



## **Transportation Committee**

May 25, 2017

### **Transportation Project-Level Performance Assessment**

**Issue:** SACOG has been continuing its work on project-level performance assessment.

**Recommendation:** None. This is for information and discussion.

**Discussion:** This item provides a brief update on staff's continuing work to improve SACOG's ability to evaluate transportation investments in response to Board direction and federal and state emphasis on performance-based transportation planning. The primary purpose of this work is to provide the Board with additional quality information about the impacts of different transportation projects when providing direction to staff on regional priorities for seeking out and investing transportation dollars.

In the fall of 2016, staff briefed the Board and committees on potential tools and methods for expanding SACOG's existing performance evaluation techniques to better evaluate transportation investments at the project level. Since that time, staff has convened a Project Performance Working Group of local agency staff and regional stakeholders to provide input and insights for two new methods for project performance assessment: Benefit Cost Analysis and Performance Outcomes Analysis. Attachment A provides an overview of how these two methodologies can fit into SACOG's existing performance assessment process.

To date, staff has held three working group meetings, the first of which was summarized at the March Transportation Committee meeting. The two working group meetings since then have taken a closer look at the specific methodology for benefit cost analysis, explained the more qualitative approach for an outcomes analysis, and provided a review of best practices from around the country for performance evaluation. Attachment B includes meeting summaries from the first three working group meetings. Highlights from the discussions thus far include the following:

- These tools should provide information for the Board when setting investment priorities, but should not act as a filter to remove projects before they are considered by the board.
- There is interest in having these tools provide benefits beyond prioritization for the MTP/SCS, such as improving the case for projects in grant applications to state and federal programs.
- Members appreciate the need for both a quantitative and qualitative approach to looking at project benefits because some projects, particularly those early in the planning stages or small in size, do not have easily quantified impacts.

- Of particular concern to local agency staff on the working group is that these tools enrich, and ideally streamline, the submission of projects for consideration to SACOG's and other funding programs.

No action is required from the committee at this time; however, staff will incorporate any committee input into future discussions with working group members. Staff will also continue to provide updates on working group discussions and take board member feedback as the project progresses.

Approved by:

James Corless  
Chief Executive Officer

JC:CH:ds  
Attachments

Key Staff: Kirk E. Trost, Chief Operating Officer/General Counsel, (916) 340-6210  
Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276  
Bruce Griesenbeck, Principal Transportation Analyst, (916) 340-6268  
Clint Holtzen, Associate Analyst, (916) 340-6246  
Garett Ballard-Rosa, Associate Analyst, (916) 319-5183

## Project Performance Assessment

The **SACOG Board of Directors** has steadily increased its focus on prioritizing cost-effective transportation projects with high performance benefits. This Board direction coincides with the passage of a new federal transportation bill, the **FAST-ACT**, which reaffirms a new federal and state emphasis on outcome-based performance measurement. In response, the Board has tasked staff to develop tools and methods to analyze transportation investments at the project-level.

### Existing Process

#### Project-level Assessment

Early steps include:

**Project Phasing**

**Roadway Optimization**

**New Process**  
(See Detail →)

**Benefit Cost Analysis**

**Performance Outcomes Analysis**

#### Improvements

- Responds to Board and federal direction
- Increases clarity and transparency in SACOG project selection priorities
- Helps position local agencies to better compete for state and federal dollars

#### Packages of Projects

Existing tools for system-wide performance evaluation

**Regional Model**

**Financial Constraint**

#### Outcomes

**Improved MTP/SCS Investment List**

**Possible Better Link to Flexible Funding Rounds**

**Support for Other Grant Applications**

## Two New Methods for Project Performance Assessment



### Benefit Cost Analysis

**Benefit Cost Analysis (BCA)** is a focused analysis that places a dollar value on the various benefits of major transportation projects, such as:

- Improve travel time
- Decrease accidents
- Reduce emissions
- Reduce out of pocket uses costs
- Improve travel reliability
- Increase physical activity

### Performance Outcomes Analysis

**Performance Outcome Analysis (POA)** is a broader analysis that connects a vision for improving mobility and quality of life with key performance outcomes:

- Reduce VMT per capita
- Reduce congestion
- Increase multi-modal travel and choice of transportation options
- Provide long term economic benefit
- Improve goods movement
- Improve safety and security
- Demonstrate state of good repair

