

## 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 Assessment Working Group Member Organizations

|                                                   |                                              |
|---------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| CA Rural Legal Assistance                         | Region Business                              |
| California Bike Coalition                         | Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates            |
| Caltrans                                          | Sacramento County Engineering & Planning     |
| City of Folsom                                    | Sacramento County Public Health              |
| City of Sacramento Public Works                   | Sacramento Housing Alliance                  |
| City of Woodland                                  | Sacramento Metropolitan AQMD                 |
| City of Yuba City                                 | Sacramento Metro Chamber                     |
| El Dorado County Department of Transportation     | Sacramento Regional Transit                  |
| El Dorado County Transportation Commission        | Southeast Capital Connector JPA              |
| Environmental Council of Sacramento               | Transform                                    |
| Franklin Blvd Business Association                | UC Davis Center for Regional Change          |
| Greater Sacramento Economic Council               | WalkSacramento                               |
| Mack Road Partnership                             | West Sacramento Transportation Division      |
| North State BIA                                   | Yolo County                                  |
| Paratransit                                       | Yolo County Transportation District          |
| Placer County Transportation Planning Association | Yuba-Sutter Economic Development Corporation |