

PART A: Performance Targets for **Healthy and Safe Communities** Goal

Approach	ID #	Potential PBA40 Target	  	Comments
<i>Minor Update to Existing Targets</i>	3	Reduce premature deaths from exposure to fine particulates (PM2.5) by X%	 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health and smog data needed to measure the effectiveness of reducing PM2.5 along highways and roads A real reduction by testing and not just modeling. Will take a great effort in reduction of miles traveled and industrial cooperation. Need to keep target It is unclear whether this target is clearly linked to transportation planning. If the large percentage reductions are scenario independent, there seems to be little purpose in retaining the measure. Shouldn't have two separate targets for PM2.5
			 3	
			 1	
	4	Reduce premature deaths from exposure to fine particulates (PM2.5) in CARE communities by Y%	 3  4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We should reduce fine particulates in CARE communities to the average level in all communities. Geography should be roadway proximate communities Preferable to focus on improving in places were exposure is worst
5	Reduce per-capita fatalities and serious injuries from crashes by 50% for all modes	 4  4  2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Politically difficult, but lowering the urban speed to 55 on the freeways and only allowing right turn on red in few areas would help. Not discussed at our meeting. Why not a larger reduction? Need to stratify the injuries by mode of victim and link with the active transportation target. An increase in walking and bicycling may achieve target #6 but increase injuries unless safety improvements are included. Unlikely to show differences across scenarios 	
6	Increase time spent walking and biking for transportation by 70%	 2  4  4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Like the clear focus but DALYs capture benefit better This is a physical exercise measure that increases by increasing the time required to walk/bike to work. Measure should be on access to these modes. (x2) Prefer using an absolute measures rather than a relative one (x2) Is there a way to balance the tradeoffs between 5 and 6 vs. 4 and 5 in approach #2 to more closely resemble each other? Is an indirect measure for public health and CO2, which are better addressed directly 	
<i>Unified Health Target + Priority Breakdown Targets via ITHIM</i>	3	Improve life expectancy associated with particulate emissions, road safety, and physical activity by X% as measured in disability-adjusted life-years	 13  --  1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern with large cost associated with calculation. Might be better to use these measures when cost of calculation decreases. Data on healthy diets from supermarkets could help measure healthy lifestyle choices, especially between organic and non-organic foods Change "particulate emissions" to pollutants Measure balances the positive and negative aspects of walkable neighborhoods near heavily-traveled roadways Using ITHIM's disability adjusted life years will help demonstrate a more accurate picture of the net health impacts of the Plan versus only premature deaths. The unified target will allow us to better quantify and compare the health impacts and benefits from different scenarios, including active transport from walking and bicycling, and thus communicate the cost-effectiveness of healthy planning. DALY needs to be explained carefully as it is not a concept that is readily understood.

Approach	ID #	Potential PBA40 Target	  	Comments
	4	Improve life expectancy associated with particulate emissions in CARE communities by Y% (as measured in disability-adjusted life-years)	 4  3  1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concern these measures only consider death but not serious injury. - Change “particulate emissions” to pollutants - Include Toxics, PM2.5, NO2, and O2
	5	Reduce per-capita fatalities and serious injuries from crashes by Z% for vulnerable modes (bicycle and pedestrian)	 3  4  1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - % should be 50% or higher - Assuming you feel the modeling provides reasonable results - Why not include this in #5 of Minor Updates to Existing Targets? - Unclear that this target can be modeled in a way that meaningfully distinguishes the scenarios and is already included within the composite ITHIM measure #3
Other Suggestions	?	<p>--</p> <p>Improve life expectancy associated with PM 2.5 emissions in areas close to roadways communities by Y% (as measured in disability-adjusted life-years)</p> <p>--</p> <p>--</p>		<p>Deeper look into access to organic and all-natural food products. Increasing access might increase life expectancy.</p> <p>Add additional measure for vulnerable communities to particulate matter.</p> <p>How will the X, Y, and Z in either approach be determined?</p> <p>Could the two packages of Healthy and Safe goals be merged?</p>

