed Metrics**

1. **Theme: Transportation Availability and Choices:** This theme included many measures that we believe require more explanation. It is hard to tell whether these metrics are intended to cover some of the quality issues raised at previous meetings, such as: (1) service reliability; (2) off-peak transportation needs; or (3) availability of shuttles and para-transit. These points might be part of the ‘embedded data’ described in the staff memo, and we hope to see more information soon that explains exactly what is included.
  2. **Theme: Accessibility:** We were glad to see this separated out from the Transportation Availability and Mobility theme as it provides greater clarity between them. However, we believe this theme is missing two additional critical measures:
    - “Access to essential destinations by transit for a fare of no more than \$2.25 (as an example);” and
    - “Access to essential destinations by a 30-minute auto trip.”The first measure helps address the issue that some transit is too expensive for low-income riders to afford. The second measure allows us to assess how much of an advantage auto-ownership provides (if any).
  3. **Theme: Mobility:** We are glad to see this theme and measure included in the analysis.
  4. **Theme: Affordability:** We agree with the first measure of transportation costs as a percentage of household income and would recommend that there be a comparable measure for housing costs as a percentage of household income. That will give us a sense of which COCs are paying too much for each and too much for transportation and housing combined.
  5. **Theme: Safety:** We support the current measure, focused on collisions, but feel as if this theme is missing a major safety issue – crime and violence or the perception of crime and violence. Real and perceived danger, of course, is difficult to measure. The Community Based Transportation Plans seem like the best current source from which to draw qualitative data on how peoples’ perceptions of safety act as a real barrier to their mobility and access.
  6. **Theme: Environment:** We support the two measures currently listed in this theme. We also recommend that a third measure be: “Density of toxic air contaminants from all sources.” This will provide us with a picture of the cumulative air quality within the COCs, enabling us to monitor those communities that are most polluted.
  7. **Theme: Transportation Investments:** This theme is missing from the proposal and staff explains in its memo that it is intentionally left off due to the lack of consensus within MTC about how to define ‘equitable transportation investment.’ We agree that there is a lack of consensus on the definition of equity in transportation funding. However, from our experience, we do believe that there are fairly straightforward financial analysis that can
-

provide useful information informing our sense of the level of fairness of our investments. These have been provided in the 2006 Financial analysis by MTC:

- “Funding per passenger or per passenger trip by transit operator (operations and capital should be included).”

### **Other Considerations**

1. **Qualitative information:** Perception of safety may not be the only qualitative issue that you would like to include in the Snap Shot analysis. You may want to consider including a qualitative description of outstanding issues, such as perception of danger, in each COC, to surface those critical issues that are not easily measured quantitatively.
  2. **Transit Map:** To help answer one of your key questions: “Can residents of COCs get where they need to go (by non-automotive means)?”, we recommend that the Snap Shot be accompanied by a map of existing transit routes. These could be color coded to differentiate between high-frequency trunk routes and low-frequency local routes. This will provide a very clear picture of the density of transit – where it is good and where it is poor and how well connected neighborhoods are to one another. (The same could be done for completed bike networks.)
  3. **Comparisons:** We believe that it is essential that this analysis reveal not just differences between COCs, but also differences between COCs and non COC communities. We recognize that it could be quite difficult to collect the Snap Shot data for every Census Tract in the Bay Area. We have begun discussing with staff alternative ways to provide meaningful comparisons.. such as taking averages from different categories of non-COCs (urban, inner-ring suburban, suburban and ex-urban) and using those as a means of comparison. Similarly, perhaps comparisons could be done between COCs and ‘comparable’ non-COCs with within the same county. We believe this warrants further discussion.
-