Disclaimer
The contents of this report reflect the views of the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization. The Richmond Regional Planning District Commission is responsible for the facts and accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT), the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), or the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission (RRPDC). This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

Questions
The Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, income, gender, age, and disability in access to, or operation of its programs, services, activities or in its hiring or employment practices. ADA and Title VI inquiries should be forwarded to: Richmond Regional TPO Title VI Coordinator, c/o Richmond Regional Planning District Commission, 9211 Forest Hill Avenue, Suite 200, Richmond, VA 23235 or call Phone (804) 233-2033 Fax (804) 323-2025.

For questions on the Richmond Regional TPO’s Title VI Plan please contact Martha Shickle, RRPDC Title VI Coordinator, at 804-323-2033 or by email at mshickle@richmondregional.org.

For information on the Richmond Regional TPO’s work program, reports and publications, board and committee meeting schedules, and other related information, please visit the TPO’s website at www.richmondregional.org
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NONDISCRIMINATION

The Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO) fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes and regulations in all programs and activities. The RRTPO will strive to provide reasonable accommodations and services for persons who require special assistance to participate in this public involvement opportunity. For more information on meeting accessibility, or to obtain a Title VI Complaint Form, see www.richmondregional.org or call the Title VI Coordinator at 804-323-2033.

NO DISCRIMINACIÓN

Aviso de Título VI abreviado al público: El Organización de Planeación Regional de Transporte de Richmond (RRTPO) cumple con el Título VI de la Ley de los Derechos Civiles de 1964 y con los estatutos y regulaciones relacionadas en todos los programas y actividades. RRTPO se esforzará en proveer acomodaciones razonables y servicios para personas que requieran asistencia especial para participar en esta oportunidad pública. Para más información sobre accesibilidad a la reunión o para obtener los documentos de reclamación del Título VI, entre a la página web (www.richmondregional.org) o llame al Coordinador del Título VI en 804-323-2033.

Title VI Policy Statement

The Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO) is committed to ensuring that no person shall, on the grounds of race, color, or nation origin, as provided by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987 (PL 100.259), be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity, whether those programs and activities are federally funded or not.

The RRTPO Title VI Coordinator is responsible for initiating and monitoring Title VI activities, preparing required reports, and other responsibilities as required by Title 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 200, and Title 49 CFR Part 21.
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Barbara Jacocks
Interim Executive Director
Richmond Regional Planning District Commission
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TPO AGENDA 9/24/15; ITEM II.A.

RRTPO TITLE VI PLAN UPDATE

Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization

On motion of Patricia S. O’Bannon, seconded by David T. Williams, the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO) unanimously approved the following resolution:

**RESOLVED**, that the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) approves the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) Title VI Plan as submitted; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the TPO’s action to approve the TPO Title VI Plan as submitted meets all requirements noted in the VDOT/RRPDC Agreement for the Utilization of Federal and State Funds to Support Metropolitan Planning in the Richmond Area as provided in Article IX, Publication Provisions, which includes approval by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) authorizing final publication and distribution of the Title VI document as submitted.

******************************************************************************

This is to certify that the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) approved the above resolution at its meeting held September 24, 2015.

WITNESS:                           BY:

[Signatures]

Sharon E. Rebeson
Administrative Secretary
Richmond Regional Planning District Commission

Barbara S. Nelson
Secretary
Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization
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PURPOSE

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states, "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." Subsequent laws, regulations, directives, and executive orders broadened the criteria for which discrimination is prohibited to include disability, sex, age, income, and limited proficiency in English. A list of these related authorities is provided in Appendix A.

Of note are two Presidential Executive Orders regarding non-discrimination requirements. Executive Order 12898 mandates that federal agencies address equity and fairness, or Environmental Justice, toward low-income and minority persons and populations. Executive Order 13166 mandates that federal agencies ensure that people who have Limited English Proficiency (LEP) have meaningful access to federally-conducted and/or funded programs and activities.

Title VI applies to federal agencies and recipients and sub-recipients of federal funds. In this document, Title VI refers to the entirety of the statutory, regulatory, and other directives related to the prohibition of discrimination in federally-funded programs including the requirements to address Environmental Justice and accessibility for those with Limited English Proficiency.

The Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO), as a sub-recipient of federal financial assistance, is required to comply with Title VI. The purpose of this plan is to describe the measures incorporated in RRTPO’s urban transportation planning program to assure compliance with Title VI.

This plan provides a brief discussion of Title VI and the concepts of Environmental Justice (EJ) and Limited English Proficiency (LEP). Summarized in the plan is how these concepts, along with Title VI, are incorporated into the metropolitan transportation planning process in the areas of Communication and Public Participation; Planning and Programming; Contracts; and Education and Training. The plan provides specific information on the responsibilities of the Title VI Coordinator, and includes direction on filing and processing complaints of discrimination.
Organizations Background

Overview

MPOs are designated under Section 134 of Title 23, U.S. Code, for maintaining and conducting a “continuous, cooperative, and comprehensive” (3-C) regional transportation process that results in plans and programs consistent with adopted plans for development of the metropolitan area. Census defined urbanized areas of 50,000 or greater in population are designated as MPOs. The Governor, with the concurrence of area local governments, is charged with designating the MPO’s member organizations. Note that the MPO for the Richmond region portion of the Richmond urbanized area changed its name in October 2014 (for unofficial use) to the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO). The RRTPO is designated as a Transportation Management Area (TMA), creating additional requirements for transportation planning. Like many metropolitan areas, the RRTPO encompasses several jurisdictions, each with their own comprehensive plans and transportation programs.

The RRTPO is a policy-making organization made up of local elected officials from each of the region’s nine member jurisdictions - Virginia’s capital city of Richmond, the surrounding counties of Charles City, Chesterfield, Goochland, Hanover, Henrico, New Kent, and Powhatan; and the Town of Ashland which falls within Hanover County. Membership in the RRTPO also includes state and federal transportation agencies, and area transportation service/system operators. In Virginia, planning district commissions, which are established under state code to conduct regional planning, serve as staff for most of Virginia’s MPO’s/TPO’s. The RRPDC serves as the fiscal agent for RRTPO and provides staffing as lead for the region’s federally-mandated urban transportation planning process. In addition, the Virginia Department of Transportation and the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation provide additional technical support in RRTPO’s urban transportation planning.

The RRTPO serves as the forum for cooperative regional transportation decision-making. The RRTPO is required to carry out metropolitan transportation planning in cooperation with the state and transit providers. The RRTPO develops the region’s transportation plans and programs, and approves the Long Range Transportation Plan (Metropolitan Transportation Plan) which is a prerequisite for the allocation of federal-aid highway and transit funds. The development of an efficient and effective multi-modal transportation network is essential for the region if it is to sustain a strong economy, clean environment, and high quality of life standards.