### SACOG plans on incorporating **both** methodologies to potentially:

1. **Improve** MTP/SCS investment list
2. Possible **better link** to flexible funding rounds
3. **Support** for other grant applications

## Project Performance Working Group Meeting Summary

Meeting Date: Friday, February 24, 2017

Meeting Location: SACOG

Time: 11am-1pm

### Meeting Attendees:

California Bike Coalition	Sacramento County Engineering & Planning
Caltrans	Sacramento County Public Health
City of Sacramento Public Works	Sacramento Housing Alliance
City of West Sacramento Transportation Division	Sacramento Metropolitan AQMD
City of Woodland Public Works	Sacramento Regional Transit
Environmental Council of Sacramento (ECOS)	Southeast Capital Connector JPA
North State Building Industry Association	UC Davis Center for Regional Change
Placer County Transportation Planning Agency	WalkSacramento

### Meeting Agenda:

Introduction & Working Group Welcome

Background polling

Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities (MTP/SCS) Strategy Overview

Performance Assessment Practice at SACOG

Project Performance Assessment: BCA and Outcomes Analysis

Overview of SACOG's Benefit Cost Assessment

Overview and Discussion of Performance Outcome Analysis\*

Next steps

Meeting evaluation

*\* Due to valuable dialogue on earlier agenda items this topic was not covered and will be an agenda item in a subsequent meeting.*

### Meeting Summary:

Staff welcomed working group participants and conducted a round of introductions. Staff provided an overview of working group goals and outcomes from the meeting. Next, staff conducted live background polling to understand working group familiarity with project performance assessment and benefit cost analysis practices (poll results are included at the end of this meeting summary). The working group then transitioned to the agenda items, described below.

### MTP/SCS Background

Staff presented a brief overview of the MTP/SCS and how performance assessment fits into the larger plan update. Discussion focused on the purpose of the working group itself and how it fits within this larger context.

- Is this work getting to project selection for SACOG, or is this more for informing?
  - No. The working group simply considers and provides input on a technical methodology. There is no prioritization or selection conducted by the working group.
- Is this tool for local agency or SACOG staff?
  - There are potential applications for both local and SACOG staff.
- How will this be used?

- Two potential uses for Board consideration:
  - Future MTP/SCS (investment list for Federal dollars and regionally significant projects)
  - Potentially as criteria for regional funding programs, to be determined by the SACOG Board.
- Will this be used to eliminate projects before they go to the SACOG Board?
  - No. This is a methodology for the SACOG Board to consider as part of a larger performance assessment program.
- Are federal agencies doing this work? To what degree are you adding vs. responding to guidance.
  - This work responds to clear federal and state guidance.
- What does benefit and cost mean?
  - Will be discussed in benefit cost explanation.
- It appears that agencies could tie this idea to future tax measures/project identification.

### **Performance Assessment Practice at SACOG**

Staff framed performance assessment work at SACOG, beginning with the agency's longstanding practice of performance evaluation at the system, or regional, scale. The working group next discussed initial performance evaluation methods at the project level, turning to benefit-cost assessment as a potential new methodology. Due to a robust discussion, the working group did not get to performance outcomes analysis agenda item, which will be taken up at a subsequent meeting.

THEME: The region needs to be better at competing for discretionary state and federal dollars- how can performance assessment help?

- The region has not been able to compete well for state (Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities) money. Likewise, for the Active Transportation Program. This work can help the region better compete by responding to enhanced performance criteria in these programs.
- The need [for PPA] is even more timely as grant policies around the state are becoming more stringent.
- If this project performance assessment work is done well, it can inform the state on how different areas can demonstrate benefits.
- In prior state funding programs, you can see how state methodologies are not ranking us high. Is the state looking for different types of projects or tools?
- Why is it that we are not getting enough or equal money?

THEME: Benefit Cost Assessment as a Performance Tool

- Method draws on the agency travel demand model. How much time does working group want to spend on the travel model?
- The method has several limitations. It can't look at all projects, and is better suited in analyzing larger regionally significant projects.
- Caltrans has a BCA model. Why is SACOG not using that? Is there a simplified version of BCA we could use? We need to be sure that small projects are considered too, as they can be more cost effective.
  - Are there ways to group projects together? The complementary Performance Outcomes Assessment will also consider projects of all size.
- Make sure you are not just assessing the value of large projects.
- For project costs, does the BCA consider the full cost, or just the local share? What effect would this have on elected officials favoring projects that have a different local share?

