

ILMAPCO

2019 Transportation Justice & Title VI Report

Analysis Update & Findings

> **TJ Working Group** June 2019







Title VI and Environmental Justice Analysis

Low-income and racial/ethnic minorities

Introduction
Basic reporting requirements
Demographic profile
Public opinion survey
Spatial analysis
Public outreach
Key recommendations







Seniors, disabled, and zero-car households

Introduction
ADA self evaluation
Demographic profile
Spatial analysis
Key recommendations







Limited English proficiency/low literacy

o Introduction
o Demographic Profile
o Spatial analysis
o Public outreach
o Key recommendations





Title VI/EJ: Spatial Analysis





Concentrations of low-income and minority populations

 Used in WILMAPCO project prioritization processes
 Points for projects given, or taken

Historically, other spatial analyses



Microsoft





2012-2016 American Community Survey

Census block group level analysis

ID heaviest concentrations of EJ groups

Affordable housing data and elementary school demographic data to ID other areas







MODERATE – 5 paths

- 1. Poverty greater than the regional average, and
 - NH Blacks 3x the regional average, or
 - Hispanics 3x the regional average, or
 - NH Asians 3x the regional average
- 2. Racial/ethnic minorities 2x the regional average
- 3. Poverty 2x the regional average
- 4. Within elementary school feeder zone with the above demographic conditions (1, 2, or 3)
- 5. Affordable housing development w/25 -99 units

SIGNIFICANT - 5 paths

- 1. Poverty 2x greater than the regional average, and
 - NH Blacks 3x the regional average, or
 - Hispanics 3x the regional average, or
 - NH Asians 3x the regional average
- 2. Racial/ethnic minorities 90% or more the block group's population
- 3. Poverty 3x the regional average
- 4. Within elementary school feeder zone with the above demographic conditions (1, 2, or 3)
- 5. Affordable housing development w/> 99 units



METHOD – Affordable Housing Data

Delaware's 2016 Preservation Inventory (DSHA)

Point file to parcels

Total affordable units = Sum of "Subunits," "Non-LIHTC_Income Restricted" and "IncRestricted (tax credits)"

Preservation		× lenar
Name	Maryland Park	
Address	699 Robinson Lane	
City	Wilmington	Irown
ZIP	19,805.00	
County		1
Management	Westwood Properties, LP	H
TotalUnits	198.00	
POP	Family	
SubUnits	72.00	
Non_LIHTC		
LIHTC_Unit	126.00	
Unrestrict	0.00	Jonnesteen
⊕,		





METHOD - Affordable Housing Data

Housing Search: Cecil MD

Maryland Housing Search

www.socialserve.com

Built upon old subsidized property file

IDed accepted rental voucher or income based rent developments

Created parcel file

Populated units from development websites or analysis of external housing unit files/air photos

using search. cech, MD	Choose a different a
Basic <u>Advanced</u> S	ccessible
General Search Information	
Do you have a Housing Choice Vouc	Cher or other rental
assistance? [?]	
Bedroom[s]	0+ 🔻
Bath	Any 🔻
Rent range	\$0 ▼ to \$1,200 ▼ a month
Optional Filters	
Wait Listed Properties	💿 Display 🔿 Hide
Senior/Disability Housing	Include in Results
ZIP Code[s]	List relevant ZIP codes
Public Transit	Not Applicable
Smoking Policy [?]	Any
Landlord Speaks	English 🔻
Shov	w me 10 🔻 Properties per Page
CLIC	CK HERE TO SEARCH



MODERATE EJ AREA

Census defined or Affordable developments w/25 – 99 units

SIGNIFICANT EJ AREA

Census defined or Affordable developments w/>99 units





Race/ethnicity and income

Grade 3 school feeder zones vs. IDed EJ areas

Flag feeder zones w/high minority or low-income NOT covered by IDed EJ areas Image: Construction

Consider these zones for EJ classification





Step 1 Gilpin Manor EJ Area ID



DEMOGRAPHICS

25% Black6% Hispanic1% Asian21% 2 or more races

Cecil County Feeder Boundaries www.schooldigger.com

81% Free/reduced lunch



Refined Gilpin Manor's Feeder Boundaries www.maryland.hometownlocator.com

Step 2 Gilpin Manor EJ Area ID



Step 3 Gilpin Manor EJ Area ID

Gilpin Manor Feeder Zone

VS.

