



## Land Use & Natural Resources Committee

Item #14-12-4C  
Information

November 26, 2014

### 2016 MTP/SCS Update: Performance Measures and Outcomes for the MTP/SCS

**Issue:** What are the performance measures and outcomes to use for the 2016 MTP/SCS Update?

**Recommendation:** None, this item is for information and discussion.

**Discussion:** As described in the Framework 2.0, transportation performance measures—the basic relationships between land use, the transportation system, and travel outcomes—have been a focus of the process to prepare the 2016 MTP/SCS update.

Technical work and Board briefings have spotlighted the emphasis in the current plan on a balance of transportation projects that collectively offer high performance and promising implementation opportunities. As part of that work, a set of Scenario Performance Outcomes was prepared for the regional scenarios used in the public workshops and CEQA alternatives. These performance outcomes are being used again for the plan update work. They provide critical insights into the performance of each of the three plan scenarios and for the work ahead to develop a draft preferred scenario.

In addition to the limited set of Scenario Performance Outcomes, a more extensive set of performance measures will be reported that go deeper to reflect the range and diversity of policy areas in the MTP/SCS. The attachment identifies the indicators reported in the 2012 MTP/SCS and key regional SACOG funding programs. Together, these sources provide a reference of possible performance measures for the plan update. Ongoing input from the Board and external stakeholders will be reflected in a refined set of performance measures & outcomes that will be provided as part of the draft MTP/SCS Framework 3.0 in spring 2015.

Approved by:

Mike McKeever  
Chief Executive Officer

MM:MC:gg  
Attachment

Key Staff: Matt Carpenter, Director of Transportation Services, (916) 340-6276  
Kacey Lizon, MTP/SCS Manager, (916) 340-6265

# Performance Measures from the adopted 2012 MTP/SCS and Scenarios for the 2016 MTP/SCS

## Summary of Performance Measures and Outcomes

The following tables are designed to provide a quick reference to the range of measures used to assess the performance of the MTP/SCS, associated land use and transportation scenarios, and SACOG's regional funding programs.

### Land Use Measures

Indicator	Specific Measures	2012 MTP/SCS	2016 MTP/SCS Scenarios
Housing	Growth in housing units by Community Type	X	X
	Change in housing product mix and by Community Type	X	X
	Housing growth through reinvestment	X	
Employment	Employment growth in different Community Types by sector	X	
	Employment growth by Community Type	X	
	Employment growth through reinvestment	X	
Land Usage	Compact development: growth in population compared with acres developed	X	
	Farmland acres developed – total and per capita	X	X
	Vernal pool acres developed	X	X
	Developed acres by Community Type	X	
Mix of uses	Jobs-Housing balance within four-mile radius of employment centers	X	
	Mix of use by Community Type	X	
Transit-oriented development	Growth in dwelling units within half-mile of quality transit (in TPA) by county	X	Regional Only
	Growth in employees within half-mile of quality transit (in TPA) by county	X	Regional Only
	New housing product mix in TPAs by county	X	
	Proximity to transit by Community Type	X	
Urban Design	Change in street pattern in different Community Types	X	
	Change in residential density by Community Type	X	

# Performance Measures from the adopted 2012 MTP/SCS and Scenarios for the 2016 MTP/SCS

## Transportation Measures

Indicator	Specific Measures	2012 MTP/SCS	2016 MTP/SCS Scenarios
Driving access	Total jobs within 30-minute drive by Community Type	X	
Vehicles Miles Traveled (VMT)	Total weekday VMT & average annual growth rates – regionally, by county, and per capita	X	<b>Percent Change per Capita</b>
	Weekday VMT by source and total Commuter share of household-generated VMT Weekday VMT by source per capita or per job Total VMT per capita Percent change in VMT per capita or per job compared to 2008	X	
	Weekday household-generated VMT per capita by Community Type Weekday household-generated VMT per capita by TPA	X	
	Household-generated commute VMT by Community Type and regional total Commuter VMT per worker by Community Type and regional total	X	
Congested Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)	Congested VMT total and per capita Congested VMT by source - total, per capita, per job Congested VMT for household-generated travel by Community Type	X	X
Travel Time	Travel time spent in car per capita	X	X
Transit Service	Increases in transit vehicle service hours per day by transit type	X	
Transit productivity	Weekday transit vehicle service hours Weekday passenger boardings Weekday boardings per service hour Farebox revenues as percent of operating costs (farebox recovery rate)	X	<b>Weekday VSH &amp; Farebox Recovery Only</b>
Bicycle Infrastructure	Increases in miles of bicycle route mileage by county Bike route miles per 100,000 population	X	X
Road and Highway Infrastructure	Lane miles of new or expanded roads and highways	X	X
Transit, walk and bike travel	Weekday person trips by transit, walk and bike modes Transit, walk and bike trips per capita Transit, bike and walk trips per capita by Community Type Transit trips per capita by Transit Priority Area (TPA)	X	<b>Percent share of total trips</b>
	Transit, bike and walk trips per capita by Community Type	X	
	Transit trips per capita by Transit Priority Area (TPA)	X	
Roadway Utilization/Optimal use	Underutilized, optimally utilized, over-utilized roadways by roadway type	X	
Commuter Travel	Weekday commuter tours by mode Commuter mode share	X	