The RRTPO assures that no person shall, on the grounds of race, color, national origin, income, gender, age, or disability, as provided by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987 (PL 100-259), be excluded from participation in, be denied the
benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity. More specifically, RRTPO assures that every effort will be made to prevent discrimination through the impacts of its programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations. Additionally, RRTPO will take reasonable steps to provide meaningful access to services for persons with Limited English Proficiency. In the event the RRTPO distributes federal-aid funds to another governmental entity, the RRTPO will include Title VI language in all written agreements and will monitor for compliance. RRTPO further assures that every effort will be made to ensure nondiscrimination in all of its programs and activities, whether those programs and activities are federally funded or not.

The RRPDC Executive Director is responsible for ensuring implementation of the RRTPO’s Title VI Plan. The Title VI Coordinator, under supervision of the Executive Director, is generally responsible for coordinating the overall administration of the Title VI Plan and assurances, and overseeing compliance with applicable nondiscrimination authorities in each of the metropolitan transportation planning and programming areas. Other staff assists the Title VI Coordinator in conducting this work.

General responsibilities of the Title VI Coordinator include:

- Identify, investigate, and eliminate discrimination when found to exist;
- Process discrimination complaints received by the RRTPO;
- Meet with appropriate staff members to monitor and discuss progress, implementation, and compliance issues related to the RRTPO Title VI Plan;
- Periodically review the RRTPO’s Title VI Plan to assess whether administrative procedures are effective, staffing is appropriate, and adequate resources are available to ensure compliance;
- Work with staff involved with consultant contracts to ensure contracts are solicited in accordance with federal and state laws and regulations; that contracts awarded include appropriate language on non-discrimination requirements; to monitor compliance; and in cases of deficiencies to investigate, resolve, and implement a remedial action plan;
- Review important nondiscrimination-related issues with the Executive Director of the Richmond Regional PDC, as needed;
- Assess communications and public involvement strategies to ensure adequate participation of impacted Title VI protected groups and address additional language needs, as appropriate;
• Maintain and update, as needed the Title VI Plan and disseminate it to appropriate parties including the RRTPO board, its committee members, and staff to RRTPO, and to the general public through the RRPDC’s web site.

• Coordinate with appropriate federal, state, and regional entities to periodically provide RRTPO employees (i.e., RRTPO staff) with training opportunities regarding nondiscrimination and Title VI.

• Develop and maintain a contact list of interpretation and translation service providers (as a supplement to currently available staff resources for conducting needed interpretation and translation services)
Organizational Structures
Richmond Regional PDC and
Richmond Area TPO
Boards and Standing Committees

RRPDC Board
- Executive Committee
- Personnel and Operating Policies Committee
- Charter and Bylaws Committee
- Audit Committee

RRTPPO Board
- Executive Committee
- Technical Advisory Committee
- Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee
- Elderly and Disability Advisory Committee

RRPDC Staff
Administrative, Planning, Technical Support

Other state, federal, regional agencies; local governments; consultants
RRTPO Boards and Committees

RICHMOND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

JURISDICTION VOTING MEMBERS/BOARD ALTERNATES (number of votes)

TPO bylaws allow weighted voting for local jurisdictions with two or more votes (number of votes for each member shown in parenthesis). Jurisdictions with more than one vote may allow its members and/or alternates to cast the vote of any absent member. Note that only local elected officials representing TPO member jurisdictions are eligible to vote on behalf of their appointing jurisdiction (i.e., staff and non-elected officials are not eligible to vote on behalf of TPO member jurisdictions).

Town of Ashland
Member: Edward “Ned” L. Henson, III, Town Council (1)
Alternate: Faye O. Prichard, Mayor

Charles City County
Member: Floyd H. Miles, Sr., Board of Supervisors (1)
Alternate: William G. Coad, Board of Supervisors

Chesterfield County
Members: Steve A. Elswick, Board of Supervisors (2)
          Daniel A. Gecker, Board of Supervisors (1)
          James M. Holland, Board of Supervisors (1)
Alternate: Arthur S. Warren, Board of Supervisors

Chesterfield County notes that if any one representative is absent, the remaining two will each have 2 votes. If two are absent, the remaining representatives will have 4 votes. If all three are absent, Arthur S. Warren will serve as alternate representative and will cast 4 votes.

Goochland County
Members: Manuel Alvarez, Jr., Board of Supervisors (1)
         Susan F. Lascolette, Board of Supervisors
Alternates: Ned Creasey, Board of Supervisors
            Thomas M. W. Coleman, Principal Planner*

Hanover County
Members: Executive Committee Member (2)
          W. Canova Peterson, IV, Board of Supervisors, FY16 Chairman
          Regular Member (1)
          Sean M. Davis, Board of Supervisors
Alternates: Angela Kelly-Wiecek, Board of Supervisors (1)
           Wayne T. Hazzard, Board of Supervisors (1)
J. Michael Flagg, Director of Public Works*

Hanover County notes the following scenarios by which to determine the number of votes for each of its members and alternates, depending upon the members and alternates present and voting:

- Scenario One: Executive Committee member has 2 votes and regular member has 1 vote.
- Scenario 2: Regular member has 2 votes and alternate member has 1 vote.
- Scenario Three: Two alternate members present decide who gets two votes and who gets one vote if they share the same position. If their positions are different, each alternate gets only 1 vote (i.e., third vote is not cast).
- Scenario Four: Three votes if only one member or one alternate is present.

**Henrico County**

Members: Patricia S. O’Bannon, Board of Supervisors (2)
          Frank J. Thornton, Board of Supervisors (2)

Alternates: David A. Kaechele, Board of Supervisors
            Ralph J. Emerson, Jr., Director of Planning*
            Stephen J. Yob, Director of Public Works*

**New Kent County**

Member: James H. Burrell, Board of Supervisors (1)
        C. Thomas Tiller, Jr., Board of Supervisors (1)

Alternates: Thomas Evelyn, Board of Supervisors
            W.R. Davis, Jr., Board of Supervisors

**Powhatan County**

Members: Carson L. Tucker, Board of Supervisors (1)
         David T. Williams, Board of Supervisors (1)

Alternates: March Altman, Director of Community Development*

**City Of Richmond**

Members: Jonathan Baliles, City Council (1)
         Kathy C. Graziano, City Council (1)
         Michelle R. Mosby, City Council (1)
         Parker C. Agelasto, City Council (1)

Alternates: Ellen F. Robertson, City Council
            Chris A. Hilbert, City Council
            Cynthia I. Newbille, City Council
            Reva M. Trammell, City Council
Agency Voting Members (number of votes)

TPO bylaws provide that voting membership for organizations that administer or operate major modes of transportation and appropriate state transportation officials shall each have one vote.

