

***“ Connecting Knowledge and Policy: Using Performance Measures for Developing
Housing and Transportation Policy in Communities ”***

(Work in progress, do not use for quotation or citation without permission of the author)

***Milan J. Dluhy, PhD.
Professor of Public Administration
University of North Carolina Wilmington***

dluhym@uncw.edu

910-962-7705

Department of Political Science
Leutze 268
University of North Carolina Wilmington
601 S. College Rd.
Wilmington, N.C. 28403
USA

Prepared for Presentation

“A Performing Public Sector: The Second Transatlantic Dialogue”

Leuven, Belgium

Workshop 1

June 1-4, 2006

Introduction

Communities around the country are significantly increasing their use of community indicators to assess their well being and to measure their progress toward shared visions and goals (Bresleme, 1997). What is most interesting about this explosion of community indicator projects is that most of them are reported to be “bottoms up” projects. The purpose and focus of these projects vary considerably because most communities do not use a common structure or template. Thus, the literature reports on Quality of Life Projects, Benchmarking Projects, Economic Indicator Projects, Social Indicator Projects, Healthy Communities and Healthy Cities Projects, and Sustainable Cities Projects (Dluhy, forthcoming). Although diverse in purpose and focus, what they all have in common is that they use community indicators developed at the local level which are then used to impact policy agendas and other strategies that are used to move toward a desired future (Redefining Progress, 2004).

Connecting knowledge and policy at the local level is a critical concern in Public Administration and it is very consistent with the “results-oriented management” approach that now dominates the profession (Broom, 1995; Aristigueta, 1999). While there is a growing body of literature and numerous local jurisdictions developing performance measures and/or community indicators, the actual utilization of these measures still has a long way to go (Dluhy, 2006). Now is a good time to take stock of the lessons we have learned about what impacts utilization of these measures and how local jurisdictions and communities can make the connections between knowledge and policy in a more meaningful way.

For clarity, this discussion uses the following definition of a Performance Measure (PM):

“A quantifiable, enduring measure of outcomes, outputs, efficiency, or cost effectiveness. In general, measures should be related to an agency’s (community’s) mission and programs (policies), and they should not merely measure one-time or short term activities”. (Newcomer, 2002).

Among other things, PMs can be used to:

- Track projects in a strategic plan
- Track accomplishment of goals and objectives in planning/policy
- Track policy and program outcomes over time
- Report community progress to elected officials, the media, and the public
- Benchmark with other jurisdictions or communities to gauge effectiveness of efforts
- Track performance over time to determine trends, progress, and priorities

How to Improve Advice Giving at the Agency/Community Level

The remainder of this paper focuses on housing and transportation measures and what strategies can be used to improve the utilization of these measures at the agency and/or community level. By selecting specific policy areas, particularly critical areas like housing and transportation, this analysis will give concrete examples of how to “learn by doing.”

Guideline One. Always use a wide range of measures when deciding what data will be collected. The investment of resources to put together the data sets for analysis should be comprehensive enough to interest a wide range of stakeholders, a point that we will return to below. Looking at Tables 1 and 2, a careful review of the literature on local indicators and measures in housing and transportation, a review of the U.S. Census and other federal data collection agencies, and a synthesis of applied research institutes and centers who publish national data sets identified 21 housing and 19 transportation measures. In future research on this project, local decision makers will be asked to rank the best indicators to use so that a validity check on these lists can be made.

The two lists are heavily oriented toward output and outcome indicators. There are few input, efficiency, and productivity measures in the two lists. The bias, of course, is toward outcomes because that is what most stakeholders want and need. Other types of indicators might help with the management issues but outcome tracking allows broad evaluations of progress.

Another important point about these two lists is that they are all available on line and any community can have access to this information. Although many communities supplement these kind of national data sets with local surveys and state and local agency data, any community can get started with the lists in Tables 1 and 2 and develop a rather comprehensive perspective on their community with little effort and at a relatively low cost.

