


le VI Equality Methodology Equality Title VI Public Outreach Title VI
Public Outreach Title VI Justice Public Outreach Justice Equality Justic
VI Justice Methodology Equality Title VI Equality Methodology Title VI
ity Title VI Justice Title VI Methodology Title VI Justice Public Outreach



Environmental Justice AT DVRPC

Fiscal Year 2010



DELAWARE VALLEY
dvrpc
REGIONAL
PLANNING COMMISSION

Equality Title VI
Public Outreach Title VI Justice Public Outreach Justice Equality Meth
Justice Methodology Equality Title VI Equality Methodology Title VI

The Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission is dedicated to uniting the region's elected officials, planning professionals, and the public with a common vision of making a great region even greater. Shaping the way we live, work, and play, DVRPC builds consensus on improving transportation, promoting smart growth, protecting the environment, and enhancing the economy. We serve a diverse region of nine counties: Bucks, Chester, Delaware, Montgomery, and Philadelphia in Pennsylvania; and Burlington, Camden, Gloucester, and Mercer in New Jersey. DVRPC is the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Greater Philadelphia Region—leading the way to a better future.



The symbol in our logo is adapted from the official DVRPC seal and is designed as a stylized image of the Delaware Valley. The outer ring symbolizes the region as a whole, while the diagonal bar signifies the Delaware River. The two adjoining crescents represent the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey.

DVRPC is funded by a variety of funding sources, including federal grants from the U.S. Department of Transportation's Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the Pennsylvania and New Jersey departments of transportation, as well as by DVRPC's state and local member governments. The authors, however, are solely responsible for the findings and conclusions herein, which may not represent the official views or policies of the funding agencies.

DVRPC fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes and regulations in all programs and activities. DVRPC's website (www.dvrpc.org) may be translated into multiple languages. Publications and other public documents can be made available in alternative languages and formats, if requested. For more information, please call (215) 238-2871.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
DVRPC Environmental Justice Degrees of Disadvantage Method	3
Environmental Justice at Work in Plans and Programs	15
Future Direction	27

Tables

Table 1: Poverty Guidelines by Family Size: 2001 and 2010	7
Table 2: Degrees of Disadvantage (DOD) and Number of Census Tracts	10
Table 3: Regional and Philadelphia DOD Concentrations	13
Table 4: Regional DOD Concentrations Excluding Philadelphia	13
Table 5: Jobs Added to EJ Communities: 2005 to 2035	17

Figure

Figure 1: Degrees of Disadvantage	11
-----------------------------------	----

Appendices

Appendix A: Degrees of Disadvantage Tables and Figures

Table A-1: Non-Hispanic Minority Census Tract Rankings	A-1
Figure A-1: Non-Hispanic Minority Population Concentrations	A-2
Table A-2: Carless Household Census Tract Rankings	A-3
Figure A-2: Carless Household Concentrations	A-4
Table A-3: Households in Poverty Census Tract Rankings	A-5
Figure A-3: Concentrations of Households in Poverty	A-6
Table A-4: Persons with Physical Disabilities Census Tract Rankings	A-7
Figure A-4: Concentrations of Persons with Physical Disabilities	A-8
Table A-5: Female Head of Household with Child Census Tract Rankings	A-9
Figure A-5: Female Head of Household with Child Population Concentrations	A-10
Table A-6: Elderly (75 Years and Older) Census Tract Rankings	A-11
Figure A-6: Elderly (75 Years and Older) Population Concentrations	A-12
Table A-7: Hispanic Census Tract Rankings	A-13
Figure A-7: Hispanic Population Concentrations	A-14
Table A-8: Limited English Proficiency Census Tract Rankings	A-15
Figure A-8: Limited English Proficiency Population Concentrations	A-16

Appendix B: FY 2009 – 2012 PA TIP Figures, FY 2010-2013 NJ TIP Figures

Figure B-1: Degrees of Disadvantage and TIP Projects for the Regional Highway Program (FY 2011-2014 PA TIP)	B-1
Figure B-2: Disadvantaged Census Tracts with or without TIP Highway Program Projects (FY 2011-2014 PA TIP)	B-2
Figure B-3: Degrees of Disadvantage and TIP Projects for the Regional Transit Program (FY 2011-2014 PA TIP)	B-3
Figure B-4: Disadvantaged Census Tracts with or without TIP Transit Program Projects (FY 2011-2014 PA TIP)	B-4
Figure B-5: Degrees of Disadvantage and TIP Projects for the Regional Highway Program (FY 2010-2013 NJ TIP)	B-5
Figure B-6: Disadvantaged Census Tracts with or without TIP Highway Program Projects (FY 2010-2013 NJ TIP)	B-6
Figure B-7: Degrees of Disadvantage and TIP Projects for the Regional Transit Program (FY 2010-2013 NJ TIP)	B-7
Figure B-8: Disadvantaged Census Tracts with or without TIP Transit Program Projects (FY 2010-2013 NJ TIP)	B-8

Introduction

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the 1994 President's Executive Order on Environmental Justice (#12898) state that no person or group shall be excluded from participation in, or denied the benefits of, any program or activity utilizing federal funds. Each federal agency is required to identify any disproportionately high and adverse health or environmental effects of its programs on minority and low-income populations. In turn, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) are charged with evaluating their plans and programs for environmental justice (EJ) sensitivity, including expanding their outreach efforts to low-income, minority, and other disadvantaged populations, as part of the United States Department of Transportation's certification requirements.

The Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC) is the MPO for the nine-county, bi-state Philadelphia-Camden-Trenton region. To further DVRPC's mission to plan for the orderly growth and development of the Delaware Valley region and to respond to federal guidance on EJ, the agency published "*...and Justice for All: DVRPC's Strategy for Fair Treatment and Meaningful Involvement of All People*" in September 2001. This initial EJ report provided background information and defined EJ; summarized DVRPC's existing EJ-related plans, policies, and public involvement activities; and described a quantitative and qualitative method for evaluating the Long-Range Plan (LRP), the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and other planning programs. DVRPC has since published annual updates, providing a summary of activities conducted by the Commission, and new data and analysis related to EJ.

Since the introduction of the EJ report in 2001, planning activities relating to EJ have grown and evolved. Initially used to evaluate the LRP and the TIP, DVRPC's EJ "degrees of disadvantage" (DOD) method of analysis has been included in many projects, programs, and studies, with more applications being explored each year. This document includes the current DOD method, with definitions and maps of each population group analyzed. Descriptions for each project or program that utilizes the EJ method in fiscal year (FY) 2010 are included, such as the TIP, LRP analysis, and corridor studies.

The EJ program at DVRPC is constantly evolving. New programs or projects identify innovative ways to employ EJ, while existing programs include new requirements that call for expanded analysis. Finally, DVRPC internally strives to make the EJ program more effective over time, reaching into additional areas and strengthening current programs. All DVRPC staff are empowered to incorporate EJ into DVRPC's

day-to-day activities. All employees are provided copies of the *Public Participation Plan*, the *Title VI Compliance Plan*, and the *Title VI and Environmental Justice Quick Reference Guide*. Staff also receive a copy of *The Planner's Methodology and Checklist*, which offers an overview of integrating Title VI, EJ, and public participation into DVRPC Work Program projects.

Title VI Compliance

DVRPC's work in EJ assists the Commission in meeting federal requirements related to Title VI compliance. Since its implementation in 2006, *Equity & Opportunity*, DVRPC's Title VI Compliance Plan, provides a framework for DVRPC's efforts to ensure compliance with Title VI and related statutes regarding nondiscrimination and EJ in DVRPC's Work Program, publications, communications, public involvement efforts, and general ways of doing business. The Title VI Compliance Plan also defines the role of the Title VI Compliance Manager, a position within the Commission to manage the overall administration of the Title VI program, plan, and assurances.

Limited English Proficiency

Executive Order 13166 compels federally funded agencies to make services more accessible to eligible persons who are not proficient in the English language. DVRPC has made a conscious effort to reach out to populations with limited English proficiency (LEP). DVRPC translates a number of Commission documents and takes all reasonable steps in providing Commission documents in alternative languages or formats. As online communication continues to increase, DVRPC's website now offers online translations of its website through *Google*. Online translations were launched in the summer of 2006, and additional languages were added to the DVRPC website in FY 2010, with 17 language translations now available.

DVRPC Environmental Justice

Degrees of Disadvantage Method

In 2001, DVRPC developed the initial “...and Justice for All” report to identify impacts of disparate funding and services on defined low-income and minority groups. Six initial population groups were included in this report: non-Hispanic minorities, Hispanics, elderly (older than 85 years), persons with physical disabilities, carless households, and households in poverty. This report utilized the most recent 2000 U.S. Census information available for each population group, though 1990 U.S. Census data had to be used for three categories. The report also included quality-of-life factors, such as regional transit routes, Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) routes, and hospitals. In 2002, two new demographic factors were added to the analysis: female head of household with child and LEP, thus expanding the DOD from six to eight indicators. By 2003, the U.S. Census released its final demographic information, and all eight categories can now be analyzed using 2000 U.S. Census data. Over time, slight adjustments have been made to particular categories of the DOD to more accurately define the population groups. For instance, in 2008, the elderly population group definition was changed to individuals over the age of 75.

Developing a Method

Neither Title VI of the Civil Rights Act nor Executive Order 12898 provide specific guidance to evaluate EJ within a region’s transportation planning process. Therefore, MPOs must devise their own methods for ensuring EJ in transportation decision-making. This is a challenging assignment, and serious consideration must be given to the available types of quantifiable data, as well as how the data is to be used and interpreted.

This section summarizes the technical method that DVRPC initially developed to analyze the adopted LRP and the TIP in 2001. DVRPC’s current LRP, *Connections—The Regional Plan for a Sustainable Future*, identifies priority areas for transportation investment consistent with the goals and policies of the regional land use plan. The TIP is the regionally agreed-upon list of priority projects, which is required by federal law. It lists all federally funded and regionally significant projects. Since 2001, DVRPC’s EJ method of analysis has been incorporated into many more programs and projects, which are highlighted later in the report.

Broadly speaking, DVRPC's EJ method:

- Identifies groups that may be negatively impacted
- Locates them in the region
- Plots key destinations, such as employment or health care locations, that they would access
- Acknowledges nearby land use patterns
- Overlays these destinations with the region's existing and proposed transportation network
- Determines what transportation service gaps exist for these disadvantaged groups

This analysis illustrates the existing accessibility conditions for residents of the region. DVRPC's LRP and the TIP are then evaluated to determine how they fill these accessibility gaps. This regional technical analysis is a people- and place-based approach that locates the people most in need and determines how the regional transportation system and DVRPC's programs, policies, and investments impact these groups.

Regional Demographics

EJ is concerned with the impacts of disparate funding and disparate services on defined minority and low-income groups. Many programs employ the EJ DOD method as the first step of a demographic analysis, identifying the potentially disadvantaged population groups first, and then using this knowledge as a planning tool for further recommendations. Additionally, DVRPC's Public Affairs office can then be employed to assist with outreach to specific population groups identified through the EJ analysis.