Capital Region Airport Commission
Member: John B. Rutledge, Director of Planning & Engineering (1)
Alternate: Jon E. Mathiasen, Executive Director

GRTC Transit System
Member: David Green, Chief Executive Officer (1)
Alternate: Garland W. Williams, Dir. of Planning and Scheduling

Richmond Metropolitan Transportation Authority
Member: Angela L. Gray, General Manager (1)
Alternate: Vacant

Virginia Secretary of Transportation Designee
Member: Vacant (1)
Alternate: Mark E. Riblett, Assistant Richmond District Administrator
Planning and Investment Management

Non-voting Member Organizations/Appointees

TPO bylaws provide for nonvoting membership on the TPO policy board for FHWA, FTA, Chairman of the TPO Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), Chairman of the Elderly and Disability Advisory Committee (EDAC), and up to two citizens appointed by the Chairman to serve as non-voting TPO member citizen appointees. Other organizations may be added or removed based on a majority of all votes by the TPO board.

Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) Chairman
Member: Thomas A. Fletcher, Powhatan County / CTAC Chairman
Alternate: Robert P. Morris, Hanover County / CTAC Vice Chairman

Elderly and Disability Advisory Committee (EDAC) Chairman
Member: Brian Montgomery, TPO Chairman’s Appointee/EDAC Chairman
Alternate: Chris M. Lloyd, AARP / EDAC Vice Chairman

Federal Highway Administration
Member: Ivan Rucker, Planning and Environmental Specialist
Alternate: Vacant

Federal Transit Administration
Member: Ryan Long, Community Planner
Alternate: Vacant

TPO Chairman’s Citizen Appointees
Member: Vacant
Member: Vacant

RideFinders, Inc.
Member: Von S. Tisdale, Executive Director
Alternate: Cherika Ruffin, Marketing Representative

Virginia Department of Aviation
Member: P. Clifford Burnette, Jr., Airport Planner
Alternate: Vacant

Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation
Member: Vacant
Alternate: Vacant

*Non-elected official ineligible to vote*
RRTPo Executive Committee

Voting Members: Appointed by the TPO Chairman

Town of Ashland: Edward “Ned” L. Henson  
Town Council

Charles City County: Floyd H. Miles, Sr.  
Board of Supervisors

Chesterfield County: Steve A. Elswick, FY16 TPO Vice Chairman  
Board of Supervisors

Goochland County: Manuel Alvarez, Jr.  
Board of Supervisors

Hanover County: W. Canova Peterson, IV, FY16 TPO Chairman  
Board of Supervisors

Henrico County: Patricia S. O’Bannon  
Board of Supervisors

New Kent County: C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.  
Board of Supervisors

Powhatan County: David T. Williams  
Board of Supervisors

City of Richmond: Kathy C. Graziano  
City Council
RRTPO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)

Voting Members and Alternates

Town of Ashland  
Member: Nora Amos, Director of Planning  
Alternate: Garet Prior, Senior Planner and GIS Analyst

Charles City County  
Member: Matthew D. Rowe, Director of Planning  
Alternate: Vacant

Chesterfield County  
Member: Vacant  
Alternate: Barbara K. Smith, Principal Engineer

Goochland County  
Member: Thomas M. W. Coleman, Principal Planner  
Alternate: Debbie Byrd, Civil and Environmental Engineer

Hanover County  
Member: Joseph E. Vidunas, Traffic Engineer  
Alternate: J. Michael Flagg, Director of Public Works

Henrico County  
Member: E. Todd Eure, Director, Transportation Development Division Dir.  
Alternate: Rosemary Deemer, County Planner III

New Kent County  
Member: Kelli Le Duc, Planning Manager  
Alternate: Vacant

Powhatan County  
Member: March Altman, Director of Community Development  
Alternate: Ed A. Howland, Planner III

City Of Richmond  
Member: Vacant  
Alternate: Travis A. Bridewell, Traffic Engineering Operations Manager

Capital Region Airport Commission
Member: John B. Rutledge, Director of Planning and Engineering
Alternate: Jon E. Mathiasen, Executive Director

GRTC Transit System  
Member: Garland W. Williams, Dir. of Planning and Scheduling  
Alternate: Clinton Edwards, Transit Analyst

Richmond Metropolitan Transportation Authority  
Member: Theresa Simmons, Director of Operations  
Alternate: Vacant

Richmond Regional Planning District Commission  
Member: Barbara S. Nelson, Director of Transportation  
Alternate: Tiffany Dubinski, Principal Planner

RideFinders  
Member: Von S. Tisdale, Executive Director  
Alternate: John O’Keefe, Account Executive

Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation  
Member: Nick Britton, Statewide Manager of Transit Planning  
Alternate: Amy M. Inman, Manager of Transit Planning

Virginia Department of Transportation  
Member: Mark E. Riblett, Assistant Richmond District Administrator  
Alternate: Ronald D. Svejkovsky, District Transportation Planning Engineer
Voting Members and Alternates

Town of Ashland  
Member: Upton S. Martin  
Alternate: Robert F. Brown

Charles City County  
Member: Vacant  
Alternate: Vacant

Chesterfield County  
Members: Herbert A. Richwine  
John K. Jacobs  
Alternates: Jonathan H. Jackson  
Vacant

Goochland County  
Member: Robert L. Basham, Jr.  
Alternate: Vacant

Hanover County  
Members: Robert P. Morris/FY16 CTAC Vice-Chairman  
Alternate: Vacant

Henrico County  
Members: James D. Jamison  
Amber B. Lancaster  
Alternates: Vacant (2)

New Kent County  
Member: Lisa M. Guthrie  
Alternate: John P. Moyer

Powhatan County  
Member: Thomas A. Fletcher/FY16 CTAC Chairman  
Alternate: Christopher D. DeHart

City Of Richmond  
Member: William Steele  
Julien H. Williams  
Alternates: Todd M. Phillips  
John T. Sydnor
RRTPO CTAC (cont.)

Virginia Conservation Network
Member: Vacant
Alternate: Frederick S. Fisher

League of Women Voters
Member: Virginia P. Cowles
Alternate: Mary Crutchfield

Greater Richmond Chamber of Commerce
Member: John Easter
Alternate: Vacant

NAACP
Member: Roy L. Bryant
Alternate: Walter L. Johnson, Jr.

