

OneBayArea

Equity Working Group

June 8, 2011, 10:30 a.m. – 12:45 p.m.

MetroCenter, Claremont Conference Room

101 8th Street, Oakland, 2nd Floor

AGENDA

- | | Estimated Time
for Agenda Item |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Welcome and Self-introductions | 10:30 a.m. |
| 2. Start Time for Future Meetings (<i>Jennifer Yeamans</i>) | |
| 3. Equity Working Group Work Plan and Schedule Update* (<i>Jennifer Yeamans</i>) | |
| 4. Notes from May 11 Meeting* (<i>Jennifer Yeamans</i>) | |

DISCUSSION ITEMS

- | | |
|---|-------------------|
| 5. Draft Equity Analysis Framework for Alternative Scenarios* (<i>Jennifer Yeamans/
Marisa Raya</i>)
<i>Staff will present an initial framework for quantitative equity analysis of the Alternative Scenarios
for review and input from the group.</i> | 10:40 a.m. |
|---|-------------------|

INFORMATION ITEMS / OTHER BUSINESS

- | | |
|---|-------------------|
| 6. Lifeline Transportation Program Needs Assessment for Plan Bay Area*
(<i>Jennifer Yeamans</i>)
<i>Staff will present information on the needs assessment conducted for MTC's Lifeline Transportation
Program.</i> | 12:30 p.m. |
| 7. Future Agenda Items (<i>All</i>) | |
| 8. Public Comment | |
| 9. Adjournment | |

Next meeting: PLEASE NOTE START TIME

Wednesday, July 13, 2011

11:15 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

MetroCenter, 2nd Floor Claremont Conference Room

101-8th Street, Oakland 94607

* Agenda Items attached

** Attachments to be distributed at the meeting.

T:\SCS\SCS Engagement\SCS Equity\Equity Working Group\2011-06-June\0_June 8 11 Agenda.doc





Plan Bay Area Equity Working Group Work Plan and Schedule

6/1/2011

Tasks	2011												2012												2013			
	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A
1. Vision Scenario Analysis																												
1.1 Review populations and measures to be analyzed		*																										
1.2 Review results			*																									
2. Alternative Scenarios Analysis																												
2.1 Review populations and measures to be analyzed							*																					
2.2 Review results										*																		
3. Draft Plan (Preferred Scenario) Analysis																												
2.1 Review populations and measures to be analyzed																*												
2.2 Review results																						*						
4. Complementary Tasks																												
4.1 Update Snapshot Analysis/SCS Indicators																												
4.2 Identify other essential equity tasks that can be effectively analyzed							*																					
4.3 Review/comment on Scenarios relative to equity analysis results														*														
4.4 Support engagement in low-income and minority communities																												
4.5 Recommend possible policies for consideration in the SCS/RTP															*													
Key Committee/Board Meetings			1										2	3								4						5
RTP/SCS + EIR		Vision																					D					F
RHNA																												

* Milestone D = Draft F = Final

Meetings:

- (1) Review Vision Scenario Results
- (2) Adopt RHNA methodology
- (3) MTC/ABAG Approve Draft SCS (Preferred Scenario)
- (4) Release Draft Plan
- (5) Final RTP/SCS

All dates/workplan elements subject to change

Summary of May 11, 2011 Equity Working Group meeting

Discussion of Alternative Scenarios

Comment	Possible Follow-up
Parameters on Alternative Scenarios are so general it will be difficult for good analysis to proceed	Will bring whatever details are available to group discussions.
Hard to give input on the scenarios when they lack specificity	Staff will relay that need for greater certainty to those developing the scenarios
What level of transportation/land use integration will be in the scenarios?	It will have to go back and forth between the two