A review of the Housing measures shows the traditional and fairly well known financial, plumbing, and structural measures that are frequently used. What is relatively new and extremely helpful is the measure of *Housing Affordability* in the community. It

measures the percentage of recent homes sold that a median income family can afford (i.e., spends no more than 30% of income). For example, in the pricey San Francisco area in 2000, only 5.7% of the median income families could afford the average priced home sold but in Springfield, Illinois 90 % of the families could afford the average priced home sold (National Association of Home Builders, 2000). Communities can establish goals for the development of affordable housing and encourage lower cost developments if they are serious about better access to homeownership by low to moderate income families.

Table 1 also illustrates a set of community measures collected by the U.S. American Housing Survey. Communities can gauge the desirability of neighborhoods in terms of schools, crime, cleanliness, amenities, etc. Since home values and prices are largely influenced by these types of neighborhood characteristics, communities need to track how neighborhoods are doing. Affordability and neighborhood quality of life indicators are essential when establishing local priorities for policies and programs.

From a community perspective, density and the fraction of acre per resident are good proxies for sprawl. Low density and larger lots drive the costs of infra-structure up needlessly and result in larger amounts of land consumption than is usually necessary. Thus, the 21 measures cover the quality of the structure itself, its cost, its surrounding neighborhood, and the larger community. Again, all of this data is readily available at low cost.

On the transportation side, the experts have historically been preoccupied with outcomes like travel time to work, congestion, energy use, and safety. More recently *Transportation Affordability* has received some attention as well since after housing,

transportation is the largest item in most people's budget (The Brookings Institution, 2006). Simply put, how can transportation expenses be kept down and how can the overall system become more efficient? Tracking the number of people driving alone, driving in carpools, and riding public transit allows communities to track transportation behavior over time to see if policies and programs aimed at more efficiency are making progress. For example, do reserved HOV lanes help, does congestion pricing make a difference, or does trying to locate housing developments closer to transit stops help consumers shift to transit. Again, the 19 core indicators in Table 2 allow communities to get a good start at tracking progress.

In sum, Guideline One emphasizes selecting a wide range of measures that appeal to different stakeholders in the community and establishing these measures so they can be looked at over time to establish progress and problem areas for further attention. Newer affordability indicators in both housing and transportation are gaining acceptance and being used to develop more effective policies and programs. As noted earlier, housing and transportation are being used as illustrations in this analysis but the goal for communities is to develop measures in a wide variety of areas in addition to the ones discussed here. Thus, a Quality of Life Index might include housing, transportation, economics, environment, education and participation, crime, child welfare, arts and culture, etc. (Dluhy, forthcoming).

Guideline Two. When designing the data sets for the community makes sure there are measures for all major constituencies/stakeholders interested in progress and change. In Tables 1 and 2, each measure is assessed in column five according to which constituencies or stakeholders might be the most interested in that measure for planning and decision making purposes. For example, all major stakeholders in housing prefer and utilize measures like median value, affordability, home ownership rates, average square foot of the unit, and high quality neighborhoods. However, elected officials are particularly interested in property tax burden, sprawl, and the quality of local schools. While planners are preoccupied with sprawl and commute times, city administrators pay the most attention to units over 30 years in age (i.e., future problems of decay and decline in neighborhoods) and median value of units (i.e., growth in the tax base). Consumers, in particular, are overly concerned with financial burden, structural quality, tax burden, and commutes to work.

With transportation, the most popular measures for all stakeholders are living with one quarter mile of transit, % of population owning a car, safety, cost of gasoline, and transportation affordability. Elected officials pay more attention to travel time to work, congestion, spending on transit, energy use, and sprawl. City administrators and planners focus on number of people driving alone, rider-ship on transit, operating expenses per passenger mile (i.e., preference for buses), per capita emissions, congestion and sprawl.

