

Comments from the August 18<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee on Performance Measures

- **Topic: Work Plan**
  - **Comments**
    - Indicators could be considered outputs for targets; target and indicator goals do not match
    - What is the difference between indicators and targets?
    - When are targets applied in the scenario assessment process?
    - What models will be used in the RTP/SCS analysis?
    - When are financial constraints considered?
  - **Staff Responses**
    - Acknowledgement of goal mismatch; will be remedied in the future
    - Targets are used to compare between scenarios, to create predictions, and represent overarching goals; indicators use data at single point in time to measure progress
    - Targets applied in the early vision scenarios, then again on the second round of scenarios; second round of scenarios will have additional analysis performed (e.g. cost-benefit analysis)
    - MTC's new activity-based transportation model and ABAG's latest PECAS model will be used
    - Financial constraints are considered later in the analysis as part of the scenario assessment phase
  
- **Topic: Guidelines**
  - **Comments**
    - Focus should be on "output", not "input", targets; focus on land use & transportation rather than jobs, etc.
    - Add guideline that numerical targets should be "achievable", "feasible", "financially constrained", and/or "sensitive to policy choices" by MTC/ABAG
    - Cannot force inclusion of local governments to enact targets; don't want to scare local governments; must consider what SCS can truly do
    - Need to reference who implements SCS policy to achieve target; what is the specific role of local agencies?
    - Need to have a balance of the 3 E's in targets selected
    - Need to better articulate requirement #2 to reflect role of local governments; this requirement is critical to include
    - Some argue that guideline #5 should be a requirement, not guideline; others argue that it is far too early to move guideline #5 into the requirement category
    - Housing target: not a quantifiable target, acts as requirement
  - **Staff Responses**
    - Requirement #2 has been updated to reflect role of local governments
    - Housing target will be used to see which scenarios can achieve that goal; this is the one target that is not an output due to legislative requirements – for simplicity, however, we have included it in the target list
  
- **Topic: Goals**
  - **Comments**
    - Interest in reorienting goals – proposals included: reorienting goals around mobility, land use, and air quality; start from blank slate as current goals are problematic and may be "cooking the books"; create goal of environmental sustainability where climate preservation and greenfield protection act as sub-categories; consider removing non-transportation items such as housing and equitable access; fit economic metrics elsewhere
    - Reminder to group that economy has fundamentally changed and that economic "sustainability" may be the wrong goal (economic "health" might be better)
    - Economy is a necessary goal and should be included
    - Need to focus on agency goals even if external factors cause group to struggle with targets
    - Desire to see BCDC target/indicator included (e.g. sea level rise)
    - Is SCS or RTP overarching?
  - **Staff Responses**
    - There is flexibility to refine goals as we review potential targets, but we do not plan for this committee to spend time on this up front

- Target list in handout marked with categories of transportation, land use, and other to facilitate comparison of existing goal orientation and alternative proposal
  - SCS & RTP are fundamentally intertwined
- **Issue: Targets – General Comments**
  - **Comments**
    - Consider what metrics we can actually use to meet target – especially numerical values needed for other targets to achieve GHG reduction
    - Watch out for scope creep - GHG should be viewed as overarching target under SB 375
    - Consider local governments’ requirements and impacts from SCS targets
    - Still haven’t considered parking needs in any of these targets
    - Some livable communities metrics are redundant with CO<sub>2</sub> target – should create “complete communities” metrics instead [by email]
    - Access to labor metric is good [by email]
    - Lack of clarity regarding GRP and system maintenance metrics [by email]
    - Delay per capita is poor metric of freight reliability [by email]
- **Proposed Target: VMT**
  - **Comments**
    - One perspective: keep VMT as target if we have more than 2-3 targets in total, put under healthy & safe communities goal; supported by Caltrans policies; highway pricing can align GHG and VMT targets
    - Other perspective: place only GHG target, not VMT target, in SCS; VMT is scope creep and should go under another category if at all; VMT target is redundant [by email]
- **Proposed Target: Mode Split**
  - **Comments**
    - Shift to non-motorized transport needs to be reflected by some target in some category, especially in light of electric vehicles and other non-gasoline-fueled vehicles increasing in popularity
    - Keep non-auto mode split as target since it is useful, put under healthy & safe communities goal
- **Proposed Target: Energy Intensity**
  - **Comments**
    - Consider using “decrease hydrocarbon intensity” or “decrease use of HC fuel” instead of energy intensity target as these are more direct measures of success
    - One perspective: energy intensity target is interesting, but we could have 1 or 2 mode split targets instead of energy intensity target
    - Another perspective: energy intensity target not useful, should be dropped as it duplicates GHG target [by email]
- **Proposed Indicator: Impact of Sea Level Rise**
  - **Comments**
    - Suggestion to add this as a target
    - Sea level rise is difficult to include as a target, perhaps as an indicator instead; study indicator could be acres underwater in 2100
    - Be very careful before selecting this as an indicator, as it is very difficult to predict global warming flood areas
- **Proposed Indicator: Local/Regional Food Production [by email]**
  - **Comments**
    - Proposal for new indicator: number of square feet per capita that is available for non-commercial local food production at the neighborhood scale
    - Proposed for new indicator: number of acres per capita that is permanently preserved for local-serving commercial food production at the regional scale