

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

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

### **Meeting Attendees:**

Walk Sacramento

Sacramento County Engineering and Planning

Yolo County Transit District

Environmental Council of Sacramento (ECOS)

El Dorado County DOT

Capital Southeast Connector JPA

California Bike Coalition

Sacramento Metropolitan AQMD

California Rural Legal Assistance

City of Woodland Public Works

Sacramento Regional Transit District

City of Elk Grove Public Works

Placer County Transportation Planning Agency

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.