Discussion: RHNA Update

Comment	Possible Follow Up
Will opportunity for siting new schools be evaluated?	Focus is on regional-scale tasks, rather than those decisions that are primarily local.
What is the role of analyzing senior housing?	Analyzing the scale and distribution of the growth of the older-adult population has been identified as a task
Consider a joint meeting with the Housing Methodology Committee to connect some of the dots	Staff can bring this idea to the HMC to gauge interest
Look at fair-share obligations first	Unmet needs from last RHNA cycle are incorporated into next cycle.
Consider flipping the 70/30 component	Variation between the two was not that great
Needs to be a nexus between low-income housing and specific locations of transit, not just whether available at the jurisdictional level, and start tracking production near transit	Affordable housing production is one factor to be included
Can the 30% be put in opportunity-rich areas?	A variation on this was introduced to the Housing Methodology Committee with “opportunity” defined as jobs, transit access, and school API score.
Look at best practices on how to site schools so they are driving “good” growth rather than sprawl/congestion.	ABAG has a forthcoming report on Schools; siting is a state and local issue but one that we intend to frame as a challenge to implementing the SCS.
Carryover of existing needs should be addressed	Will bring updates on the methodology process as it unfolds with the committee
Support income readjustment concept	HMC supported this
Need to understand where infrastructure gaps are for each PDA in the region	The PDA Assessment includes self-reported infrastructure needs from each jurisdiction.
Different growth dynamics and trends exist for different racial and ethnic groups, be explicit in describing those differences	Could add an overview of demographic changes from 2000-2010.
Will there be guidelines or best practices to release to locals?	Guidelines and best practices for planning are currently embodied in the Station Area Planning program.

Discussion: Populations and Communities of Concern

Comment	Possible Follow Up
Geographic-based approach is preferable because it accounts for place	Final framework will likely incorporate both geographic-based and population-based measures
Be transparent about technical limitations, do spatial disaggregation of performance targets to the extent possible	Targets-based approach revealed some limitations in the Initial Vision analysis, both technically and with respect to interpreting the results around priority equity issues
Can we access the data behind the low-income/minority maps?	It is drawn from the 2005–09 American Community Survey at the census tract level
Bring a map showing the relationship of communities of concern to PDAs	Map is available at http://www.bayareavision.org/initiatives/PDFs/Region_PDAs_CoC_11x17_4.pdf
Show population density	This is on the list of SCS Indicators.
Would be helpful to get some summary information related to the maps	Will bring this to a future meeting
Split senior populations into 65+, 85+ because mobility issues are distinct between the two	Proposed framework will to the extent possible match indicators to identified needs/challenges
Use data that is as up-to-date as possible, even if it means mixing data sets	Will bring back to group for further discussion in June or July
If region doesn't accommodate everyone, analyze who is impacted	Could incorporate into displacement analysis

T:\SCS\SCS Engagement\SCS Equity\Equity Working Group\2011-06-June\3_May 11 2011 meeting notes.doc



To: Equity Working Group
 From: Equity Working Group staff
 Date: June 2, 2011
 Subject: Draft Equity Analysis Framework for Alternative Scenarios

This memorandum summarizes staff's proposed framework for the equity analysis of Plan Bay Area's Alternative Scenarios. The proposed framework consists of five equity measures addressing a range of distinct themes that were elevated in discussions with Equity Working Group members.

The goal of the Alternative Scenarios equity analysis is to compare how the different scenarios perform in distributing the benefits and burdens between the target populations of concern and non-target populations. As discussed at your meeting last month, this comparison requires identifying a set of equity performance measures that can be readily summarized for each scenario, as well as relevant target population(s) for each performance measure.

The purpose of our discussion June 8 is for group members to offer input and feedback on the proposed framework so that staff can make further refinements to the measures and finalize them in July. This timeframe will enable equity analysis results to be presented concurrently with other technical analyses of the Alternative Scenarios in the fall.

Initial Vision Scenario Equity Analysis: Takeaways

You will recall that the equity analysis of the Initial Vision Scenario relied on breaking out results for the 10 adopted performance targets by income level to the extent possible, and identifying relevant proxies for the targets that could not be broken out by income. While tying the equity analysis directly to adopted policy objectives is a powerful way to promote equity in discussions of regional priorities, staff identified two drawbacks in this approach: (1) the large number of equity measures was challenging to summarize in terms of the Initial Vision Scenario's *overall* equity performance; and (2) not every target, when disaggregated, translated into an effective equity measure.

