

OneBayArea

Equity Working Group
March 14, 2012, 11:15 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.
MetroCenter, Claremont Conference Room
101 8th Street, Oakland, 2nd Floor

AGENDA

Estimated Time
for Agenda Item
11:15 a.m.

1. Welcome and Self-introductions
2. Equity Working Group Work Plan and Schedule* (*Jennifer Yeamans, MTC*)
3. Notes from February 8 Meeting* (*Jennifer Yeamans, MTC*)
4. Reports from Other Regional Advisory Groups:
 - Housing Methodology Committee
The Housing Methodology Committee met on March 8. Agenda/packet to be posted at:
http://www.onebayarea.org/plan_bay_area/housing.htm
 - Regional Advisory Working Group
The March 6 Regional Advisory Working Group meeting was cancelled. The next meeting is scheduled for April 3.
 - Partnership Technical Advisory Committee
The Partnership Technical Advisory Committee is scheduled to meet March 19; agenda/packet will be posted to <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/meetings/schedule/> approximately 1 week in advance.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

11:30 a.m.

5. Preferred Scenario Development – Draft Land Use Scenario* (*Miriam Chion, ABAG*)
Staff will provide an overview of the Draft Preferred Land Use Scenario to be released March 9.
6. Equity Analysis Methodology Refinements for Preferred Scenario (*Jennifer Yeamans, MTC/ Johnny Jamarillo, ABAG*)
Staff will review proposed refinements to the Equity Analysis methodology for the Preferred Scenario, based on results of the Alternative Scenarios analysis and prior feedback from group members.
 - a. Income forecasts**
 - b. Housing costs**
 - c. Transportation measures*

INFORMATION ITEMS / OTHER BUSINESS

12:50 p.m.

7. Future Agenda Items (*All*)
8. Public Comment
9. Adjournment

Next meeting:

Wednesday, April 11, 2012 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.

The Equity Working Group assists staff in the development of the Equity Analysis for the Sustainable Communities Strategy/Regional Transportation Plan.

T:\SCS\SCS Equity\Equity Working Group\2012\03-March\0_Mar 14 2012 Agenda.doc





Equity Working Group Work Plan and Schedule

Revised 3/7/2012

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	M
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																													
3.1 Review populations and measures to be analyzed															*														
3.2 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		Alternative Scenarios									Plan Preparation				D										F		
RHNA			Methodology										D															F	

* Milestone D = Draft F = Final

Meetings:

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

All dates/workplan elements subject to change

Summary of February 8, 2012 Equity Working Group meeting

Discussion: Overview of Feb. 6 RAWG Presentations

Comment	Response and Possible Follow Up
Tie education sector to the types of jobs being forecast, if forecasts point to growth in jobs that require higher education	Concur that this should be addressed in some way in the SCS.
This issue emphasizes how important good affordable transit is for getting young people to school.	See above
Identify policies that can encourage school quality in every neighborhood, minimizing the need for young people to commute long distances to better schools.	See above

Discussion: Plan Bay Area Project Performance Assessment — Revised Results, Next Steps, and Equity Considerations

Comment	Response and Possible Follow Up
Show project cost in addition to B/C performance	Project capital costs are shown in summary tables for Planning Committee. It's important to remember that there is not enough budget to fund all the high and medium performers.
Performance assessment overall seems stilted toward transit projects in already transit rich areas	The targets assessment generally favors transit over roads regardless of geographical location; the B/C assessment favors denser areas where transit investments are more cost-effective in terms of ridership generated.
This is a typical tension in public transit, productivity and serving existing ridership vs. coverage and attracting new riders	No response
Is BART Bay Fair project part of BART Metro or standalone?	It can be implemented independently of Metro, but it is a central component to the current BART Metro concept.
Why was the threshold for Low Income transit ridership set where it was?	The threshold was based on the % of low-income riders on a given system, as well as each system's % of the region's low-income riders.
Can the analysis take into account affordability of fares?	Not directly but ability-to-pay is intrinsic to observed utilization rates by low-income people on different systems. Nevertheless, staff recognizes the issue and will flag that it continues to be an issue in the analysis.
On the maps, the gray and blue are hard to distinguish (similar comments about pink/purple and what the "urbanized area" represents)	Staff will see if that can be improved without making the map less readable.