## Performance Measures from the adopted 2012 MTP/SCS and Scenarios for the 2016 MTP/SCS

Non-Commute Travel	Weekday non-commute person trips by mode Non-commute mode share	X	
Safety	Percent reduction in accident rates	X	
Transportation Budget	Spending in billions for road capacity, transit operations, transit capital, bicycle and pedestrian, system maintenance and programs	X	X

### Environmental Measures

Indicator	Specific Measures	2012 MTP/SCS	2016 MTP/SCS Scenarios
Farmland impacts	Farmland conversion Acres of impact from growth and transportation projects by type of farmland Percent of Williamson Act contract acres impacted	X	
Habitat impacts	Percent of habitat and land cover impacted Acres of impact from growth and transportation projects by type of wildland habitat/land cover	X	
Floodplain development	Percent of housing units expected to be constructed in 200-year floodplain	X	
Toxic air contaminants	Percent of population within 500 feet of high-volume roadway by county, region	X	
Greenhouse gas emissions	Greenhouse gas emissions by sector Greenhouse gas emission reductions per capita by pounds per day, percentage	X	Passenger Vehicle CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions

### Environmental Justice Measures

Indicator	Specific Measures	2012 MTP/SCS	2016 MTP/SCS
Land Use	Percent of EJ Area and Non-EJ Area population in Community Types Percent of EJ Area and Non-EJ Area population in TPAs by county	X	
Housing	Housing product mix in EJ and Non-EJ Areas by Community Type	X	
Transit service	Increases in daily transit vehicle service hours in EJ Areas	X	
Transit accessibility	Accessibility from EJ and Non-EJ Areas within 30 minutes by transit to jobs, retail jobs, medical jobs, higher education, park acres	X	Percent of homes near high-frequency transit
Mode share	EJ and Non-EJ Area transit mode share Bike and Walk mode share in EJ and Non-EJ Areas	X	
Auto accessibility	Accessibility from EJ and Non-EJ Areas within 30 minutes by car to jobs, retail jobs, medical jobs, higher education, park acres	X	
Comparison of transit and auto accessibility	Percent of jobs, retail jobs, medical jobs, higher education enrollments, park acres Accessible within 30 minutes by transit vs. car from EJ and Non-EJ Areas	X	
Toxic air contaminants	Percent of population in EJ and Non-EJ areas within 500 feet of high-volume roadway by county, region	X	

## Performance Outcomes in Key SACOG Regional Funding Programs

Regional/Local Funding Program	Community Design Funding Program	Regional Active Transportation Program (ATP)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The project supports a <b>regional reduction in VMT per household/per capita.</b></li> <li>▪ The project supports a <b>regional reduction in congested VMT per household/per capita.</b></li> <li>▪ The project supports an <b>increase in multi-modal/alternative travel/choice of transportation options.</b></li> <li>▪ The project <b>provides long-term economic benefit within the region</b>, recognizing the importance of sustaining both the urban and rural economies.</li> <li>▪ The project <b>improves goods movement, including farm-to-market travel</b>, in and through the region.</li> <li>▪ The project <b>significantly improves safety and security.</b></li> <li>▪ The project <b>demonstrates “state of good repair” benefits</b> that improve the efficiency of the existing transportation system.</li> </ul>	<p>The overall purpose of the Community Design Program is to provide financial support for federal aid eligible capital projects that promote implementation of the Blueprint Project Principles. Projects must also conform to some of the seven Blueprint Principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>transportation choices</b></li> <li>• <b>housing diversity</b></li> <li>• <b>compact development</b></li> <li>• <b>mixed land uses</b></li> <li>• <b>use of existing assets</b></li> <li>• <b>natural resource protection</b></li> <li>• <b>quality design</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project has potential to <b>increase walking and bicycling through targeted strategies:</b> increasing access to transit services, increasing access to schools, eliminating gaps or removing barriers in the bicycle/pedestrian network, and completing facilities.</li> <li>• Project has the <b>potential to reduce the number and/or rate of pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities and injuries.</b></li> <li>• Project <b>improves public health</b> through the targeting of populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma or other health issues.</li> <li>• Project <b>demonstrates cost effectiveness</b>, which is achieved by minimizing projected capital and operating expenditures while offering strong performance benefits.</li> <li>• Project <b>provides benefit to a disadvantaged community</b> and includes project features that provide benefit for members of this community.</li> <li>• Project <b>advances active transportation efforts to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals</b> through reducing or shortening vehicle trips today and over time, as established pursuant to SB 375 and SB 391.</li> </ul>