August 11, 2024

Mr. Sergio Ruiz and Mr. Tyler Brown Caltrans District 4 111 Grand Avenue Oakland, CA 94612

Re: Caltrans D4 Transit Plan Technical Advisory Committee Meeting 3 - Performance Measures

Dear Mr. Ruiz and Mr. Brown:

SPUR believes that making transit faster and more reliable is an essential step on the path towards achieving a new, sustainable business model for transit. The success of the District 4 Transit Plan is therefore a critical part in transit's transformation and longevity.

This letter is in response to the request for feedback on the performance measures outlined in the third meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee for the D4 Transit Plan. There were more than 60 performance measures brainstormed. Many require significant resources to collect and many are not reasonably within the control of transit agencies or Caltrans. Therefore, this letter offers a framework to prioritize which measures to evaluate.

In our view, there are three distinct types of indicators to consider. One type of indicator should measure *transit operating outcomes* and be aligned with supporting the state's policy goals. Such measures should be focused on variables that are reasonably within the control of transit agencies, local governments, and Caltrans, used to prioritize locations for investment, and to compare the effects of various transit priority treatments.

Transit priority operating outcomes should focus on:

- Transit travel time reliability (1.B.2, 1.B.3)
- Average transit travel speed (4.E.1)
- Average transit travel speed relative to automobile travel speed (1.B.7)
- Transit travel delay (1.B.4)
- Passenger travel delay (new)

The second category of indicators are those that *support transit outcomes*.

- Safety, particularly the change in serious injuries and deaths on the state highway network for people walking, biking and taking transit (variation on 1.A.2)
- Accessibility, particularly the change number of projects that do not meet ADA standards (variation on 2.D.1, 2.D.2)

The third category of indicators is what we will refer to as *performance measures*. We recommend that performance measures focus on evaluating Caltrans' goals of (1) cultivating excellence in planning, supporting, and implementing transit priority treatments, and (2) achieving broader cross-cutting policy goals such as safety and more equitable access and mobility. These measures express *how* Caltrans is translating state goals into organizational strategies and a specific program of work and say something about the *effectiveness* of those strategies and programs of work.

In our view, Caltrans has three key roles in advancing transit priority that could be measured.

- Support changes to the state highway network to ensure that high-ridership bus routes are fast and reliable. The most applicable performance measures are 1.A.2, 2.E.1, 2.F.1, 2.F.2, 3.C.1, 3.C.2, 4.A.1, 4.C.2, 4.C.3, 5.B.1, 5.C.1, 5.C.2, 5.E.2, 5.E.3, 5.E.4.
- Demonstrate leadership in coordinating the implementation of transit priority treatments, especially across corridors and routes that cross multiple jurisdictions. The most applicable performance measures are 5.E.1, 5.E.2, 5.E.3, 5.E.4.
- Leveraging roadway and transit funding to reward actions that deliver transit priority projects. None of the proposed indicators addressed this role. One such indicator could quantify the amount of competitive state funds awarded to applicants who meet state performance targets for bus speed and reliability by incorporating transit priority treatments.

Respectfully,

Laura Tolkoff

Transportation Policy Director