DVRPC currently assesses the following population groups: non-Hispanic minorities, carless households, households in poverty, persons with physical disabilities, female head of household with child, elderly, Hispanic persons, and limited English proficiency. Each population group has specific planning-related challenges.

Until the new U.S. Census data from the 2010 Census is available, the 2000 Census data is the most recent available data. Using U.S. Census data for the year 2000, disadvantaged groups are identified and located at the census tract level. Data is gathered at the regional level, combining populations from each of the nine counties, for either individuals or households, depending on the indicator. From there, the total number of persons in each demographic group is divided by the appropriate universe (either population or households) for the nine-county region, providing a regional average for that population group. Any census tract that meets or exceeds the regional average level, or threshold, is considered an EJ-sensitive tract for that group.

The impacted demographic groups are defined in the following sections, which include an explanation of the population group, as well as the regional threshold. Figures A-1 through A-8, which depict census tracts considered significant for each population group, are located in Appendix A.

Population Group: Non-Hispanic Minority

Regional Total: 1,339,000 people

Regional Threshold: 24.9%

County Thresholds: 6.5% to 49.0%

The U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) Order (5610.2) on EJ defines “Minority” as:

- Black: a person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa
- Asian American: a person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, the Indian subcontinent, or the Pacific Islands
- American Indian and Alaskan Native: a person having origins in any of the original people of North America who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition

In addition to the groups mentioned above, the U.S. Census also recognizes two more racial categories: Some Other Race Alone and Two or More Races. All five racial categories have been included in this analysis. The U.S. Census also recognizes a difference between race and ethnicity, creating separate minority categories for Hispanic or Latino and race. The population group recognized in this category is non-Hispanic minorities. Hispanic ethnicity, regardless of race, is recognized as a separate category.

The 2000 U.S. Census question on race differed from the 1990 U.S. Census question by offering respondents the option of selecting one or more racial categories. There are now 57 possible racial categories. Because of this change, 2000 Census data on race is not directly comparable with data from the 1990 Census. Thus, caution should be used in interpreting changes in racial composition over time. However, the overwhelming majority, 98 percent of the U.S. population, reported only one race. Figure A-1 illustrates which census tracts are significant for non-Hispanic minority concentrations

Population Group: Carless Households

Regional Total: 323,500 households

Regional Threshold: 16.0%

County Thresholds: 5.1% to 35.7%

Carless households are defined in the U.S. Census as having zero vehicle availability. This population is often referred to as “transit dependent,” i.e., those who must rely on public transit for their daily travel needs and who have limited mobility. It is recognized that not owning a personal automobile may be a

lifestyle choice for some, but for others automobile ownership is unattainable due to various constraints, including income or disability. Additionally, many carless individuals may take transit to one destination, and then continue their trip as a pedestrian. Figure A-2 illustrates which census tracts are significant for concentrations of carless households.

Population Group: Households in Poverty

Regional Total: 219,200 households

Regional Threshold: 10.9%

County Thresholds: 4.7% to 21.8%

U.S. Census poverty *threshold* definitions, based on household income and family unit size, are updated every year by the Census Bureau to reflect cost of living changes. DVRPC's DOD analysis counts the number of households in poverty according to the U.S. Census for the most recent census year.

Poverty status is alternatively defined by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) poverty *guidelines*. Poverty *guidelines* are also based on household income and family unit size, and are updated annually. The HHS *guidelines* are used to determine eligibility for many federal assistance programs and are approximately equal to the U.S. Census poverty *thresholds*. According to the HHS definition in 2001, a family of four qualified for poverty status if its household income was at or below \$17,650. In 2010, poverty status income for a family of four is \$22,050.

The HHS poverty guidelines for 2001 and 2010 are shown in Table 1. These poverty guidelines are updated annually and are used as eligibility criteria for federal programs, such as Community Service Block Grants, Head Start, the Food Stamp program, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP), the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), and the National Free Lunch program. Many of these programs use a percentage multiplier for eligibility, such as 130 percent of poverty to be eligible for the Food Stamp program. Note that in general, cash public assistance programs (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families and Supplemental Security Income) do NOT use the poverty guidelines in determining eligibility. Figure A-3 illustrates which census tracts are significant for concentrations of households in poverty.

Table 1: Poverty Guidelines by Family Size: 2001 and 2010

Size of family unit	2001 household income	2010 Household income for 48 contiguous states and D.C.
1	\$8,590	\$10,830
2	\$11,610	\$14,570
3	\$14,630	\$18,310
4	\$17,650	\$22,050
5	\$20,670	\$25,790
6	\$23,690	\$29,530
7	\$26,710	\$33,270
8	\$29,730	\$37,010
Each Additional Person:	\$3,020	\$3,740

Source: Federal Register, Vol. 75, No. 148, August 3, 2010, pp. 45628-45629

Population Group: Persons with Physical Disabilities

Regional Total: 387,900 people

Regional Threshold: 7.7%

County Thresholds: 5.1% to 10.7%

Definitions for “people with disabilities” vary from agency to agency. The 2010 U.S. Census classifies individuals as having a disability if they report difficulty working at a job, leaving home due to a disability, or report long-lasting sensory, physical, mental, emotional, or self-care disabilities. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) provides comprehensive civil rights protection for “qualified individuals with disabilities.” An individual with a disability, according to the ADA, is a person who has: (A) a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities of such individual; (B) a record of such impairment; or (C) is regarded as having such impairment.

DVRPC has decided to identify persons with a physical disability for the disability indicator, but recognizes that each disability type presents specific challenges. This analysis of the distribution of persons with physical disabilities relies on data from the U.S. Census, which defines a physical disability as “a condition that substantially limits one or more basic physical activities, such as walking, climbing stairs, reaching, lifting, or carrying.” The Census universe for this category includes only the population

five years and older. Figure A-4 illustrates which census tracts are significant for concentrations of persons with a physical disability.

Population Group: Female Head of Household with Child

Regional Total: 149,500 households

Regional Threshold: 7.4%

County Thresholds: 4.0% to 11.0%

“Female head of household with child” is defined in the 2000 U.S. Census as a “female maintaining a household with no husband present, and with at least one child under 18 years old who is a son or daughter by birth, marriage (a stepchild), or adoption, residing in the home.” This factor was chosen to add gender and children into the analysis, as well as to acknowledge the strong correlation between female heads of household with child and poverty status. In addition, this group exhibits different travel patterns and needs. Figure A-5 illustrates which census tracts are significant for female-head-of-household-with-child concentrations.

Population Group: Elderly (75 Years and Over)

Regional Total: 353,300 people

Regional Threshold: 6.6%

County Thresholds: 5.3% to 7.9%

In the last two years, several DVRPC programs have worked closely with the elderly community. Mobility barriers and age are linked together. Not every elderly individual has mobility challenges, but the likelihood of a challenge increases as an individual ages. Seniors aged 75 years qualify for most, if not all, mobility programs that have an age requirement.

In 1900, seniors aged 65 years and older accounted for less than five percent of the total population of the United States. Now numbering over 35 million, seniors currently account for over 12 percent of the nation’s population. By 2030, the senior population will double to more than 70 million, or 20 percent of the U.S. population. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, Pennsylvania has the third highest proportion of elderly residents in the country, trailing only Florida and West Virginia. At 19th, New Jersey ranks lower, but ranks ninth if the number of persons 60 years and older is counted. Statewide, the number of people 60 years or older in New Jersey grew by 3.5 percent between 1990 and 2000, to 1.4 million, and is expected to climb to 2.4 million by 2025. Figure A-6 illustrates which census tracts are significant for concentrations of the population aged 75 years and over.

Population Group: Hispanic

Regional Total: 288,300 people

Regional Threshold: 5.4%

County Thresholds: 1.5% to 9.7%

Though often included in minority definitions, Hispanic is an ethnicity, not a racial category; but it deserves separate consideration nevertheless. Hispanics are defined by the U.S. Census as “persons of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race.” Persons in the 2000 U.S. Census were asked, “Is this person Spanish, Hispanic, Latino?” Thus, persons of Hispanic origin can be of any race. Hispanics should have indicated their origin in the Hispanic origin question, not in the race question, because in federal statistical systems, ethnic origin is considered to be a separate concept from race. This interpretation is based on changes made by the Office of Management and Budget in October 1997, requiring all federal agencies that collect and report data on race and ethnicity to follow these new standards. Figure A-7 illustrates which census tracts are significant for Hispanic concentrations.

Population Group: Limited English Proficiency (LEP)

Regional Total: 121,700 people

Regional Threshold: 2.4%

County Thresholds: 0.8% to 3.9%

Executive Order 13166 of 2000 on Limited English Proficiency (LEP) charges all federally funded agencies to make services more accessible to eligible persons who are not proficient in the English language. LEP is defined in the U.S. Census as “primary language spoken at home other than English and speak English not very well.” This captures the populations with a primary language other than English spoken at home. These languages include Spanish, Asian and Pacific Island languages, Indo-European languages, and other languages. This category includes those who cannot speak English very well or cannot speak English at all. The Census universe for this category includes only the population aged five years and older.

It is assumed that an inability to speak English well can be a barrier to accessing goods and services, including transportation. In addition, identifying these populations and their locations is important to DVRPC’s outreach efforts, particularly in assessing the need to make the agency’s publications and written materials available in additional languages. Figure A-8 illustrates which census tracts are significant for LEP concentrations.

Degrees of Disadvantage

Each census tract can contain a concentration greater than the regional average for each individual population group previously discussed, and any census tract can contain zero to eight categories that have been recognized as regionally sensitive. The number of sensitive groups in each census tract is referred to as its DOD. Figure 1 illustrates DOD by the number of census tracts that contain zero DOD, one to two DOD, three to four DOD, five to six DOD, and seven to eight DOD. Of the region's 1,378 census tracts, 76 percent have at least one DOD, which is not surprising given the multiple demographic categories. Over a quarter of the census tracts contain five to eight DOD. These areas are recognized as potentially highly disadvantaged; thus, extra care should be taken when projects or programs occur there.

Table 2 displays the DOD and the number of census tracts in each category. Tracts with one to two DOD (36 percent) represent the largest percentage, followed by zero DOD (24 percent), and then five to six DOD (19 percent). Ninety-three tracts have seven to eight DOD (seven percent), and these are mostly found in the core cities of Philadelphia, Camden, Chester, and Trenton, as well as older boroughs, such as Oxford, Coatesville, and Pottstown.