Revised Equity Analysis Framework for Alternative Scenarios

Compared to the targets-based framework of the Initial Vision Scenario, the proposed Alternative Scenarios framework follows a more succinct approach to selecting measures, based not only on the availability and quality of data for both the base and horizon years, but also on the following criteria that each measure:

- Ties directly to key regional equity priorities identified by past studies and in group discussions.
- Adds a distinct dimension of equity not captured in any of the other equity analysis measures.



- Is simple, straightforward, and easy to understand.
- Has potential to reflect substantive differences between Alternative Scenarios relevant to equitable development, and “roll up” meaningfully into a way to identify which Alternative Scenario best supports equitable development.
- Is able to inform and support policy initiatives related to equity that are within the regional agencies’ policy realm.

Attachment A summarizes staff’s proposed equity analysis framework for the Alternative Scenarios, consisting of five measures that address a range of priority regional equity issues identified in past agency studies and by discussions with working group members. Each measure presented includes a detailed description of what data the measure would produce, the relevant key questions the measure would help answer, which target population(s) would be compared, and brief discussion of the advantages and potential issues related to the inclusion of each measure.

Identification of Target Populations

In addition to the low-income and minority Communities of Concern that have been analyzed in past RTP Equity Analyses, staff is proposing to identify additional target populations to include in the analysis, including “Low Engagement Communities” and “Low Mobility Communities,” as indicated in Attachment A. Staff proposes to characterize these communities as having concentrations of the following populations based on the most recent data available from the Census Bureau:

Communities of Concern

Low Income Population (less than 200% of federal poverty level)

Minority Population (any race or ethnicity besides white/non-Hispanic)

Low Engagement Communities

Population That Speaks English Less Than “Very Well”

Population 25+ with Less Than High School Diploma

Low Mobility Communities

Population 5+ with a Disability

Population 75+

Zero-Vehicle Households

Staff will bring more detailed summaries of these communities in the regional context and proposed population thresholds to your June 8 meeting.

Inclusion of Supplemental Data

In addition to the five proposed equity metrics, it may be possible as staff time and resources permit to include other supplemental data to further inform the selected metrics, as was presented for the Initial Vision Scenario equity analysis at your April meeting. Staff invites your feedback about what other data would be most informative to supplement the analysis.

Next Steps and Timeline

Meeting Goal

- | | |
|--------|---|
| June | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review and provide input on staff proposal for model-based equity measures• Review and provide input on staff proposal to identify target populations for the analysis• Identify other potential "off-model" analysis needs |
| July | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Finalize framework, proceed with model-based analysis of Alternative Scenarios• Initial report back on off-model analysis refinements (continues to August) |
| August | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Finalize methodologies for off-model analyses |

