

To: Performance Working Group  
 From: Kristen Carnarius and Dave Vautin  
 Re: Plan Bay Area 2040 Performance Targets Criteria – Updated Proposal

At the July 10th meeting of the Performance Working Group, members had an opportunity to provide feedback on the draft criteria for the project-level targets score. Since that meeting, staff have incorporated feedback from the working group members, as well as from ABAG and internal stakeholders. This memorandum presents the currently proposed criteria with an explanation of what has changed since the July 10 proposal and an explanation for the change.

It is important to note that the targets criteria will need to reflect the language and intent of the final Plan Bay Area 2040 targets. The MTC Commission will adopt the targets in September 2015. Staff will incorporate any changes to the criteria based on target language changes that the MTC Commission adopts at a later point in the performance assessment.

**Proposed Target Criteria**

**Goal: Climate Protection**

<b>Staff proposal<sup>1</sup></b>	<p>Support if project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides an alternative to driving alone</li> <li>• Likely to cause VMT reduction</li> <li>• Advances clean fuels and/or vehicles beyond CARB targets</li> <li>• <del>Project outside of sea level rise inundation area</del></li> </ul> <p>Impact if project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project inside of sea level rise inundation area AND does not include a <b>potential adaptation strategy</b> in project description [only can be used to decrease score by 0.5 points, does not add points to projects outside inundation area]</li> </ul>
<b>What changed?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changed the sea level rise language to say adaptation rather than mitigation</li> <li>• Added restriction on the sea level rise criterion</li> </ul>

The targets criteria are the same as Plan Bay Area, except for the addition of the criteria related to sea level rise. Several of the working group members expressed concern that projects near the bay would inherently be disadvantaged with this criterion. Staff clarified that a project in an inundation area that includes an adaptation strategy could receive strong support for this target. Upon further deliberation of the target, staff is also proposing that the sea level rise criterion could only decrease a project's score. This would address the issue of a project far from the bay receiving a boost in the score irrespective of its impact on vehicle-miles travelled.

<sup>1</sup> The staff proposal presents the criteria used to determine if a project supports a target. A project would generally adversely impact the target if it does not accomplish the criteria in the support category, unless otherwise noted.

Staff also changed the wording to reflect the difference between mitigation and adaptation. Mitigation is generally the term used to describe what is being done to reduce pollutants that lead to climate change like GHG reduction strategies. Adaptation refers to strategies to make infrastructure more resilient to sea level rise. To address the impacts of sea level rise, a project in an inundation area would need to consider adaptation strategies or include a plan for developing adaptation strategies. Per Caltrans guidance, adaptation strategies include the decision to rebuild, relocate, or abandon in place.

**Goal: Adequate Housing**

<b>Staff proposal</b>	Support if project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increases accessibility to and from areas with planned housing growth more than <del>1,500</del> <b>500</b> units (moderate support) or more than <del>10,000</del> <b>5,000</b> units (strong support)</li> <li>• <del>Does not increase capacity at regional gateways</del></li> <li>• <b>Project serves an area that permitted at least 25% of its 2007-2014 RHNA allocation</b></li> </ul>
<b>What changed?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removed “increase capacity at regional gateways” from targets criteria</li> <li>• Reduced the housing thresholds to reflect growth rates for medium-sized cities</li> <li>• Added criteria based on permitting levels in the most recent RHNA allocation cycle</li> </ul>

The working group expressed strong concern with having criteria related to capacity at regional gateways associated with this target. Staff agrees and removed the gateway language from the target criteria. The target criteria is now only related to a project’s connection to housing. Per a suggestion from the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), staff also decreased the housing threshold to benefit medium-sized jurisdictions and added a new criterion related to the regional housing needs allocation (RHNA). The RHNA criterion reflects the ability of a jurisdiction to produce adequate housing The Bay Area permitted 50% of its RHNA allocation for 2007-2014. The RHNA threshold for this target is half of the regional value for the same cycle.

**Goal: Healthy and Safe Communities**

<b>Staff proposal</b>	Support if project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Likely to reduce VMT (support for PM2.5, collisions, active transportation)</li> <li>• Has safety component (support for collisions)</li> <li>• Includes infrastructure for walking and biking (support for active transportation)</li> <li>• <b>Project increases access to parks or adds park space (e.g. urban greening)</b></li> </ul>
<b>What changed?</b>	Added criteria related to urban greening or access to open space

The working group recommended adding criteria related to increasing access to parks and urban greening to either the healthy and safe communities target or the open space target. Staff recommends inclusion of urban open space in this target since the outcome of urban open space is potentially a healthier community.

**Goal: Open Space and Agricultural Preservation**

<b>Staff proposal</b>	Support if project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project itself would not consume areas of open space</li> <li>• Project itself would not consume areas of agricultural land</li> <li>• Improves freeway, arterial or rail access to agricultural land</li> </ul>
<b>What changed?</b>	No change

Staff recommends no change to these target criteria. There was some concern about adding a criterion for access to agricultural land. Staff explained that part of the goal of agricultural preservation is improving the connection between agricultural land and markets. Staff also considered evaluating the type of open space land (e.g. grazing land, farm land, wildlife corridors) that a project might consume. Due to difficulties in assigning scores to different types of open space, staff recommends to consider all open space as contributing equally to the target score.

