

### Overview

On September 11, 2015, the MTC Planning Committee and ABAG Administrative Committee reviewed the revised staff recommendation for Plan Bay Area 2040 goals and performance targets. In addition to amending the staff recommendation to include two new placeholders for targets related to jobs/wages and goods movement, the committees recommended approval of the goals and nine of the thirteen targets in September, deferring action on the remaining four targets until November. On September 17 and September 23, the ABAG Executive Board and MTC Commission, respectively, approved that recommendation.

Based on the direction received from policymakers, staff has developed a draft recommendation for the four remaining targets slated for review and approval in November (refer to **Table 1**). The purpose of this stakeholder meeting is to seek feedback and engage in collaborative discussion for these remaining targets.

### Current Status

- **Target #2 (Adequate Housing):** Staff was directed by policymakers to continue internal dialogue about the phrasing of the Adequate Housing target. As of this point, a resolution has not yet been reached. Given that there are no new MTC or ABAG proposals on the table beyond what was shown and discussed at meetings in early September, this stakeholder meeting will instead focus on the three remaining performance targets.
- **Target #7 (Risk of Displacement):** Policymakers and stakeholders had a number of questions about this issue and the approach for including it in the performance targets. Staff has incorporated revisions based on feedback and concerns into the three options highlighted on the following page. Staff is requesting your input to inform the selection of the staff recommendation in November.
- **Target #9 (Jobs/Wages):** Staff has reviewed potential targets for feasibility based on direction from policymakers and is seeking feedback on the two options highlighted on the following page.
- **Target #10 (Goods Movement):** Staff has reviewed potential targets for feasibility based on direction from policymakers and is seeking feedback on the proposed target.

**Table 1: Draft Staff Recommendation for Four Remaining Performance Targets** (goals/targets already adopted in gray)

Goal	#	Performance Target
Climate Protection	1	Reduce per-capita CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from cars and light-duty trucks by 15%
Adequate Housing	2	<i>[placeholder pending internal MTC/ABAG dialogue on target phrasing]</i>
Healthy and Safe Communities	3	Reduce adverse health impacts associated with air quality, road safety, and physical inactivity by 10%
Open Space and Agricultural Preservation	4	Direct <b>all</b> non-agricultural development within the urban footprint (existing urban development and UGBs)
	5	Decrease the share of lower-income residents' household income consumed by transportation and housing by 10%
Equitable Access	6	Increase the share of affordable housing in PDAs, TPAs, or high-opportunity areas by 15%
	7	<i>[refer to three options in Table 2 below]</i>
Economic Vitality	8	Increase by 20% the share of jobs accessible within 30 minutes by auto or within 45 minutes by transit in congested conditions
	9	<i>[refer to two options in Table 3 below]</i>
	10	Reduce per-capita delay on the Regional Freight Network by 20%
Transportation System Effectiveness	11	Increase non-auto mode share by 10%
	12	Reduce vehicle operating and maintenance costs due to pavement conditions by 100%
	13	Reduce per-rider transit delay due to aged infrastructure by 100%

## Equitable Access – Risk of Displacement Target (Target #7)

At the joint committees meeting in mid-September, staff presented three potential options for performance targets related to the issue of displacement risk, given that it is not possible to directly forecast displacement. Since that meeting, staff has refined each of the options (note that the underlined text has either been modified or added over the past few weeks), as shown in **Table 2**. Staff is seeking your input as we work to identify a recommended target.

