

Project Performance Assessment Working Group Meeting Summary

Wednesday, June 21, 2017 | 9:00-11:00 a.m.

Meeting Attendees:

City of Woodland

City of West Sacramento

DKS Associates

El Dorado County Department of Transportation

Sacramento County Department of
Transportation

Sacramento County Public Health

Sacramento Housing Alliance

Sacramento Regional Transit District

Yolo County

Meeting Agenda:

Present SACOG's Benefit Cost Analysis tool to date on test projects

Review recent conference and best practice research

Working Group feedback on BCA tool and use

Framework of Performance Outcomes Assessment

Meeting Recap and Evaluation

Meeting Summary:

Staff provided working group participants a recap of May's modeling workshop that replaced the monthly working group meeting. Staff reviewed with the working group SACOG's Travel Model as an underlying tool on different bundles of projects by project type. The working group delivered feedback to staff about the current scoring criteria. Staff reviewed Performance Outcomes Analysis outcomes, factors and indicators.

Benefit Cost Analysis Tool Application

THEME: Travel Model as the underlying tool.

- What are the land use inputs in the travel model? Staff gave the working group a refresher on SACOG's travel demand model; this topic was covered in depth in the May modeling workshop
- How does the model estimate the reliability benefit measure? The working group discussed the buffer approach to reliability travel time.
- What data does the model draw on to estimate time and congestion? The working group discussed observed vs. simulated traffic counts and indicators.
- Could the time savings generated as a project benefit also be applied to the public health metric? Technically, as an activity based model, this is an area of exploration. Benefit measures to date have focused just on the transportation system, not necessarily what people then choose to do with extra time.

THEME: Example Projects.

- The working group reviewed five bundles of transportation projects, by project type.
- The main point of discussion was if the tool—as it is currently specified—can adequately measure rural transportation projects. Several members of the working group representing rural communities expressed concern that rural projects would not score as well under the existing system, and noted that rural transportation project construction costs are higher.
- The working group also raised rural equity as a factor to consider. The working group committed to run a series of rural projects through the benefit/cost tool for the next working group meeting. The working group also tasked DKS and Associates to explore further the rural/urban dynamic in benefit cost analyses.
- The working group discussed the scoring criteria. There was some concern that the way the scoring criteria is created and monetized is more subjective, and could influence the results of the

BCA tool. In contrast, the group discussed the state of practice in benefit/cost analysis, and how existing systems drew on the same performance metrics.

- Further working group members also expressed interest in running more test projects to see how the tool performs under a variety of situations and project types. Some working group members expressed concern that they could not assess the efficacy of the tool without this broader deployment. Group members noted that these further tests are needed to make sure the tool does not favor one type of transportation project over another.

THEME: Further Measures

- The working group will explore the rural/urban application of the BCA tool, as discussed above.
- The working group discussed economic development as a measure, and the challenges in putting together a consistent, quantifiable measure.
- The working group discussed maintenance as a measure, and noted that local transportation agencies already have a good knowledge of this issue.

Performance Outcomes Analysis Framework

THEME: Tool Demo

- SACOG should consider what data the state will ask for in their funding cycles, and endeavor to add that to our tool.
- SACOG should look to expand the existing ATP tool to be relevant to each of the three programs, and make it more accessible to find on SACOG's website.
- Federal and state grants often ask for indicators that cannot be measured with available data. Instead, when developing our criteria, let's keep in mind what can be measured. And have all the information available upfront. It adds more time to the upfront work, but then makes it easier for everyone moving forward.
- There are actually some good examples for grant programs in the arts, where a new system was developed that made it easier to apply.
- Increasingly applications are asking for public health data. The group noted how even if applicants get access to the data, they have a hard time interpreting.

Project Performance Working Group Meeting Evaluation

June 21, 2017

RANKING: 1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree
This workshop was well organized.
Average:
4.75
The length of the meeting was appropriate to get through the material.
Average:
4.50
I better understand the Benefit cost Analysis method after the presentation today.
Average:
4.75
The review of test regional projects was a useful use of working group time.
Average:
4.25
The Outcome-Factors-Indicators framework helps me better understand performance outcomes assessment.
Average:
3.75
I understand the next major steps in SACOG's Project Performance Assessment.
Average:
4.50
What should be done next time to make the working group session more effective?
Looking forward to seeing more models.
Introductions
Additional comments or questions not captured in the meeting: