

REGIONAL EQUITY WORKING GROUP (REWG)
Wednesday, November 4, 2015 – 11:15 AM to 1:15 PM
Claremont Conference Room, Metropolitan Transportation Commission
101 8th Street Oakland CA 94607

Conference Call Number
Dial 1-888-273-3658
Password 9427202

AGENDA

-
- | | |
|------------|---|
| 11:15 a.m. | 1. Introductions and Agenda Overview |
|------------|---|
-
- | | |
|-------|---|
| 11:25 | 2. October 2015 REWG Meeting Notes |
|-------|---|
-
- | | |
|-------|---|
| 11:30 | 3. Confirm Communities of Concern Framework
- Vikrant Sood, MTC, and Pedro Galvao, ABAG |
|-------|---|
-
- | | |
|------------|--|
| 12:30 p.m. | 4. Update on Displacement Risk and Middle-Wage Jobs Targets
- Dave Vautin, MTC, and Pedro Galvao, ABAG |
|------------|--|
-
- | | |
|-------|----------------------------------|
| 12:55 | 5. Summary and Next Steps |
|-------|----------------------------------|
-
- | | |
|------|--------------|
| 1:00 | Close |
|------|--------------|
-

- Next REWG meeting is scheduled for **Tuesday, December 8, 2015**

MTC Staff Contacts:
Doug Johnson, djohnson@mtc.ca.gov
Vikrant Sood, vsood@mtc.ca.gov

ABAG Staff Contacts:
Duane Bay, duaneb@abag.ca.gov
Pedro Galvao, pedrog@abag.ca.gov

Schedule of Upcoming Meetings

Note: meetings and agenda items are subject to change

All meetings are scheduled from 11:15am to 1:15pm in the Claremont Conference Room at MTC, 101 8th Street Oakland CA 94607, unless otherwise stated

2015

December 8* Update on Project Performance
Update on Scenario Concepts

2016

January **No Meeting**

February 10 Draft Project Performance Results
Draft Scenarios for Analysis

March 9 Draft Scenarios Analysis Results

April **No Meeting**

May Introduction to Proposed Preferred Alternative
Preliminary Results from Additional Research

June Preferred Alternative

July-August **No Meeting**

Sept.- Dec. Title VI and Environmental Justice Analysis

2017

January-June TBD

* Note that these meetings are not scheduled on the regular recurring day

REWG Minutes 10/14

Staff presented three options for definitions of Communities of Concern for Plan Bay Area 2040 and discussed four guiding questions listed below:

- Whether to consider census tracts that meet BOTH income and race thresholds as communities of concern
- Whether to increase the threshold of concentration for low income households from 30% to 34% of households in a given census tract
- Whether any disadvantage factors being considered for the CoC definition should be removed or any new factors added
- Whether to revise the CoC definition to include census tracts that meet the income and race criteria AND meets an additional 3 or the 6 disadvantage factors and whether such tracts should also be included if it also meets the race OR income criteria.

1. Whether to consider census tracts that meet BOTH the race and income criteria as communities of concern.

- Consider using only income as a threshold rather than race as low-income communities likely already overlap with race.
- Consider using county poverty rates as opposed to 200% of federal poverty level (FPL)
 - Staff responded that the 200% FPL is already less than 80% of county area median income throughout the Bay Area. FPL is also preferable for consistency between concurrent regional analyses (i.e. Title VI)
- Consider using cost of living as another disadvantage factor
 - Staff responded that this is already embedded in the definition of rent burden
- Staff explained that the definition of CoCs being developed through the equity analysis would be used at a regional level, but that individual counties could revise the definition to better fit their local contexts through the county transportation plan (CTP) process.

2. Concerning raising the threshold of concentration for low income households from 30% to 34% of households in a given census tract

- Staff explained that increasing the threshold of low income households from 30% to 34% for the Plan update would make it consistent with how the Plan determines the threshold of concentration for each disadvantage factor which uses the regional mean + $\frac{1}{2}$ a standard deviation
- REWG members indicated a desire to keep the threshold of concentration for low income households at 30% as having a concentration of at least 30% low-income households in a given census tract still represents a concentration of poverty