- Important to note how method would work for small jurisdictions with small budgets and large, significant and/or costly projects. With this type of project it can be hard to show cost effective performance.
- Are costs just limited to construction, or also include permitting, environmental, design and right of way?
- How does the measure consider tolls and transit fares?

THEME: Other possible issues to consider in a Benefit Cost Assessment

- Could an outcome be a case study with a sensitivity analysis around the method?
- Could the method show a connection between who is paying for the transportation infrastructure and how much benefit is received? For example, people paying into the system but don't see any benefit.
  - Theoretically could be something we could do but is a very complicated method. Currently we look at all users with monetized benefits, not divided out by subgroups.
- Is there a place where working group can see the full list of benefits?
  - ACTION: SACOG will place the list on the PPA webpage.
- Is staff thinking about affordable housing and transit dependencies of specific populations?
- Could this be comparable to how AHSC is assessed?
- How do you assign a dollar value to changes in land use? For example, agricultural impacts, including the value of the agricultural cluster plus the value of ecosystem services. How can this be reflected in these scenarios?
- How does the method monetize air quality?
  - Currently the method uses the same source as MTC and SANDAG. An air quality subgroup could consider this further.
- How constrained are we in going above what state/federal sources want? How much latitude should we have to try to bring in new benefit measures and outcomes?
- Does the method consider lifecycle benefit?
- Is there sensitivity to displacement of risk of low income people?
  - The method is about the transportation infrastructure.

THEME: Project Delivery

- Will this group look at projects that are at risk for failure or higher potential for success in terms of project delivery? Should project delivery be considered a performance outcome?
- We should think about the potential of comparing projects on delivery so that you don't deter innovation or mistakenly lose sight of a long and significant project.
- Also do we consider funding earlier phases of projects? Region has to weigh benefits of moving projects forward in the early phases. We could miss good projects because they don't get started.
- If the region funds earlier stages, that helps leverage local projects for state and federal construction dollars.

THEME: Big picture summary and next steps

- We talked about the FAST-ACT as the indicator of this type of analysis. Do we know what the new administration will do around performance assessment?
- Is there a calculation on how the method helps local jurisdictions implement their general plans?
- Overall method the group will consider is the BCA and the Performance Assessment. The Outcomes have more flexibility to include the things that can't be monetized in a BCA.

- Can working group talk about project performance measures SACOG already uses, especially roadway optimization?
- When we get to the outcomes assessment, does the measure weight indicators, i.e., through a dashboard, rather than a composite score, so different board members can better assess projects by their own community's needs?


NEXT: In the next meeting the working group will consider the Performance Outcomes Assessment.



## Live Working Group Polling Results


### What sector do you represent?

When poll is active, respond at [PollEv.com/garettballar218](https://poll.ev.com/garettballar218)  
Text **GARETTBALLAR218** to **22333** once to join



### How familiar are you with transportation project assessment?

When poll is active, respond at [PollEv.com/garettballar218](https://poll.ev.com/garettballar218)  
Text **GARETTBALLAR218** to **22333** once to join



# Project Performance Working Group Meeting Evaluation

February 24, 2017

<b>RANKING:</b> 1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree
<b>This meeting was well organized.</b>
Average: 4.6
<b>The length of the meeting was appropriate to get through the material.</b>
Average: 4
<b>The materials provided in advance were useful to prepare for this meeting.</b>
Average: 3.6
<b>The presentation on SACOG's overall Performance Assessment Practice was clear.</b>
Average: 4
<b>The presentation on BCA and Outcomes Analysis was clear.</b>
Average: 3.8
<b>I understand the next major steps in SACOG's Project Performance Assessment.</b>
Average: 4.2
<b>I understand how Project Performance Assessment may inform future Metropolitan Transportation Plans and/or future funding rounds.</b>
Average: 4
<b>What should be done next time to make the working group session more effective?</b>
You should include local chambers of commerce since "economic benefits" is a preferred outcome.
The challenge with this meeting was the depth of the MTP process and background discussions of what may or may not be included in analyses. This was necessary, yet we did not get to the core parts of the agenda.
<b>Additional Comments</b>
Well done! :)
Great Job, meeting facilities and organization was stellar
Needed more information but I'm it sure will come in future meetings.
The BLT sandwich was great, as well as SACOG staff.
Maybe a bit more time