Census Block Group Poverty





Step 4 Gilpin Manor EJ Area ID



Step 4 Gilpin Manor EJ Area ID

Delineated high poverty area within the feeder zone



Step 5 Gilpin Manor EJ Area ID

Trimmed non-residential away from the high poverty area to form a new moderate EJ area





Transportation Equity Concerns, to date

	Poverty/low-income	Blacks	Hispanics
Transportation Access (in General)	yes	yes	
Neighborhood Transportation/Housing Cos	sts yes		
Travel Time from Neighborhoods			
Travel Time on Public Transit (in General)		yes	
Traffic Volumes	yes	yes	yes
All Vehicle Crashes			
Pedestrian and Bike Crashes		yes	
Bike Level of Traffic Stress			
Public Electric Vehicle Stations	yes	yes	yes
Community Transportation Project Funding	I	yes	
- WILMAPCO Community Planning			
Knowledge of WILMAPCO	yes	yes	yes













TJ Analysis: Location Efficiency

Affordable neighborhoods by concentration



T+H Affordability within Areas of Concentration 2012-2016

Percentage of affordable neighborhoods (block groups) within areas of concentration.

Affordable is defined as having combined transportation and housing costs less than 48% of household expenses for a household earning 80% of median regional income.

Considered racial and ethnic and low income concentrations to be block groups with double or more the regional average for that population, or >90% for whites

2012 - 2016 ACS



T+H COST AFFORDABILITY FOR LOWER INCOME HH WITHIN POVERTY CONCENTRATIONS

6% of high poverty neighborhoods have affordable transportation costs

58% of high poverty neighborhoods have affordable housing costs

 $\frac{1}{4}$ of high poverty

neighborhoods have equal or higher transportation costs than housing costs





It's really hard to save for your bills, take care of the home, and go to work.

[I may be able to] pay for my child's medicine this month, but I also need car insurance, gas, and rent all in the same week. And it doesn't add up.





TJ Analysis: Travel Time to Work

Driving Alone to Work >30 minutes



Travel Time Equity within Areas of Concentration 2012-2016

Travel times greater than 30 minutes within areas of racial/ethnic and low income population concentrations.

Considered racial and ethnic and low income concentrations to be block groups with double or more the regional average for that population, or >90% for whites

■ 2012 - 2016 ACS



TJ Analysis: Travel Time to Work

Taking Transit to Work >30 minutes



Travel Time Equity within Areas of Concentration 2012-2016

Travel times greater than 30 minutes within areas of racial/ethnic and low income population concentrations.

Considered racial and ethnic and low income concentrations to be block groups with double or more the regional average for that population, or >90% for whites

2012 - 2016 ACS



TJ Analysis: Travel Time to Work

Average Commute to Work in minutes



Average Commute Time WILMAPCO Region 2012-2016

Only commutes to work considered

2012 - 2016 ACS


TJ Analysis: Travel Time to Work

Commuter Demographic Composition



Commuter Demographics WILMAPCO Region 2012-2016

Demographic/socio-economic composition of commuters using each mode

2012 - 2016 ACS





Median Traffic Levels by neighborhood



Traffic Level Equity WILMAPCO Region

Median AADT of roadway segments within group concentrations vs. regional median

Figures rounded to hundreds

2012 – 2016 ACS; DelDOT; MDOT





Crashes in TJ group concentration vs. total population within those concentrations

Expressway crashes excluded
Year 2016 data
Total crashes, pedestrian, and bicycle



Photo: Denis Hehman







All Crash Equity within Areas of Concentration in 2016

Deviation from "expected" crash levels. Total crashes compared to the total population within the concentrations.

Expressway crashes excluded

Considered racial and ethnic and low income concentrations to be block groups with double or more the regional average for that population, or >90% for whites

2016 data from DelDOT and MDOT; 2012 – 2016 ACS



TJ Analysis: Pedestrian Crash Equity



Pedestrian Crash Equity within Areas of Concentration in 2016

Deviation from "expected" crash levels. Total crashes compared to the total population within the concentrations.

Expressway crashes excluded

Considered racial and ethnic and low income concentrations to be block groups with double or more the regional average for that population, or >90% for whites

2016 data from DelDOT and MDOT; 2012 – 2016 ACS





TJ Analysis: Bicycle Crash Equity



Bicycle Crash Equity within Areas of Concentration in 2016

Deviation from "expected" crash levels. Total crashes compared to the total population within the concentrations.

