

# Meeting Summary



Washington County  
**Transportation Futures Study**  
Exploring options • Informing choices

## Health & Equity Workgroup – Meeting #3

Tuesday, March 8, 2016

3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.

Beaverton Library, Meeting Room A, 12375 SW 5<sup>th</sup> St., Beaverton OR 97005

### H&E Workgroup Members Present

**Kimberly Armstrong**, Washington County  
Housing Authority

**Steve Boughton**, Washington County Bicycle  
Coalition

**Scotty Ellis**, Metro DEI Program

**Amanda Garcia Snell**, Washington County  
Department of Health and Human Services

**Marni Kuyl**, Washington County Department of  
Health and Human Services

**Mary Kyle McCurdy**, 1000 Friends of Oregon  
**Sia Lindstrom**, Washington County Senior  
Deputy County Administrator

**Felicita Montebalco**, Vision Action Network of  
Washington County

**Jennie Proctor**, Washington County Office of  
Community Development

**Phillip Wu**, SAC Member and Kaiser  
Permanente

### Other Attendees

Matt Davis, Washington County Department of Health and Human Services  
Meeky Blizzard, SAC Co-Chair

### Study Team

Chris Deffebach, Washington County

Dyami Valentine, Washington County

Erin Wardell, Washington County

Sylvia Ciborowski, JLA Public Involvement

Heidi Guenin, Groxie LLC

Terry Moore, ECONorthwest

Scott Richman, David Evans and Associates, Inc.  
(DEA)

## Welcome and Introductions

---

Chris Deffebach, Washington County, welcomed the group and noted that Andrew Singelakis sends his regrets that he could not participate in today's meeting. The meeting purpose is to review the final transportation investment packages that will move forward for evaluation, and to review and discuss the proposed evaluation framework, including criteria and measures for evaluating the packages.

Sylvia Ciborowski, meeting facilitator, reviewed the agenda and led introductions. Participants and attendees introduced themselves. Scott Richman noted that DEA has added Heidi Guenin to serve as an advisor to the Study team with focus on the health and equity evaluation.

Sylvia gave a brief update from the last meeting including a summary of input on Land Use Scenarios and Transportation Investment Packages.

## Study Update: Future Conditions

---

Erin Wardell, Washington County, [presented an overview of future conditions](#) in Washington County, including descriptions of future land use and growth Scenario 1 and Scenario 2. Erin highlighted overall differences in population and employment, plus other demographic characteristics that are incorporated into Metro's MetroScope model for each of these scenarios.

Erin explained that the Study team has limited future conditions data to use to represent vulnerable populations. For example, the MetroScope model that has been used to estimate household and employment distributions for a future year of 2055, does not include data on race/ethnicity, but does include income ranges by household and age ranges for head of household. The Study team is considering applying the lowest income quintile and head of household age greater than 65 as data to correlate generally with other populations of concern. For race/ethnicity, the Study will refer to the most current Census-based data for the County.

A member asked if the model assumes that people who live in the County also work in the County. Erin responded that it is a regional model that disperses housing and jobs within and beyond the County, so the proximity between housing and jobs assigned to workers within households varies.

## Study Update: Transportation Investment Packages

---

Dyami Valentine, Washington County presented the three proposed Transportation Investment Packages (TIPs) and clarified the differences between packages A, B and C. He clarified that Package A is both a stand-alone option, and that it is incorporated into Packages B and C

## Committee Discussion

Members discussed and made these comments on the TIPs:

- The TIPs descriptions do not specify whether parking pricing would be included. Suggest that the Study look at more aggressive parking pricing and minimizing parking supply associated with future development.
- Employment destinations should have bike parking and trip end facilities for bicyclists in addition to ride share programs.
- Members expressed some concern about assuming 100% build out of the bicycle and pedestrian network on major roads, as there is not current available funding or plans to complete this build out.

## Evaluation Framework and Criteria

---

Terry [presented the proposed framework, criteria and measures](#) for evaluating the three TIPs. The measures incorporate input that the Study team has received from the Combined Planners Group (CPG),

and the team will also be considering modifications based on input received from the Study Advisory Committee (SAC) at their meeting last Thursday (March 3<sup>rd</sup>).

## Committee Discussion

Members discussed and made these comments on the evaluation framework and measurements:

### Discussion on Segmentation by Income (as a measure of Equity)

Staff explained that the evaluation will map out projected areas of low, medium-low, medium, medium-high, and high-income areas. This will help provide an assessment of the equitable distribution of transportation improvements and benefits. Staff asked members for input on this evaluation method.