PART B: Performance Target(s) for Adequate Housing Goal

Goal	ID #	PBA Target	  	Comments
Adequate Housing	2	House 100% of the region's projected growth by income level (very-low, low, moderate, above-moderate) without displacing current low-income residents	 5  6  1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Does not seem to be a useful measure since this is a requirement of the Plan (x2) – PDAs may have too much housing relative to businesses. – Rather have metric that explains how the Plan incents actual housing production – Add a measure of the effectiveness of programs that ensure the forecasts can be fulfilled – We need to plan for assistance of low income residents who are displaced. We need more housing in PDA's, market and below market. – Extremely important to explain definition of displacement to public. – The Plan needs to recognize that in-commuting will still exist for a variety of reasons (personal choice, affordable housing, etc) – Metric is only useful to the extent that it captures actual production numbers and/or models location decisions of households in response to housing supply and demand. – Please clarify that adequate and equitable share of housing is available for all income areas throughout the Bay Area, especially in PDAs. – The availability and affordability must be explicit.
Other Comments	?	--		Add a measure on the theoretical jobs/housing threshold to determine which cities will be able to add more housing
		--		Add a measure capturing the quality of housing, not just quantity (e.g. overcrowding, age, condition, etc)
		--		Reducing or removal of local height restrictions would help to lower cost of housing, reduce co2 exposure and allow for more BMR housing. A law should be passed at the state level that would allow for increased heights based on an even larger percent of BMR units in a project.
		Achieve the adequate housing target with the least required financial subsidy per unit.		Plan should compare alternatives based on the per-unit cost necessary to subsidize affordable housing. Analysis was done for PBA 1.0 but not part of the formal targets process.
		Reduce housing cost burden by X % for lower-income households		Housing cost burden is closely associated with health for low-income households. Include a metric to capture this.
		Reduce residential occupancy burden (people per room)		
		Increase by X% the share of homes affordable to lower income households located residing in transit-rich or high opportunity areas.		Add the Proxy #1 displacement target to this goal area, with minor revisions. Dedicated affordable housing is a hedge against displacement in areas where rising values threaten to displace current residents and provides needed opportunity in areas with historic patterns of exclusion.

PART C: Performance Target(s) for **Equitable Access Goal**

Issue Area within Equitable Access Goal	Potential PBA40 Target	Rank** (#1 is best target for equity, etc.)	Comments
<i>Equitable Access to Jobs (Auto)</i>	Increase the share of income-matched jobs within 30 minutes by auto by X% for lower-income residents	 8  4  2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Measure by county and city – Does this time estimate include congestion at peak travel time? – These two travel time targets do not get at the core issue of equitable access: affordability. It may be best to combine these two targets into one that states, increase low-income-matched jobs within 30 minutes by affordable transportation and calculate how much households would spend on transportation, similar to how you would measure the other target of decreasing the combined “transportation-housing cost” in the bay area. – Prefer making PDAs successful.
<i>Equitable Access to Jobs (Transit)</i>	Increase the share of income-matched jobs within 45 minutes by transit by Y% for lower-income residents	 7  7  --	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Many people travel by auto and that needs to be income-matched. – Compare between urban and suburban parts of the Bay Area – Add walking and biking to the measure – 45 minutes seems high – what is driving this? Same as autos at 30min? Even if wait and walk time are included, those factors are included in discrete mode choice. – Actually, The Transit Capacity Manual states that people have a higher tolerance for travel time on transit, particularly because it's cheaper. As long as transit is less than 2X the travel time by car, it has a low-to-medium competitiveness. – Revise – Increase the share of income-matched jobs within 45 minutes by transit, walking, and biking, or a combination of two modes by Y% for lower-income residents. – Prefer making PDAs successful.
<i>Affordability for Lower-Income Households (Existing Target)</i>	Decrease by 10% the share lower-income residents' household income consumed by transportation and housing	 11  3  1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Concern this measure is too influenced by housing cost and difficult to forecast. – Correlation between higher increases in real estate prices and changes in income and GDP – This target goes directly to the core of what the SCS aims to deliver. – This would be more useful if housing and transportation were disaggregated. – Keep the combined housing and transportation costs to more effectively capture the full cost burden.
<i>Displacement (Proxy #1)</i>	Increase by X% the share of lower-income households residing in transit-rich or high-opportunity areas	 9  3  3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Some cities with PDAs in the downtown may not have public support for this – This is better proxy than # 2, since it signals a positive direction. – Only useful if it is based on modeled household locations rather than RHNA allocations, since housing production (especially for low-income units) does not come close to RHNA targets.