Expressway crashes excluded

Considered racial and ethnic and low income concentrations to be block groups with double or more the regional average for that population, or >90% for whites

2016 data from DelDOT and MDOT; 2012 – 2016 ACS





Pedestrian/Bike Crashes within in Black Concentrations in 2016

142 pedestrian crashes - 51% of all NCC ped crashes

19 bicycle crashes - 41% of all NCC bike crashes

16% - NCC's population within black concentrations



Photo: Delaware Free News









TJ Analysis: Bicycle LTS Equity



Bicycle LTS Equity within Areas of Concentration in 2019

 Percentage of roads within areas of concentration with low levels of traffic stress (LTS)

Delaware = LTS 1 and 2

Maryland = Level of Traffic Comfort 1 and 2

Sources: DelDOT and MDOT



TJ Analysis: EV Station Location Equity

Equitable distribution of public electric vehicle (EV) charging stations

21 regionally as of 2019

ТАА

Tag census block groups with EV stations

Calculate racial/ethnic and poverty makeup of those places vs. regional average







TJ Analysis: EV Station Location Equity



EV Station Location Equity in 2019

Deviation from "expected" levels. The total racial/ethnic and low income populations with block groups with EV charging stations compared to the regional averages for those populations.

2019 data from Alternative Fuels Data Center; 2012 – 2016 ACS





TJ Analysis: EV Station Location Equity

Count of EV Station Locations



EV Station Location Equity within Areas of Concentration 2019

Tally of EV station locations within areas of racial/ethnic and low income population concentrations.

Considered racial and ethnic and low income concentrations to be block groups with double or more the regional average for that population, or >90% for whites

2019 data from Alternative Fuels Data Center;
 2012 - 2016 ACS







TIP Project Funding Equity within Areas of Concentration 2002 - 2018

Deviation from "expected" funding levels. Project funding received compared to the total population with the concentrations.

 Summed TIP Spending on "community projects" from years 2002, 2006, 2010, 2014, and 2018.
 Compared to total mappable TIP spend.

Considered racial and ethnic and low income concentrations to be block groups with double or more the regional average for that population, or >90% for whites

Census data: 2000 Census, 2006 - 2010 ACS, 2012 - 2016 ACS



Title VI/EJ: Spatial Analysis recommendations – page 73



Title VI/EJ: Engagement





WILMAPCO has a strong outreach program

Specific outreach to low-income/minorities since 2008

Some success in implementation... But not enough to end disparities

Revamp recommendations for 2019



Newsletter Subscribers



TJ Analysis: Public Opinion Survey

Public Opinion Survey

Low-income and black residents

- * more transportation difficulties
- * less familiarity with WILMAPCO







Title VI/EJ: Public Engagement

LITERATURE REVIEW



OUR EXPERIENCES





Title VI/EJ: Engagement recommendations – page 99

Mobility Challenged Analysis





Seniors, disabled, and zero-car households

Introduction
ADA self evaluation
Demographic profile
Spatial analysis
Key recommendations







Unable to travel due to lack of transportation in the past 6 months New Castle County







Physical access barriers are limited

Agency policies generally meet ADA guidelines

Communication of policies needs improvement

Front line communications should consider needs of people with disabilities







Use latest available data: 2012-2016 American Community Survey

Census block group level analysis

Tweak methodology

- High percentages of groups only (not in combination) become at least a moderate area
- Very high percentage of households without vehicles needed to become significant area







MODERATE – 4 paths

- 1. Households without vehicles greater than 2x the regional average, and
 - Disabled greater than the regional average, or
 - Seniors greater the regional average, or
- 2. Households without vehicles greater than 3x the regional average
- 3. Disabled greater than 3x the regional average
- 4. Seniors greater than 3x the regional average

SIGNIFICANT

- 1. Households without vehicles greater than 3x the regional average, and
 - Disabled greater than the regional average, or
 - Seniors greater than the regional average, or







Age-restricted Community Connectivity Analysis (ARCCA)

Developed in 2011 and further refined by WILMAPCO/Bucknell Univ.

How connected (or not) are suburban age-restricted communities to the fixed route bus system and pedestrian system?