## Project Performance Working Group Meeting Summary

Tuesday, March 21, 2017 | 9:30-11:30am

Location: SACOG

### Meeting Attendees:

California Bike Coalition

Caltrans

City of Sacramento Public Works

City of West Sacramento Transportation Division

City of Woodland Public Works

Environmental Council of Sacramento (ECOS)

North State Building Industry Association

Placer County Transportation Planning Agency

Sacramento County Engineering & Planning

Sacramento County Public Health

Sacramento Housing Alliance

Sacramento Metropolitan AQMD

Sacramento Regional Transit

Southeast Capital Connector JPA

UC Davis Center for Regional Change

WalkSacramento

Yolo County

Yolo County Transportation District

### Meeting Agenda:

Introduction & Working Group Welcome

Kickoff Meeting Questions and Summary

Meeting Outcomes

Overview and Discussion of Methodology: Performance Outcome Analysis

Meeting Recap and Evaluation

### Meeting Summary:

Staff welcomed working group participants and conducted a round of introductions. Staff from DKS Associates that will be serving as an impartial technical resource to the working group were introduced. Staff provided a quick summary of the previous meeting. The working group transitioned to the agenda items, described below.

### Kickoff Meeting Summary

Working group members reiterated that project performance assessment needs to consider rural perspectives as well as land use and transportation co-benefits. There was a brief discussion.

- How do you assess rural needs that often don't compete well?
- How do you measure or include compact development?
- How does the land use component of MTP work into this? Some clearly does, but in particular how does putting houses in the right place and affordability fit into this?
  - Because of the SCS and its land use footprint there are co-benefits being analyzed by the plan including equity. Theoretically, we'd like to see displacement and environmental concerns addressed.
- AB32 makes it easier to quantify fuel efficiencies compared to land use efficiency if all potential benefits are not being included.
- Always acknowledge that there are air quality benefits to all the work being presented.

### Performance Outcomes Analysis

THEME: Local Perspective on project performance in various funding applications.

- Working group members discussed the need for a uniform tool on how outcomes are measured.
  - Local agencies in particular were interested in this.

- The tool could be used in SACOG funding rounds and in other discretionary funding programs.
- Working group discussed the tradeoff of together material for these funding programs.
  - Currently it takes a lot of time for local agency staff to complete applications.
  - Selection committee also needs enough information to make an informed decision.
  - Analysis tool (and this process) should try to make the process more efficient.

THEME: Performance Outcomes Analysis Background

- SACOG has a current model and methodology to look at large projects.
- But how does SACOG or a local agency weigh a small project, or compare projects across types?
  - We want to look at projects through a combination of GIS analysis, the environment around project areas, and then analyze the performance outcomes.
- How would this method work with, for example, a transit replacement project?
  - It is likely in a scenario like this, additional qualitative analysis would be used.

THEME: Seven Outcomes of Performance Outcomes Analysis

- SACOG has seven outcomes tied to prior funding rounds.
  - Each of these outcomes have specific measures already. Should the process consider targets for the outcomes as a way to show movement in the right direction, and to not pit one outcome against the other?
- What are the criteria that should be used to evaluate when considering the seven outcomes?
  - We need to address the 'black box' challenge of how projects are being selected.
  - We don't think there is a good public process that gets public to input on what projects get selected. There should be a way to evaluate the way projects get funded or land in or out of the plan.
- More details on the outcomes are needed, including what they mean from different perspectives.
  - With the absence of outcome details, it is hard to say what is missing.
  - The working group may need greater definitions to the outcomes. *Staff will address this point in the next meeting.*

THEME: Other possible outcomes suggested by working group

- Equity
  - Equity doesn't fit anywhere in these outcomes; making transportation more affordable, prioritize investments.
- Public Health
- Rural Communities
- Technology
  - Missing smart city/technology outcomes and/or inputs.
- Air Quality
- Innovative Delivery Methods/Project Delivery Efficiency
- Displacement
- Housing
  - More housing as well as more affordable housing.
  - Plans and projects should plan/incentivize housing with the greatest benefits to equity
- Security
  - Evacuation models
    - SACOG staff is currently working on this project.

- Complete streets and maintenance
- Natural resource conservation, including agricultural lands
- How applicable is congestion as a measure?