Richmond Area Bicycling Association
Member: Lloyd Vye
Alternate: Champe M. Burnley

Virginia Association of Railway Patrons
Member: Michael Testerman
Alternate: Vacant

Virginia Commonwealth University
Member: Brian J. Ohlinger
Alternate: Vacant

Elderly and Disability Advisory Committee
Member: Brian Montgomery/FY16 EDAC Chairman
Alternate: Chris M. Lloyd/FY 16 EDAC Vice Chairman
RRTPO ELDERLY AND DISABILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (EDAC)

Voting Members and Alternates

Senior Connections, The Capital Area Agency on Aging (Staff or Board)
Member: Carolyn Comerford, Mobility Manager
Alternate: Thelma Bland Watson, Executive Director

Senior Connections, The Capital Area Agency on Aging (Elderly Consumer)
Member: Charles Barker
Alternate: Bill Payne

AARP
Member: Chris M. Lloyd/FY16 Vice Chairman
Alternate: Vacant

Greater Richmond Age Wave Initiative and Readiness Coalition
Member: Sarah A. Link, Director
Alternate: Vacant

Paralyzed Veterans of America
Member: David R. Coffield, Virginia Mid-Atlantic Chapter
Alternate: Jennifer Purser, Administrative Director

Virginia Rehabilitation Center for the Blind Volunteer Council
Member: Vacant
Alternate: Vacant

Resources for Independent Living
Member: Kelly A. Hickok, Community Services Manager
Alternate: Angie Waranis, Independent Living Coordinator

Disability Consumer Representative (TPO Chairman’s Appointee)
Member: Brian Montgomery/FY16 Chairman
Alternate: Vacant

The Greater Richmond ARC
Member: Carolyn Trimmer, Compliance Specialist
Alternate: Vacant
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Goodwill of Central Virginia
Member: Londella C. Hamilton, Job Coach – Case Manager
Alternate: Veronica Rhame, Director of Vocational Services

Capital Area Partnership Uplifting People (CAPUP)
Member: Thomas D Wagstaff, President
Alternate: Dora J. Hall, Community Services Manager

Greater Richmond Chapter, American Red Cross
Member: Vacant
Alternate: Vacant

Private, For-profit Transportation Operator (TPO Chairman’s Appointee)
Member: J. Sid del Cardayre, President, Van Go Inc.
Alternate: Travis Snellings, Operations/General Manager, Van Go Inc.

City of Richmond, Office of Aging, Disabilities and Volunteerism
Member: E. Yvette Jones, Human Services Manager
Alternate: Vacant

United Way of Greater Richmond and Petersburg
Member: Gigi Amateau, Director of Community Impact – Health
Alternate: Vacant
TITEL VI, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE, LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

Title VI Requirements

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA), an agency of the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT), issued Circular 4702.1A – Title VI and Title VI-Dependent Guidelines for Federal Transit Administration Recipients in May of 2007. Reporting requirements of all funding recipients and TPO-specific requirements contained in this circular are as follows:

- Provide Title VI Certification and Assurance.
- These Title VI assurances must be submitted as part of a standard list of assurances provided by sub-recipients to their direct recipient(s).
- Develop Title VI Complaint Procedures.
- Develop procedures for investigating and tracking Title VI complaints, and make the procedures for filing a complaint available to members of the public upon request.
- Record Title VI investigations, complaints, and lawsuits.
- Prepare and maintain a list of any active investigations conducted by entities other than FTA, lawsuits, or complaints that allege discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin.
- Provide Meaningful Access to LEP Persons.
- Take responsible steps to ensure meaningful access to the benefits, services, information, and other important portions of programs and activities for individuals who are Limited English Proficient (LEP).
- Notify beneficiaries of protection under Title VI.
- Sub-recipients shall provide information to the public regarding their Title VI obligations and apprise members of the public of the protections against discrimination afforded to them by Title VI.
- Provide additional Information upon request.
• Provide additional information to FTA, as requested, to investigate complaints of discrimination or to resolve concerns about possible noncompliance with Title VI.

• Have an analytic basis in place for certifying TPO compliance with Title VI. Examples of this analysis can include:
  ▪ A demographic profile of the metropolitan area that includes identification of the locations of socioeconomic groups, including low-income and minority populations as covered by the Executive Order on Environmental Justice and Title VI.
  ▪ A metropolitan transportation planning process that identifies the needs of low-income and minority populations.
  ▪ An analytical process that identifies the benefits and burdens of metropolitan transportation system investments for different socioeconomic groups, identifying imbalances and responding to the analyses produced.

• Report to direct recipient consistent with reporting procedures established by the direct recipient.
Environmental Justice (EJ)

Executive Order 12898 (EO 12898): Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations applies to all federal agencies and directs them to identify and address, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations and low-income populations. EO 12898 was designed to ensure that Federal agencies promote and enforce nondiscrimination as one way of achieving the overarching objective of environmental justice — a fair distribution of the adverse impacts of, or burdens associated with, federal programs, policies, and activities. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is one of several federal laws that should be applied. EO 12898 states as its purposes:

- to focus attention of federal agencies on human health and environmental conditions in minority and low-income communities with the goal of achieving environmental justice (EJ);
- to foster non-discrimination in federal programs that substantially affect human health or the environment;
- to give minority and low-income communities greater opportunities for public participation in, and access to public information on, matters relating to human health and the environment.

US DOT Order 5610.2 on Environmental Justice encourages a proactive approach to the implementation of environmental justice principles in its programs, policies, and activities. This Order sets forth a process by which US DOT will integrate the goals of EJ into their existing operations to ensure that consideration of EJ principles are an integral part of all programs, policies and activities, from the inception of the planning process through to project completion, operations and evaluation.

Definitions contained in USDOT Order 5610.2 (a) include:

- Low-Income - a person whose median household income is at or below the Department of Health and Human Services poverty guidelines.

- Minority - a person who is:
  - Black: a person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa;
- Hispanic or Latino: a person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race;
- Asian American: a person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent;
- American Indian and Alaskan Native: a person having origins in any of the original people of North America, South America (including Central America), and who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition;
  or
- Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander: people having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands.

- Low-Income Population - any readily identifiable group of low-income persons who live in geographic proximity, and, if circumstances warrant, geographically dispersed/transient persons (such as migrant workers or Native Americans) who will be similarly affected by a proposed DOT program, policy or activity.

- Minority Population - any readily identifiable groups of minority persons who live in geographic proximity, and if circumstances warrant, geographically dispersed/transient persons (such as migrant workers or Native Americans) who will be similarly affected by a proposed DOT program, policy or activity.

- Adverse effects - the totality of significant individual or cumulative human health or environmental effects, including interrelated social and economic effects, which may include, but are not limited to: bodily impairment, infirmity, illness or death; air, noise, and water pollution and soil contamination; destruction or disruption of man-made or natural resources; destruction or diminution of aesthetic values; destruction or disruption of community cohesion or a community’s economic vitality; destruction or disruption of the availability of public and private facilities and services; vibration; adverse employment effects; displacement of persons, businesses, farms, or nonprofit organizations; increased traffic congestion, isolation, exclusion or separation of minority or low-income individuals within a given community or from the broader community; and the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of, benefits of DOT programs, policies, or activities.

- Disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority and low-income populations - an adverse effect that:
is predominantly borne by a minority population and/or a low-income population, or

- will be suffered by the minority population and/or low-income population and is appreciably more severe or greater in magnitude than the adverse effect that will be suffered by the non-minority population and/or non-low-income population.