ARCCA Analysis – Pedestrian

Unlikely/difficult

 There are no sidewalks, trails or paths surrounding the community, and connections to public uses/other networks exist beyond one mile

Long-term improvement

 The sidewalks, trails or paths surrounding the community are not connected, or do not exist, but connections to public uses/other networks exist between a quarter mile to one mile

Short-term improvement

 The sidewalks, trails or paths surrounding the community are not fully connected, but connections to public uses/other networks exist within a quarter mile

Connection exists

 The sidewalks, trails, or paths have connections are clearly defined from the community to public uses/other networks within a quarter mile





ARCCA Analysis – Pedestrian

Cecil County

New Castle County











Community Amenities

- 24-Hour Locked Main Entrance with Intercom
- 24-Hour Emergency Maintenance
- Resident Coffee & Cookie Bar
- Business Center with Fax & Scanner
- Luxury Corporate Furnished Apartments Available
- Comcast High Speed Internet Wired
- Beautiful Stone Buildings Built on Former Orchard Farm
- Exclusive 52 unit property with Ample Lighted Parking
- Walking Distance to Becks Pond, Shopping & Bus Route

Unit Amenities

- Full size Washer & Dryer in Every Apartment
- Open Kitchen Design with Breakfast Bar
- Natural European Wood Cabinets
- Modern Kitchens with Built-in Microwaves
- 18 cu FT Refrigerator with Auto Ice Maker
- Energy Efficient Electric Heat Pump
- Central Air-conditioning
- Spacious Over-Sized Walk-In Closets
- Two Panel Doors
- Enerav Efficient Thermopane Windows & Doors





ARCCA Analysis – Public Transit



with a stop or hub





ARCCA Analysis – Public Transit

Cecil County



New Castle County






Connectivity Analysis







Extended analysis: all regional block groups to destinations (calculated at housing unit level) by mode

Block groups with TJ and MC and other variables flagged for analysis

Rich regional AND equity based analyses



Air photo: Microsoft









. J₉









10 minute accessible walking trip
10 minute accessible biking trip

15 minute accessible car trip

30 minute accessible, one-way bus trip (including no more than 10 mins walking, total)



















22% of houses connected to a library by walking







100% of houses connected to one or more library by walking





FINAL PRODUCT Percent of housing units accessible to one or more libraries by walking, by block group

85%	25%	0%
100%	0%	5%





Homes with Connections to Supermarkets WILMAPCO Region

	Ê		98%
14%	28%	24%	
Walking	Biking	Transit	Car





New Castle Co. 20%

Cecil Co. 2%

Region 17%





六	Supermarket	Pharmacy	Hospital	Library	Low-Wage Emp. Center	Medical Center	Community Center	Senior Center	State Service Center
Regional Average	14%	17%	1%	5%	3%	6%	8%	8%	2%
NEIGHBORHOODS	5								
Black	40%	40%	5%	22%	5%	16%	27%	28%	11%
Hispanic	30%	28%	5%	11%	4%	12%	19%	17%	2%
Poverty	44%	43%	4%	23%	11%	19%	28%	27%	8%





Л	E Supermarket	Pharmacy	Hospital	Library	Low-Wage Emp. Center	Medical Center	Community Center	Senior Center	State Service Center
Regional Average	14%	17%	1%	5%	3%	6%	8%	8%	2%
NEIGHBORHOODS									
Seniors	8%	19%	3%	7%	1%	2%	3%	9%	0%
Disabled	4%	22%	0%	36%	0%	46%	63%	25%	46%
Zero-car HH	38%	47%	8%	20%	7%	18%	28%	35%	12%





New Castle Co. 25%

Cecil Co. 7%

Region 23%





	E Supermarket	Pharmacy	Hospital	Library	Low-Wage Emp. Center	Medical Center	Community Center	Senior Center	State Service Center
Regional Average	28%	39%	12%	23%	17%	24%	25%	28%	15%
NEIGHBORHOODS									
Black	60%	71%	42%	63%	40%	60%	57%	63%	50%
Hispanic	34%	60%	22%	35%	31%	27%	33%	41%	22%
Poverty	61%	64%	53%	57%	50%	50%	60%	65%	54%





	E Supermarket	Pharmacy	Hospital	Library	Low-Wage Emp. Center	Vo Medical Center	Community Center	Senior Center	State Service Center
Regional Average	28%	39%	12%	23%	17%	24%	25%	28%	15%
NEIGHBORHOODS									
Seniors	31%	47%	14%	20%	20%	30%	21%	30%	14%
Disabled	2%	100%	22%	100%	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Zero-car HH	48%	70%	43%	56%	47%	51%	56%	64%	47%





New Castle Co. 99%

Cecil Co.