Table 2: Degrees of Disadvantage (DOD) and Number of Census Tracts

Number of DOD	Number of census tracts	Percentage of tracts
0	328	24
1-2	501	36
3-4	195	14
5-6	261	19
7-8	93	7

Source: DVRPC, 2003

The region's four core cities of Philadelphia, Chester, Camden, and Trenton contain 293, or 83 percent, of the 354 highly disadvantaged (five to eight DOD) census tracts in the nine-county region. There are 1.72 million people who live in these four communities, or 32 percent of the region's 5.39 million residents. Over 65 percent of all the tracts in these four communities contain five to eight DOD, much higher than the regional average of 25 percent. Philadelphia has 240 highly disadvantaged tracts, which constitute 68 percent of the region's total of highly disadvantaged tracts and 63 percent of all Philadelphia census tracts; Chester has 13 highly disadvantaged tracts, which constitute three percent of the region's highly disadvantaged tracts and 92 percent of all Chester census tracts; Camden has 20 highly disadvantaged

Figure 1: Degrees of Disadvantage



tracts, which constitute six percent of the region's highly disadvantaged tracts and 95 percent of all Camden tracts; and Trenton has 20 highly disadvantaged tracts, which constitute six percent of the region's highly disadvantaged tracts and 83 percent of all Trenton tracts. In summary, over 80 percent of all highly disadvantaged tracts are concentrated in four communities, and these communities represent one-third of the region's population.

Method of Analysis Updates

The DOD method of analysis relies on regional averages for each population group; specifically, whether a census tract is above or below the regional threshold. In some ways, this yes/no approach does not paint a true picture of the region. It suggests that some areas just below the line may not have a disadvantage. A census tract where 12 percent of the households do not have vehicles is not considered disadvantaged (carless household threshold is 16 percent). However, perhaps these carless households should somehow be considered a relevant factor. It also treats all tracts that are above the threshold the same. This is a bit problematic, for there are differences in potential recommended strategies and outreach if a census tract has three or 15 percent of the population with a language barrier (LEP threshold is 2.4 percent).

As the majority of the highly disadvantaged tracts are concentrated in four communities, these communities may be distorting the regional levels of disadvantage. For example, in Philadelphia, the overall county averages are greater than each of the regional thresholds. Several population groups are highly concentrated here: 65 percent of all carless households in the region live in Philadelphia. In other categories, the county threshold is over twice the regional threshold, as illustrated in Table 3. If Philadelphia is removed from the regional analysis, a different picture is painted, and several population group thresholds decrease significantly, as illustrated in Table 4.

If Philadelphia is removed, the regional threshold decreases by 10 percentage points for non-Hispanic minority, eight percentage points for carless households, and five percentage points for households in poverty. By lowering the threshold levels, more census tracts, and therefore more communities outside of Philadelphia, would be recognized as containing sensitive populations.

Table 3: Regional and Philadelphia DOD Concentrations

DOD Category	Total in category in Philadelphia	Percentage of total in category in Philadelphia	Total in category in 9-county region	Philadelphia as a percentage of regional total
Non-Hispanic Minority	743,277	49.0%	1,339,011	55.5%
Carless Households	210,866	35.7%	323,494	65.2%
Poverty	128,486	21.8%	219,246	58.6%
Physically Disabled	151,250	10.7%	387,896	39.0%
Female Head of Household with Child	70,955	12.0%	149,454	47.5%
Elderly: Over 75 Years	106,095	7.0%	353,321	30.0%
Hispanic	128,300	8.5%	288,291	44.5%
Limited English Proficiency	55,314	3.9%	121,671	45.5%

*Source: DVRPC, 2008***Table 4: Regional DOD Concentrations Excluding Philadelphia**

DOD Category	Total in category in region	Regional threshold	Total in category excluding Philadelphia	Regional threshold excluding Philadelphia
Non-Hispanic Minority	1,339,011	24.9%	595,734	15.4%
Carless Households	323,494	16.0%	112,628	7.9%
Poverty	219,246	10.9%	90,760	6.4%
Physically Disabled	38,7896	7.7%	236,646	6.5%
Female Head of Household with Child	149,454	7.4%	78,499	5.5%
Elderly: Over 75 Years	353,321	6.6%	247,226	6.4%
Hispanic	288,291	5.4%	159,991	4.1%
Limited English Proficiency	12,1671	2.4%	66,357	1.8%

Source: DVRPC, 2008

The application of the traditional analysis also has been modified. The Appendix A figures illustrate variations in the overall population concentrations in relation to the regional threshold. This approach was first introduced in the *Mercer County Human Service Transportation Coordination Plan*, and later refined in the *Demographic Trends and Forecasts in the Philadelphia Region*.

The figures in Appendix A are illustrated using the following formula:

0 percent to ½ of the threshold = no color

½ of the threshold to the threshold = grey

The threshold to 1.5x the threshold = pink

1.5x the threshold to 2x the threshold = purple

2x the threshold and over = dark purple

Using this format to illustrate the overall concentration levels more accurately assists the agency in identifying the sensitive tracts and helps relate one tract to another within that population group. In addition, each map contains the overall averages for each county. This assists the agency in identifying particular census tracts that may be considered disadvantaged in a particular county, but not in the region as a whole. As an example, in Census Tract 1030.01, Richland Township, Bucks County, 9.8 percent of households are carless households. The regional DOD threshold for carless households is 16.0 percent, while Bucks County is 5.1 percent. In this example, the Richland Township tract would not be identified as regionally significant in the analysis of carless households, but it is significant at the county level.

Finally, the five census tracts in the region and two census tracts in each county with the highest total number and percentage of people or households are included for each population group. This information is illustrated in tabular format in Appendix A and paired with the relevant population group figure. The number in the first column indicates the census tract ranking for that particular category. These tables help illustrate how each population group is represented within the region as they relate to each county.

As an example, for Households in Poverty, the total number of households will be used. The first entry is Census Tract 151 in Philadelphia, with 1,441 households. This census tract contains the greatest number of households in poverty out of all the census tracts in the region. Census Tract 88 in Philadelphia, at 1,371 households, contains the second largest number of households in poverty, and on through to the next three census tracts with the largest number of households in poverty. The sixth entry, Census Tract 6008, Camden City, Camden County, with 890 households in poverty, is ranked 21st. This tract contains the largest total number of households in poverty for Camden County, as this is the first time that Camden County is listed in the table. The first time Gloucester County is mentioned is Census Tract 5004, Paulsboro Township, with 405 households in poverty, and a ranking of 149. From this entry, the reader learns that there are 148 census tracts that have a larger number of households in poverty than any census tract in Gloucester County and that no census tract in Gloucester County contains more than 405 households in poverty.

Environmental Justice at Work in Plans and Programs

In 2001, the year of the initial EJ report, the DOD evaluation method was used extensively for analysis of the TIP. Since that time, many other DVRPC programs have adopted the method for use within specific program or project analyses. Furthermore, individual studies now use the method as a basis for demographic evaluations, comparing individual places in the region in terms of which populations live in that location and what challenges they may face. Several programs and projects incorporate EJ-related components or contain one of the eight DOD demographic categories. The following section provides a brief overview of DVRPC programs, plans, and studies that have incorporated the EJ method or have an EJ-related component in FY 2010.

Environmental Justice in Specific DVRPC Plans and Programs

The Transportation Improvement Program: FY 2011 - 2014 TIP for Pennsylvania

The TIP is the regionally agreed-upon list of priority projects, as required by the Federal Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), formerly the Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). The TIP document must list all federally funded projects, as well as non-federally funded projects that are regionally significant. Also included are all other state-funded capital projects, including multimodal, bicycle, pedestrian, freight-related, and air quality, as well as the more traditional highway and public transit projects.

The location of transportation investments can greatly influence the level of mobility and accessibility within and through the region. DVRPC's EJ method is used to analyze the equitable distribution of the TIP for both highway and transit programs. Figures illustrating TIP locations are utilized to help determine the equitable distribution of projects (see Appendix B). Not all TIP projects can be mapped due to the scale and nature of the improvement. The TIP update usually occurs annually for New Jersey and every other year for Pennsylvania. The most recent update for Pennsylvania is the FY 2011-2014 TIP. No TIP update occurred last year for New Jersey, so the most recent update for New Jersey remains the FY 2010-2013 TIP.

DVRPC Capital Programming staff worked with the EJ staff on development of the FY 2011 TIP for PA and incorporated the *DVRPC Degrees of Disadvantage* methodology for the program for highway- and transit-funded TIP projects in FY 2011-2014. The location of transportation investments can greatly influence the level of mobility and accessibility for the surrounding population. Figures illustrating TIP

locations are utilized to help determine the equitable distribution of projects. While a TIP project may not occur in an EJ sensitive area, the proposed project can still impact disadvantaged populations, especially if the project occurs on a highway or within a transit project that is used by a particular disadvantaged population. There is no formula to determine the potential beneficial or detrimental impact of a TIP project. Each TIP project must be analyzed individually in order to consider the specific impacts on nearby EJ communities. For the FY 2011 to 2014 TIP for Pennsylvania, 36 highway and 16 transit programs have not been mapped; thus, these 52 projects have not been included in this analysis.

In the Pennsylvania counties' 288 most highly disadvantaged census tracts (those with five to eight DODs), 145 tracts (50.3 percent) have a TIP highway project. Additionally, 248 (53.3 percent) out of the 465 moderately disadvantaged census tracts (with one to four DODs) have a TIP highway project. For the FY 2011-2014 Pennsylvania Transit TIP, 42 tracts (14.6 percent) of the 288 most highly disadvantaged tracts have a TIP project, while 32 (6.9 percent) of the 465 moderately disadvantaged tracts contain a TIP project.

The same analysis will be performed in spring 2011 for the update of the FY 2012 TIP for New Jersey, for the years FY 2012-2015.

The Long-Range Plan

DVRPC's adopted LRP, *Connections – The Regional Plan for a Sustainable Future*, has been updated and provides a blueprint for future regional transportation facilities and services in 2035. *Connections* focuses on strengthening the linkages between land use, the environment, economic development, and the transportation system. Recent long-range planning policies have emphasized sustainable growth, redeveloping existing regional centers, and funding transportation projects that support the plan's goals. Additionally, *Connections* addresses new focus areas such as climate change and energy needs.

Making the Land Use Connection: Regional What-If Scenario Analysis, a precursor document to the *Connections* plan, considers the effects of two extreme land-use forms on the transportation system, environment, energy needs, household expenditures, infrastructure costs, and other regional issues. This study compares the differences between two scenarios: one based on recentralization, and a second on sprawl. For additional comparison, a "trend" scenario is considered, based on the Board-adopted population and employment forecasts.

Recentralization consists of concentrating the location of most regional forecasted population and employment growth from 2005 to 2035 in the region’s core cities or inner ring suburbs. The recentralization scenario incorporates many of the long-range planning principles that are included in *Connections*. Sprawl is based on an acceleration of long-term trends of existing and new population and employment shifting away from the region’s centers and locating around the periphery.

Many EJ communities are located in transit-accessible areas. Supporting and maintaining transit is a positive outcome of the recentralization scenario for these EJ populations. Recentralization also improves the feasibility of increasing transit service to transit-dependent populations that are currently not well served by the existing transit systems. This is in keeping with the LRP’s stated goal, to increase mobility and accessibility with coordinated and integrated transportation systems.