**Table 2: Options for Displacement Risk Target**

Option	Performance Target	Pros	Cons
1	Reduce the share of <u>low- and moderate-income renter</u> households that are at <u>an increased</u> risk of displacement to 0%	Addresses displacement throughout the entire region. Assumes no net increase in displacement risk compared to conditions in 2005, the Plan baseline year.	Does not address PDAs, although what happens in PDAs affects this target as PDAs will accommodate 2/3 of the region's projected growth (PDAs are areas most influenced by the Plan through future growth allocations and investments). Aims to address risk factors that might not be influenced by the Plan.
2	Reduce the share of <u>low- and moderate-income renter</u> households that are at risk of displacement to 30% ( <i>half its current share</i> )	Addresses displacement throughout the entire region. Assumes a 50% reduction in displacement risk compared to conditions in 2013.	Same as in Option 1.
3	Reduce the share of <u>low- and moderate-income renter</u> households in PDAs that are at risk of displacement by 30% ( <i>to same share as outside PDAs</i> )	Emphasizes PDAs as a geography. PDAs are the framework for developing land use and transportation policies and investments for the Plan.	Does not address risk of displacement in the broader region. Displacement in PDAs is emphasized due to the focused nature of growth in PDAs. Factors other than PDA designation could positively or negatively impact displacement risk including local development pressures and local displacement mitigation measures.

## Economic Vitality – Jobs/Wages Target (Target #9)

During the September joint meeting of the MTC Planning Committee and ABAG Administrative Committee, a placeholder was added to the performance targets related to jobs and wages, particularly with regards to living-wage (i.e., middle-class) jobs. As discussed at meetings of the Performance Working Group earlier this year, the challenge with including such a target is that the Plan's scenario forecasting approach relies upon fixed population and employment control totals across all scenarios. These control totals have assigned income/wage distributions that are held constant through the planning process, given that transportation investments and land use patterns are not expected to strongly influence these types of economic conditions. At the same time, both MTC and ABAG recognize the importance of this critical issue, in particular the lack of living-wage job growth in recent years.

Given these modeling limitations, staff has developed two options to respond to interest in jobs/wages through the performance targets, as shown in **Table 3** below. Staff is seeking your input as we work to identify a recommended performance target. Note that Option 1 is focused primarily on total jobs by industry, while Option 2 is focused on residents' access to jobs by industry.

**Table 3: Options for Jobs/Wages Target**

Option	Performance Target	Pros	Cons
1	Increase by 35%* the number of jobs in predominantly middle-wage industries	Most responsive to stakeholder concerns about living-wage job growth; relatively simple and easy to understand	Would not vary between scenarios as jobs are held constant (via control totals); does not meet all eligibility criteria to be a performance target
2	Increase by 35%* the number of jobs in predominantly middle-wage industries accessible within 30 minutes by auto or 45 minutes by transit in congested conditions	Reflects how Plan Bay Area 2040 can actually benefit middle-wage workers (by providing better access to jobs); has a linkage to target #8 (overall access to jobs)	Does not explicitly assess the overall change in middle-wage jobs in the region

\* = indicates that the numeric target will be revised based on the final ABAG forecast for overall job growth

For either option, the proposed numeric target is based on preliminary figures from ABAG's Forecast of Populations, Households, and Jobs, which shows an approximately 35 percent increase in the number of total jobs in the Bay Area over the planning period. The target seeks to ensure that jobs in middle-wage industries (or access to such jobs, depending on which option is preferred) grow at the same rate as total regional jobs.

### **Economic Vitality – Goods Movement Target (Target #10)**

In response to feedback from stakeholders and policymakers at the committee meeting, staff has reviewed a number of different options for a goods movement target, recognizing the primary concern raised was the impact of congestion on freight. Based upon the criteria shown in **Table 4** and **Table 5** on the following page, staff identified the following target as preferred, as it meets all relevant criteria and is responsive to the concerns raised at the meeting: **Reduce per-capita delay on the Regional Freight Network by 20%**. Note that the proposed numeric target – a 20 percent reduction over the Plan lifespan – is based on the congestion reduction target identified in *Transportation 2035*.