- Regarding separating income data by quintiles, some members raised concern that the **middle quintile (\$50K-\$100K) is too broad**, and requested that this be considered further. Staff clarified that population, household and employment data is aggregated by transportation analysis zone (TAZ). Another way to create income categories is by applying standard deviation from a mean income to compare to segmenting income by quintiles; in this case, a standard deviation of 2.5 from the mean generally corresponds to the lowest income quintile. Members supported using the standard deviation approach, or some other method that does not put income in absolute dollars.
- Members expressed concern that limiting the segmentation to income does not address impacts based on **age and disability**. Staff noted that data is limited regarding future projections for age and disability.
- Members expressed concern that the study would not provide results based on race and ethnicity; although they acknowledged that there is not good data to map out the location of racial and ethnic communities for the next 50 years. They suggested that the Study **acknowledge data limitations, including for race and ethnicity**. The County should commit to policies for **collecting relevant race and ethnicity data in the future**, and measuring and monitoring equity-based community characteristics and changes in conditions relative to transportation. Data shows race-based income inequities, e.g. changes in median income, correlate with race. There is a need to collect important information to track performance through a social equity lens.
- The study report could emphasize changes in the racial and ethnic makeup in Washington County that have occurred over the past 20+ years.

### Discussion on Using Baseline Conditions

- Members suggested starting from a “baseline” condition to determine how impacts will be distributed in the future compared to how they are distributed today. The evaluation could **use current conditions as a baseline** to describe relative changes in the future. Distribution of transportation system impacts and benefits has not been equitable in the past. Members asked how the study will be able to gauge absolute impacts/ benefits and communicate outcomes that

are meaningful from an equity standpoint. For example, if the evaluation results show that two areas in Washington County each receive a 20% increase in transportation benefits, but 20% for one is from a much lower baseline, this is not truly an equitable result.

- The study should consider where different affected populations are starting from so that we don't advance future actions that perpetuate disparities between different groups. Members suggested that the Study consider even **qualitatively the benefits and impacts** to people with mobility issues and other disabilities given future demographic data limitations.
- Staff responded that the study is not set up to evaluate a current conditions scenario, but that the Study team will review the evaluation measures and look for areas that can help bridge the gap between existing and future conditions with each of the TIPs to study. We can consider current conditions for select measures. For example, the evaluation could use current data on race/ ethnicity, and consider factors such as barriers to transportation, and transit service coverage that we can compare to current conditions.

### Discussion on Mobility and Accessibility Evaluation Measures

- A member asked if the evaluation will be looking exclusively at proximity to transportation facilities, or the different ways that different people use the transportation system. For example, we know that **some population groups walk or use transit more** than other demographics. Staff responded that the evaluation can look at both proximity and available modes and use geospatial tools including isochrones to measure and show travel times using difference modes to and from key activity areas.
- Staff clarified that for the bicycle and pedestrian system along arterials and collectors, that currently the system is about 38 percent complete. The study evaluation assumes that that by 2040, to the system will be about 58 percent complete, and by 2055 it would be 100 percent complete for existing and planned facilities.

### Discussion on “Local Air Quality” Measure (Health Category)

- Members suggested conducting a **spacial analysis of current air quality conditions** and comparing this to future conditions.

### Discussion on Environmental Sustainability Category

- A member asked if the study will measure amounts of **impervious surface that contribute to storm water impacts** as well as “hot spot” heat island impacts. Staff replied that the study will consider this measure by estimating the quantity of new impervious surface and assessing the impact qualitatively.

### Other Comments

- Members expressed concern that the Study proposes to limit technical (modeling) evaluation to roads classified as collectors and higher, and not local streets. Group members raised concern

that **local system deficiencies can substantially affect health and equity**. The Study team will need to figure out how best to address this issue qualitatively.

- Staff from the Washington County Department of Health and Human Services reported that the County will conduct a **rapid (mini) Health Impact Assessment**. It will include an updated literature review, and apply an Integrated Transport and Health Impact Model (ITHIM). ITHIM estimates health impacts (and the monetized value of those impacts) of transportation scenarios through three indicators: (1) changes to physical activity rates, (2) changes to traffic-related injuries, and (3) changes to air quality. ITHIM takes measures and correlates to chronic disease and mortality. The HIA could highlight disparities in County currently and identify strategies to address them. The County is contracting someone to run the ITHIM model. The HIA will be folded into the health evaluation for the Study.
- A member asked how the evaluation will consider the **potential for gentrification** relative to the different investments. Staff replied that housing price is an indicator for gentrification, and that we may also consider changes in trip lengths for lower income households which could reflect displacement.
- There was discussion about **measuring and applying benefits in monetized terms**. For example, ITHIM provides monetized benefits and impacts. It is also possible to monetize the impact of improved health due to transportation investments. Staff replied that the Study is not developing recommendations, including a benefit/cost relation, and will instead be developing findings using “native measures” instead of monetized values.

## Next Steps

---

Chris Deffebach summarized the next steps. The Study team will provide notes back to this group, and go forward in the next few months to conduct the evaluation work, including modifying measures as appropriate based on the input received from the Health and Equity Workgroup. The next Workgroup meeting will be held in July or August with the purpose of that meeting to present and receive feedback on the evaluation findings before they are shared with the broader community through a public outreach process.

Chris thanked the group for participating and the meeting was adjourned.