

Summary of Feb. 9, 2011 Equity Working Group meeting

Several members mentioned items they wanted to add to a “wish list”:

Comment	Possible Follow-up
Map of current RHNA added to Snapshot, reflecting current affordable housing conditions and also current policies and restrictions (and perhaps indicating what restrictions are set to expire)	This could take a lot of time and resources to do meaningfully
Identification of factors that are pushing low-income people away from transit (such as greater personal safety and better schools), better identification of choice movers vs. displaced	Data is limited but can explore further in Detailed Scenario development, SCS Indicators discussion
Look more closely at current senior population and changing income status trends (trend may be for seniors to be becoming more low-income)	Explore in Detailed Scenario development, Indicator on Access for Elderly and Disabled

Discussion: Background and Trends

Comment	Possible Follow-up
Incorporate information from Initial Vision Equity Analysis in to Call for Projects	Review Call for Projects guidance
Survey movers to figure out why some trends appear to be conflicting (such as rise in low-income population vs. greater spending on H+T)	New surveys beyond scope of current process but could pursue for future research. Past surveys and research can add further complication or nuance; for example, an increase in middle-class households of color to a former area of concentrated poverty also shows up as “gentrification.”
Need to identify mechanisms for accountability and enforcement	Review indicators for how they tie to specific regional policies and programs
Is the outward migration of low-income households continuing now that homeownership is not as attainable or desirable? Is this finding still valid	Could review 2009 1-year ACS data for % of regional low-income population in central cities – may not capture worst of recession/foreclosure crisis
Is it assumed that a project located in a low-income community benefits that community?	Not how the existing program-level analysis has worked; depends on if project impacts can be modeled and how project relates to equity performance measures.
How does the increasing demographic and socioeconomic diversity of neighborhoods factor in?	Explore in Detailed Scenario development
How have cuts to transit and social services impacted low-income communities?	Transit service changes available in Snapshot. Unsure how to track provision of social services

Track unemployment rates	Most recent data for 2009 only available for geos greater than 65,000. Tract level data for 2005-9 is probably a mixed picture for that period. Could explore more in Detailed Scenarios but unclear how to tie to forecasting. Potential employment indicators include labor force participation, job growth by industry and wage level, and existing wages
Track housing crowding	Similar to above, could produce data for 2009 for areas with greater than 65,000 population, or tract level for 2005-9. However, cannot be forecast since don't forecast number of rooms in units.
What data is available about jobs (wages and schedules) and connection to provision of transit service	Bring more info about how service hours/times of day are forecast. Review variables available in jobs forecasts in Detailed Scenarios. Review of job growth by industry and wage level could be tied to future housing projections and income levels.
Look at daytime vs. nighttime populations of places like San Francisco	Can explore how new travel model tracks people "all day long" wherever they go.
Low-income households disproportionately affected by foreclosures	Available data only reveals which tracts are affected, not individuals. Not sure how to connect to RTP/SCS scenario development.
Disconnect between actual and perceived availability of transportation options	Currently unclear how forecasting could address perceptual barriers.

Discussion: Initial Vision Scenario Draft Equity Performance Measures

Comment	Possible Follow Up
Measure #1: Low-lying areas are disproportionately affected by sea level rise	BCDC tracking adoption of Adaptation plans for jurisdictions affected by sea level rise
Measure #3: Something more immediate term than asthma rates is needed	Trying to keep to the targets for the Initial Vision; could explore more in Detailed Scenarios
Measure #2: Disaggregate this measure spatially or else it could be misleading	Could explore possibilities for spatial analysis further in Detailed Scenarios
Measure #8: add an affordability dimension such as within a \$2 fare or by mode as a proxy for affordability.	Out-of-pocket travel costs can be analyzed.
Measure #10: Present % of operating shortfalls by operator	Could explore further in Detailed Scenarios. May be appropriate to link to Transit Sustainability Project.
For all measures: Demonstrate a reduction in inequities	Explore this question with Initial Vision results and then carry forward to Detailed Scenarios
Ensure achievement of targets does not create any perverse inequities	Can further elucidate "how" targets are achieved, but can only account for those factors that are present in the model
Provide trip rates by income level as a measure of overall mobility	Should be able to produce this to show at a minimum how trip rates change between base year, current plans, and Initial Vision. Could expand in Detailed Scenarios.

Delve further into literature on inequities to identify the specific inequities we wish to reduce.	Explore further in Detailed Scenarios
Measure #3: Get everybody below the state level for PM2.5	Explore further in Detailed Scenarios
Measure #3: Health outcomes impacted far more by other things than transportation and land use policies	Targets selected based on relation to regional agencies' respective jurisdictions
Measure #7: Need some kind of basic level of access before talking about cost or affordability	Explore further in Detailed Scenarios
Measure #8: Incorporate educational attainment	Can't be forecast, but could potentially provide more information as background.

T:\SCS\SCS Engagement\SCS Equity\Equity Working Group\2011-03-March\3_Feb 9 2011 meeting notes.doc