Strengths of the proposed target include its emphasis on delay (demonstrating responsiveness to truck congestion concerns), its primary focus on the Regional Freight Network<sup>1</sup> (a defined network from the Goods Movement Plan of heavily-traveled truck routes), its inclusion of a per-capita component (thus ensuring that the target reflects drivers' conditions and is not biased by population growth), and its ease of communication. At the same time, the target does have a few known limitations, primarily due to limits in the travel model. As Travel Model One does not include a freight rail component and lacks a sufficiently robust truck trip model, the proposed target focuses on truck corridors and explore the overall delay from congestion specific to those facilities. Staff believes this target strikes the right balance between reflecting the concerns of goods movement stakeholders and ensuring the target can be forecasted well using available tools.

### **Process Going Forward**

We look forward to your feedback on the draft staff recommendation for the remaining performance targets. In order to review and, as appropriate, incorporate your feedback into the staff recommendation in November, **we are asking for all feedback to be submitted by Friday, October 16<sup>th</sup> to [dvautin@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:dvautin@mtc.ca.gov)**. In addition to this meeting and the subsequent comment period, we will be taking the final staff recommendation for the four remaining targets to the following committees in November and seeking their feedback as well:

- Regional Advisory Working Group – Tuesday, November 3 [feedback]
- Regional Equity Working Group – Wednesday, November 4 [information]
- MTC Policy Advisory Council – Wednesday, November 4 [feedback]
- MTC Planning Committee & ABAG Administrative Committee – Friday, November 13 [move for approval]
- MTC Commission – Wednesday, November 18 [final adoption]
- ABAG Executive Board – Thursday, November 19 [final adoption]

The November meeting packets will include final proposals for target language, as well as methodology documentation similar to what was produced for all other performance targets in September.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Regional Freight Network includes segments along the following highway corridors: I-880, I-80, I-580, US-101, I-680, SR-12/SR-37, SR-152 and SR-4; it was finalized earlier this year as part of the Goods Movement Plan.

**Table 4: Primary Technical Criteria for Selecting Performance Targets**

- 1** **Targets should be able to be forecasted well.**

A target must be able to be forecasted reasonably well using MTC's and ABAG's models for transportation and land use, respectively. This means that the target must be something that can be predicted with reasonable accuracy into future conditions, as opposed to an indicator that can only be observed.
- 2** **Targets should be able to be influenced by regional agencies in cooperation with local agencies.**

A target must be able to be affected or influenced by policies or practices of ABAG, MTC, BAAQMD and BCDC, in conjunction with local agencies. For example, MTC and ABAG policies can have a significant effect on accessibility of residents to jobs by virtue of their adopted policies on transportation investment and housing requirements.
- 3** **Targets should be easy to understand.**

A target should be a concept to which the general public can readily relate and should be represented in terms that are easy for the general public to understand.
- 4** **Targets should address multiple areas of interest.**

Ideally, a target should address more than one of the three "E's" – economy, environment, and equity. By influencing more than one of these factors, the target will better recognize the interactions between these goals. Additionally, by selecting targets that address multiple areas of interest, we can keep the total number of targets smaller.
- 5** **Targets should have some existing basis for the long-term numeric goal.**

The numeric goal associated with the target should have some basis in research literature or technical analysis performed by MTC or another organization, rather than being an arbitrarily determined value.

**Table 5: Primary Technical Criteria for Identifying a Set of Targets**

- A** **The total number of targets selected should be relatively small.**

Targets should be selected carefully to make technical analysis feasible within the project timeline and to ensure that scenario comparison can be performed without overwhelming decision-makers with redundant quantitative data.
- B** **Each of the targets should measure distinct criteria.**

Once a set of targets is created, it is necessary to verify that each of the targets in the set is measuring something unique, as having multiple targets with the same goal unnecessarily complicates scenario assessment and comparison.
- C** **The set of targets should provide some quantifiable metric for each of the identified goals.**

For each of the seven goals identified, the set of performance measures should provide some level of quantification for each to ensure that that particular goal is being met. Multiple goals may be measured with a single target, resulting in a smaller set of targets while still providing a metric for each of the goals.