Issue Area within Equitable Access Goal	Potential PBA40 Target	Rank** (#1 is best target for equity, etc.)	Comments
<i>Displacement (Proxy #2)</i>	Retain the share of lower-income households residing in transit-rich or high-opportunity areas (+0% change)	 2  3  5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Gentrification impact should be analyzed for long-term trends – Wouldn't this be shown in Proxy #1? – What if a transit-rich area already includes high concentration of lower-income residents? Would we really want to increase their concentration?
<i>Other Suggestions</i>	--		<p>Question – how does HSR between Bay Area and Sacramento feed into the megalopolis concept? Solano County is split between two metro areas.</p> <p>Include an updated inventory of existing and planned bike infrastructure to complete the Transit model analysis, thereby accounting for financial costs and travel time for bicycling modes, noting savings in transport costs and advantages of bicycle commuting in areas with poor public transit availability.</p> <p>Need to clarify overall what a % increase or decrease means; eg, is a 10% change from 55% to 45%, or from 55% to 49.5%?</p>

** Ranks were converted to feedback symbols to incorporate all responses. A rank of 1 or 2 was considered the same as a 😊, 3 and 4 as a 😐, and a 5 as a 😞.

PART D: Performance Targets for **Economic Vitality** and **Transportation System Effectiveness** Goals

Approach	#	Potential PBA40 Target	  	Comments
Existing Approach	A	Increase gross regional product (GRP) by an average annual growth rate of approximately 2%	 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Not useful for differences between scenarios – Employment not related to white-collar work should be analyzed in each Bay Area county and types of jobs that are entry-level with potential for advancement – No clear link to transportation investments and land use patterns – Need to reduce GHGs and VMT
			 2	
			 9	
	B	Increase non-auto mode share by 10%	 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Not an end-goal – Many Bay Area households want to travel by car with reduced congestion and repaired roads – How about average travel time improvements? – Both Mode Share and VMT are fairly standardized metrics for understanding the transportation system and how effective it is. – If we increase the share of transit accessible jobs, but we do not increase the mode share, it points toward incompleteness of the transportation planning process, including factors such as access, education, right-sized parking etc. – In keeping with our state's climate action goals for more sustainable communities, we should maintain a modal shift target. While technological advancements and cleaner vehicles improve air quality, moving more people on higher occupancy vehicles in the form of transit buses and trains is the most cost effective and efficient use of scarce transportation resources and existing infrastructure. This target helps maintain a multi-modal perspective to regional planning that prioritizes populations more dependent on public transit service. – Need to reduce GHGs and VMT – Non-auto mode share is a key measure and should be considered for PBA40. It relates to the goals of SB 375 and Complete Streets concepts. – Not ambitious enough to achieve meaningful net aggregate CO2 emissions.
			 1	
			 5	
	C	Decrease automobile vehicle miles traveled per capita by 10%	 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Not an end-goal – More important to reduce congested VMT. – Reductions in travel time would be a more direct measure – It is good, but doesn't show anything new or different given the GHG target. – VMT is currently being proposed as the best alternative to analyzing LOS as part of CEQA. MTC should be consistent with this trend of measuring the effectiveness of our strategies and alternatives with these metrics. – Transportation system effectiveness should measure the cost of the systems (highway and transit) in dollars and time: to build, operate, maintain and use. – Should be overall VMT, not per-capita – Need to reduce GHGs and VMT
			 4	
			 3	

Approach	#	Potential PBA40 Target	  	Comments
		<i>[state of good repair targets pending review at June PWG meeting]</i>		
Access to Jobs Approach	A	Increase the share of income-matched jobs within 30 minutes by auto by X%	 6  3  3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Need to include the auto measure – Housing/jobs imbalance is a concern – present graphic showing the imbalance by county and city – Combine these – “Increase the share of income-matched jobs within a reasonable commute shed (30 mins by auto, 45 mins by transit, bike, and walk) – Add access to living wage jobs – Part of economic vitality should include the cost of doing business in the region – There are other reasons for making a trip than for work – Given that we are running at capacity with limited funds to increase transits reach, this idea make very good sense. How do we do it? – We should not have the same targets (equitable access) for multiple goals. – Transportation System Effectiveness and Economic Vitality should be separate goals (x2) – This measures appears to only be related to office jobs. Since 1/3 of jobs in the region are related to goods movement, this measure should consider all types of businesses. – The access measures are not transportation system measures. – This one is fine, but would not reflect improvements in housing production/affordability and job creation in corridors that have excellent transit but terrible highway congestion (BART and Caltrain)
	B	Increase the share of income-matched jobs within 45 minutes by transit by Y%	 6  2  3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Need to somehow address transit capacity. Is it possible to add a penalty in the model to wait time as transit capacity increases? – Large employers have shuttles as well as coaches coming into the area to transport workers. Encouraging employers to produce their own fleets would be helpful. – We should not have the same targets (equitable access) for multiple goals. – Need to get the SCS to be successful, which requires housing production. Not comfortable with 45-minute transit travel times. – How have the travel times for car and transit changed in the last two RTPs and the 2017 RTP? Need a baseline for comparisons. Have these two time targets been getting longer? – This one is fine, but will only deal with maybe 12% of employees who can commute via transit. – We seem to need both, or a combined metric. Share of income-matched jobs accessible by either 45 minute transit ride or 30 minute car trip?