It is necessary politically to put together a data set locally that will appeal to these different constituencies/stakeholders. The questions asked by constituencies/stakeholders are quite different. Some want to know about outcomes or

outputs exclusively while others want measures of efficiency or productivity. Management looks more at cost and expenses while consumers and elected officials dwell more on outcomes and enhancing the quality of life. Convenience for many consumers comes first. Cost is important but as a recent study showed, 78% of Americans will continue to drive to work alone until a gallon of gas reaches \$3. Then they might change their driving habits (Parade, 2005). So the planner and administrators may be trying to design the most efficient transportation system but consumers and the elected officials who want to please them continue to develop policies and programs that allow consumers to drive alone in their cars whenever and wherever they want. Here is an area where community perspectives on pollution, energy use, sprawl, and efficiency are in direct contrast to consumer perspectives on driving alone, owning multiple cars in a household, increasing vehicle miles driven, and keeping the cost of gasoline down are paramount.

Guideline Three. Use stakeholders to develop measures and then fully integrate the measures into the planning and decision making processes. First, multiple and strategic stakeholders should be involved from the beginning in the development, review, and revision of measures. Consumers, elective officials, interest or advocacy groups, city administrators, and planners should all be at the Table. This is not a planning or administrative exercise, it is community building effort where measures are collected and monitored regularly and trends and progress are gauged. Cities like Austin, Asheville, Jacksonville, San Francisco, and Seattle have been using this approach for many years with great success (Dluhy, forthcoming).

Second, developing an integrated approach at the community level should start with setting up a Community Advisory Task Force made up of all relevant constituencies/stakeholders. This Task Force should hold community forums, run focus groups, seek community input, encourage input from the local bureaucracies, and allow elective officials to participate as well as endorse the measures adopted. In short, there needs to be ownership, ownership, ownership!

Community based projects flourish using this type of consensus building process (Swain, 2001). Civic engagement is required to be successful. Obviously people who participate in the process have a vested interest in the results. Participation results in ownership and ownership establishes commitment and a willingness to seek policy and program changes. Civic engagement is essential in this consensus building, “bottoms up” process (Portney, 2003).

The proof that comprehensive integration of measures has taken place is when local governments, non-profits, advocacy groups, private sector groups, and other interested parties adopt the measures and the time series data when they plan, make policy decisions, seek external funding, and report to citizens. The media can play an important role alongside universities by developing annual regional conferences that focus on the “state of the region”. These processes are parallel to what each stakeholder mentioned above does on its own. The goal here is to have multiple constituencies using and valuing the same measures for the entire community. This becomes a truly cross-cutting collaborative approach rather than having each sector pursuing its own set of goals and objectives.

Guideline Four. Present reports of measures to interested parties on a regular basis and work with the media to disseminate results--focus on community building and cross-cutting Issues. Below are some suggestions for disseminating the results and otherwise assisting in the agenda setting process in the community.

- Institutionalize and utilize an annual conference to report on the “state of the region”. Work with the media to promote this conference and disseminate the results .
- Issue an annual written report with an analysis and the data.
- Develop a series of White Papers (Position Papers) that addresses issues raised in conference and other meetings.
- Develop a user friendly web-site with the goal of having the data on all measures accessible to all interested parties in the community.
- Organize town hall meetings to get feedback on the Written Report.
- Develop a 501 c3 non-profit group to oversee the data collection and dissemination.
- Help organizations in the community to use data for grant applications, evaluations, and long range planning.

Just like many communities display signs on how many people are using seat belts, how the accident rate has gone down, or how much the United Way has raised in the fund raising drive, the community performance measures adopted should be consistently and effectively disseminated in the community and follow ups in terms of agenda setting should be pursued by the 501 c3 organization recommended above. This cross-cutting approach does not supplant the existing private, public, and non-profit

sector Rather the approach focused on a small set of cross-cutting issues that all major stakeholders can buy into but none can solve or alleviate alone. No one sector can substantially improve housing affordability or get people to get out of their cars when they are commuting to work. It will take a focused community effort building partnership across all the sectors.

Guideline Five. Whenever possible make cross community or cross jurisdiction comparisons. Benchmarking against other areas helps to identify priorities and other approaches that might work for the community doing the comparison. Recently a number of Wilmington, North Carolina stakeholders completed a comparison of Wilmington with nine other urban areas in the state in terms of public transit rider-ship rates. They wanted a benchmark for how they were doing but they also wanted to improve their transit rider-ship.