Environmental Justice is a regulatory framework within Title VI regulations which directs every federal agency to identify and address the effects of all programs, policies, and activities on traditionally disadvantaged groups. Environmental Justice seeks to ensure equal access to transportation systems and transportation planning process inputs for everyone regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin. In the past, minority and low-income populations have been identified as the largest disenfranchised group, both in terms of equal access to transportation supply and citizen input. Recently, persons with limited English proficiency (LEP) have been added to the disadvantaged groups.

Each TPO receiving federal funds needs to examine that all future transportation plans, programs, and processes address the following environmental justice principles:

- To ensure the level and quality of transportation service is provided without regard to race, color, or national origin.

- To avoid or minimize high and adverse human health and environmental effects on low income and minority population.

- To ensure the full and fair participation by low income and minority population.

- To prevent the denial of benefit to low income and minority population.

- To ensure meaningful access to programs and activities by persons with limited English proficiency.
Limited English Proficiency (LEP)

Note: LEP analysis to be updated as part of the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and this updated LEP analysis will be incorporated into the next RRTPO Title VI report.

Both Executive Order 12898 and Executive Order 13166 address nondiscrimination in the participation of and provision of services to persons with Limited English Proficiency (LEP).

EO 12898 states with regard to Public Participation and Access to Information:

- Agencies must convey recommendations made by the public relating to the incorporation of EJ principles into their programs or policies.
- Whenever practicable and appropriate, agencies may translate crucial public documents, notices, and hearings relating to human health or the environment for limited English-speaking populations.
- Agencies must work to ensure that public documents, notices, and hearings relating to human health and the environment are concise, understandable, and readily accessible to the public.

EO 13166 is titled Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency. The thrust of this order requires federal agencies and recipients of federal funding:

- to ensure that the programs and activities they normally provide in English are accessible to LEP persons and thus do not discriminate on the basis of national origin in violation of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, and its implementing regulations; and
- to ensure that stakeholders, such as LEP persons and their representative organizations, recipients, and other appropriate individuals or entities, have an adequate opportunity to provide input that will assist the agencies in developing an approach to ensuring meaningful access by LEP persons that is practical and effective, fiscally responsible, responsive to the particular circumstances of each agency, and can be readily implemented.

According to FTA, federally funded transportation planning programs must take reasonable steps to provide meaningful access to the benefits, services, information, and other important portions of its programs and activities for individuals who are Limited English Proficient (LEP). Individuals who do not speak English as their primary language and who have a limited ability to read, speak, write, or understand English can be limited English proficient, or "LEP."
Like the Environmental Justice Executive Order, the Limited English Proficiency Executive Order is structured to avoid adversely affecting these populations and to develop strategies to better engage these populations in their community. This order was signed by President Clinton in 2000. Limited English speaking populations are often isolated from engaging in their larger communities. By making materials and opportunities accessible to these populations, it becomes easier to communicate and perhaps determine methods of providing necessary resources.

In considering how to access these populations, four factors need to be addressed. These factors include the following:

- **Demographics**: Knowing where the populations are located.
- **Frequency**: Determining how often the populations are contacted or engaged by the agency.
- **Importance**: Determining if the issues under consideration are important to these communities.
- **Resources**: Keeping an inventory of the resources available to engage these populations.

This analysis, known as the four-factor analysis, is used to determine which language assistance services are appropriate to address the identified needs of the LEP population. Below is the four-step process for RRTPO.

**Factor 1:** Demographics: Assessment of the number and proportion of LEP persons likely to be served or encountered in the eligible service population.

The RRTPO has reviewed census data on the number of individuals in its service area that have Limited English Proficiency, as well as the languages they speak. This data comes from the American Community Survey (2007 – 2011). This data indicates the extent to which translations into other language are needed to meet the needs of LEP persons. It should be noted that the figures below cover all of the Richmond Region Planning District Commission jurisdictions (which includes rural areas outside of the TPO study area).

It should be noted that these figures are estimates from the table B16001 and include people who “Speak Non English at home – Speak English not well.” “People who Speak Non English at home – Speak English well” are not taken into consideration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Group</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>21,359</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo European</td>
<td>6546</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Island Languages</td>
<td>9732</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Languages</td>
<td>2312</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39,949</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.29%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Spanish is an Indo-European language, but considered a separate category because of the number of speakers in the Region. Indo-European language consists of European languages and languages of the Indian subcontinent. Asian and Pacific Island languages include East Asian languages like Chinese, Japanese and Pacific Island languages. Other languages include West Asian, African, and Native American languages.

The most pervasive non-English language in the region is Spanish, which makes up about 2.29% of the total population, while the Indo-European group and the Asian and Pacific Island group are also around 0.70% and 1.04% respectively. These groups are split over numerous languages that are within these categories. Please see Table 1, “Languages Spoken at Home by the ability to speak English for Population 5 and above in the Richmond Region ACS 2007 – 2011 5 Year Estimates” at the end of the LEP section.

Note that the location of LEP populations at the census tract level is provided in Maps 1 (Native Spanish Speakers in the Richmond Region) and 2 (Native Speakers of Other Languages in the Richmond Region), and is included with Table 1 at the end of the LEP section.

Factor 2: Frequency: Determining how often the populations are contacted or engaged by the agency.

The RRTPO is rarely approached for information by any populations who do not have a reasonable competent grasp of the English language; however, staff will provide such services when requested. This agency has made efforts for certain projects to create materials in both English and Spanish should the project affect these populations, but this need is on a project-by-project basis.

The goal of RRTPO is to make sure that for any potential project that could affect this community, the TPO staff makes every effort to include all stakeholders that could be affected by the project, including limited English speaking populations. We perform outreach when needed and provide assistance when requested.

Factor 3: Importance: Determining if the issues under consideration are important to these communities.
As stated above, RRTPO provides materials, interpreters and other assistance appropriate for limited English speaking populations if it is needed for the project. For example, the RRDC, in conducting community outreach meetings with various groups and organizations in the Richmond Region as part of the Capital Region Collaborative (CRC) Regional Strategic Plan draft “Strawman Plan,” held one meeting with the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce. There were two staff fluent in Spanish who attended this outreach meeting and portions of the meeting were conducted in Spanish (including discussion in response to questions and the presentation). The results of this meeting were included and considered in developing the draft CRC Regional Strategic Plan.

Factor 4: Resources: Keeping an inventory of the resources available to engage these populations.

The following language assistance measures are currently being provided by RRTPO. The TPO provides translators for TPO meetings for Spanish speaking citizens if given at least two days’ notice. The TPO will do its utmost to provide translators for other languages if requested to do so. We aim to complete a document translation within a reasonable time frame. Also, for various projects we make every effort to include all stakeholders in the planning and implementation process. When a project affects a limited English speaking population, we take action to make the information about the project as accessible as possible.