Making the Land Use Connection: Regional What-If Scenario Analysis considered an EJ indicator based on the change in the number of jobs forecast for EJ communities. To perform this analysis, the number of jobs forecast for each EJ census tract for all the scenarios was subtracted from its base year 2005 estimate, as shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Jobs Added to EJ Communities: 2005 to 2035

Indicator	Recentralization	Trend	Sprawl
Jobs Added to EJ Communities	79,401	17,313	- 151,494

Source: DVRPC, 2008

In 2005, 641,316 total jobs were located in EJ communities. The Board-adopted trend scenario anticipates increasing this amount by approximately three percent over the 30-year planning period. The recentralization scenario would increase the current total by 12 percent, while the sprawl scenario predicts the loss of 24 percent of the existing job base.

The number of jobs added to EJ communities is one of more than 100 indicators used to analyze the impacts of these disparate land-use forms on the DVRPC region. Overall, the recentralization scenario has more efficient and sustainable impacts than the sprawl scenario. The findings from this study guide the LRP updates and strategies for sustainable growth that benefits the well-being of all residents.

The established EJ method is used to evaluate the LRP vision. For highway projects, all eight DODs are considered. All EJ populations, including those that are not transit dependent, can be impacted by highway projects. For transit projects, only four DODs are considered: populations with greater than the regional average of elderly, disabled, poverty, and female head of households.

Transportation and Community Development Initiative (TCDI)

The Transportation and Community Development Initiative (TCDI) is an opportunity for DVRPC to provide funding support for local development and redevelopment efforts that implement municipal, county, state, and regional planning objectives in individual municipalities of the Delaware Valley. Although the region continues to prosper, there are still communities that face ongoing challenges, including population or job loss. The TCDI program is intended to reverse the trends of disinvestment and decline in many of the region's core cities and first-generation suburbs. To identify these communities, census tracts that represent at least three DODs are eligible for a TCDI grant; and, in all cases, areas that are appropriate for future growth are targeted.

TCDI provides funding of up to \$100,000 to eligible municipalities to undertake planning activities, analyses, or design initiatives that enhance development or redevelopment and improve the efficiency or enhance the regional transportation system. The most recent funding round was in 2010. Approximately 225 municipalities, as well as Community Development Corporations (CDCs) within the City of Philadelphia, were eligible to apply for funds. To date, the TCDI program has funded over 130 different projects over the past eight years, with \$10.62 million in grants leveraging over \$250 million in additional public and private funding.

Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan

Enacted in 2005, SAFETEA-LU authorized \$45.3 billion in transportation funding over a four-year period (2005 to 2009). Under the new regulations, the previous area-wide JARC and the New Freedom Initiative (NFI) are now components of the revised Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan (CHSTP). The CHSTP identifies the transportation needs of individuals with disabilities, older adults, and people with low incomes; provides strategies for meeting those local needs; and ranks transportation services for funding and implementation. Within this new plan, three programs must be coordinated to address transportation barriers: JARC (Section 5316), NFI (Section 5317), and Elderly Individuals and Individuals with Disabilities (Section 5310). DVRPC facilitates the selection process for JARC and NFI.

In order for CHSTP stakeholders to develop a strategy for the region, a transportation service gap analysis is required. By using the DVRPC EJ method, which locates persons with the most need and with proximity to the regional transportation system, a larger analysis of the needs for these specific populations can be conducted. A quality-of-life analysis is conducted that includes the proximity of the region's transportation network, including arterial highways, transit systems, access to employment centers through job access services, fixed-route service, and paratransit service. Locations of employment, health, and childcare services are also identified. The resulting DOD and quality-of-life factors are combined to reflect the positive and negative influences of these three special grant programs and the services that they provide. Based on the CHSTP analysis, services applied for under these grant programs can target areas where various populations are located that have little or no transportation services that meet their specific needs.

During this past year, DVRPC facilitated a JARC and NFI funding round in Pennsylvania for FY 2011 funds. For Pennsylvania projects, over \$7.4 million was available for JARC projects, and over \$1.4 million for FY 2011 and \$1.6 for FY 2012 was available for NFI from combined Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Pennsylvania Department of Transportation funds. Twenty-five JARC projects and four NFI projects were recommended for approval for FY 2011 funding in Pennsylvania. In New Jersey, JARC and NFI funding decisions are made biannually, and two years of funding is committed to selected projects. The most recent funding round in New Jersey assigned approximately \$500,000 FTA funds for JARC and approximately \$400,000 FTA funds for NFI for each of FYs 2010 and 2011. An additional local contribution was provided by the Transportation Innovation Fund (TIF) and the New Jersey Department of Human Services (NJ DHS). About eight JARC projects and four NFI projects were recommended for approval in New Jersey for each of those years.

DVRPC has also been working to streamline and summarize the regional CHSTP document (Improving Access to Opportunities in the Delaware Valley Region – Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan, Publication 07008). This summary document will serve as an interim, more functional user manual for CHSTP in the region, in place of the May 2007 document, and will be forthcoming early in FY 2011 (Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan Summary, Publication 10009). DVRPC's local and federal partners anticipate that reauthorization of SAFETEA-LU will bring some significant changes and reorganization to CHSTP. Therefore, an update, rather than summary, will take place after SAFETEA-LU is reauthorized.

Congestion Management Process

The Congestion Management Process (CMP) is a multifaceted approach to minimize road congestion and advance toward regional goals. DVRPC's CMP defines 30 congested corridors, divided into subcorridors, with "appropriate" and "secondary" congestion management strategies for each subcorridor. Census tracts containing higher EJ concentrations were considered when developing corridors and defining strategies for congested subcorridors. Virtually all EJ-significant tracts, defined in this process as census tracts with five to eight DODs, are targeted for appropriate multimodal transportation investments.

Over 100 congestion management strategies are contained in the CMP Report (Publication 09028). Several strategies were further explained in terms of EJ sensitivity and then correlated to a specific disadvantaged group or groups. For example, one strategy states that outreach should be conducted at unconventional locations and hours to reach segments of the population that ordinarily cannot attend meetings at traditional hours or locations. This strategy is targeted to specific disadvantaged groups, including non-Hispanic minority, Hispanic, poverty, limited English proficiency, and female head of household with child. It is included as a strategy for subcorridors where these groups are at two or more times the regional average.

The CMP also includes outreach steps to audiences not always incorporated in planning efforts. DVRPC prepares a newsletter for the whole region and one each year for two congested subcorridors (one in each state) oriented to participants in nonprofit organizations, interested citizens, and municipal officials. These newsletters briefly and clearly explain what a person can do to address congestion in their community. DVRPC's CMP website resources (<http://www.dvrpc.org/CongestionManagement/>) include a summary and the full report, as well as online mapping features. The concepts of congestion management were described in an article written by DVRPC staff and published by Pennsylvania Borough News in June 2010. This article will also be posted on the CMP web pages.

Central Jersey Transportation Forum

The Central Jersey Transportation Forum has been meeting since 1999 to address concerns of municipalities along the US 1 corridor in central New Jersey. The key issues are east-west access; improving coordination of transportation and land use in this high-growth, congested area; and transit. This is a major employment corridor (including regional shopping malls and medical facilities), and with the rising cost of housing, there has been ongoing concern about how to get a range of people to the jobs.

Safety and Security Program

Safety matters to everyone, so DVRPC pursues an active, wide-ranging approach to improve it. Safety is incorporated in a great many of DVRPC's Work Program efforts, from safe routes to school, to use of technology for operations and incident management, to corridor studies. The broad Transportation Safety and Security program helps coordinate these efforts and also includes many specific tasks.

- The updated Safety Action Plan (Publication 09032) enhances cooperation in improving transportation safety in the Delaware Valley among a wide range of multimodal partners. The seven emphasis areas include sustaining safe senior mobility and ensuring pedestrian safety, both of which directly matter to EJ populations.
- Road Safety Audits are focused analyses to make high-crash road sections safer for all users.
- DVRPC seeks to enhance planning-level communication efforts throughout the Delaware Valley to prepare the transportation system to deal with natural and man-made emergencies.
- DVRPC has prepared a safety and security report, *Fitting the Pieces Together: Improving Transportation Security Planning in the Delaware Valley* (Publication 09018). Recommendations include that DVRPC could provide expertise in sheltering in place and would consider EJ populations in such planning.

Air Quality

The Air Quality Partnership (AQP) is dedicated to providing information regarding the health effects of ground level ozone and fine particle pollution, while encouraging individuals to take action to reduce polluting activities, throughout the DVRPC service area. AQP primarily delivers these messages through paid advertising and outreach in major regional newspapers, radio ads, and targeted (weather and traffic) television sponsorships. AQP also sponsors and participates in numerous community events to disseminate educational materials and provide information to attendees.

In an effort to ensure that air quality information and health advisories are accessible to minority populations and communities in the region, AQP purchases advertisements and event sponsorships that are targeted to or traditionally attended by largely minority audiences. Below is a list of targeted advertisements and sponsorships supported by the AQP in FY 2010:

Series of Ads in Al Dia Spanish Language Newspaper: The AQP ran a series of air quality advertisements in the *Al Dia* Spanish language newspaper for eight weeks in the months of July and August. *Al Dia* newspaper produced a Spanish language anti-idling commercial, which it ran on its website through the summer of 2010. It is planned to make this video available to Pennsylvania

Department of Environmental Protection for further distribution. The newspaper is the leading Spanish language newspaper in the region.

Spanish Language Materials: The AQP distributes Spanish versions of the *Air Quality in the Delaware Valley* educational brochure at public events. The air quality index, on the AQP webpage (<http://www.airqualitypartnership.org/>), is also available in Spanish by clicking a button below the index. DVRPC staff also recorded the air quality forecast in Spanish through the summer of 2010.

Sponsorships of Diverse Radio Programming: The AQP-sponsored programming includes minority-oriented public radio programming (WRTI Jazz program) and programs oriented to older people (WRTI Classical programming). These programs have a large reach to minority and older populations.

Advertisements and sponsorships provide basic air quality information and direct audiences to the AQP website and free telephone information line (800-872-7261), where they can receive air quality forecasts, health information, and tips to reduce air pollution.

Transportation Enhancements Program

Transportation Enhancement (TE) projects are mandated by Congress in SAFETEA-LU for the funding of nontraditional projects designed to strengthen the cultural, aesthetic, and environmental aspects of the nation's intermodal transportation system. Typical TE projects include bicycle and pedestrian trails, restoration of historic train stations, downtown streetscape improvements, roadside beautification, and preservation of scenic vistas. As a part of the approval process, each project must obtain environmental clearance. To obtain that clearance, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) guidelines must be followed, which include at least one public meeting that allows citizen concerns to be voiced. DVRPC does not hold this public meeting, but rather it is facilitated by the individual project sponsor. In addition, the environmental clearance takes into account cultural resources and socioeconomic project impacts. Since the inception of the program in 2000, a total of 157 projects have been awarded funding. The latest TE round, in 2005, awarded funding to 33 projects.

