Appendix Q: Regional Project Distribution / Title VI Equity Analysis

As a recipient of federal funds the Southeastern Regional Planning and Economic Development District (SRPEDD), acting as staff to the Southeastern Massachusetts Metropolitan Planning Organization (SMMPO) complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Acts of 1964. Title VI prohibits discrimination based upon race, color and national origin. Additional federal nondiscrimination laws prohibit discrimination on the basis of age, sex and disability.

The SMMPO is equally committed to complying with federal Executive Order 12898, entitled “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations.” In this capacity, the SMMPO identifies and addresses disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income (poverty) populations. The SMMPO carries out this responsibility by involving minority and low-income individuals in the transportation process and considering their transportation needs in the development and review of the SMMPO’s transportation plans, programs and projects.

SRPEDD routinely maps minority, low-income (below poverty level) and LEP populations / areas for our Transportation Evaluation Criteria, for public outreach purposes, for the Title VI submissions of our regional transit agencies, for transit route equity analyses and evaluations, and for other general planning purposes. As part of the requirements for the TIP we have extended these efforts into a regional project distribution / Title VI equity analyses.

Methodology

This Equity Analyses is based on projects that were programmed with regional target funds in the TIP over the 5-year ‘look-back’ period (FFY2015-2019) in our region. SRPEDD defines a Title VI/EJ community and Title VI/EJ Census tracts as such if they are greater than the regional average for minority, low income (poverty), and Limited English Proficiency (LEP).

Minority is defined as those persons who identify as other than white in the 2010 Census and this includes Hispanics. This population is protected under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. Limited English Proficient (LEP) refers to any person age 5 and older who reported speaking English less than 'very well' in the 2010 Census. The Census Bureau uses a set of dollar value thresholds that vary by family size and composition to determine who is in low income (poverty). LEP and low-income populations are ensured participation and consideration of their transportation needs with Federal Executive Order 12898, otherwise known as Environmental Justice (EJ). For minority populations the regional average was 10.98% and for
LEP populations the regional average was 7.4%. The low-income (or percent below the poverty level) was 12.13%.

Minority, low-income (or below poverty level) and LEP areas were mapped for each of the 27 communities in the SRPEDD region, with low-income (or below poverty level) and LEP using 2010-2014 ACS data, and minority using 2010 Census data with the intent to determine the level of project distribution equity in areas designated as Title VI/EJ and in non-Title VI/EJ areas in our region. We mapped the geographical distribution of the FFY2015-2019 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) projects and compared the number of projects in identified Title VI and EJ census tracts versus the number in non-Title VI and EJ census tracts.

If a project was located directly adjacent to one of the areas designated as low-income (poverty), minority or LEP or if that project directly connected and/or served the designated area, we included the project as falling within one of these areas. Out of the 15 total projects in the look-back period, there were 10 projects in the FFY2015-19 TIP that were located within or directly adjacent to these designated areas. (Please see map entitled 2015-2019 TIP Project Locations and Title VI / Environmental Justice.)

We also determined the number of projects in a community, the total dollar amount of funding per community, per capita and the population density per community to analyze the distribution of TIP projects and funding in our region. (Population density is population per square mile and was included as an element of this analytical process for the first time.) Both data sheets and mapping of project data was utilized.

Regardless of the results of this analysis, there are a number of factors that would affect some communities having a disparate number of projects or funding compared to other communities in this region. Although the SMMPO (SRPEDD) offers a myriad of services and technical assistance to all 27 communities in the region on request, including intersection analysis, signal warrants analysis, safety and congestion studies for intersections and corridors, as well as road safety audits, including the accompanying public outreach efforts, some communities simply do not take advantage of this, whether by indifference or by design.

Some communities have expressed concern regarding the length of the TIP process, as well as their own unwillingness to be held to MassDOT’s stricter design standards that now include Complete Streets and significantly raise the scope and the cost of a project. Those communities not seeking this assistance will not benefit in the number of projects and amount of funding to the same extent that communities in this region that are proactive.
Results

The total number of TIP projects programmed in the look-back FFY2015-2019 TIP, total 15 in 9 communities. The analysis identified 18 communities out of the 27 in the SRPEDD region with no projects over the 5-year look-back period. However, 8 of these 18 communities (Attleboro, Dighton, Lakeville, Mansfield, Mattapoiset, Raynham and Rehoboth and Swansea) have projects programmed in the existing FFY2020-2024 TIP. Nine of the remaining 10 communities (Acushnet, Berkley, Carver, Fairhaven, Fall River, Freetown, Marion, Rochester, Somerset) have had no recent or future projects in the TIP. The remaining community on the list, Plainville, had a project listed in our TIP that is now being funded with statewide funds.