Through the four-factor analysis, RRTPO has determined that the following types of language assistance are most needed and feasible:

Limited English speaking populations who do not understand English well, make up approximately 4.29% of the Richmond Region’s total populations (Age 5 and above). This 4.29% equates to 39,949 citizens in a total population of 931,826. The largest group within this cohort is Spanish speaking, which is 2.29% (21,359) of the total population. Note that the next single largest cohort is Chinese, which is 0.27% (2,518) of the total population (see Table 1 at end of this section for a detailed breakdown by each language cohort and by jurisdiction and for the Richmond Region). The TPO will conduct outreach to the Spanish speaking population as a part of our general community outreach or our project-specific efforts. Again, the TPO will do its utmost to engage all stakeholder groups and meet all limited English speaking requests.
### Table 1: Languages Spoken at Home by the ability to speak English for Population 5 and above in the Richmond Region

ACS 2007-2011 5 Year estimates

Table B16001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Charles City</th>
<th>Chesterfield</th>
<th>Goochland</th>
<th>Hanover</th>
<th>Henrico</th>
<th>New Kent</th>
<th>Powhatan</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Richmond Region</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (Age 5 And above)</td>
<td>6,927</td>
<td>292,970</td>
<td>20,517</td>
<td>94,110</td>
<td>283,546</td>
<td>17,144</td>
<td>26,572</td>
<td>190,040</td>
<td>931,826</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak only English</td>
<td>6,853</td>
<td>282,530</td>
<td>19,491</td>
<td>90,052</td>
<td>245,353</td>
<td>16,703</td>
<td>25,256</td>
<td>171,733</td>
<td>838,241</td>
<td>89.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Non English at Home</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>30,440</td>
<td>1,076</td>
<td>4,958</td>
<td>38,193</td>
<td>4,146</td>
<td>10,598</td>
<td>18,307</td>
<td>93,585</td>
<td>10.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Non English at Home (Speak English Well)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>17,755</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>2,759</td>
<td>21,779</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>9,549</td>
<td>53,636</td>
<td>7.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Non English at Home (Speak English Not Well)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12,685</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>1,999</td>
<td>16,414</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>8,758</td>
<td>39,949</td>
<td>4.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Charles City</th>
<th>Chesterfield</th>
<th>Goochland</th>
<th>Hanover</th>
<th>Henrico</th>
<th>New Kent</th>
<th>Powhatan</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Richmond Region</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish or Spanish Creole</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,698</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>6,272</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>6,303</td>
<td>21,359</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French (incl. Patois, Cajun)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Creole</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese or Portuguese Creole</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yiddish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other West Germanic languages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian languages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbo-Croatian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Slavic languages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gujara</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urdu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Indic languages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Indo-European languages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>2,518</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1,621</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon-Khmer,Cambodian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herero</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laoitan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,352</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian languages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Pacific Island languages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauru</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Native North American languages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African languages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other and unspecified languages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12,685</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>1,359</td>
<td>16,414</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>8,758</td>
<td>39,949</td>
<td>4.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

“Each Metropolitan Planning Organization shall provide citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of individuals with disabilities, and other interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the transportation plan.” [Title VI of SAFETEA-LU Section 134 (i)(S)(a)]

Initiated under the mandate of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA), strengthened in the provisions of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), continued in 2005’s Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act, A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), and in Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) public participation in the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) planning process is an integral part of regional transportation plans.

It is necessary to establish a free exchange of information and allow for public input at all stages of the planning process. In order for the public input process to be effective, it must be proactive; it must provide complete information to the public; there must be timely public notices to ensure the public’s awareness of the opportunities; the public must be allowed to provide input toward decisions; the process must begin early and be continuing; and the process must involve a broad cross-section of the public.

The intent of RRTPO’s Public Participation Plan (contained in Appendix B) is to provide meaningful citizen input for the metropolitan transportation planning and programming process through effective citizen involvement activities, open and accessible information, and opportunities for participation. Details of TPO’s public participation process is covered in the TPO’s Public Participation Plan (PPP) document. Note that this TPO took action on June 4, 2015 to adopt the updated PPP document. Major elements/details of this process include the following:

A. TPO Policy Board
   - Representation of the regions nine local governments by local elected officials who are directly accountable to citizens from districts they represent.
   - Non-voting membership status on the TPO policy board of the TPO’s two citizen advisory committees (i.e., CTAC and EDAC).
   - Public comment periods at the beginning of all TPO board meetings.
• Notice of TPO board meetings posted on the RRPDC’s website, mailed/e-mailed to any interested party (ten days in advance of a meeting), and regularly scheduled meeting dates and times at an accessible location (on GRTC bus line).

B. TPO Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC)
• Representation from the region’s nine jurisdictions and up 12 members from at-large organizations that represent diverse organizations with recognized transportation planning concerns.
• CTAC advises the TPO on plans and other matters necessary and appropriate for providing viable and reasonable citizen input.
• Resolutions approved by CTAC are presented to the TPO. The TPO’s response is reported to CTAC.
• CTAC members may also serve on other special purpose TPO committees (e.g., 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) Advisory Committee).
• Public comment period and meeting notice (similar to TPO Board).

C. TPO Elderly and Disability Advisory Committee (EDAC)
• Representation of up to 18 members from at-large organizations and qualified individuals with balanced representation from groups, organizations and individuals representing the elderly, persons with disabilities and low income groups.
• EDAC also provides input to GRTC which attends and participates at all EDAC meetings.
• EDAC members may also serve on other special purpose TPO committees (e.g., TPO Ad Hoc Committee on Increasing TPO Public Awareness and Accessibility; 2040 MTP Advisory Committee; TPO ad hoc Committee on Regional Paratransit Services and Programs).
• Participate in staff level review of EDAC’s organization structure and status as a TPO standing committee to determine if it should remain as a standing committee or if it should transition to work group status. As part of this review, staff will examine the potential for expanding EDAC’s role for obtaining input from various groups and organizations to help the TPO in meeting Title VI, EJ and LEP requirements and needs (FY2016 UWP task 5.2 work activity under work element one).
• Public comment period with meeting notice (similar to TPO Board).

D. RRPDC Website
• Website for public information and engagement maintained by the RRPDC with information on TPO plans, reports, meetings, notices and other information provided in website. One website feature allows contents to be translated into 90 different languages.
- Website serves as place where draft documents, plans and programs are placed and made accessible for public review. Staff is planning for the TPO to establish a separate website for the TPO in FY2016. (see FY2016 task 1.2 Work Element 2).

E. Social Media
- In FY2016, staff plans to research use of social media such as creating a Facebook page to engage different demographic groups, similar to what is currently being done for the RRPDC.
- Use of Facebook could provide a different media for meetings; news related to the TPO, projects, plans and studies; and to fostering discussion on regional transportation issues.