Greater Philadelphia Economic Development Framework

The Greater Philadelphia Economic Development Framework (Publication 09008) was created at the behest of the Philadelphia Regional Office of the U.S. Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration (EDA), to satisfy provisions for a Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDs) document for the Greater Philadelphia Region (which includes portions of Pennsylvania, New

Jersey, and Delaware). The document was developed according to provisions outlined in 13 C.F.R. § 303.7(c), *Consideration of non-EDA funded CEDS*, and was authored cooperatively with Select Greater Philadelphia and Ben Franklin Technology Partners.

The *Framework* provides an overview of economic development in Greater Philadelphia. It includes a regional profile (including historical overview, current economic and demographic characteristics, a discussion of economic disparities and EJ, and projected trends); a review of regional economic development organizations, programs, and resources; and summaries of key economic development documents, including numerous studies, reports, and analyses that have been developed over the last few years that provide insight into challenges and opportunities for economic growth in Greater Philadelphia. Finally, the report identifies broad and inclusive recommended criteria for regional economic development projects, including focusing on growth in recognized centers; creating jobs appropriate to employing and building on the skills of the region's most vulnerable and distressed populations; and creating jobs that match the workforce supply.

US 30 (Lancaster Avenue) Corridor Study: Creating Linkages and Connecting Communities

DVRPC is currently studying US 30 (Lancaster Avenue) between 52nd Street in West Philadelphia and Old Eagle School Road in Wayne. Transportation, land use, and the environment will be addressed through recommendations made to enhance the existing assets of the 11-mile corridor by addressing transportation and livability issues and concerns. An EJ screening and evaluation will be conducted for the tri-county corridor study area using the DOD methodology. The results will help shape the study recommendations, and specific improvements will be identified for disadvantaged areas of the corridor. As part of the final report, an implementation plan will be created that identifies priority recommendations in both the short- and long-term.

NJ Route 73 Transportation/Land Use Corridor Study

DVRPC is currently conducting a Transportation and Land Use Corridor Study of a six-mile segment of NJ 73, between NJ 90 and NJ 70, along with major parallel and perpendicular routes in western Burlington County. The study identifies a variety of existing transportation facilities in the study area, including bicycle, pedestrian, and transit service. Coordination with Cross County TMA services was explored. An EJ screening and evaluation was conducted for communities within the study area in order to specifically consider the needs of disadvantaged groups in the corridor. Short-, medium-, and long-term recommendations will be developed and outlined in a final report.

Mercer County Future Bus Plan

A great deal of work has already been done to envision future growth in central New Jersey and to plan transit services that will maintain and improve mobility in the context of this growth. This work includes NJ TRANSIT's recent near-term implementation plan for the Route 1 BRT, NJ TRANSIT's longer-term plan for a complete BRT network, and the forthcoming report on NJDOT's Route 1 Regional Growth Strategy. This plan draws on the results of those projects and others to articulate a cohesive vision for future bus transit services in Mercer County, and benefits transit-dependent and EJ communities through pursuing a high-quality, expanded transit network where service is more effective and convenient. Outreach for the Mercer County Future Bus Plan included workshop participation by advocates for disadvantaged and disabled communities, such as ARC Mercer, the United Way, and Mercer County TRADE.

SEPTA Pulse Scheduling Study – Phase I

DVRPC has conducted an investigation to identify candidate sites in the SEPTA service area for service improvements through pulse scheduling. Pulse scheduling, also known as timed transfers, is a technique employed to facilitate passenger transfers between intersecting routes that operate infrequently. Schedules are designed so that vehicles from different routes arrive at a designated intersecting node point at the same time and depart in unison. This allows passengers to transfer conveniently, with a more seamless multi-seat transit trip experience. This is especially beneficial to transit-dependent passengers, who must otherwise endure long waits between uncoordinated transfers. In the initial phase of this study, DVRPC developed a method to identify effective candidate routes and locations in the SEPTA network, and developed a set of short-list candidate locations for Phase II consideration by SEPTA.

Chester Riverfront and Community Rail Access Study

This study identified and analyzed Highland Avenue Station and alternate station locations for the SEPTA Wilmington/Newark Regional Rail Line to assess potential station relocation closer to existing and proposed developments along the Chester riverfront between Highland Avenue and Flower Street. Both new rail station construction and new shuttle bus operation between the existing station and the new development areas were considered. A series of stakeholder meetings was held within the general study area, and EJ issues were defined and summarized for inclusion in the final report.

Eating Here: Greater Philadelphia's Food System Plan

This multi-phase project began in FY 2009 with a large surveying and assessment effort to identify prominent stakeholders and regional competitive advantages, culminating in the *Greater Philadelphia Food System Study* (Publication 09066) and guided by a newly formed committee of nontraditional stakeholders. In FY 2010, the Stakeholder Committee continued to provide guidance in the creation of *Eating Here: Greater Philadelphia's Food System Plan* (Publication 10063). This plan identifies the values of and goals for a food system that better meets the needs of all of Greater Philadelphia's residents. Values include economic development, hunger and fairness, human health, ecological stewardship, collaboration, and sustainable farming. Identified quantitative and qualitative indicators measure different aspects of the food system and its ability to reflect those values, including fair wages and jobs for food system workers, water quality for all residents, access to affordable healthy foods, and rates of diet-related disease. Finally, stakeholders identified over 50 recommended strategies to improve social equity, create economic development opportunities, and reduce ecological impacts of the regional food system. Strategies include policy reform, expanding existing efforts, and new innovations.

Future Direction

Forthcoming Reports

The following documents are currently in process and will be released during FY 2011.

Eating Here: Greater Philadelphia's Food System Plan

In FY 2011, DVRPC will continue to convene the Food System Stakeholder Committee to explore different areas and issues within Greater Philadelphia's food system, building on the FY 2010 plan. Food access, hunger and nutrition, and the effects of poverty continue to be prevalent issues within Greater Philadelphia's food system.

Camden City Parking Needs Assessment

DVRPC is conducting an analysis of current and future parking demands in and around the downtown area of Camden. The study focuses primarily upon the core commercial area; however, certain adjacent residential areas are also included. Various stakeholder groups, including transit service providers (PATCO, NJ Transit), have been contacted to provide a more complete perspective on parking demands, limitations, and desires. An EJ screening and evaluation will be conducted for the study area so that the needs of disadvantaged groups are incorporated into the study. Public meetings will be held to identify local concerns and wishes and to generate feedback for proposed recommendations. The final report will provide short-, medium-, and long-term recommendations to better manage existing and future parking demands.

Routes 130 and 206 Traffic Study

DVRPC will conduct an analysis of traffic operations along US 130 and US 206 in northern Burlington County, in Bordentown Borough and Township. Improved safety, congestion, and multi-modal mobility will be points of emphasis. To better understand travel demands, DVRPC will coordinate with transit service providers and TMAs. An EJ screening and evaluation will be conducted for the study area to ensure consideration of specific needs of disadvantaged groups and to inform preparation for public meetings, which will be held to define local priorities. The final report will provide short-, medium-, and long-term recommendations to improve safety, congestion, and multi-modal mobility in the study area.

Coordinated Human Services Transportation Planning

DVRPC will maintain its role as a regional coordinator of the Federal Transit Administration's JARC and NFI programs, components of the CHSTP process. DVRPC facilitates coordination with member governments and funding agencies regarding project development and plan updates, and provides technical support through the selection process for JARC and NFI. Continuing coordination of the competitive CHSTP grant selection rounds are scheduled for both Pennsylvania (annual funding round schedule) and New Jersey (biannual funding round schedule) in FY 2011.

In an effort to address FTA's requirement for each county to identify local, county-specific CHSTP priorities in Pennsylvania counties, DVRPC has initiated a county stakeholder outreach process. In order to begin a targeted outreach process, each Pennsylvania county will meet with a selected group of stakeholders that have expertise in the various needs of CHSTP communities. DVRPC will provide assistance with meeting facilitation and output summary review in order to ensure that each county produces a county-specific CHSTP document. These documents, brief summaries of stakeholder-identified county priorities, will provide a stepping off point for future, larger outreach processes. The product of this initial outreach process will identify both short- and long-term priorities and will serve as guidance to county and regional transportation providers.

Other Activities

DVRPC will continue to implement EJ activities as part of its annual Work Program, fulfilling federal certification requirements, as well as attaining regional goals. DVRPC will also:

- Keep abreast of legal developments related to Title IV and other Executive Orders
- Monitor the effectiveness of the policy statement and policy participation strategies developed in FY 2001 to 2009
- Assess DVRPC studies and processes, including the TIP for Pennsylvania and New Jersey and the 2035 LRP *Connections – The Regional Plan for a Sustainable Future*, to identify the regional benefits and challenges of different socioeconomic groups
- Continue outreach to limited-English-proficient populations and strengthen efforts to include those citizens in the planning process
- Participate and collaborate in regional and national programs that will allow DVRPC to exchange fresh ideas with others, and
- Continue EJ education and training for DVRPC staff to heighten the awareness of EJ in the planning process.

Environmental Justice
at DVRPC
Fiscal Year 2010

Appendix A

- Degrees of Disadvantage Tables and Figures

Table A-1: Non-Hispanic Minority Census Tract Rankings



Ranking by Population	Census Tract	County	Municipality	Total Non-Hispanic Minority Population in Census Tract	Percent of Non-Hispanic Minority Population in Census Tract
1	C.T. 172	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	8531	98.7%
2	C.T. 81	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	8166	98.5%
3	C.T. 71	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	8014	96.4%
4	C.T. 151	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	7938	99.0%
5	C.T. 201	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	7553	97.7%
23	C.T. 11	Mercer	Trenton	5725	84.8%
37	C.T. 4021	Delaware	Yeadon	4910	82.1%
46	C.T. 6015	Camden	Camden	4536	70.6%
54	C.T. 6014	Camden	Camden	4369	91.2%
71	C.T. 22	Mercer	Trenton	3906	66.3%
80	C.T. 4045	Delaware	Chester	3695	72.6%
118	C.T. 2024.01	Montgomery	Cheltenham	3127	93.2%
129	C.T. 7028.03	Burlington	Willingboro	2889	70.8%
131	C.T. 7028.06	Burlington	Willingboro	2844	70.5%
139	C.T. 2063	Montgomery	Collegeville	2738	34.1%
157	C.T. 3055	Chester	Coatesville City	2540	72.2%
204	C.T. 5004	Gloucester	Paulsboro	2113	34.3%
239	C.T. 1057.04	Bucks	Morrisville	1808	27.0%
240	C.T. 1003.03	Bucks	Bristol	1788	34.4%
247	C.T. 5010.02	Gloucester	Woodbury	1668	39.4%
280	C.T. 3056	Chester	Coatesville City	1520	55.9%

