

Slide 1: Presentation Title: Briefing on Proposed Enhancements to the Title VI / Environmental Justice Analysis of the C L R P

Subtitle: Phase 1: "Communities of Concern" Methodology and Map

October 27, 2016

Slide 2: Purpose of Briefing

- Receive briefing on the methodology and provide feedback on resulting map of Phase 1: "Communities of Concern".
- A key enhancement of the EJ Analysis is the Identification of the "Communities
-

Slide 3: Structure of Presentation

- Review Title VI and EJ requirements for analysis of the CLRP
- Describe enhancements to the TPB's EJ Analysis
- Overview of Phase 1: Methodology and Map of "Communities of Concern"
 - Solicit Committee feedback
- Plans for Phase 2: Examine the CLRP for Disproportionate Impacts on "Communities of Concern"

Slide 4: Title VI and Environmental Justice

Figure with definitions for Title VI and Environmental Justice, with an arrow showing Environmental Justice is a related subset but a different regulation from Title VI.

- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination based on race, color, or national origin under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.
- Environmental Justice is from a 1994 Executive Order 12898 where recipients of Federal funds must identify and avoid disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority and low-income populations.

Slide 5: Purpose of Title VI / Environmental Justice Analysis

- Federal requirement is to examine the “benefits and burdens” of the Financially Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) for disproportionately high and adverse impacts on low-income and minority populations.
 - It must also ensure non-discrimination in all Metropolitan Planning Organization programs and activities.
 - Metropolitan Planning Organization decides how to perform the analysis.
- It is to also inform regional transportation decision making by identifying demographic trends and areas that may need special consideration

Slide 6: Demographic Profile of the Region

A chart presents the percent minority groups make up compared to the entire DC region.

Low-Income population: 14 percent
 African American: 26 percent
 Asian: 10 percent
 Latino or Hispanic: 15 percent
 American Indian or Alaskan Native: 0.2 percent
 Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander: 0.1 percent
 Other alone: 0.3 percent
 Two or more alone: 2.9 percent
 Limited English Proficiency: 11 percent
 People with Disabilities: 8 percent
 Older Adults: 11 percent

Low-income, African American, Asian, and Latino or Hispanic are the groups used to Communities of Concern

Slide 7: Enhancing the TPB Approach to Environmental Justice Analysis

- Previous approach identified transportation impacts at the regional level using a single measure. Specifically, accessibility to jobs.
- National scan of best practices among metropolitan planning organizations’ (MPOs) analyses found the TPB’s approach is typical and compliant but could be enhance and that many Metropolitan Planning Organizations identify Communities of Concern and use multiple transportation measures to examine impact of their Plan.

Slide 8: TPB’s Enhanced EJ Analysis: A Two-Phased Process

- Phase 1 is the Identification of “Communities of Concern”. A new approach for this analysis
 - TPB staff developed and test various methodologies
 - We are currently conducting briefings to and getting feedback from stakeholders.
 - The Transportation Planning Board will be briefed in November or December 2016
- Phase 2 is to examine the CLRP for disproportionate impacts on “Communities of Concern”. This phase includes additional measures from previous analyses. It will be conducted for the 2016 CLRP Amendment, and then for every major plan update (next one is the 2018 CLRP).
- Communities of Concern will be used in other TPB and COG planning activities, and can be tailored by local jurisdictions for their purposes.

Slide 9: What are Communities of Concern?

Small geographic areas that have significant concentrations of low-income or minority populations.

Areas identified using an index based on demographic data from the U.S. Census 2010-2014 American Community Survey at the tract-level.

Image on the right of the region with Communities of Concern highlighted in orange.

Slide 10: Scoring Example from Prince George’s County

A flow chart shows how tract-level population for the four groups (Low Income, African American, Asian, and Hispanic or Latino) go from numbers, to tract percent, to percent of region, then with an index applies, a total index score. Tracts with total index scores greater than three are considered Communities of Concern.

Slide 11: Proposed Communities of Concern

A map is presented that identifies Communities of Concern in orange. A link to the interactive map is here: <https://gis.mwcog.org/webmaps/tpb/clrp/ej/>

Maps and tables of the proposed “Communities of Concern” for each TPB member jurisdiction have been created to facilitate the Technical Committee’s review, and are

posted along with the regional maps and tables here:
http://old.mwcog.org/clrp/performance/EJ/EJ_CoC.asp

Slide 12: The “Communities of Concern” represent multiple Transportation-Disadvantaged Populations

A chart is presented with percent of region’s minority groups population in “Communities of Concern”. All exceed the regional average for these groups and many, including low-income, African American, Latino or Hispanic, Limited English Proficiency, and People with Disabilities, exceed the regional average by a large margin.

Slide 13: Phase 1: “Communities of Concern” Completion

- Phase 1 will be completed after TPB Committees have had the opportunity to provide feedback; and
- The TPB concurs with the “Communities of Concern”

Slide 14: Phase 2: Examine the CLRP for Disproportionate Impacts on “Communities of Concern”

- Compare forecast changes in accessibility and travel times for Communities of Concern versus the rest of the region
- Accessibility: Change in accessibility within 45 minutes by automobile and transit:
 - All Jobs
 - Retail Jobs
 - Educational Institutions
 - Hospitals
- Travel Time: Changes in average travel time to work by automobile and transit

A major caveat of this analysis is that the locations of population groups in the future are unknown and are assumed to be the same as today.

Slide 15: Phase 2: Examining the CLRP, Identification of Benefits and Burdens

Benefits are increases in accessibility to jobs, hospitals and educational institutions or decrease in travel time.

Burdens are decreases in accessibility to jobs, hospitals and educational institutions or increase in travel time

Analysis compares between 2016, 2040 (Plan Build) and 2040 (No Build) by Transit and Auto Within 45 Minutes.

Slide 16: Phase 2: Examining the CLRP, Distribution of Benefits and Burdens in the Region

The test is if the Benefits and Burdens are fairly distributed between "Communities of Concern" and the rest of the region? Analysis compares between 2016, 2040 (Plan Build) and 2040 (No Build) by Transit and Auto.

Slide 17: Next Steps

Phase 1: Identification of the "Communities of Concern". Currently ensuring comfort level among stakeholders and the presenting to TPB in November or December

Phase 2: Examine the 2016 CLRP Amendment for Disproportionate Impacts
In Late 2016 / Early 2017 staff will conduct the CLRP analysis.
In February / March 2017: Present results to Technical Committee and TPB

Slide 18: Questions or Comments

Slide 19: Contact Information

Wendy Klancher
TPB Principal Transportation Planner
(202) 962-3321
wklancher@mwkog.org

Sergio Ritacco
TPB Transportation Planner
(202) 962-3232
sritacco@mwkog.org

Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
777 North Capitol Street NE, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002