Below are the figures for rider-ship in the 10 largest urban areas in the state.

1. Chapel Hill	6.5%
2. Durham	3.5%
3. Charlotte	3.2%
4. Winston-Salem	2.5%
5. Raleigh	2.4%
6. Asheville	2.2%
7. Wilmington	1.9%
8. Greensboro	1.7%
9. Greenville	1.6%
10. Cary	.3%

Source: U.S. Census, 2000.

These figures prompted Wilmington to contact Chapel Hill and Durham to find out why their rider-ship was so much higher. For at least a year, Wilmington has continued to use peer comparisons to identify urban areas that have better outcome figures but then to identify what policies and programs they should use to improve their rider-ship. This example demonstrates the most clearly how using the right measures and making the right comparisons can lead to policy and program improvements and ultimately improved outcomes desired by the community.

To further illustrate the point of the utility of using community and jurisdictional comparisons to further policy and program improvements, the largest 50 urban areas in the U.S. were examined using the following measures:

- Population
- Living in Same House, 1995-2000
- Housing units
- Median Value of Owner Occupied Housing
- Persons Per Household
- Commuting to Work with Personal Vehicle
- Carpooling to Work
- Land Area
- Mean Travel Time to Work
- Homeownership Rates
- Commutes Via Public Transit
- People Per Square Mile (Density)

These twelve variables were analyzed to indicate what strategies individual communities could use to achieve policy or program goals. Table 3 reports on the intercorrelations between some of the more important outcome variables.

First, most stakeholders would like to see the *Median Value of Housing* high and growing at a rate above their peers. Few would not adopt this as desirable. From Table 3, urban areas with higher mean travel times to work, lower homeownership rates, fewer people driving alone in cars, more people using transit, and higher densities are more likely to have higher median values for their housing. It makes sense that the larger more

dense areas would have more expensive housing. It also means that as more modest sized and less dense areas grow and their density increases, the value of homes will escalate faster than more sprawling and less dense areas. Thus New York will always have better median values for housing than the most sprawled city of Atlanta.

The data are also interesting when the *Homeownership Rates* are examined. Again, stakeholders would mostly prefer to have high ownership rates for a variety of reasons. In the 50 largest urban areas homeownership rates are the highest in smaller areas, areas with less travel time to work, areas where people are more likely to drive alone and not use public transit. In short, smaller less dense areas with lower value homes have higher ownership rates. Therefore, there is an interesting trade-off between size and density and housing value and homeownership. The biggest cities are the best investment for those who are fortunate enough to be able to afford homeownership. Young families starting out and seniors may therefore prefer smaller areas. Nevertheless, larger areas need to work on homeownership and smaller areas on growing the value of their real estate.

With transportation, there are some interesting findings from Table 3 as well. As is well known, *Transit Rider-Ship* is higher in the largest, most dense cities where the housing values are the highest, there is more carpooling, the travel times to work are the longest, and people are less likely (i.e., %) to drive alone. Small communities like Wilmington mentioned above are always struggling to improve rider-ship but it is size and density that makes transit goals hard to achieve. Another independent analysis indicated that a density of 3000 per square mile is needed to reach acceptable rider-ship rates which means only about 15-20 urban areas can really make a go of it. This is rather

discouraging for smaller communities but it may lead them to very different strategies like highly selective routes, congestion pricing, or HOV lanes.

Table 3 also reports on correlations for Driving Alone, Mean Travel Time, Carpooling, and Density. Consistently the findings are that the large, dense areas have longer commutes to work, higher home prices, less homeownership, more people carpooling and taking transit, and fewer people driving alone to work. In contrast, smaller and less dense communities have more people driving alone and not taking transit as well as having shorter commutes but they also have higher homeownership rates.

By implication, peer analysis among the 50 largest urban areas shows the broadest relationships between factors that effect favorable outcomes---higher value homes, more homeownership, more carpooling and transit rider-ship, and fewer people driving alone to work.