Ranking by Percent	Census Tract	County	Municipality	Total Non-Hispanic Minority Population in Census Tract	Percent of Non-Hispanic Minority Population in Census Tract
1	C.T. 148	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	633	100.0%
2	C.T. 46	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	177	100.0%
3	C.T. 152	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	5149	99.7%
4	C.T. 106	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	1505	99.6%
5	C.T. 95	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	3569	99.5%
14	C.T. 4051	Delaware	Chester	2175	98.8%
41	C.T. 4029	Delaware	Darby	3293	97.6%
69	C.T. 15	Mercer	Trenton	2807	95.3%
76	C.T. 6065	Camden	Lawnside	2570	94.3%
80	C.T. 14.02	Mercer	Trenton	2496	94.0%
88	C.T. 2024.01	Montgomery	Cheltenham	3127	93.2%
96	C.T. 6014	Camden	Camden	4369	91.2%
142	C.T. 7028.11	Burlington	Willingboro	2180	79.0%
149	C.T. 7028.10	Burlington	Willingboro	1082	76.6%
153	C.T. 2067.02	Montgomery	Skippack	77	75.5%
171	C.T. 3055	Chester	Coatesville City	2540	72.2%
214	C.T. 3058	Chester	South Coatesville	612	61.4%
252	C.T. 1004.03	Bucks	Bristol	1031	48.0%
271	C.T. 5014.02	Gloucester	Glassboro	1444	43.7%
296	C.T. 5010.02	Gloucester	Woodbury	1668	39.4%
324	C.T. 1003.03	Bucks	Bristol	1788	34.4%

A-1

Sources: DVRPC, U.S. Census Bureau

Figure A-1: Non-Hispanic Minority Population Concentrations




County Boundary
Percent of Population by Tract (2000)

- 0 - 12.3
- 12.4 - 24.8
- 24.9 - 37.2
- 37.3 - 49.6
- 49.7 - 100

Regional Threshold: 24.9%

Percent of County	
Bucks (PA)	6.5%
Chester (PA)	9.0%
Gloucester (NJ)	11.9%
Montgomery (PA)	12.5%
Delaware (PA)	19.0%
Burlington (NJ)	19.5%
Camden (NJ)	22.6%
Regional Threshold	24.9%
Mercer (NJ)	26.1%
Philadelphia (PA)	49.0%



Sources: DVRPC, U.S. Census Bureau

A-2



Table A-2: Carless Household Census Tract Rankings

Ranking by Households	Census Tract	County	Municipality	Total Carless Households in Census Tract	Percent of Carless Households in Census Tract
1	C.T. 8	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	3207	52.4%
2	C.T. 9	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	2430	76.1%
3	C.T. 12	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	2399	48.2%
4	C.T. 4	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	2226	73.4%
5	C.T. 11	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	2181	56.5%
41	C.T. 6008	Camden	Camden	1088	59.6%
50	C.T. 11	Mercer	Trenton	1039	38.8%
76	C.T. 21	Mercer	Trenton	885	44.2%
77	C.T. 6015	Camden	Camden	884	42.3%
128	C.T. 4003.01	Delaware	Upper Darby	687	27.3%
172	C.T. 3055	Chester	Coatesville City	568	42.8%
176	C.T. 4024	Delaware	Darby	563	48.0%
197	C.T. 1047.01	Bucks	Doylestown	527	30.0%
208	C.T. 2038.03	Montgomery	Norristown	506	25.0%
213	C.T. 5010.02	Gloucester	Woodbury	500	28.9%
243	C.T. 2039.01	Montgomery	Norristown	451	42.7%
252	C.T. 7012.04	Burlington	Burlington	277	27.2%
274	C.T. 5004	Gloucester	Paulsboro	382	16.2%
282	C.T. 7004.06	Burlington	Maple Shade	370	9.0%
296	C.T. 3080	Chester	Oxford	348	20.4%
297	C.T. 1002.11	Bucks	Bensalem	347	12.9%




Ranking by Percent	Census Tract	County	Municipality	Total Carless Households in Census Tract	Percent of Carless Households in Census Tract
1	C.T. 76	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	2	100.0%
2	C.T. 328	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	1	100.0%
3	C.T. 5	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	243	88.0%
4	C.T. 89	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	430	87.4%
5	C.T. 127	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	208	85.6%
14	C.T. 6017	Camden	Camden	678	69.3%
28	C.T. 6005	Camden	Camden	328	62.6%
87	C.T. 10	Mercer	Trenton	623	52.0%
111	C.T. 4058	Delaware	Chester	425	48.5%
116	C.T. 4024	Delaware	Darby	563	48.0%
143	C.T. 9	Mercer	Trenton	668	45.5%
162	C.T. 3055	Chester	Coatesville City	568	42.8%
163	C.T. 2039.01	Montgomery	Norristown	451	42.7%
198	C.T. 3105	Chester	Pennsbury	131	38.1%
221	C.T. 2039.02	Montgomery	Norristown	444	35.3%
252	C.T. 7021.12	Burlington	Wrightstown	6	31.6%
264	C.T. 1047.01	Bucks	Doylestown	527	30.0%
268	C.T. 5010.02	Gloucester	Woodbury	500	28.9%
287	C.T. 7012.04	Burlington	Burlington	277	27.2%
380	C.T. 1016.05	Bucks	Warminster	299	19.6%
397	C.T. 5014.02	Gloucester	Glassboro	219	18.1%

Sources: DVRPC, U.S. Census Bureau

Figure A-2: Carless Household Concentrations



County Boundary
Percent of Housing Units by Tract (2000)



Sources: DVRPC, U.S. Census Bureau



Table A-3: Households in Poverty Census Tract Rankings

Ranking by Households	Census Tract	County	Municipality	Total Households in Poverty in Census Tract	Percent of Households in Poverty in Census Tract
1	C.T. 151	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	1441	47.4%
2	C.T. 88	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	1371	63.6%
3	C.T. 177	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	1332	50.2%
4	C.T. 195	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	1279	49.5%
5	C.T. 175	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	1248	55.9%
21	C.T. 6008	Camden	Camden	890	48.9%
40	C.T. 11	Mercer	Trenton	682	25.4%
41	C.T. 6013	Camden	Camden	680	42.8%
65	C.T. 10	Mercer	Trenton	588	48.8%
73	C.T. 3026	Chester	West Chester	567	35.4%
144	C.T. 3055	Chester	Coatesville City	413	32.0%
149	C.T. 5004	Gloucester	Paulsboro	405	17.1%
156	C.T. 5010.02	Gloucester	Woodbury	395	22.7%
163	C.T. 1001.04	Bucks	Bensalem	383	21.5%
179	C.T. 4045	Delaware	Chester	362	19.5%
180	C.T. 4047	Delaware	Chester	361	35.4%
207	C.T. 1002.07	Bucks	Bensalem	318	21.7%
225	C.T. 2038.03	Montgomery	Norristown	303	15.0%
227	C.T. 2035	Montgomery	Norristown	303	12.2%
297	C.T. 7022.05	Burlington	Pemberton	232	8.2%
305	C.T. 7004.06	Burlington	Maple Shade	222	5.4%

Ranking by Percent	Census Tract	County	Municipality	Total Households in Poverty in Census Tract	Percent of Households in Poverty in Census Tract
1	C.T. 6001	Camden	Camden	10	100.0%
2	C.T. 46	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	49	79.0%
3	C.T. 88	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	1371	63.6%
4	C.T. 2	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	317	62.8%
5	C.T. 89	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	315	60.9%
16	C.T. 6017	Camden	Camden	478	51.7%
28	C.T. 10	Mercer	Trenton	588	48.8%
60	C.T. 4049	Delaware	Chester	233	40.1%
74	C.T. 5014.04	Gloucester	Glassboro	252	36.3%
75	C.T. 20	Mercer	Trenton	159	36.1%
79	C.T. 3026	Chester	West Chester	567	35.4%
80	C.T. 4047	Delaware	Chester	361	35.4%
110	C.T. 3055	Chester	Coatesville City	413	32.0%
169	C.T. 2039.01	Montgomery	Norristown	284	26.9%
199	C.T. 2090	Montgomery	Pottstown	154	23.3%
210	C.T. 5010.02	Gloucester	Woodbury	395	22.7%
212	C.T. 7020	Burlington	Wrightstown	64	22.5%
220	C.T. 1002.07	Bucks	Bensalem	318	21.7%
223	C.T. 1001.04	Bucks	Bensalem	383	21.5%
271	C.T. 7022.04	Burlington	Pemberton	101	17.2%

Sources: DVRPC, U.S. Census Bureau


Figure A-3: Concentrations of Households in Poverty



County Boundary
Percent of Households by Tract (2000)

- 0 - 5.3
 - 5.4 - 10.8
 - 10.9 - 16.2
 - 16.3 - 21.6
 - 21.7 - 100
- Regional Threshold: 10.9%*

Percent of County	
Burlington (NJ)	4.7%
Montgomery (PA)	4.7%
Bucks (PA)	4.8%
Chester (PA)	5.0%
Gloucester (NJ)	6.7%
Delaware (PA)	7.9%
Mercer (NJ)	8.6%
Camden (NJ)	10.0%
Regional Threshold	10.9%
Philadelphia (PA)	21.8%



Sources: DVRPC, U.S. Census Bureau


Table A-4: Persons with Physical Disabilities Census Tract Rankings

Ranking by Population	Census Tract	County	Municipality	Total Persons with Physical Disabilities in Census Tract	Percent of Persons with Physical Disabilities in Census Tract
1	C.T. 28	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	1401	16.1%
2	C.T. 337	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	1371	15.5%
3	C.T. 345	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	1147	14.3%
4	C.T. 151	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	1136	15.4%
5	C.T. 27	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	1114	15.4%
30	C.T. 6008	Camden	Camden	830	15.8%
51	C.T. 11	Mercer	Trenton	711	11.5%
53	C.T. 35	Mercer	Ewing	697	10.8%
66	C.T. 6075.01	Camden	Voorhees	664	8.8%
70	C.T. 5004	Gloucester	Paulsboro	645	11.3%
86	C.T. 7004.06	Burlington	Maple Shade	618	8.6%
90	C.T. 4041.01	Delaware	Ridley	611	10.1%
91	C.T. 1004.01	Bucks	Bristol	611	9.9%
97	C.T. 1057.04	Bucks	Morrisville	597	9.6%
98	C.T. 7032.03	Burlington	Southampton	595	15.8%
110	C.T. 4033	Delaware	Clifton Heights	577	9.1%
115	C.T. 5016.07	Gloucester	Monroe	567	7.5%
207	C.T. 2025	Montgomery	Cheltenham	467	9.5%
223	C.T. 2019.02	Montgomery	Abington	452	8.2%
240	C.T. 3049	Chester	Honey Brook	435	7.5%
245	C.T. 3055	Chester	Coatesville City	429	13.2%