Region 95%





	E Supermarket	Pharmacy	Hospital	Library	Low-Wage Emp. Center	Medical Center	Community Center	Senior Center	State Service Center
Regional Average	98%	97%	92%	99%	92%	95%	97%	94%	92%
NEIGHBORHOODS									
Black	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%	99%
Hispanic	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Poverty	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%





	E Supermarket	Pharmacy	Hospital	Library	Low-Wage Emp. Center	Medical Center	Community Center	Senior Center	State Service Center
Regional Average	98%	97%	92%	99%	92%	95%	97%	94%	92%
NEIGHBORHOODS									
Seniors	99%	99%	97%	99%	98%	96%	99%	99%	97%
Disabled	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Zero-car HH	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%





New Castle Co. 26%

Cecil Co.

Region 24%





	E Supermarket	Pharmacy	Hospital	Library	Low-Wage Emp. Center	Medical Center	Community Center	Senior Center	State Service Center
Regional Average	24%	35%	8%	18%	19%	20%	18%	18%	10%
NEIGHBORHOODS									
Black	47%	69%	16%	44%	39%	37%	46%	41%	25%
Hispanic	42%	54%	17%	29%	32%	30%	37%	32%	15%
Poverty	61%	71%	28%	58%	56%	52%	61%	62%	34%









	Ĩ.					Ug	ŕŇ	1	
	Supermarket	Pharmacy	Hospital	Library	Low-Wage Emp. Center	Medical Center	Community Center	Senior Center	State Service Center
Seniors	🖈 🏎		_	ోం	ጵ 📟	🖈 🏎	🛧 🖧 🏎	_	* 5 0
Disabled	ጵ 🖧 🏎		ጵ 🏎	_	ጵ 🐔 🏎	_	_	_	_
Zero-car Households	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_





Identify food deserts, regionally

Enhance USDA methodology, including use of connectivity data

Allow for more targeted policy/intervention







WILMAPCO Food Deserts

Method

Block groups with >20% poverty where >=33% of the population are >=1 mile from a supermarket

Only residential areas shown

Classed by housing unit transit connectivity to supermarket





Wrap up and insert connectivity analysis

Finalize recommendations

MC personal story

Executive summary and front matter

Projected Council endorsement in Nov. 2019







45-minute transit trip to supermarket

10-minute walk access to a low-wage center





Ô).

0



TJ Analysis: TIP Project Equity

Project spending within TJ group concentrations vs. total population of that concentration

Poverty, blacks, Hispanics, Asians

Whites added for comparison

Concentration = >2x the regional %
 For whites, >90%





TJ Analysis: TIP Project Equity

Only "community TIP projects" counted

- Excluded: Expressways, Railways
- Grouped bridge projects assumed equal funding

 Wilmington Riverfront projects not counted as "minority" or "low income"
 Shares block groups w/distressed neighborhoods

Versus total TIP funding in equity analysis









TIP Project Funding Equity within Black Concentrations

"Expected Funding Level" = total population within the black concentrations







TIP Project Funding Equity within Areas of Concentration 2002 - 2018

Deviation from "expected" funding levels. Project funding received compared to the total population with the concentrations.

 Summed TIP Spending on "community projects" from years 2002, 2006, 2010, 2014, and 2018.
 Compared to total mappable TIP spend.

Considered racial and ethnic and low income concentrations to be block groups with double or more the regional average for that population, or >90% for whites

Census data: 2000 Census, 2006 - 2010 ACS, 2012 - 2016 ACS



TJ Analysis: UPWP Planning Equity

Equitable distribution of Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) plans

- List of plans undertaken by WILMAPCO
- Considered years 1999 to 2019

╷╷╷

Excluded regional level projects

Tag census block groups with UPWP projects

Calculate racial/ethnic and poverty makeup of those places vs. regional average A Plan for Walking and Bicycling in the Town of Perryville

PERRYVILLE GREENWAY PLAN



Developed by WILMAPCO In partnership with The Town of Perrynile, Maryland Cecil County With technical assistance from Design Collective Approved 3.8.2012

WWW.WILMAPCO.ORG/PERRYVILLE



TJ Analysis: UPWP Plans Equity



Transportation Planning Equity 1999 - 2019

Deviation from "expected" planning levels. The total racial/ethnic and low income populations within block groups with UPWP projects compared to the regional averages for those populations.

Census data: 2000 Census, 2006 - 2010
 ACS, 2012 - 2016 ACS





15 plans within black concentrations
1999 - 2019
9 plans (60%) in 2013 or after





ASPIRATION (UNFUNDED) PROJECTS W/IN BLACK AREAS

17 total projects

10 Median tech score for these projects & all RTP constrained list projects

5 unfunded projects in black concentrations score >10