F. General Public Outreach
- Meetings conducted to obtain public comments as part of process for development of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
- Informational meetings held in response to requests from local elected officials, business and civic groups, and other organizations.
- Information booths set up/held at local festivals, events, and VDOT Six-Year Improvement Program public meetings to obtain citizen input on plans, programs, projects and issues.
- Staff serves as panelists for civic/business groups and organizations.
- Staff participates in the Capital Region Collaborative (CRC) work groups for Transportation and Healthy Communities. CRC work groups draw members and participation from a wide variety of groups, organizations, and individuals interested in transportation and regional issues. Note the RRPDC staff currently chairs the CRC Transportation Work Group.
- The TPO’s CTAC and EDAC provide for outreach to a wide variety of groups and organizations through their members’ participation.

G. Consultations with Interested Parties
- Representation on CTAC and EDAC includes a wide variety of at-large member organizations that provide opportunities for input into the regional transportation planning process from groups and organizations with the following interests:
  i. Bicycle/pedestrian
  ii. Freight and commuter rail
  iii. Public transportation/paratransit services
  iv. Elderly, persons with disabilities and low income
  v. Women and minorities
  vi. Environmental
• Staff consults with a wide variety of groups and organizations on an ongoing basis (as part of CTAC and EDAC) and during the TPO and MTP/CMP development process.

H. Consultation with Federal, State and local agencies
• Federal, state and regional transportation agencies are an active part of the TPO’s planning and programming process.
• Staff notifies federal and state resource agencies during the TIP and MTP/CMP development process to advise them of these draft documents being available for their review and comment.

I. Periodic Review and Adoption of its PPP
• The TPO’s current update to the Public Participation Plan (PPP) for the Metropolitan Transportation Planning and Programming Process was adopted on June 4, 2015. It was first adopted by the TPO on July 14, 1994. Revised PPP documents have been adopted on October 9, 1997, July 21, 2004, and April 12, 2007.

J. Public Notice, Review and Open Access
• Notice (i.e., meeting agendas) for all TPO board and committee meetings are distributed to the news media, posted on the RRPDC website, and distributed to interested parties. TPO board meeting agendas are distributed 10 days in advance of meetings and TPO committee meeting agendas are generally distributed 5 to 7 days in advance.
• At least two weeks notice is provided for all TPO public review meetings (for draft TIPs and MTPs, and when requesting input for MTP and TIP development). Notice is advertised in metro or business sections of a general circulation newspaper (i.e., Richmond Times-Dispatch) and in at least one minority media newspaper. Notice is also posted on the RRPDC website, and distributed to CTAC, EDAC and all interested parties.
• Public comment periods are held at the beginning of all TPO board and committee meetings.
• Staff has set a goal of participating at a minimum of three events every year, engaging both the general public and various target groups/populations in providing input (conducted as time and resources are available).

K. Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)
• Action taken by the TPO on January 29, 2015 to establish the 2040 MTP/CMP Advisory Committee as a special purpose TPO committee for the purpose of developing the TPO’s 2040 MTP/CMP update. Participation in this special purpose committee includes members from CTAC and EDAC.
• Staff will develop a public participation plan process for the 2040 MTP/CMP update, to identify specific activities and steps for public participation in the MTP/CMP update.

L. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
• Process for TIP development is identified in the PPP update document. It includes a 45-day public review period of the draft TIP document.
• Note that the City of Richmond uses the TPO’s public review process for the draft TIP to meet its FTA requirements as the designated recipient of FTA Section 5307 funds for the Main Street Station project.

Additional communications and public participation activities of note are as follows:

A. Community Meetings with the Capital Region Collaborative - Effective collaboration and communication is the hallmark of the Capital Region Collaborative (CRC). This consortium of government and business leaders brings together stakeholders across the spectrum of regional planning topics to identify common concerns and possible paths to effectively address those concerns. Starting in May 2010, the CRC “Strawman” process engaged the Richmond Region in 88 community meetings seeking input on seven regional focus areas, including transportation. Meetings were held with a variety of civic associations, businesses, social groups, and those across the socio-economic spectrum including two meetings with groups of homeless persons. The findings and needs identified through these community listening sessions culminated in a community survey which is being used to guide transportation planning and programming. Note that staff provides technical support for the CRC’s Transportation work group and also participates on the CRC’s Healthy Communities/Active RVA work group.

B. Affiliated Organizations - Serve as distribution links such as the Virginia Hispanic Chamber of Commerce for dissemination of information to the Hispanic community; Asian American Society of Virginia, Asian American Society of Central Virginia and Virginia Asian Chamber of Commerce for dissemination of information to the Asian community; community libraries, RideFinders (a ride-share program), the Greater Richmond Chamber, Leadership Metro Richmond, and the Richmond Regional PDC.

C. Bilingual Staff – Richmond Regional PDC has two staff fluent in Spanish, one fluent in Korean, and two fluent/conversant in French.

The Title VI Coordinator is responsible for evaluating and monitoring compliance with Title VI requirements in all aspects of the agency’s public participation process. The Coordinator will conduct or provide oversight and direction to other staff for conducting the following [also, see Planning and Programming section for list of additional responsibilities]:
• Ensure that all communications and public participation efforts comply with nondiscrimination authorities.

• Include proper notice in all contracts and subcontracts for procurement of consultant services, proper statements and notice on compliance with all Title VI requirements.

• Develop and distribute information on nondiscrimination and the RRTPO’s urban transportation planning and programs to the general public, and provide information in languages other than English, as needed.

• Disseminate information to minority media and ethnic/gender related organizations, to help ensure all social, economic, and ethnic interest groups in the region are represented in the planning process.

• Notify affected, protected groups of public hearings regarding proposed actions, and make the hearings accessible to all residents. Accessibility includes providing deaf interpreters, language translators or other accommodations (upon request and with sufficient advance notice). Notifications of opportunities for public participation will include contact information for people with accessibility needs.

• Include Title VI Notice to the Public on the RRPDC web site; in all public notices; in significant publications distributed to the public including updates to the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and the Transportation Improvement Program; and to RRPDC employees (full and abbreviated versions in both English and Spanish provided below). The full version of the notice is the preferred text, but where space is limited or in publications where cost is an issue, such as public notices in print media, the abbreviated version may be used.

**Title VI Notice to the Public:**

**English Version:**

The Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO) fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes, executive orders, and regulations in all programs and activities. The RRTPO operates without regard to race, color, national origin, income, gender, age, and disability. Any person who believes him/herself or any specific class of persons, to be subjected to discrimination prohibited by Title VI may by him/herself or by representative file a written complaint with the RRTPO’s Title VI Coordinator. A complaint must be filed no later than 180 days after the date of the alleged
discrimination. Please contact the Title VI Coordinator via phone at 804-323-2033 for more information. The RRTPO meetings are conducted in accessible locations and materials can be provided in accessible formats and in languages other than English. If you would like accessibility or language accommodation, please contact the Title VI Coordinator at 804-323-2033. If you wish to attend a RRTPO function and require special accommodations, please give RRTPO one week’s notice in advance.