Ranking by Percent	Census Tract	County	Municipality	Total Persons with Physical Disabilities in Census Tract	Percent of Persons with Physical Disabilities in Census Tract
1	C.T. 354	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	5	100.0%
2	C.T. 6025.01	Camden	Pennsauken	96	55.5%
3	C.T. 148	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	183	30.4%
4	C.T. 6005	Camden	Camden	200	26.9%
5	C.T. 1058.06	Bucks	Falls	24	23.5%
16	C.T. 1047.01	Bucks	Doylestown	532	18.2%
18	C.T. 3105	Chester	Pennsbury	117	17.9%
19	C.T. 2088.01	Montgomery	Pottstown	182	17.8%
26	C.T. 10	Mercer	Trenton	516	16.9%
29	C.T. 7022.06	Burlington	Pemberton	286	16.5%
30	C.T. 7014.02	Burlington	Mansfield	271	16.4%
31	C.T. 20	Mercer	Trenton	213	16.3%
35	C.T. 4066	Delaware	Marcus Hook	342	16.0%
51	C.T. 2039.02	Montgomery	Norristown	397	15.2%
56	C.T. 3058	Chester	South Coatesville	138	14.9%
57	C.T. 5016.05	Gloucester	Monroe	491	14.9%
62	C.T. 5011.01	Gloucester	Deptford	555	14.7%
104	C.T. 4084	Delaware	Haverford	257	13.7%

Sources: DVRPC, U.S. Census Bureau


Figure A-4: Concentrations of Persons with Physical Disabilities



County Boundary
**Percent of Population*
 by Tract (2000)**

- 0 - 3.7
 - 3.8 - 7.6
 - 7.7 - 11.4
 - 11.5 - 15.3
 - 15.4 - 100
- Regional Threshold: 7.7%*
- *Five Years and Older

Percent of County	
Chester (PA)	5.1%
Montgomery (PA)	5.7%
Bucks (PA)	6.4%
Burlington (NJ)	6.5%
Mercer (NJ)	6.8%
Delaware (PA)	7.3%
Gloucester (NJ)	7.5%
Regional Threshold	7.7%
Camden (NJ)	7.8%
Philadelphia (PA)	10.7%



Sources: DVRPC, U.S. Census Bureau



Table A-5: Female Head of Household with Child Census Tract Rankings

Ranking by Households	Census Tract	County	Municipality	Total Female Head of Household with Child Households in Census Tract	Percent of Female Head of Household with Child Households in Census Tract
1	C.T. 177	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	825	31.1%
2	C.T. 151	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	708	23.3%
3	C.T. 195	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	692	26.8%
4	C.T. 286	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	627	28.9%
5	C.T. 274	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	618	18.6%
20	C.T. 6015	Camden	Camden	528	25.1%
24	C.T. 11	Mercer	Trenton	480	17.9%
29	C.T. 4003.01	Delaware	Upper Darby	471	18.7%
30	C.T. 6019	Camden	Camden	463	40.2%
43	C.T. 14.01	Mercer	Trenton	421	29.6%
61	C.T. 7022.05	Burlington	Pemberton	385	13.6%
79	C.T. 2024.01	Montgomery	Cheltenham	338	20.7%
81	C.T. 4053	Delaware	Chester	333	27.1%
127	C.T. 2087.04	Montgomery	Lower Pottsgrove	285	19.1%
129	C.T. 5010.02	Gloucester	Woodbury	284	16.3%
130	C.T. 1058.01	Bucks	Falls	284	11.2%
132	C.T. 7031.01	Burlington	Lumberton	280	8.2%
140	C.T. 3055	Chester	Coatesville City	274	21.2%
151	C.T. 5004	Gloucester	Paulsboro	266	11.2%
157	C.T. 1057.04	Bucks	Morrisville	257	9.4%
215	C.T. 3054	Chester	Coatesville City	199	22.5%

Ranking by Percent	Census Tract	County	Municipality	Total Female Head of Household with Child Households in Census Tract	Percent of Female Head of Household with Child Households in Census Tract
1	C.T. 6001	Camden	Camden	10	100.0%
2	C.T. 46	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	40	64.5%
3	C.T. 6019	Camden	Camden	463	40.2%
4	C.T. 69	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	433	39.1%
5	C.T. 6017	Camden	Camden	353	38.2%
11	C.T. 20	Mercer	Trenton	145	32.9%
19	C.T. 14.01	Mercer	Trenton	421	29.6%
26	C.T. 4052	Delaware	Chester	298	28.0%
30	C.T. 4053	Delaware	Chester	333	27.1%
67	C.T. 3054	Chester	Coatesville City	199	22.5%
68	C.T. 2039.01	Montgomery	Norristown	237	22.5%
85	C.T. 3055	Chester	Coatesville City	274	21.2%
93	C.T. 2090	Montgomery	Pottstown	138	20.9%
154	C.T. 7028.09	Burlington	Willingboro	108	17.8%
170	C.T. 7022.04	Burlington	Pemberton	100	17.1%
185	C.T. 1016.05	Bucks	Warminster	250	16.4%
188	C.T. 5010.02	Gloucester	Woodbury	284	16.3%
212	C.T. 5014.02	Gloucester	Glassboro	187	15.2%
241	C.T. 1007	Bucks	Bristol	157	13.7%

Sources: DVRPC, U.S. Census Bureau

Figure A-5: Female Head of Household with Child Population Concentrations




County Boundary

Percent of Households by Tract (2000)

- 0 - 3.6
- 3.7 - 7.3
- 7.4 - 11
- 11.1 - 14.7
- 14.8 - 100

Regional Threshold: 7.4%

County	Percent of County
Chester (PA)	4.0%
Montgomery (PA)	4.2%
Bucks (PA)	4.3%
Burlington (NJ)	5.4%
Gloucester (NJ)	5.7%
Delaware (PA)	6.2%
Mercer (NJ)	6.8%
Regional Threshold	7.4%
Camden (NJ)	8.5%
Philadelphia (PA)	12.0%




Sources: DVRPC, U.S. Census Bureau

Table A-6: Elderly (75 Years and Over) Census Tract Rankings

Ranking by Population	Census Tract	County	Municipality	Total Elderly Population in Census Tract	Percent of Elderly Population in Census Tract
1	C.T. 4072.01	Delaware	Middletown	2019	37.1%
2	C.T. 122	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	1966	24.5%
3	C.T. 7032.03	Burlington	Southampton	1522	39.6%
4	C.T. 337	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	1451	15.6%
5	C.T. 345	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	1449	17.2%
12	C.T. 1046.04	Bucks	Doylestown	1037	15.6%
14	C.T. 2104	Montgomery	Springfield	968	20.1%
16	C.T. 2025	Montgomery	Cheltenham	916	18.3%
17	C.T. 6032	Camden	Cherry Hill	904	14.9%
19	C.T. 4081.01	Delaware	Marple	876	17.0%
29	C.T. 1047.01	Bucks	Doylestown	788	25.5%
31	C.T. 37.05	Mercer	Ewing	772	11.6%
34	C.T. 6035.07	Camden	Cherry Hill	768	11.0%
37	C.T. 3049	Chester	Honey Brook	723	11.5%
41	C.T. 3028.03	Chester	East Goshen	706	31.5%
49	C.T. 7029.08	Burlington	Mount Laurel	688	15.1%
50	C.T. 27.02	Mercer	Hamilton	681	10.3%
117	C.T. 5011.01	Gloucester	Deptford	540	13.7%
120	C.T. 5010.02	Gloucester	Woodbury	536	12.7%


Ranking by Percent	Census Tract	County	Municipality	Total Elderly Population in Census Tract	Percent of Elderly Population in Census Tract
1	C.T. 3105	Chester	Pennsbury	553	84.7%
2	C.T. 6025.01	Camden	Pennsauken	139	80.3%
3	C.T. 3109	Chester	Pocopson	549	61.1%
4	C.T. 3012.01	Chester	East Vincent	130	43.0%
5	C.T. 7032.03	Burlington	Southampton	1522	39.6%
6	C.T. 4072.01	Delaware	Middletown	2019	37.1%
7	C.T. 6101	Camden	Pennsauken	10	37.0%
8	C.T. 226	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	164	35.1%
9	C.T. 7014.02	Burlington	Mansfield	573	34.8%
10	C.T. 220	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	518	32.9%
12	C.T. 4084	Delaware	Haverford	611	31.4%
15	C.T. 2012.03	Montgomery	Lower Gwynedd	790	28.3%
17	C.T. 2018	Montgomery	Abington	853	27.3%
20	C.T. 1047.01	Bucks	Doylestown	788	25.5%
27	C.T. 1015.04	Bucks	Upper Southampton	690	23.2%
91	C.T. 5011.01	Gloucester	Deptford	540	13.7%
92	C.T. 5013.03	Gloucester	Pitman	379	13.7%
100	C.T. 30.08	Mercer	Hamilton	656	13.4%
139	C.T. 37.05	Mercer	Ewing	772	11.6%

Figure A-6: Elderly (75 Years and Over) Population Concentrations





County Boundary

Percent of Population by Tract (2000)



Percent of County



Sources: DVRPC, U.S. Census Bureau



Table A-7: Hispanic Census Tract Rankings

Ranking by Population	Census Tract	County	Municipality	Total Hispanic Population in Census Tract	Percent of Hispanic Population in Census Tract
1	C.T. 195	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	6802	78.7%
2	C.T. 176.01	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	5223	89.1%
3	C.T. 177	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	5047	55.1%
4	C.T. 175	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	4871	65.4%
5	C.T. 289	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	4391	43.4%
7	C.T. 6008	Camden	Camden	3660	63.6%
9	C.T. 6010	Camden	Camden	3576	63.0%
24	C.T. 3065	Chester	New Garden	1980	21.8%
27	C.T. 4	Mercer	Trenton	1874	40.8%
30	C.T. 9	Mercer	Trenton	1677	38.7%
35	C.T. 7021.04	Burlington	New Hanover	1580	29.4%
55	C.T. 1002.08	Bucks	Bensalem	1064	16.5%
59	C.T. 1016.05	Bucks	Warminster	1013	24.1%
62	C.T. 3034.01	Chester	Kennett Square	988	29.2%
70	C.T. 2039.01	Montgomery	Norristown	757	24.4%
77	C.T. 7022.05	Burlington	Pemberton	738	9.1%
89	C.T. 2038.03	Montgomery	Norristown	675	13.6%
150	C.T. 4048	Delaware	Chester	372	13.7%
169	C.T. 4049	Delaware	Chester	312	17.6%
177	C.T. 5012.11	Gloucester	Washington	301	3.4%
200	C.T. 5004	Gloucester	Paulsboro	263	4.3%