Conclusion

Connecting knowledge and policy at the local level is a challenge for academics, planners, elected officials, and other administrators. Community based, “bottoms up” development of performance measures and other types of community indicators are now popular and becoming more common-place. Redefining Progress recently reported that there were over 200 community indicator projects in the U.S. and many more in Europe (Redefining Progress, 2004). The main theme of this paper has been to focus on housing and transportation performance measures in an effort to illustrate how to provide better advice to decision makers at the local level when they develop and use these types of measures. The secondary theme is that while communities may engage in building a lot of information about their community and develop many performance measures, there are

already readily available data sets to do preliminary community analysis in the housing and transportation area. The important point is to get started and begin a time series.

In order to maximize and improve advice giving at the community level, the following advice is given:

- Use a wide variety of performance measures.
- Include performance measures for all major constituencies/stakeholders in the community.
- Use constituencies/stakeholders in the development and full integration of the performance measures into the planning and decision making processes.
- Disseminate results of measures and focus on community building around cross-cutting issues.
- Periodically benchmark your community against others to identify critical areas for policy and program changes and re-engineering.

In the end, better policy is informed policy and those communities who take control of their environment can make their areas better places to live and work in. Only when communities focus in and narrow the issues based on analysis and comparisons with other places engaged in best practices will consensus building at the local level become more effective.

References:

Aristigueta, M. 1999. Managing for Results in State Government. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Besleme, K. 1997. "Community Indicators and Healthy Communities," National Civic Review, Volume 86, Issue 1, 43-53.

The Brookings Institution. 2006. "The Housing and Transportation Affordability Index," http://www.brookings.edu/metro/umi/ctod_page.htm.

Broom, C. 1995. "Performance Based Government Models," Public Administration Review," Volume 15, Number 4, 3-17.

Dluhy, M. Forthcoming. "Connecting Knowledge and Policy: The Promise of Community Indicators in the U.S.," Social Indicators Research.

Dluhy, M. 2006. "Enhancing the Utilization of Performance Measures in Local Government: Lessons from Practice," reprinted in Public Financial Management, ed. H.Frank, 567-578. Boca Raton: Taylor and Francis.

"Gas and Driving Habits," Parade, July 3, 2005, 15.

National Association of Homebuilders. <http://www.nahb.com/facts/hoi/2000>

Newcomer, K., et. al. 2002. Meeting The Challenges of Performance-Oriented Government. Washington, D.C.: American Society for Public Administration.

Portney, K. 2003. Taking Sustainable Cities Seriously: Economic Development, the Environment, and Quality of Life in American Cities. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Redefining Progress. 2004. "Community Indicators Project," <http://www.redefiningprogress.org/projects/indicators>.

Swain, D. 2001. "Linking Civic Engagement and Community Improvement," National Civic Review, Volume 90, Issue 4, 319-34.