Anecdotal observations are that the 9 remaining communities (Acushnet, Berkley, Carver, Fairhaven, Fall River, Freetown, Marion, Rochester, Somerset) with no recent or future projects are absent from the process due to varying reasons. Fall River has recently experienced turnover on their staff, however, that community is actively working with SRPEDD on the identification and development of projects to be funded through the TIP process. Fairhaven has experienced both turnover and unfilled vacancies to their staff and prior to this were active participants in the JTPG and the TIP process. The remaining communities make little or no effort to attend Joint Transportation Planning Group (JTPG) meetings or to take advantage of the array of services and technical assistance offered by the staff of the SMMPO.

Of the 9 communities with TIP projects in the look-back period of FFY2015-2019 TIP, there were 5 communities with 1 project in the TIP. These communities were, Middleborough, Norton, Seekonk, Taunton and Wareham. There were 3 communities, North Attleborough, Dartmouth, and Westport, with 2 projects each, and the city of New Bedford had 4 projects in the look-back period. (Please see maps entitled Number of 2015-2019 Projects by Municipality and Number of 2015-2019 TIP Projects and Title VI / Environmental Justice.)

The location of each TIP project was mapped and overlaid with the areas that met the criteria previously discussed and designated as low-income (poverty), minority and LEP areas. As far as the geographical distribution of projects, out of the 15 total projects in the region over the 5-year look-back period, 10 projects fell within, directly connected or served areas designated as meeting the criteria for low-income (poverty), minority or LEP populations. (See map entitled 2015-2019 Project Locations and Title VI & Environmental Justice (Numbered) & the table entitled 2015-2019 TIP Projects.)

Five of the SRPEDD communities met the criteria to be designated as Minority Municipalities. These communities are Attleboro, Fall River, New Bedford, Taunton and Wareham. (See map entitled Minority Municipalities.) Attleboro and Fall River had 0 projects in this ‘look-back’
period, both Taunton and Wareham had 1 project each, and New Bedford had 4 projects in the FFY2015-2019 TIP.

The median per capita spending for the 9 communities with projects programmed in the FFY2015-2019 TIP was $181. Two of minority communities, Attleboro and Fall River had no projects in the look-back period, leaving 3 that did. Taunton ($78) is below the median per capita spending but New Bedford ($247) is above the median for per capita spending. Wareham ($846) is well above the median due to a large scale project at $18.4 million. (See map entitled 2015-2019 Project Expenditures per Capita in Minority Municipalities.)

Once again, the median per capita spending for the 9 communities with projects programmed in the FFY2015-2019 TIP was $181. Among those communities per capita spending ranged from a low of $55 in Middleborough to a high of $846 in Wareham. (See map entitled 2015-2019 Project Expenditures and the Table within the map entitled Municipality Per Capita.)

Total project expenditures were calculated and mapped by community and per capita for minority municipalities, LEP and low-income (poverty) areas. (See maps entitled Minority Municipalities; 2015-2019 Project Expenditures Per Capita with Title VI and Environmental Justice; & 2015-2019 Project Expenditures with LEP.)

We determined the average population density for the region using the same method used to calculate LEP, minority, and low-income and simply established an average for the region. We took the total population for the SMMPO region and divided it by the total square miles of the region. The average population density for the SMMPO region is 766. (See map entitled 2015-2019 Population Density with Total Cost of Projects per Municipality.)

Eight of the 27 SMMPO communities have population densities higher than the regional average. These are Attleboro, Fairhaven, Fall River, Mansfield, New Bedford, North Attleborough, Somerset and Taunton. Three of the 9 communities that had projects in the FFY2015-2019 TIP have population densities above the regional average; they are Taunton, North Attleborough and New Bedford. New Bedford is the most population dense community in the region and they also have the most projects in number and in dollar amount. Six out of the 9 projects in this TIP are located in communities with population densities above the regional average.