continued

Red-green legend style may be hard for some color blind people to distinguish	Complexity of map information and sheer number of colors needed to represent data may make it impossible to represent all the information with fewer colors.
Maps are very useful overall (comment widely echoed by many members)	No response
Explain on legend what is mapped, i.e. all projects evaluated? A certain selection?	All projects with geographical locations are shown on the map. Regional programs cannot be shown in this geographical format.
Visual representation is useful but not addressing whether the project is a direct community need; may be helpful to overlay with SCS Indicators or Snapshot maps showing existing transit service	It may not be possible to represent that much information on a single map, but side-by-side comparisons are still possible.
Consider adding a regional summary map that just shows the red and green projects in CoCs	A regional summary map isn't very legible – instead we will continue to focus on the county level.
Are some projects getting buried under other projects? Add a downtown Oakland inset	Final maps will include a downtown Oakland inset. Buried projects will be shown in the final maps as well.
HOT lanes deserve more rationale/explanation for their investment based on what the maps are showing	Note that the red indicates adverse effect on <i>any one</i> target, not necessarily a net adverse effect across all equity related targets. Nevertheless, the question is likely to garner more attention going forward
Give maps more detailed explanation on them so they can function more “stand-alone” so that one does not have to cross-reference project performance results table with the maps	Maps were designed to function alongside the equity considerations table. Additional detail can be added in the final maps.
Show elderly as a community of concern next time; concern that investments will not reach those who will be needing them	Will flag as an issue for next time
Consider impact of where low-income workers are working in addition to where they live	Since communities of concern are defined by zone-of-residence, they at least represent one end of the work trip. More sophisticated modeling techniques could be applied at the regional/scenario level, if not the project/mapping level.
The mapping effort is positive overall but have concern that decisions will be made in spite of negative impacts	Scenario level analysis should address all impacts together.

ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

Representing City and County Governments of the San Francisco Bay Area



ABAG

To: ABAG Administrative Committee

From: Ezra Rapport, ABAG Executive Director *P. Jones for ER*

Subject: Plan Bay Area: Release of Draft Preferred Land Use Scenario

Date: March 2, 2012

At the Joint MTC Planning and ABAG Administrative Committee meeting on March 9, 2012, staff will present the draft Preferred Land Use Scenario for Plan Bay Area. The Scenario will include jobs, population and housing distribution by 2040 for the region, counties, cities and priority development areas. The draft Preferred Land Use Scenario will provide an overview of past and projected trends: how the region grew over the past thirty years and expected economic and demographic trends; housing access and production challenges; and the relationship of housing, employment centers and transportation infrastructure.

The draft Preferred Land Use Scenario has been developed to demonstrate how the Bay Area's diversity of communities and natural resource areas can retain and enhance their unique qualities and characteristics supported by a strong, globally competitive economy with housing opportunities located in proximity to job centers and transit services.

OneBayArea

To: Equity Working Group
 From: Jennifer Yeamans, MTC
 Date: February 6, 2012
 Subject: Equity Analysis Methodology Refinements for Preferred Scenario

In presenting the results of the Alternative Scenarios Equity Analysis in December, staff received a range of feedback and suggestions on how the measures might be refined or changed for the coming analysis of the Preferred Scenario. This memorandum provides an initial discussion of proposed refinements to the three travel model-based measures based on this feedback, for your consideration and discussion at your February 8 meeting. Discussion of the methodological approach will continue in March, when staff must finalize the methodology for all measures so that analysis of the Preferred Scenario can commence in a timely fashion.

Feedback on Alternative Scenarios

Comments and suggestions received from the Equity Working Group and members of the Joint MTC Planning/ABAG Administrative Committee included¹:

- Incorporate subsidized housing into the H+T Affordability measure
- Add school trips to the analysis of commute travel time
- Consider looking at the number of accessible destinations in lieu of travel time
- Consider analyzing trip distance and/or average speed instead of travel time

Recommendations for Travel Related Measures

In consideration of the last three points above, staff recommends the following in response:

- Keep analysis of school trips separate from work-related commute trips. The rationale for keeping these separate is because assumptions about the locations of educational destinations do not vary between scenarios as do the location of and mixes of employment forecast. School trips could potentially be examined a separate measure, but the results in terms of overall trends/observations is very likely to be duplicative with the two travel time measures already being analyzed.
- Continue to analyze travel time rather than use accessibility measures, in that the results are more intuitive to interpret (average commute time = X minutes rather than an average of 13,000 jobs accessible from a group of locations). This is a case where MTC's new travel model is a substantial improvement in terms of representing travel characteristics at the individual level rather than the neighborhood or "zone" level as in the past when MTC used accessibility measures for equity analysis.
- Continue using travel time as a measure instead of distance or speed. Attachment A provides a summary comparison of these three possible measures for your consideration. Because all three measures represent similar overall trends across the