Ranking by Percent	Census Tract	County	Municipality	Total Hispanic Population in Census Tract	Percent of Hispanic Population in Census Tract
1	C.T. 176.01	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	5223	89.1%
2	C.T. 195	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	6802	78.7%
3	C.T. 176.02	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	3000	77.6%
4	C.T. 163	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	2908	77.0%
5	C.T. 162	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	1840	75.3%
8	C.T. 6009	Camden	Camden	3028	69.5%
10	C.T. 6008	Camden	Camden	3660	63.6%
22	C.T. 8	Mercer	Trenton	1118	47.2%
24	C.T. 1	Mercer	Trenton	1369	46.7%
35	C.T. 3064	Chester	Avondale	430	38.7%
46	C.T. 7021.04	Burlington	New Hanover	1580	29.4%
47	C.T. 3034.01	Chester	Kennett Square	988	29.2%
61	C.T. 2039.01	Montgomery	Norristown	757	24.4%
63	C.T. 1016.05	Bucks	Warminster	1013	24.1%
64	C.T. 7035	Burlington	Washington	139	24.0%
88	C.T. 4049	Delaware	Chester	312	17.6%
95	C.T. 1002.08	Bucks	Bensalem	1064	16.5%
117	C.T. 2036.01	Montgomery	Norristown	381	13.8%
119	C.T. 4048	Delaware	Chester	372	13.7%
185	C.T. 5023	Gloucester	Swedesboro	162	7.9%
198	C.T. 5010.01	Gloucester	Woodbury	158	7.1%

A-13

Figure A-7: Hispanic Population Concentrations



County Boundary
Percent of Population by Tract (2000)





Sources: DVRPC, U.S. Census Bureau

Table A-8: Limited English Proficiency Census Tract Rankings

Ranking by Population	Census Tract	County	Municipality	Total Limited English Proficiency Population in Census Tract	Percent of Limited English Proficiency Population in Census Tract
1	C.T. 28	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	1358	15.6%
2	C.T. 357	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	1342	15.9%
3	C.T. 195	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	1332	17.4%
4	C.T. 289	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	1330	14.4%
5	C.T. 274	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	1269	13.1%
11	C.T. 3065	Chester	New Garden	1030	12.3%
14	C.T. 6011.02	Camden	Camden	937	21.3%
15	C.T. 6008	Camden	Camden	936	17.8%
21	C.T. 4002	Delaware	Upper Darby	746	20.8%
31	C.T. 18	Mercer	Trenton	609	16.1%
32	C.T. 4	Mercer	Trenton	603	14.4%
35	C.T. 1001.04	Bucks	Bensalem	591	14.1%
37	C.T. 1002.08	Bucks	Bensalem	570	9.3%
46	C.T. 7021.04	Burlington	New Hanover	494	9.3%
57	C.T. 7006.03	Burlington	Delran	424	7.4%
74	C.T. 2039.01	Montgomery	Norristown	372	13.2%
84	C.T. 3062	Chester	London Grove	336	7.0%
88	C.T. 4004.01	Delaware	Upper Darby	327	7.4%
120	C.T. 2035	Montgomery	Norristown	257	4.6%
214	C.T. 5012.09	Gloucester	Washington	130	2.8%
303	C.T. 5012.11	Gloucester	Washington	94	1.2%

Ranking by Percent	Census Tract	County	Municipality	Total Limited English Proficiency Population in Census Tract	Percent of Limited English Proficiency Population in Census Tract
1	C.T. 2	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	478	37.1%
2	C.T. 6011.01	Camden	Camden	859	25.0%
3	C.T. 176.01	Philadelphia	Philadelphia	1218	23.4%
4	C.T. 3064	Chester	Avondale	223	21.9%
5	C.T. 6011.02	Camden	Camden	937	21.3%
6	C.T. 4002	Delaware	Upper Darby	746	20.8%
10	C.T. 8	Mercer	Trenton	375	17.6%
15	C.T. 7	Mercer	Trenton	390	16.4%
21	C.T. 4001	Delaware	Millbourne	132	15.1%
22	C.T. 1002.07	Bucks	Bensalem	544	14.9%
36	C.T. 1001.04	Bucks	Bensalem	591	14.1%
43	C.T. 3034.02	Chester	Kennett Square	230	13.2%
44	C.T. 2039.01	Montgomery	Norristown	372	13.2%
68	C.T. 2036.01	Montgomery	Norristown	250	9.8%
73	C.T. 7007.03	Burlington	Riverside	209	9.3%
74	C.T. 7021.04	Burlington	New Hanover	494	9.3%
222	C.T. 5023	Gloucester	Swedesboro	64	3.3%
272	C.T. 5012.09	Gloucester	Washington	130	2.8%

Figure A-8: Limited English Proficiency Population Concentrations





County Boundary

Percent of Population*
 by Tract (2000)



*Five Years and Older

Percent of County



Sources: DVRPC, U.S. Census Bureau

Environmental Justice
at DVRPC
Fiscal Year 2010


Appendix B

- FY 2009 – 2012 PA TIP Figures
- FY 2010 – 2013 NJ TIP Figures

Figure B-1: Degrees of Disadvantage and TIP Projects for the Regional Highway Program (FY2011-2014 PA TIP)



- TIP Highway Program Project
- Degrees of Disadvantage by Tract
 - 0
 - 1 or 2
 - 3 or 4
 - 5 or 6
 - 7 or 8



Note: Projects that are not mappable (i.e., roadway landscaping, preliminary studies, etc.) are not shown



Sources: DVRPC, U.S. Census Bureau

B-1

Figure B-2: Disadvantaged Census Tracts with or without TIP Highway Program Projects (FY2011-2014 PA TIP)



TIP Highway Program Project

Census Tract Boundary

Tracts with 1 - 4 Degrees of Disadvantage


Have a TIP Project

Without a TIP Project

Tracts with 5 - 8 Degrees of Disadvantage

Have a TIP Project

Without a TIP Project



Note: Projects that are not mappable (i.e., roadway landscaping, preliminary studies, etc.) are not shown




Sources: DVRPC, U.S. Census Bureau

B-2


Figure B-3: Degrees of Disadvantage and TIP Projects for the Regional Transit Program (FY2011-2014 PA TIP)



- TIP Transit Program Project
- Degrees of Disadvantage by Tract**
- 0
- 1 or 2
- 3 or 4
- 5 or 6
- 7 or 8



Note: Projects that are not mappable (i.e., roadway landscaping, preliminary studies, etc.) are not shown



Sources: DVRPC, U.S. Census Bureau

Figure B-4: Disadvantaged Census Tracts with or without TIP Transit Program Projects (FY2011-2014 PA TIP)



TIP Transit Program Project

Census Tract Boundary

Tracts with 1 - 4 Degrees of Disadvantage


Have a TIP Project

Without a TIP Project

Tracts with 5 - 8 Degrees of Disadvantage

Have a TIP Project

Without a TIP Project



Note: Projects that are not mappable (i.e., roadway landscaping, preliminary studies, etc.) are not shown




Sources: DVRPC, U.S. Census Bureau

B-4


Figure B-5: Degrees of Disadvantage and TIP Projects for the Regional Highway Program (FY2010-2013 NJ TIP)




 TIP Highway Program Project

Degrees of Disadvantage by Tract

-  0
-  1 or 2
-  3 or 4
-  5 or 6
-  7 or 8




Note: Projects that are not mappable (i.e., roadway landscaping, preliminary studies, etc.) are not shown




Sources: DVRPC, U.S. Census Bureau


Figure B-6: Disadvantaged Census Tracts with or without TIP Highway Program Projects (FY2010-2013 NJ TIP)



 TIP Highway Program Project

 Census Tract Boundary


Tracts with 1 - 4 Degrees of Disadvantage


 Have a TIP Project

 Without a TIP Project


Tracts with 5 - 8 Degrees of Disadvantage

 Have a TIP Project

 Without a TIP Project



Note: Projects that are not mappable (i.e., roadway landscaping, preliminary studies, etc.) are not shown



Sources: DVRPC, U.S. Census Bureau


Figure B-7: Degrees of Disadvantage and TIP Projects for the Regional Transit Program (FY2010-2013 NJ TIP)



 TIP Transit Program Project

Degrees of Disadvantage by Tract

-  0
-  1 or 2
-  3 or 4
-  5 or 6
-  7 or 8



Note: Projects that are not mappable (i.e., roadway landscaping, preliminary studies, etc.) are not shown



Sources: DVRPC, U.S. Census Bureau

Figure B-8: Disadvantaged Census Tracts with or without TIP Transit Program Projects (FY2010-2013 NJ TIP)



TIP Transit Program Project

Census Tract Boundary

Tracts with 1 - 4 Degrees of Disadvantage


Have a TIP Project

Without a TIP Project


Tracts with 5 - 8 Degrees of Disadvantage

Have a TIP Project

Without a TIP Project



Note: Projects that are not mappable (i.e., roadway landscaping, preliminary studies, etc.) are not shown



Environmental Justice at DVRPC: Fiscal Year 2010

Publication Number: 10067

Date Published: December 2010

Geographic Area Covered: Nine-County Delaware Valley Region: Bucks, Chester, Delaware, Montgomery, and Philadelphia counties in Pennsylvania, and Burlington, Camden, Gloucester, and Mercer counties in New Jersey.

Key Words: Environmental Justice, Title VI, Executive Order 12898, Executive Order 13166, minority populations, persons with disabilities, households in poverty, Hispanic, elderly, carless households, limited English proficiency, demographics, Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Connections—A Regional Plan for a Sustainable Future, Transportation and Community Development Initiative (TCDI), Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan (CHSTP), Transportation Enhancements (TE) corridor studies, Title VI plan, air quality, public outreach

Abstract: In 2001, DVRPC published the “... *and Justice for All*” report to identify impacts of disparate funding and services on defined low-income and minority groups. An analysis method was created, refined in subsequent years, to identify populations that may be adversely affected by transportation planning decisions. This report is an annual update of that initial report and catalogues DVRPC's fiscal year 2010 programs and plans that contain Environmental Justice (EJ) elements. Descriptions for each project or program that utilizes DVRPC's EJ analysis method are discussed; including DVRPC's adopted Long-Range Plan, the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan (CHSTP), and corridor studies.

Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission
190 North Independence Mall West
The ACP Building – 8th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19106

Phone: 215-592-1800

Fax: 215-592-9125

Internet: www.dvrpc.org

Staff Contacts

Meghan Weir
Transportation Planner
Direct Phone: 215-238-2832
E-mail: mweir@dvrpc.org

Jane Meconi, AICP
Manager, Public Involvement and Title VI Compliance
Direct phone: 215-238-2871
E-mail: jmeconi@dvrpc.org

*le VI Equality Methodology Equality Title VI Public Outreach Title VI
Public Outreach Title VI Justice Public Outreach Justice Equality Justice
T Justice Methodology Equality Title VI Equality Methodology Title VI
ity Title VI Justice Title VI Methodology Title VI Justice Public Outreach
le VI Equality Methodology Equality Title VI Public Outreach Title VI
Public Outreach Title VI Justice Public Outreach Justice Equality Justice
T Justice Methodology Equality Title VI Equality Methodology Title VI
ity Title VI Justice Title VI Methodology Title VI Justice Public Outreach
le VI Equality Methodology Equality Title VI Public Outreach Title VI
Public Outreach Title VI Justice Public Outreach Justice Equality Justice
T Justice Methodology Equality Title VI Equality Methodology Title VI
ity Title VI Justice Title VI Methodology Title VI Justice Public Outreach*



190 N. Independence Mall West
8th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19106-1520
P: 215.592.1800
F: 215.592.9125
www.dvrpc.org