#### THEME: Results

- The Performance Outcomes Analysis method could potentially be used as two tracks for SACOG project applications and also to apply to state and federal grants.
- Did SACOG find others in its peer review who did the equalization process? Or have a best practice outcomes assessment?
  - We have not identified anyone that has done an outcomes assessment exceptionally well, except possibly the Bay Area. We will ask DKS to identify other best practice in the field.
  - There are challenges with the level of effort in grant applications. Small jurisdictions may find it easier to pursue grants that may be more vehicle focused, because they are less cumbersome than other programs.
- How can Performance Outcomes Analysis compare different types of projects? For example, is there a project contributing to these varied outcomes?
  - Land use and site enhancement
  - Increase multi-modal connectivity
  - Transportation Demand Management and reduced VMT
- The Performance Outcomes Analysis method should be sensitive to a lot of work that is going into a small road bike/ pedestrian project. Larger expansion projects should have a further level of analysis.

#### THEME: Conclusion

- Thinking comprehensive is great, but we can't let perfect get in the way of the good. We could likely spin our wheels the whole time just thinking about expansive performance outcomes.
- As we continue to move forward, we need to think about the practicalities of trying to measure different types of projects and programs, as well as the feasibility of analyzing all types of possible benefit measures. Are we focusing too much on non-transportation issues? Or how can we show how transportation investments address each outcome?
- We should remember that the ultimate priority is project implementation. We need to provide a streamlined process that results in good projects getting built.
- The Performance Outcomes Analysis should consider targets. For example, if certain projects only hit a few of the outcomes, we need a way to show that the projects are helping the region move in right direction instead of pitting one outcome against the other.
- Can the group see how the Performance Outcomes Assessment would work on prior SACOG funding rounds?
  - SACOG staff to follow up with answer.
- Instead of competitive performance assessment, should the working group consider a more formulaic approach to each jurisdiction?
  - The working group discussed how this idea fits within a larger shift to performance assessment at the agency and in federal and state funding programs.

# Project Performance Working Group Meeting Evaluation

March 21, 2017

<b>RANKING:</b> 1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree
<b>This meeting was well organized.</b>
Average: 4.6
<b>The length of the meeting was appropriate to get through the material.</b>
Average: 4.2
<b>The materials provided in advance were useful to prepare for this meeting.</b>
Average: 4.0
<b>The material responded to questions raised in the initial working group session.</b>
Average: 4.1
<b>The presentation on Performance Outcomes Analysis was clear.</b>
Average: 3.8
<b>I understand the next major steps in SACOG's Project Performance Assessment.</b>
Average: 4.3
<b>What should be done next time to make the working group session more effective?</b>
Provide context on how the outcomes are used at SACOG & how it translates to stakeholders.
Need to understand what components are within the public outcomes.
<b>Additional Comments</b>
What is transportation equity?

## **Project Performance Working Group Meeting Summary**

Wednesday, April 26, 2017 | 2:00-4:00pm

### **Meeting Attendees:**

Walk Sacramento	Sacramento Metropolitan AQMD
Sacramento County Engineering and Planning	California Rural Legal Assistance
Yolo County Transit District	City of Woodland Public Works
Environmental Council of Sacramento (ECOS)	Sacramento Regional Transit District
El Dorado County DOT	City of Elk Grove Public Works
Capital Southeast Connector JPA	Placer County Transportation Planning Agency
California Bike Coalition	UC Davis CRC

### **Meeting Agenda:**

Introduction and meeting outcomes  
Benefit Cost Analysis: Deep Dive  
Performance Outcomes Analysis: Best Practice Review  
Meeting Recap and Evaluation

### **Meeting Summary:**

Staff provided working group participants with a presentation on the methodology and metrics for the Benefit Cost Analysis. Staff from DKS gave a presentation on best practices and lessons learned from other regions performing project performance assessments. The working group discussion regarding both presentations is described below.

### **Benefit Cost Analysis Methodology**

THEME: Responsibility for running and interpreting BCA results.

- SACOG will perform analyses on projects as part of the MTP/SCS plan update and provide summaries of results through outreach to partner agencies and in briefings to the SACOG board.
- In future working group meetings staff should continue to present the plan update process and how performance assessment fits in that context. The working group has a varying degree of exposure to this topic.
- Partner agencies would remain responsible for setting parameters for projects including scope, schedule, and cost.
- SACOG's travel model and BCA methodology is publicly available for other agencies examining BCA as an analysis tool. The next working group session will provide an optional workshop to provide more information about how the model works.
- SACOG will work with partner agency staff to make results of the BCA available for grants and other applications.