3. Whether any disadvantage factors being considered for the CoC definition should be removed or any new factors added

- Consider the overlap between seniors and people with disability

- Staff analyzed how many census tracts this would be an issue for and found that the overlap only applies to a handful of census tracts. Staff is recommending to keep both separate disadvantage factors.
 - Consider the extent to which there is not an overlap between rent burden and low income households
 - Keep zero-vehicle households as a disadvantage factor
 - Consider unemployment and overcrowding
 - Change the term “rent burden” to “severe rent burden” to better reflect the actual measure (the measure is of households spending 50% or more of their income on rent)
 - Staff committed to sending an online map of the communities of concern
- 4. Whether to revise the CoC definition to include census tracts that meet the income and race criteria AND meets an additional 3 or the 6 disadvantage factors and whether such tracts should also be included if it also meets the race OR income criteria.**
- The REWG was split on this question.
 - Staff committed to sending a survey regarding this question

Plan Bay Area Scenarios

- REWG briefly provided input on the Plan Bay Area scenarios
- Consider using equity as a guiding principle for all three scenarios instead of growth allocations
- Consider spreading equity initiatives between all three scenarios
- Consider expanding the Plan to evaluate more scenario alternatives

MEMO

To: Regional Equity Working Group (REWG)
 From: Pedro Galvao (ABAG) and Vikrant Sood (MTC)
 Re: Communities of Concern Framework for Plan Bay Area 2040 Equity Analysis
 Date: Friday, October 30, 2015

Plan Bay Area 2013 – Communities of Concern (CoCs) Framework

For Plan Bay Area 2013 Equity Analysis, CoCs were defined as (A) census tracts with a concentration of both minority AND low-income households OR (B) census tracts with a concentration of 4 or more disadvantage factors listed in the table below. Concentration thresholds for factors were set using the regional mean. See Table 1 below for details.

Summary of Discussion at October 2015 REWG Meeting

This section highlights the general outcomes from the discussion at the last REWG meeting, along with staff responses. For a complete summary of comments from the October 2015 REWG meeting, please see Attachment C.

1. There was general agreement that the CoCs should include census tracts that have a *concentration of minority AND low-income households*.
 - a. There were some concerns raised about leaving out those census tracts that have a high concentration of low-income households, but not of minorities. This issue was especially evident in the North Bay communities.
 - b. Staff recommends keeping both minority and low-income in the criteria, and highlighting the conditions in the North Bay, and other areas of the region where there is a high concentration of low-income households, in the equity report using data tables and maps.
 - c. Staff also recommends including county-level definitions of disadvantaged communities, as identified by the county congestion management agencies (CMAs) in their countywide transportation plans, as appendices in the equity report.
2. There was general agreement that *below 200% federal poverty line* was an appropriate measure and threshold for defining low-income households.
 - a. There was some interest in using county median incomes to account for variations in cost of living in different parts of the region.
 - b. Staff recommends keeping the “below 200% federal poverty line” measure and threshold to maintain consistency with federal requirements for Title VI analysis as well as eligibility for federal grant programs.
3. There was general agreement that *all 8 disadvantage factors* used for Plan Bay Area 2013 equity analysis should be retained for Plan Bay Area 2040.
 - a. There was some interest in adding education attainment, overcrowding and unemployment rates to the list of factors. There was also some interest in removing “zero-vehicle” households from the analysis since some of these households are not low-income.
 - b. Staff recommends including a discussion of issues related to education attainment, overcrowding and unemployment rates in the equity report. Education attainment is highly correlated with income, overcrowding is partly captured by “overburdened renters” and unemployment is an outcome rather than a demographic characteristic and therefore varies year-by-year thus not useful for the analysis.
 - c. Staff also recommends retaining all 8 factors in the CoC framework.
4. There was general agreement that the CoCs should also include census tracts that have a *concentration of 3 or more of the remaining 6 factors* (see Table 1 for a list of all factors).
 - a. There was interest in ensuring that seniors and people with disabilities are not double-counted. There was also interest in ensuring that seniors and low-income households are not double-counted.

- b. Staff conducted an analysis of census tracts to determine whether there is a significant overlap between seniors and people with disabilities, and seniors and low-income households. Staff concluded that there was no significant overlap in either case.
5. There was general agreement that the CoCs should include census tracts that have a concentration of 3 or more of the remaining 6 factors only IF they also have a **concentration of EITHER minority OR low-income households**.
 - a. There was interest in limiting the additional screening criteria to low-income only.
 - b. Staff conducted an analysis of census tracts to determine whether a significant number of tracts would be left out of the CoC framework if the additional screening criteria is limited to low-income only. Staff found that only 4 census tracts would be left out; one in the city of Milpitas, two in the city of Fremont and one in the Oakland Hills (see Attachment C).
 - c. Staff sent a survey on October 20, 2015, to polled REWG members on the additional screening criteria. Staff received a total of 9 responses with five respondents indicating a preference for the inclusion of either minority or low income households and four respondents indicating a preference for the inclusion of just low-income households as the additional screening criteria.
 - d. Staff recommends limiting the additional screening criteria to *low-income only*.
6. There was general agreement to **retain the same concentration thresholds** as in Plan Bay Area 2013.
 - a. There was some interest in increasing the concentration threshold for low-income to 34% given the increase in the share of low-income households since 2009.
 - b. Staff recommends retaining all thresholds from Plan Bay Area 2013, as listed below in Table 1.