Table 1-Selected Housing Measures

Measure	Explanation	Type of Measure	Uses	Appeal	Source	Comments
Affordability Index	% of homes sold that median inc. families can afford	Access to affordable housing	Outcome	Consumers Advocacy Interest Groups	National Assoc. of Realtors, National Assoc Homebuilders	Varies widely by region of country. Midwest most affordable
Financial Burden	Rent to income ratio	Financial burden	Outcome	Same as above	Census	Younger, older renters hurt
Financial Burden	Mortgage to income ratio	Financial burden	Outcome	Same as above	Census	Young buyers hurt most
Unit over 30 years in age	More likely to need repairs	Plumbing statistic	Outcome	Consumers Elected officials City Adm.s	Census	Does not apply in well maintained neighborhoods
Median Value of Unit, change over time	Equity growth for consumer	Equity growth	Output Outcome	Same as above	Census	Causes a problem for seniors
% Ownership	Ownership is major investment for consumer	Equity investment	Output Outcome	Same as above	Census	Median sale price of homes in many areas is out of reach
Average Square Feet per unit	Privacy is valued	Quality of life	Output Outcome	Most stakeholders	Census	U.S. is highest in the world and increasing
Persons per household	Same as above	Same as above	Output Outcome	Most stakeholders	Census	Same as above
Street traffic/noise	Community characteristic	Quality of neighborhood	Output Outcome	Most stakeholders	American Housing Survey (US)	Affects property values & price
Neighborhood crime present	Same as above	Same as above	Output Outcome	Most stakeholders	Same as above	Same as above
Odors present (neighborhood)	Same as above	Same as above	Output Outcome	Most stakeholders	Same as above	Same as above
No transit accessible	Same as above	Same as above	Output Outcome	Consumers	Same as above	Same as above
Amenities near	Same as above	Same as above	Output Outcome	Consumers	Same as above	Same as above
Trash,litter,etc.	Same as above	Same as above	Output Outcome	Most stakeholders	Same as above	Same as above
Heating & Air Conditioning	Structural issues	Longevity of property	Output Outcome	Consumers	Same as above	Same as above
Rating of local schools	Community	Quality of neighborhood	Output Outcome	Most stakeholders	Local media and studies	Same as above
Rating of local schools	Community	Quality of neighborhood	Output Outcome	Most stakeholders	Local media and studies	Same as above
Plumbing or maintenance	Structural issues	Longevity of property	Outcome	Consumers	Housing Survey (US)	Same as above
Tax burden	High property taxes	Financial burden	Outcome	Consumers Elected officials	Tax Foundation	Seniors are negatively effected
Commute time to work	Community	Quality of neighborhood	Outcome	Consumers City Adm.	Census	Pressure to improve
Fraction of Acre per resident	Community Sprawl	Costs of development	Output Outcome	Planner Elected officials	Dept. of Agriculture	Sprawl is inefficient
People per square mile	Community Sprawl	Costs of development	Output Outcome	Planners Elected official	Census	Sprawl is inefficient