Approach	#	Potential PBA40 Target		Comments
		<p>[state of good repair targets pending review at June PWG meeting]</p>		
Other Suggestions	?	<p>Goods movement (x3) Reliable highway travel times in key goods-movement corridors. (Or, if easier to model, reduce trucking hours of delay)</p>		<p>Goods Movement improvements? Is there a metric from the Regional Goods Movement Plan that can be incorporated? Perhaps a proxy that would show the availability of Class 1 rail vs. Truck only movement on interstates? Especially for corridors with high densities of agriculture, manufacturing wholesale and transportation, and retail land uses.</p>
		<p>Reduce time spent traveling by any mode and any distance</p>		<p>End-goal is that people spend less time travelling and getting to places and doing it without polluting (x2)</p>
		<p>Reduce congested VMT per capita by X%</p>		<p>The focus should be on reducing congestion and the time people who do choose to drive spend stuck in congested conditions. These congested conditions are also those with the highest emissions factors of pollutants.</p>
		<p>Achieve the adequate housing target with the least required financial subsidy per unit</p>		<p>The access measures are not economic targets. BIA proposes the cost-benefit housing subsidy metric as a potential economic target as it measures how the region can most efficiently (financially) hit the housing targets for all income levels.</p>
		<p>Reliability (x2) State of Good Repair Travel Time</p>		<p>Reliability and congestion measures should be added under system effectiveness. These are tracked by Vital Signs and are easily understandable as performance for the transportation system.</p>
		<p>--</p>		<p>North Counties and suburban cities have difficulties attracting modern jobs. Assistance and/or incentives to help these areas will promote the economy, increase GRP, and help encourage local transit options.</p>
		<p>Maintain system utilization between 50 and 100% capacity</p>		<p>Underused systems are not good investments. Overused systems do not serve the public well</p>
		<p>Increase supply of land zoned for commercial/industrial uses w/in 1 mile of freeway ramp or ½ mile of regional transit.</p>		<p>Land use plans and policies affect the supply of land available for commercial and industrial uses, which affects the cost of land, which affects the feasibility of developing/leasing facilities for mid-value (i.e., middle income) jobs.</p>
		<p>Increase the proportion of jobs in the Bay Area that are living- or middle-wage by [xx] percent, with a particular focus on creation and retention of living-wage and middle-wage</p>		<p>“Living- or middle-wage” to be defined as a range using existing data/benchmarks, for example, \$15 to \$40/hr; it might make sense to define the range on a county-by-county basis to better account for variation in sub-regional economies.</p>
				<p>Recent research shows that even in periods of rapid economic growth, the Bay Area is not producing enough middle wage jobs</p>

Approach	#	Potential PBA40 Target		Comments
		<p>jobs in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and Transit Priority Areas (TPAs).</p>		<p>to enable economic mobility. 1.13 million Bay Area residents (36% of the workforce) currently work in low-wage jobs. Business-as-usual projections for the next 10 years show that most of the jobs available are expected to be either high-wage or low-wage, with only 30,900 middle wage job openings projected per year.</p> <p>The land use and transportation infrastructure decisions being made at the regional and local levels across the Bay Area have a substantial impact on what industries are supported, what kind of jobs are created, retained or eliminated, and who has access to new or replacement job openings. The quality and accessibility of those jobs will in turn affect both workers' ability to afford housing and the transportation needs of workers and their families.</p> <p>Moreover, it is difficult for the public to understand what the proposed "Access to Jobs Approach" means and how it is modeled.</p> <p>As with transit, there is a big difference for roads between "maintenance" (PCI improvement) and "expansion" (express lanes/freeways). Need to maintain what we already have before building express/freeway lanes.</p> <p>Funding priority should be to streets used by transit and/or are located within PDAs that can be successful. Any new roads should require Complete Streets treatment.</p> <p>draft California Transportation Plan 2040 proposes doubling transit service and not building any more highway/ freeway lanes.</p> <p>A forecasting model that holds shares of income as a constant across scenarios is highly problematic. Land use and transportation/infrastructure decision-making, as well as the incentive/disincentive structure underlying funding programs, profoundly influence patterns of economic development and retention. We suggest, at a minimum, a pilot attempt at a modeling approach in which income shares of jobs is a model output rather than a constant.</p>