Of the 18 communities with no projects in the TIP during FFY2015-2019, 13 did not meet any of the criteria for minority, poverty or LEP. Of the remaining 5 communities, Acushnet, Attleboro, Fairhaven, Fall River and Mansfield, only two communities, Attleboro and Mansfield, have future projects programmed in the existing FFY2020-2024 TIP, leaving only 3 communities that meet these criteria, Acushnet and Fairhaven and Fall River, with no future projects in the existing FFY2020-2024 TIP. Of these three communities, Fairhaven has been an active
participant in the JTPG until recent staff vacancies in the community. Fall River had recently experienced turnover on their staff, however, their new staff is actively working with SRPEDD on the identification and development of projects to be funded through the TIP process. That leaves Acushnet as the lone community with criteria for minority, poverty or LEP that has had limited or no presence at Joint Transportation Planning Group (JTPG) meetings or with the TIP process.

Out of the 27 SMMPO communities during the look-back period FFY2015-2019, a total of 15 did not meet the criteria for Title VI or EJ populations, leaving 12 communities that did meet that criteria. (See map entitled Number of 2015-2019 TIP Projects and Title VI & Environmental Justice.)

Our results show that 13 out of the 15 projects in the look-back FFY2015-2019 TIP fall within a community that meets the criteria for Title VI or EJ populations, which is nearly 87% of the projects, while 10 out of the 15 projects, which is nearly 67%, fell directly within minority, low-income (poverty) and LEP areas.
2015-2019 TIP Project Locations and Title VI / Environmental Justice

Title VI / EJ Criteria
- Low Income
- Minority
- Low Income & Minority
- Limited English Proficiency

SRPEDD Definitions:
- Low Income: Census tracts that are greater than SRPEDD’s low income regional average of 12.13%
- Minority: Census tracts that are greater than SRPEDD’s minority regional average of 10.98%
- Limited English Proficiency: Census tracts that are greater than SRPEDD’s LEP regional average of 7.40%

Data Sources:
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Number of 2015-2019 TIP Projects by Municipality

Number of Projects

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 4

Data Sources:
SRPEDD, MassGIS, MassDOT
Number of 2015-2019 TIP Projects and Title VI / Environmental Justice

Title VI / EJ Criteria
- Low Income
- Minority
- Low Income & Minority
- Limited English Proficiency

Number of Projects
- 1
- 2
- 4

SRPEDD Definitions:
- Low Income:
  Census tracts that are greater than SRPEDD’s low income regional average of 12.13%
- Minority:
  Census tracts that are greater than SRPEDD’s minority regional average of 10.98%.
- Limited English Proficiency:
  Census tracts that are greater than SRPEDD’s LEP regional average of 7.40%

Data Sources:
2015-2019 TIP Project Locations and Title VI / Environmental Justice (Numbered)

Title VI / EJ Criteria
- Low Income
- Minority
- Low Income & Minority
- Limited English Proficiency

SRPEDD Definitions:
- Low Income: Census tracts that are greater than SRPEDD’s low income regional average of 12.13%
- Minority: Census tracts that are greater than SRPEDD’s minority regional average of 10.98%
- Limited English Proficiency: Census tracts that are greater than SRPEDD’s LEP regional average of 7.40%