¹ Refer to the December 2011 and January 2012 meeting summaries for further details on comments and input received from Equity Working Group members. For minutes of the December Joint Committee meeting, see here: http://apps.mtc.ca.gov/meeting_packet_documents/agenda_1799/1_Final_minutes.pdf



scenarios, choosing more than one would be duplicative. To make a change to the measures approved by MTC’s Planning Committee in October, staff would need to provide justification that one of the alternatives was substantially superior. Note that issues identified related to assumptions about transit travel times are also present in the travel speed measure, since speed is a function of time.

In addition to the points above, staff is also planning to modify the analytical approach to the VMT Density measure so that an identical roadway network is being analyzed across all scenarios. The previous methodology used in the Alternative Scenarios Analysis selected only “major” roadway links carrying more than 10,000 vehicles per day, but because travel patterns varied across scenarios, some links were captured in some scenarios and not others, making for “apples to oranges” comparison of VMT results across scenarios. Staff therefore proposes analyzing the union of roadway links captured across all scenarios, so that the VMT results present “apples to apples” comparisons across scenarios.

Next Steps

March	Finalize Methodology for Preferred Scenario Equity Analysis
April	Conduct Analysis
May	Adopt Preferred Scenario

Attachment	“Comparison of Potential Equity Analysis Measures Based on Alternative Scenarios Analysis of Commute Travel Time”
------------	---

Comparison of Potential Equity Analysis Measures
Based on Alternative Scenarios Analysis

Commuter Time (Current Measure) <i>Average time in <u>minutes</u> for commute trips</i>		Base Year	1. Initial Vision	2. Core	3. Focused	4. Constrained	5. Outward
				Concentration	Growth	Core Concentration	Growth
	Communities of Concern	25	28	28	27	27	27
	Remainder of Region	27	29	29	28	28	28
	Regional Average	27	29	28	28	28	28

Commuter Distance (Alternative 1) <i>Average distance traveled for commute trips in <u>miles</u></i>		Base Year	1. Initial Vision	2. Core	3. Focused	4. Constrained	5. Outward
				Concentration	Growth	Core Concentration	Growth
	Communities of Concern	11	11	11	11	11	11
	Remainder of Region	14	13	13	13	13	13
	Regional Average	13	13	13	13	13	13

Commuter Speed (Alternative 2) <i>Average speed for commute trips in <u>miles per hour</u></i>		Base Year	1. Initial Vision	2. Core	3. Focused	4. Constrained	5. Outward
				Concentration	Growth	Core Concentration	Growth
	Communities of Concern	27	24	24	25	25	25
	Remainder of Region	31	28	28	29	29	29
	Regional Average	30	27	27	28	28	28

Comparison of Potential Equity Analysis Measures
Based on Alternative Scenarios Analysis

Commute Time (Current Measure) <i>Average time in <u>minutes</u> for commute trips</i>		Base Year	1. Initial Vision	2. Core	3. Focused	4. Constrained	5. Outward
				Concentration	Growth	Core Concentration	Growth
	Communities of Concern	25	28	28	27	27	27
	Remainder of Region	27	29	29	28	28	28
	Regional Average	27	29	28	28	28	28

Commute Distance (Alternative 1) <i>Average distance traveled for commute trips in <u>miles</u></i>		Base Year	1. Initial Vision	2. Core	3. Focused	4. Constrained	5. Outward
				Concentration	Growth	Core Concentration	Growth
	Communities of Concern	11	11	11	11	11	11
	Remainder of Region	14	13	13	13	13	13
	Regional Average	13	13	13	13	13	13

Commute Speed (Alternative 2) <i>Average speed for commute trips in <u>miles per hour</u></i>		Base Year	1. Initial Vision	2. Core	3. Focused	4. Constrained	5. Outward
				Concentration	Growth	Core Concentration	Growth
	Communities of Concern	27	24	24	25	25	25
	Remainder of Region	31	28	28	29	29	29
	Regional Average	30	27	27	28	28	28