To: Health and Equity Work Group

From: Scott Richman, David Evans and Associates

Date: August 24, 2015

Subject: **DRAFT Health and Social Equity Evaluation Measures**

The Washington County Transportation Futures Study (WCTFS) is evaluating the long term transportation strategies and investments needed to sustain the county's economic health and quality of life in coming decades. The study team is in the process of developing measures to evaluate these potential transportation investments that reflect values that are important to the community, such as safety, connectivity, and efficiency and reflect trade-offs among each of the values.

This memo presents draft measures that reflect the community values of Health and Social Equity. The study team is seeking input on these questions:

- Are these the right measures to evaluate trade-offs for health and equity or should the study consider other or different measures?
- What are the best methods to use for this evaluation, such as methods to define underrepresented populations, particularly given the long-term horizon for this study?

Input from the WCTFS Heath and Equity Work Group (HEWG) will inform the development of these measures and will be shared with the Study Advisory Committee (SAC).

Health and Social Equity Values

The WCTFS team developed the Community Values with input from SAC, HEWG other stakeholders and the general public.

The draft WCTFS Community Values for Health and Social Equity are:

- Health: Personal and community health and wellbeing.
- Social Equity: Equitable benefits for all groups [or populations] within the County, including those that have been historically underserved.

These values reflect comments from multiple stakeholders about the need to consider behavioral factors that can be influenced by safe and convenient access to active transportation and transit and environmental factors that are affected by clean air and water. The values also reflect the need to consider the unique needs and challenges of the most vulnerable groups including communities of color, people with low-income, people with disabilities, older adults, and children in both urban and rural

communities. A complete list of all ten community values is attached, reflecting the most recent comments from the SAC at their June 25th meeting. These values serve as guidance for the evaluation measures – some measures will address more than one value.

Challenges and the Transportation Investment Packages

Looking beyond the typical transportation planning period of 20-25 years – beyond the year 2040 in this case – creates a unique study opportunity and technical challenges for the evaluation process. Transportation projects will be designed at only an illustrative level—not site specific— and little will be known about where vulnerable populations will live or work in the future, making detailed assessment of direct impacts difficult. For this study, transportation projects will be combined into two investment packages and considered with two different forecasts of future population and employment growth and distribution.

The study team has begun to identify challenges that the county faces in providing accessible, affordable and available transportation. These challenges include:
- Deficiencies and major gaps in the network of safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle facilities that isolate some people and communities and limit their access to transit, jobs, education and essential services.
- Conditions that contribute to elevated levels of stress and anxiety which:
  - compromise wellbeing for people with limited travel route and mode options;
  - reduce livability of communities adversely affected by excessive cut-through traffic, congestion-induced pollution, noise, etc., and
  - increase traffic congestion which lead to travel delay and driver frustration.
- Limited transit service coverage (geographic areas and schedule), infrequent service, and inefficient transit travel (e.g. indirect routing, the need to transfer between buses) , and long travel times)to key destinations.
- Affordable, accessible, and efficient transportation options that allow people to meet their needs (i.e., housing, jobs, education, health), without spending disproportionately high amounts of time and money on transportation.

Draft Health and Equity Evaluation Measures

The WCTFS team has identified some possible Health and Equity focused evaluation measures listed below for the evaluation of the two sets of IPs. Each measure would be evaluated for vulnerable populations and for the general population in the county.

Evaluation will be applied to current and projected vulnerable population groups and compared to the total population to assess the distribution of positive and negative effects of the investment packages across all measures. Current underrepresented populations are defined as low-income households, older adults, children, communities of color, households with limited English proficiency, and people with disabilities. Identifying these populations in the future in detail will not be possible because the forecasting model does not predict race and ethnicity, English proficiency, or people with disabilities. The study team proposes using model forecasts, which provide a spatial distribution of housing, income and age characteristics to identify low-income households, older adults, and children. The table below lists proposed Health and Social Equity-oriented evaluation measures and metrics for low income and elderly populations (based on household-based demographic forecasts) compared to the average for the County.

Draft Health and Equity Measures	Metrics for low income and elderly populations compared to the average for all populations
Availability of: • Pedestrian and bicycling facilities • Transit services • Road access	• % coverage of bike/ped network • # households within ¼ mile of transit • network completeness
Accessibility of: • Pedestrian and bicycle facilities • Transit service • Road access	• Use of facilities for trips, by mode share • Travel times by mode to essential destinations (jobs, school, other) • #jobs within 90 minute transit trip time or 45 minute auto time for sample neighborhoods
Affordability of Transportation	• Combined housing and transportation costs • Household transportation costs for all modes
Availability of healthy travel options	• % or # of buffered or separated active transportation facilities and crossings that reduce crash risk • Potential for cut-through traffic on local roads due to congestion • Potential for high-stress conditions due to congestion and lack of travel options
Accessibility to healthy environment	• Changes in criteria pollutants, greenhouse gas emissions • Potential impacts to natural areas and open space