Data Sources:
## FFY2015-2019 TIP Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project #</th>
<th>Title VI?</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DARTMOUTH - GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC HIGHWAY (U.S. ROUTE 6) AND FAUNCE CORNER ROAD IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>$3,747,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>NORTH ATTLEBOROUGH - TRAFFIC SIGNAL AND INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS AT EAST WASHINGTON STREET (ROUTE 1), SOUTH WASHINGTON STREET AND HOPPIN HILL ROAD (ROUTE 120)</td>
<td>$2,308,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>TAUNTON - COUNTY STREET (ROUTE 140), FROM THE ROUTE 24 (SB OFF-RAMP) NORTHERLY TO MOZZONE BOULEVARD RECONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>$4,350,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NEW BEDFORD- CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS AND RELATED WORK ON COGGESHAL STREET, FROM PURCHASE STREET TO MITCHELL AVENUE</td>
<td>$5,357,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NEW BEDFORD- RECONSTRUCTION OF ROUTE 18 (JFK HIGHWAY), FROM COVE STREET TO GRIFIN COURT (PHASE II)</td>
<td>$7,964,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>MIDDLEBOROUGH - INTERIM IMPROVEMENTS AT ROUTES 18/28/44 (ROTARY)</td>
<td>$1,268,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NEW BEDFORD- PARK AND RIDE IMPROVEMENTS INCLUDING A NEW BUS SHELTER REPLACEMENT AT THE MOUNT PLEASANT STREET PARK AND RIDE</td>
<td>$435,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NORTH ATTLEBOROUGH - TRAFFIC SIGNAL AND INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS @ EAST WASHINGTON STREET (ROUTE 1) &amp; CHESTNUT STREET</td>
<td>$1,607,851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>WESTPORT - RESURFACING AND RELATED WORK ALONG ROUTE 88 FROM MILE MARKER 0.0 (BEGINNING OF STATE HIGHWAY) NORTHERLY TO MILE MARKER 1.2, JUST NORTH OF DRIFT ROAD</td>
<td>$5,040,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>WESTPORT- RESURFACING AND RELATED WORK ON ROUTE 88 FROM MILE MARKER 1.2 (JUST NORTH OF DRIFT ROAD) NORTHERLY TO MILE MARKER 7.5, JUST SOUTH OF OLD COUNTY ROAD</td>
<td>$5,627,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>DARTMOUTH- INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS &amp; RELATED WORK AT CHASE ROAD &amp; OLD WESTPORT ROAD</td>
<td>$1,045,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>WAREHAM- RECONSTRUCTION OF ROUTE 6 &amp; 28, FROM 500 FT. EAST OF TYLER AVENUE TO RED BROOK ROAD (1.65 MILES)</td>
<td>$18,454,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>NORTON- CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS &amp; RELATED WORK ON EAST MAIN STREET (ROUTE 123), FROM PINE STREET TO I-495</td>
<td>$8,364,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NEW BEDFORD- CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS AND RELATED WORK ON KINGS HIGHWAY, FROM CHURCH STREET TO THE KINGS HIGHWAY BRIDGE (N-06-036) OVER ROUTE 140</td>
<td>$9,445,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>SEEKONK- INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS &amp; RELATED WORK AT FALL RIVER AVENUE (ROUTE 114A) AND COUNTY STREET</td>
<td>$2,998,460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Cost:** $78,016,776
2015-2019 Project Expenditures Per Capita in Minority Municipalities

Minority Municipality:
Municipality whose total minority population is greater than SRPEDD’s minority regional average of 10.98%.

Data Sources:
2015-2019 Project Expenditures Per Capita

Project Spending Per Capita
- No Projects
- $0 - $300
- $300 - $600
- $600 or more

Data Sources:
SRPEDD, MassGIS, MassDOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middleborough</td>
<td>$55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taunton</td>
<td>$78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Attleborough</td>
<td>$136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>$141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seekonk</td>
<td>$181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bedford</td>
<td>$247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norton</td>
<td>$440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westport</td>
<td>$687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wareham</td>
<td>$846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Minority Municipalities**

Minority Percent
- Greater than 10.98%

**SRPEDD Definition:**
- Minority Municipality: Municipality whose total minority population is greater than SRPEDD’s minority regional average of 10.98%.

**Data Sources:**
- SRPEDD, MassGIS, MassDOT, 2010 Census,
2015-2019 Project Expenditures Per Capita with Title VI / Environmental Justice

Title VI / EJ Criteria
- Low Income
- Minority
- Low Income & Minority

Project Spending Per Capita
- No Projects
- <$300
- $300 — $600
- > $600

SRPEDD Definitions:
Low Income:
Census tracts that are greater than SRPEDD’s low income regional average of 12.13%

Minority:
Census tracts that are greater than SRPEDD’s minority regional average of 10.98%

Data Sources:
2015-2019 Project Expenditures Per Capita with Limited English Proficiency (LEP)

Title VI / EJ Criteria

Limited English Proficiency

Project Spending Per Capita

- No Projects
- <$300
- $300 — $600
- > $600

SRPEDD Definition:

Limited English Proficiency:
Census tracts that are greater than SRPEDD’s LEP regional average of 7.40%

Data Sources:

2020 Regional Transportation Plan
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