Table 2-Selected Transportation Measures

Measure	Explanation	Type of Measure	Uses	Appeal	Source	Comments
Traffic Congestion	<i>Travel time index</i>	<i>Quality of life</i>	<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Consumer Planner</i>	<i>Texas Transportation Institute</i>	<i>Lost time may result in lost wages and stress</i>
Mean Travel Time to work	<i>Historically increasing</i>	<i>Quality of life</i>	<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Consumers Elected off.</i>	<i>Census</i>	<i>Dense cities are the worst</i>
Commutes to work alone in a car	<i>Increases energy,land consumption</i>	<i>Quality of Life</i>	<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Consumer</i>	<i>Census</i>	<i>Varies considerably</i>
Uses a carpool	<i>Decreases energy, land consumption</i>	<i>Cost savings</i>	<i>Output Outcome</i>	<i>Consumer Planners City admin.</i>	<i>Census</i>	<i>Statistics are uneven by areas of country</i>
Rides public transit to work regularly	<i>Decreases energy and land consumption</i>	<i>Cost savings</i>	<i>Output Outcome</i>	<i>All major stakeholders except consumers</i>	<i>Census</i>	<i>Only economically viable in most large/dense cities</i>
Live within one fourth mile of transit	<i>Decreases energy, land consumption</i>	<i>Cost savings</i>	<i>Output Outcome</i>	<i>All major stakeholders</i>	<i>American Community Survey(Census)</i>	<i>Planners want cities to build into zoning ord.</i>
Federal spending on mass transit	<i>Commitment to alternative modes of transportation</i>	<i>Efficient use of tax dollars</i>	<i>Input Output Outcome</i>	<i>Most Consumers prefer highway priorities</i>	<i>Federal Budget</i>	<i>Congress has consistently used only about 10 % of gas tax dollars for transit</i>
Transit work trips as % of total work trips	<i>Same as above</i>	<i>Same as above</i>	<i>Output Outcome</i>	<i>Consumers resist</i>	<i>Census</i>	<i>In smaller metro areas, transit is negligible</i>
Operating Expenses per passenger mile	<i>Data compares all modes</i>	<i>Efficiency in mode of transportation</i>	<i>Efficiency Outcome Productivity</i>	<i>Consumers resist using buses</i>	<i>U.S. Department of Transportation</i>	<i>Bus is consistently the cheapest/efficient</i>
Vehicles per household	<i>Will discourage transit use</i>	<i>Cuts down efficiency and raises energy consumption</i>	<i>Same as above</i>	<i>Consumers keep buying more autos</i>	<i>Census</i>	<i>This rate is growing faster than the population growth rate</i>
% of population owning car	<i>Will discourage transit use</i>	<i>Same as above</i>	<i>Same as above</i>	<i>Same as above</i>	<i>Census</i>	<i>Higher % than any country in the world</i>
Energy use per capita	<i>Figures for major transportation modes</i>	<i>Efficiency</i>	<i>Output Outcome</i>	<i>Planners Elected officials Advocacy groups</i>	<i>American Community Survey</i>	<i>We exceed every country in the world</i>
Per capita emissions	<i>Pollution</i>	<i>Negative Externalities</i>	<i>Output Outcome</i>	<i>Same as above</i>	<i>Same as above</i>	<i>An embarrassment in the world</i>
Fraction of Acre Per Resident	<i>Land Consumption</i>	<i>Efficiency is lowered</i>	<i>Input Output Outcome</i>	<i>Same as above</i>	<i>Department of Agriculture</i>	<i>Good measure of sprawl</i>
Vehicle Miles Driven per capita	<i>Resource consumption</i>	<i>Efficiency is lowered</i>	<i>Same as above</i>	<i>Same as above</i>	<i>U.S. Department of Transportation</i>	<i>Keeps going up each year</i>
Accidents per thousand	<i>Safety</i>	<i>Safety</i>	<i>Output Outcome</i>	<i>All stakeholders</i>	<i>Same as above</i>	
Fatal accidents per thousand	<i>Safety</i>	<i>Safety</i>	<i>Same as above</i>	<i>All stakeholders</i>	<i>Same as above</i>	
Retail cost of one gallon of gas, over time	<i>Measured in constant dollars</i>	<i>Efficiency for the consumer in going to work</i>	<i>Input Output Outcome</i>	<i>All stakeholders especially consumers</i>	<i>U.S. Energy Department</i>	<i>At \$3 consumer will consider switching modes</i>
Transportation Affordability	<i>Ratio between transp. Costs and income</i>	<i>Same as above</i>	<i>Outcome</i>	<i>Same as above</i>	<i>Brookings Institution</i>	<i>Varies considerably by area and region</i>

Table 3—Intercorrelations and Significance Levels, Housing and Transportation Statistics in the Largest 50 Urban areas in the U.S.

<i>Independent Variables</i>	<i>Median Value of Home</i>	<i>Homeownership Rate</i>	<i>Commute Public Transit</i>	<i>Mean Travel Time to Work</i>	<i>Drives Alone to Work</i>	<i>Carpool to Work</i>
<i>Population</i>		-.414 (.003)	.617 (.000)	.653 (.000)	-.540 (.000)	
<i>Same House, 95-2000</i>			.512 (.000)	.455 (.001)	-.505 (.000)	
<i>Housing Units</i>						
<i>Median Value of Home</i>		-.364 (.011)	.353 (.014)	.284 (.05)	-.406 (.004)	
<i>Persons Per Household</i>						.477 (.001)
<i>Drives Alone to Work</i>	-.406 (.004)	.707 (.000)	-.976 (.000)	-.758 (.000)		
<i>Carpool to Work</i>			-.406 (.004)			
<i>Land Area</i>						
<i>Mean Travel Time to Work</i>	.284 (.051)	-.560 (.000)	.779 (.000)		-.758 (.000)	
<i>Homeownership Rate</i>	-.364 (.011)		-.690 (.000)	-.560 (.000)	.707 (.000)	
<i>Commutes Public Transit</i>	.353 (.014)	-.690 (.000)		.779 (.000)	-.976 (.000)	-.406 (.004)
<i>Density(people per square mile)</i>	.388 (.006)	-.692 (.000)	.911 (.000)	.800 (.000)	-.870 (.000)	-.376 (.009)

*Only significant correlations at .05 or above are included.
Source: U.S. Census, 2000.*