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: Commission

DATE: February 17, 2012

FR: Executive Director

W. I.:

RE: Guidance for Applying Project Performance Assessment to Plan Bay Area Investments

At the Planning Committee meeting earlier today, staff present proposed guidelines for applying the project performance assessment results to low-performing projects seeking discretionary funding in Plan Bay Area. In brief, the guidelines would require project sponsors to present a "compelling case" for a low-performing project in one of two categories: (1) project benefits that are not adequately captured in the MTC travel demand model, and (2) projects that are given special preference under federal law or regulations. The Planning Committee approved a motion (with Commissioner Liccardo dissenting) that added several new criteria that we have grouped under a third category labeled "Regional Considerations." The Committee also decided to forward its action as a recommendation for full Commission consideration.

For your information, the Planning Committee staff report and power point presentation are included as Attachment A to this memorandum. In Attachment B, the committee's changes to the staff recommended guidelines are shown in underlined type. Finally, the committee asked staff to research the history of the Commission's adopted policy on "committed projects", which determined what uncommitted projects were subject to the project performance assessment in the first place.

The Commission deliberated on the committed projects policy in April 2011. At the Planning Committee meeting on April 7th, the bulk of the discussion revolved around two options for determining how late in the development process a project would need to advance in order to be considered "committed". Option 1 would have set the bright line at the conclusion of the environmental review process; Option 2 would have moved the line to an early phase of the construction process. At the committee meeting, Commission Green made a motion to recommend Option 1 with the additional proviso that projects funded with local sales tax dollars would be exempt from the performance evaluation. His motion died for lack of a second. The committee then adopted Option 2 as its recommendation, with Commissioners Green, Rein-Worth, and Spering dissenting. At the Commission meeting on April 27th, the full board rejected the committee recommendation and approved Option 1 with Commissioners Bates, Campos, Halsted, Kinsey, Mackenzie, and Mullin dissenting.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or concerns prior to the Commission meeting next Wednesday, February 22nd.

Steve Heminger

Attachments

J:\COMMITTE\Commission\2012\02_February 2012\M-Planning.Guidelines 2-17-12.doc