Plan Bay Area 2040 – Proposed Communities of Concern Framework

For Plan Bay Area 2040 Equity Analysis, the proposed framework would define CoCs as (A) census tracts with a concentration of both minority AND low-income households OR (B) census tracts with a concentration of 3 or more of the remaining disadvantage factors listed in the table below IF they also have a concentration of *low-income* households.

Table 1: Existing and Proposed Communities of Concern Framework¹

<i>Disadvantage Factor</i>	<i>Plan Bay Area 2013</i>		<i>Plan Bay Area 2040 Proposed</i>	
	<i>% of Regional</i>	<i>Threshold</i>	<i>% of Regional</i>	<i>Threshold</i>
1. Minority	54%	70%	58%	70%
2. Low Income ²	23%	30%	25%	30%
3. Limited English Proficiency	9%	20%	9%	20%
4. Zero-Vehicle Household	9%	10%	10%	10%
5. Seniors 75 Years and Older	6%	10%	6%	10%
6. People with Disability	18%	25%	9%	25%
7. Single-Parent Family	14%	20%	14%	20%
8. Severely Rent-Burdened ³	10%	15%	11%	15%
<i>Definitions</i>	(A) Concentration of minority AND low-income households		(A) Concentration of minority AND low-income households	
	(B) Concentration of 4 or more factors listed above.		(B) Concentration of 3 or more factors (# 3 to #8 listed above) IF tracts also have a concentration of low-income households .	

¹ Data source: 2005-2009 and 2009-2013 American Community Survey

² Below 200% federal poverty line

³ Households that spend more than 50% of their income on rent

Next Steps

Based on feedback from the REWG, staff will develop a proposal for review by the Regional Advisory Working Group (RAWG) and Policy Advisory Council (Council) in early-December 2015, and for review by the Joint MTC Planning and ABAG Administrative Committees (Joint Committees) in mid-January 2016. Staff proposal to RAWG, Council and Joint Committees will also include recommendations for equity measures, which were discussed by the REWG in August and September 2015.


Attachments

Attachment A – Plan Bay Area 2013 Communities of Concern Map

Attachment B – Plan Bay Area 2040 Proposed Communities of Concern Map




Attachment C – Options for Additional Screening Criteria

Attachment A




Communities of Concern Plan Bay Area 2013

Communities of Concern
Plan Bay Area 2013


-  Communities of Concern Plan Bay Area 2013
-  Freeways
-  State Routes

0 10 20 30 Miles

0 10 20 30






Attachment B



Proposed Communities of Concern Plan Bay Area 2040

Tracts with concentration of minority and low-income households, or tracts with concentration of three or more factors and concentration of low-income households, or concentration of three or more factors and concentration of minority households.


	Communities of Concern Plan Bay Area 2040
	Freeways
	State Routes

0 10 20 30 Miles

0 10 20 30


Attachment C

	Minority (70%)	Low-Income (30%)	Ltd. English (20%)	Zero-Vehicle (10%)	Senior (10%)	w/ Disability (25%)	One Parent (20%)	\$ Burdened (15%)
W.	<u>72%</u>	29%	13%	<u>10%</u>	3%	8%	<u>28%</u>	<u>21%</u>
X.	<u>84%</u>	28%	7%	<u>20%</u>	<u>11%</u>	11%	10%	<u>23%</u>
Y.	<u>86%</u>	15%	5%	<u>17%</u>	6%	12%	<u>21%</u>	<u>19%</u>
Z.	<u>86%</u>	21%	18%	<u>14%</u>	<u>18%</u>	12%	0%	<u>18%</u>



Proposed Communities of Concern
Option 1

Low-Income AND Minority Concentration
OR Concentration of any 3 of other 6 factors
IF also Low-Income



Proposed Communities of Concern
Option 2

Low-Income AND Minority Concentration
OR Concentration of any 3 of other 6 factors
IF also Low-Income OR Minority