THEME: Considerations for benefit cost analysis.

- It is important that the BCA is sensitive to the land use patterns around a project.
- The BCA is based on model results that are sensitive to origin, destination, and time of day when estimating travel demand for a particular facility.
- Important to set clear guidance for when the BCA will be used and for what projects.
- The BCA should be transparent regarding how benefits are monetized and treated across different project types.
- Projects should be considered in their entirety with an understanding that very large projects may be implemented sequentially as funding and other external factors dictate.
- Benefits of interest to the working group include:
  - Safety and security
  - Equity and environmental justice

- Focus on rural perspective on projects
- Wildlife preservation, ecosystem services, and other natural resources
- Is there a correlation to CEQA?
- How do you monetize equity and environmental justice in a BCA?
- To what degree is weighting costs/benefits available for BCA?
- To what extent does BCA differ across regions? Particularly relevant if the state is looking at projects across regions that have different models and methods.
- How does the measure handle cumulative effects (or possibly, redundant benefits)?

THEME: How will the results of the BCA affect sponsor agency projects?

- The BCA is one tool to provide information about the merits of transportation projects. There are other considerations that may make a project valuable or a local priority that cannot be estimated using BCA.
- The BCA is not meant to replace or diminish local priority setting for transportation projects.
- Concern that BCA could disadvantage small or rural projects that can be costly, but affect fewer people.

### **Performance Outcomes Analysis: Best Practice Review**

THEME: Setting goals and priorities.

- Need a defined framework to describe how goals, outcomes, factors, and indicators/measures fit into the Outcomes Analysis.
- Weighting of measures is useful, but subjective. Need to ensure that weighting is strategic and aligns with regional values/policy imperatives.
  - Transparent process for establishing weights.
  - Must adequately engage the SACOG board to ensure that the methods and results are consistent with Board interests.

THEME: Differences between BCA, Outcomes Analysis, and other analysis tools.

- There is no one tool that can adequately measure all projects and project types.
  - BCA is good for large expensive projects while an Outcomes Analysis can be useful for a wider range of projects
  - Outcomes analysis is qualitative and examines project potential to influence policy goals
  - Neither BCA or Outcomes analysis are substitutes for system-wide analysis and scenario planning.
  - An overall framework should consider quantitative and qualitative assessments equally, since both bring value to decision making processes.

THEME: Top level takeaways from best practice review.

- The full memo describing a best practice review is found on the project website
- The memo hones in several themes:
  - The successful examples of a project performance assessment framework are iterative. These examples show how it is important to get something on the ground as a starting point, recognizing that you can and will refine through time. In other words, to not let the perfect get in the way of the good and to evolve the program iteratively.
  - Weighting of different indicators is a method used by some programs, but not all. It seems that local dynamics indicate if weighting is an appropriate method.
  - A few national examples used different criteria by geography or jurisdiction type. The working group asked how this was set in the example- top down or through stakeholder engagement?



**Project Performance Assessment Working Group Meeting Evaluations**

April 26, 2017

<b>RANKING:</b> 1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree
<b>This meeting was well organized.</b>
Average: 4.4
<b>The length of the meeting was appropriate to get through the material.</b>
Average: 4.1
<b>The materials provided in advance were useful to prepare for the meeting.</b>
Average: 3.8
<b>I better understand the Benefit Cost Analysis method after the presentation today.</b>
Average: 4.3
<b>The presentation on best practices and case studies on performance assessment from other regions was helpful and a good use of working group time.</b>
Average: 3.9
<b>I understand the next major steps in SACOG's Project Performance Assessment.</b>
Average: 4.1
<b>What should be done next time to make the working group session more effective?</b>
May be helpful to have 1 or 2 slides w/ overall schedule, goals, and anticipated milestones.
Discuss evaluations that had to be done on Sac Regional Project for the last MTP update. Examples of projects that scored very well or were considered important. Projects that did not make the cut. And how this new process would have affected those projects.
Too long (1.5 hours is sufficient)
It probably could use another 30 minutes.
<b>Additional comments or questions not captured in the meeting:</b>
Much better job at adhering to the agenda and getting through the material.