

## TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

**DATE:** July 13, 2022  
**TO:** City of Vancouver  
**FROM:** Ryan Farncomb  
**SUBJECT:** Revised Evaluation Framework  
**PROJECT NAME:** Fourth Plain and Ft. Vancouver Way Safety and Mobility Projects

This Evaluation Framework will be used to assess lane configuration/reconfiguration alternatives and other safety or mobility improvements to the Fourth Plain and Fort Vancouver Way corridors. This is an initial framework that will be reviewed with the public during the first phase of outreach and refined based on feedback. The corridor community will both (1) inform this framework and (2) provide input on the alternatives later in this process that directly informs the selection of the preferred alternatives. This initial framework is informed by the findings and goals from prior studies and plans, including the Transportation System Safety Analysis (TSSA), Fourth Plain Forward Pedestrian Safety and Access Implementation Strategy, the Fourth Plain Forward Action Plan, City’s Complete Streets Policy, and ongoing Vancouver Moves projects.

Finally, this framework will be used to evaluate alternatives for both the Fourth Plain and Fort Vancouver Way projects.

### Evaluation Framework

Criteria	Questions the team will ask	How will we measure it?
Mobility improvement for people walking, using a mobility device, bicycling, or using the bus	Does the alternative make it more comfortable and easier for people to walk, roll, bike, use a mobility device or use the bus?	Alternative applies known best practices for increasing comfort and mobility for people walking, using a mobility device, bicycling, or using the bus.
	Does the alternative avoid serious negative impacts to freight and personal vehicle travel in the corridor?	Alternative maintains or improves transit travel time reliability.
		Alternative would meet traffic mobility standards on Fourth Plain.  Alternative minimizes diversion to local streets or diversion is mitigatable.
Safety improvement for all users of the corridor, including people walking, using a mobility device, bicycling, driving, or using the bus	Does the alternative make it safer for people to walk, roll, bike, or use the bus?	Alternative provides greatest safety benefits (based on literature review and safety countermeasure performance) relative to implementation cost.
	Does the alternative make it safer for people driving?	Alternative would improve safety for people driving by applying known safety countermeasures.
Greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction benefits	Does the alternative support the City’s goals to reduce GHG emissions?	Degree to which alternative supports mode shift, based on results from regional travel model.

Criteria	Questions the team will ask	How will we measure it?
Equitable outcomes	Does the alternative provide benefits or mitigate burdens to equity populations (see below) specifically?	Direct benefit (reduced transportation costs) or reduced burden to identified equity populations living or working within the corridor (within ¼ mile of both streets).
Access to businesses, jobs, services, parks and recreation, and educational opportunities	Does the alternative increase access to essential places as identified in the City’s equity atlas? Does the alternative increase access to businesses for people walking, using a mobility device, riding a bike, or using the bus?	Degree to which alternative support increased access to businesses and services, based on improvements in transportation safety and comfort for all users in the corridor.

Based on the discussion in the *Fourth Plain Public Engagement Plan* and the *City’s Equity Index*, this evaluation framework defines equity populations as:

- People who have low-incomes
- People who belong to a racial or ethnic minority group
- Households that speak English less than “very well”, including Spanish, Chuukese, Vietnamese, and Russian speaking communities along the corridor
- People living with a disability, including those who use mobility devices and people with low vision and/or hearing
- Households without access to a personal vehicle, who depend on public transportation, walking, using a mobility device, or bicycling to meet their daily needs
- Households with children
- Other equity populations that have been historically underserved by transportation investments, including people of color, homeless and/or houseless individuals, youth (<18), older adults (65+), LGBTQ communities, refugees, persons who are unemployed or experiencing financial hardship, and people with limited access to economic opportunities (for reasons such as immigration status, educational attainment, disability, health limitations, or otherwise)
- People who rent their home