Attachment A: Draft Equity Measures for Alternative Scenarios

Version 06.02.11

Measure/Description	Key Questions Addressed	Target Population Breakout	Discussion
Theme: Affordable Housing and Transportation Choices			
1. Housing + Transportation Affordability Result is a percentage expressing the average share of household income spent on housing and transportation costs combined. Results are compared between groups across all scenarios.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Which scenario(s) reduce the share of income spent on housing and transportation by the greatest amount for the target population? Which scenario(s) provide similar or better results for the target population compared to the rest of the population? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low-income households (all) vs. non-low-income households Communities of concern vs. non-communities of concern Low-engagement communities vs. not low-engagement communities Low-mobility communities vs. not low-mobility communities 	Advantages: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dovetails with targets analysis (which combines low and moderately low income households) Issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two of three factors rely on future-year assumptions about housing cost and income distribution Travel mode choice and access end up deeply embedded within the measure
Theme: Growing Equitably			
2. Displacement Analysis Compares forecasted number of low-income households to current-year. Results are compared across all scenarios.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Which scenario(s) result in zero displacement of low-income households? Which scenario(s) accommodate the greatest number of low-income households? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low-income households (all) 	Advantages: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dovetails with targets analysis Issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently relies on existing assumptions about allocation and distribution of low-income households in the future May be difficult to characterize market forces in forecasts
Theme: Making the Jobs/Housing Connection			
3. Jobs-Housing Fit Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Which scenario(s) provide the best fit for low-income households and entry-level jobs? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low-income Households (all) 	Advantages: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses inter-jurisdictional issues affecting locations of jobs and housing Issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Methodology still under development
Theme: Healthy Communities			
4. Vehicle Emissions (PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀) Emissions of fine and coarse particulate matter from on-road vehicles are estimated in terms of average amount (e.g. kg) per day per roadway link. Based on location of roadway links, results are compared between groups across all scenarios.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Which scenario(s) reduce emissions by the greatest amount for the target populations? Which scenario(s) provide similar or better results for the target populations compared to the rest of the population? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communities of concern vs. non-communities of concern Low-engagement communities vs. not low-engagement communities Low-mobility communities vs. not low-mobility communities 	Advantages: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dovetails with targets analysis (which analyzes BAAQMD CARE communities) Issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spatially disaggregated emissions estimates are a proxy for—but do not equate to—forecasting air quality concentrations or health outcomes
Theme: Equitable Mobility			
5. Non-commute Travel Time Result is an average travel time in minutes for non-commute trips, reflecting travel to all other destinations than work or school, including shopping, childcare, health and medical, and social/recreational trips.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Which scenario(s) reduce average trip time to non-work destinations by the greatest amount for the target populations? Which scenario(s) provide similar or better results for the target populations compared to the rest of the population? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low-income households (all) vs. non-low income households Communities of concern vs. non-communities of concern Low-engagement communities vs. not low-engagement communities Low-mobility communities vs. not low-mobility communities 	Advantages: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can capture a broad cross-section of populations who benefit from improved connections to non-work destinations. Issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doesn't individually break out more specific kinds of trips or modes of interest to specific target populations.



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

AGENDA ITEM 6

Memorandum

TO: Equity Working Group

DATE: June 1, 2011

FR: Jennifer Yeamans

RE: Lifeline Transportation Program Needs Assessment for Plan Bay Area

MTC’s Lifeline Transportation Program funds projects intended to improve mobility for the region’s low-income communities. For Plan Bay Area, MTC staff evaluated funding needs to implement the Lifeline Transportation Program over the 28-year plan period from FY 2012-13 through FY 2039-40, based on priority projects identified in Community Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs). CBTP projects cover a range of community-identified needs and solutions, including but not limited to: operational enhancements to fixed-route transit service, shuttle purchases and operations, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, bus stop improvements and other transit capital needs, information and outreach programs, demand response programs, and auto loan programs.

Methodology

Staff reviewed 470 projects prioritized in the 27 Community Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs) completed as of February 2011. A total of 41 plans are to be completed, so to estimate costs from plans yet to be completed, average total project costs from completed plans were assumed to apply to the 14 remaining plans. Annual operating costs were assumed to be ongoing for the 28-year period for all operating projects identified in CBTPs, including expansions and enhancements to existing fixed-route transit, new fixed-route transit, shuttles, and other operational programs. Other basic cost assumptions were applied as needed when more specific project costs or scope were not identified in the CBTPs.

Results

Preliminary calculations of the 28-year projected Lifeline Transportation needs produced the following estimates:

Actual and Estimated Total CBTP Project Costs: FY2013 through FY2040 (2010 \$millions)	
One-Time Costs	\$690
Annual Operating Costs	\$3,461
Total*	\$4,152

** does not sum to total due to rounding*

These totals may be revised further to reflect completion of some capital projects identified in CBTPs pending outcome of the Lifeline Program evaluation that is currently under way, or to reflect overlap with projects identified in other planning documents and/or project submissions.

For More Information

Lifeline Transportation Program: <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/lifeline/>

Community Based Transportation Planning Program: <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/cbtp/>