**Goal: Equitable Access****Target: Housing + Transportation Affordability**

<b>Staff proposal</b>	Support if project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides low-cost transportation options for low income households; degree of support varies with the operator's current low-income ridership</li> <li>• Reduces household auto ownership costs/transportation costs for low income households</li> </ul>
<b>What changed?</b>	No change

Staff recommends no change from the Plan Bay Area criteria.

**Target: Affordable Housing**

<b>Staff proposal</b>	Support if project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serves a PDA with above average production of affordable housing units (<b>moderate income, low income, very low income</b>) as compared to the regional average for the 2007-2014 RHNA cycle</li> </ul>
<b>What changed?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Added clarification on the definition of affordable housing</li> </ul>

Several members of the working group suggested adding displacement language to this target depending on the final target adopted by the MTC Commission in September 2015. See the section on displacement for more information (page 4 of this memo).

--memo continued on next page--

**Goal: Economic Vitality****Target: Access to Jobs by Transit or Auto**

<b>Staff proposal</b>	Support if project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decreases auto, freight or transit travel times during AM and PM commute hours (strong support for high travel time reduction) AND</li> <li>• Serves <b>regional or subregional</b> job centers OR</li> <li>• <b>Serves goods movement centers</b></li> </ul>
<b>What changed?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replaced major job centers with regional or subregional</li> <li>• Added criteria related to improving access to goods movement centers</li> </ul>

The working group suggested defining job centers and adding a connection to goods movement or logistics centers. Staff proposes to define job centers in terms of the place types that the Association of Bay Area Governments developed for Plan Bay Area. There are three regional job centers: downtown Oakland, San Francisco, and San Jose. There are also several sub-regional job centers such as downtown Berkeley and downtown Concord that have at least 5,000 jobs. A project will support the target if it increases access to the regional job centers or the sub-regional job centers, defined as the city center place type in the land use strategy of Plan Bay Area. A project will also support the target if it increases access to freight centers such as any of the regional seaports.

**Goal: Transportation System Effectiveness****Target: Non-Auto Mode Share**

<b>Staff proposal</b>	Support if project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides alternatives to the single occupant auto</li> <li>• Reduces household vehicle ownership</li> <li>• Creates more direct active transportation routes</li> <li>• Improves transit service and connections to transit</li> <li>• <b>Serves a planned transit-oriented development</b></li> </ul>
<b>What changed?</b>	Added criteria related to accessing planned transit-oriented development

The working group suggested adding a connection to planned transit-oriented development (TOD) in the targets criteria. Staff proposes to add the criteria of serving a planned TOD to the non-auto mode share target.

**Target: State of Good Repair for Roads and Transit**

<b>Staff proposal</b>	Support if project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improves roadway surface condition OR</li> <li>• Replaces or extends the life of bus, rail or ferry assets</li> </ul> <p>No project would receive adverse impact for this target.</p>
<b>What changed?</b>	No change

The working group expressed concern that expansion projects would increase the burden of funding the existing system. In the assessment, however, a project's cost includes new transit vehicles for a transit extension or pavement costs for roadway expansions. An expansion project might improve the asset condition in the short term but increase the burden in the long term. Due to this complication, most projects will receive a "minimum impact" for this target. Staff proposes to keep the target criteria the same as in Plan Bay Area.

#### A note on displacement

On July 10, the joint MTC/ABAG Planning and Admin Committee asked MTC and ABAG staff to return to them in September with a memo on the issue of displacement. This memo will include a definition of displacement and policy recommendations about its relationship to the Plan, including recommendations for target language changes. Before the Committee meeting in September, staff will review the proposed displacement methodology from the 6 Wins for Social Equity Network, along with feedback from a special meeting of the Regional Equity Working Group that will exclusively cover displacement. Staff will update the targets criteria depending on the outcome of the September Committee and Commission meetings on performance targets.

#### A note on multiple criteria per target and assessing regional projects

As in Plan Bay Area, there are two issues with conducting the targets assessment. The first is the treatment of multiple criteria (e.g. more than one bullet point) for single target. The second is the handling of regional projects. During the assessment, staff will develop methods for combining criteria such as assigning half of a point to each of two criteria. For the healthy and safe communities target, a project would receive a strong support if it addressed most of the criteria and a moderate support if it addressed some of the criteria. The second issue is assigning jurisdiction-specific criteria to regional projects or projects that cross multiple jurisdictions, such as for adequate housing, affordable housing, and displacement. In these instances, staff will likely look at county-level information or combine data from multiple cities. For example, if the majority of cities along a BART extension have high planned growth, the project would receive a high score for that target.