Project Performance Assessment: September Working Group Meeting

Wednesday, September 20, 2017 | 9:00-11:00 a.m.

Meeting Attendees

City of Elk Grove
City of West Sacramento
City of Woodland
DKS Associates
North State Building Industry Association
Sacramento County Public Health

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality
Management District
Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of
Commerce
Sacramento Regional Transit
Yolo County Transit District

Meeting Agenda

Summary of Working Group Charge and Meetings
Review of Working Group Synthesis Document
Discussion on Next Steps

Meeting Summary

Project staff gave a brief presentation summarizing the working group, including charge, process and major activity at each meeting. Next, the working group discussed any final thoughts on the two methodologies covered in the process, and reviewed a synthesis of working group feedback. Finally, the working group discussed next steps, offering revisions to a list of working group takeaways.

Theme: Final comments on methods

- The working group reiterated that the two new tools discussed in the process should not be a filter for what projects that SACOG Board considers. In other words, the tools should bring forward the project-specific data for Board consideration, but should not limit what the Board considers.
- The working group also discussed the big picture outcomes of funding certain types of infrastructure. In particular, the group honed in on funding transit investments. Some working group members questioned if this was an effective strategy given relatively low ridership. Others in the group raised how transit is the underpinning in meeting the region's air quality goals, and how the MTP/SCS assumes increasing transit productivity through time. As this discussion moved beyond the working group charge to focus on the Benefit Cost and Project Performance Assessment, the group suggested the topic instead be taken up via the MTP/SCS engagement process. Staff noted that the first MTP/SCS Sounding Board commences several days after the Project Performance Assessment working group concludes.
- The working group also briefly discussed the economics of development decisions, in particular, the challenges of making denser development pencil out economically. Some members of the working group noted the desire to change the math on infrastructure investments, where the public sector could build infrastructure to ease the amount the developer builds. The group also discussed briefly prevailing wage and its effect on development.

Sacramento Area Council of Governments

Theme: Final thoughts on the tools

- Members of working group raised a prior comment about how transit maintenance projects can be assessed. Members of the group also noted the substantial funding need for transit maintenance, and asked for a specific meeting specific to this topic.
- The group asked if planning projects, in addition to capital projects, should be subject to the same performance assessment. The group also noted that the split between funding planning projects and funding capital investment projects is a policy decision established by the board in the funding round framework.
- The working group asked how would the new quantitative tools fit within SACOG's Community Design program. The group talked through how the program could incorporate more quantitative elements but not lose its unique nature.
- The group discussed how far to buffer from a facility to establish a project area. The online tool being built will allow the user to set his/her own buffer.
- The group also discussed how the tool could measure a facility that provides parallel capacity improvements. For example, if a project improves a corridor that is a parallel route to a currently congested corridor, how would it score on the congestion measure.
- Finally, local member partners on the working group asked that SACOG share the Performance Outcomes Assessment tool in advance of the next funding round. The local members noted that they begin thinking through what projects to propose for the funding round months in advance, so would want tool in hand as soon as is feasible.

Theme: Consensus next steps

The group talked through what takeaways to present on the working group process. The group asked to temper several takeaways to note that the tools are important additional tools to bring to bear, but are not the only tools or frameworks. The group also asked the next steps to be clearer in documenting unresolved topic areas from the working group. Finally, the group provided revisions to the final bullet point, tasking SACOG to reconvene the group after several months to demonstrate progress made on these issues since the conclusion of the working group. The Project Performance Assessment working group next steps are listed below.

- The BCA methodology is one useful quantitative approach for project-level performance assessment and is an important additional tool for analyzing large transportation investments for the MTP/SCS, and possible future regional funding programs.
- The Outcomes Analysis methodology is also useful as an additional qualitative framework for analyzing transportation investments for the MTP/SCS and future regional funding programs.
- The working group process explaining and evaluating the BCA and Outcomes Analysis was transparent and understandable.
- Together, the BCA and Outcomes Analysis add value to SACOG's existing practice, and should be included as additional information in the next MTP/SCS performance assessment, and as part of the subsequent funding round framework.
- The BCA &/or Outcomes Analysis has value to local agencies and stakeholders for applications beyond SACOG's planning and programming activities, provided full access to all the data is provided in a user-friendly format, well before applications are due for plan or funding rounds. Detailed documentation of technical methods and data sources should also

Sacramento Area Council of Governments

be provided in advance of calls-for-projects. In particular, SACOG should study methods for project assessment and prioritization utilized by member agencies, and where possible, support those efforts with any technical methods, data or tools developed.

- SACOG should continue to work on the BCA and Outcomes Analysis, to tailor them for ongoing planning and programming activities and incorporate new methods. The SACOG Board should consider as a policy discussion the connection between performance evaluation and factors such as equity.
- SACOG should engage the Project Performance Assessment working group when necessary to inform members on progress made, and to review and comment on changes to SACOG's process over time. SACOG commits to reconvening the Working Group for an in person meeting within the next quarter.

Project Performance Assessment Working Group Meeting Evaluations
September 20, 2017

RANKING: 1. Strongly Disagree 2. Disagree 3. Neutral 4. Agree 5. Strongly Agree
This meeting was well organized.
Average: 4.8
The length of the meeting was appropriate to get through the material.
Average: 4.8
I see value in the working group concept as a way to engage with more depth on concrete issues.
Average: 5
I prefer SACOG continue to make use of time-constrained working groups focused on specific topics.
Average: 4.9
I understand the next major steps in SACOG's Project Performance Assessment, and how I can engage in this process.
Average: 4.6
What can be done to make future working groups more effective?
Ongoing participation. Ending it really limits effectiveness, since looks are ongoing process.
Add an option to listen for other staff members unable to come.
Additional comments relating to your experience as a working group member:
I appreciate the addition of outside stakeholders as a part of the process. It shows a great connection to expanding the viewpoints.