**Spanish Version:**

El Organización de Planeación Regional de Transporte de Richmond (RRTPO) cumple plenamente con Título VI de la ley de Derechos Civiles de 1964 (Civil Rights Act of 1964) y con estatutos relacionados, órdenes ejecutivos, y reglamentos en todos las programas y actividades. El RRTPO opera sin distinción de raza, color, origen nacional, ingresos, género, edad, y discapacidad. Cualquier persona que cree que él /ella o cualquier clase específica de las personas, hayan sometido a una discriminación prohibida por el Título VI puede por él /ella mismo o con un representante puede presentar una reclamación por escrito con el Coordinador del Título VI de RRTPO. La reclamación debe ser presentada no más tarde de 180 días después de la fecha de la supuesta discriminación. Por favor hace contacto con el Coordinador del Título VI por teléfono en 804-323-2033 para más información. Las reuniones se llevan a cabo en lugares accesibles y los materiales pueden ser proporcionados en formatos accesibles y en otros idiomas aparte de Inglés. Si usted desea alojamiento u otra idioma, por favor hace contacto con el Coordinador del Título VI en 804-323-2033. Si desea a asistir a una función de RRTPO y si requiere acomodaciones especiales, por favor dé RRTPO una semana previo aviso.

**Abbreviated Title VI Notice to the Public:**

**English Version:**

RRTPO fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes and regulations in all programs and activities. The RRTPO will strive to provide reasonable accommodations and services for persons who require special assistance to participate in this public involvement opportunity. For more information on meeting accessibility, or to obtain a Title VI Complaint Form, see [www.richmondregional.org](http://www.richmondregional.org) or call the Title VI Coordinator at 804-323-2033.

**Spanish Version:**
Aviso de Título VI abreviado al público: RRTPO cumple plenamente con Título VI de la ley de Derechos Civiles de 1964 y con estatutos relacionados en todas programas y actividades. El RRTPO se esforzará por proporcionar alojamiento y servicios razonables para las personas que requieren asistencia especial para participar en esta oportunidad de participación pública. Para más información sobre accesibilidad de la reunión o para obtener los documentos de reclamación de Título VI, por favor visita www.richmondregional.org o llama el Coordinador del Título VI en 804-323-2033.

- Periodically review and update the agency Title VI Plan, which includes collection of data to develop demographic profiles for Title VI population groups, and analysis and application of this data (generally conducted as part of the TPOs Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) update process).

- Maintain a list of qualified interpretation service providers (to cover language needs not covered by current staff).

- Attend training sessions and web conferences to keep aware of non-discrimination requirements, guidelines, and best practices.

- Address and resolve Title VI complaints in a timely and thorough fashion.
Each TPO receiving federal funds needs to examine that all future transportation plans address the following environmental justice principles.

- To ensure the level and quality of transportation service is provided without regard to race, color or national origin.
- To avoid or minimize high and adverse human health and environmental effects on low income and minority population.
- To ensure the full and fair participation by low income and minority population.
- To prevent the denial of benefit to low income and minority population.
- To ensure meaningful access to programs and activities by persons with limited English proficiency.

The RRTPO’s annual work plan, the Unified Work Program, specifically addresses Title VI and EJ issues through a variety of specific planning programs. These include TPO Citizen Participation; Elderly and Disability Transportation Needs and Services; Socioeconomic Data Development; Coordinated Human Services Mobility Plan; the Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program.

TPO Citizen Participation: Identification of the transportation needs of minority, elderly, disability, low-income and limited English proficiency populations is given ongoing consideration in the TPO’s planning process through involvement of representatives from groups and organizations that represent these groups. The Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) advises the TPO on issues, plans, studies, and other matters necessary and appropriate for providing viable and reasonable citizen input. Membership of CTAC consists of local government representatives and eight at-large member organizations designated by the RRTPO. Additional information on CTAC is provided in the previous section on Communications and Public Participation. A copy of RRTPO’s adopted Public Participation Plan is provided in Appendix B.

Elderly and Disability Transportation Needs and Services: The Elderly and Disability Advisory Committee (EDAC) advises the TPO on issues, plans, and studies affecting the region’s elderly persons with disabilities, and low-income groups/populations. This includes special efforts to plan public transportation facilities and services that can be effectively utilized by the elderly.
and persons with disabilities. Additional information on EDAC is provided in the previous section on Communications and Public Participation.

Socioeconomic Data Development: A comprehensive transportation planning process is used which entails the monitoring and collection of various data pertaining to transportation issues. Socioeconomic data is developed which delineates characteristics of the region including population, households, automobile ownership, and employment patterns. This helps to characterize an area – be it urban, suburban, or rural. Because the transportation network of an area influences to varying degrees where people live and work, population, household, and employment patterns are identified and considered in addressing changing commuting growth and development patterns and habits of the region’s population. Supplementing the socioeconomic data through decennial census counts, American Community Survey data, and similar sources gives to the planning process further information that may be used to address issues of Environmental Justice as they relate to the urban transportation planning process. Further information on community characteristics of the RRTPO study area, including demographic profiles for Title VI populations, is provided later in this section.

Coordinated Human Service Mobility Plan (CHSMP): The CHSMP establishes the construct for a unified comprehensive strategy for transportation service delivery in both the RRTPO and Tri-Cities Area MPO (the adjacent MPO to the south), and in the rural areas of the Richmond Region that lay outside RRTPO’s study area. The CHSMP is focused on unmet transportation needs of the elderly, individuals with disabilities and low-income individuals. It includes: the assessment of available services identifying current providers, both public and private; the assessment of transportation needs of elderly, individuals with disabilities and low-income individuals; the identification of strategies, activities, and/or projects to address identified gaps between current services and needs, and opportunities to improve efficiencies in service delivery; and the identification of priorities for implementation based on resources, time, and feasibility of specific strategies and/or activities.

Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP): The MTP places significant emphasis on public participation, outreach, and demographic analyses to address environmental justice and limited English proficiency concerns. The MTP includes specific chapters on demographic analysis, environmental justice, and public participation. The updated RRTPO 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan update was adopted by the TPO on July 12, 2012 and is posted on the RRPDC website. Chapter 18, Environmental Justice of the recently adopted 2035 LRTP is included in this report (see attached Appendix C).

The TIP must be developed through the RRTPO’s adopted Public Participation Plan. RRTPO’s report on priority projects employs visualization techniques to describe the projects, and it is made available in electronically accessible formats. The RRTPO’s FFY15 – FFY18 TIP was adopted on August 7, 2014 and is posted on the RRPDC website. Appendix D of the TIP document
provides documentation for the TPO’s Environmental Justice process as it is used to address projects included in the TIP (see attached Appendix D).

Environmental Justice is a regulatory framework within Title VI regulations which directs every federal agency to identify and address the effects of all programs, policies and activities on traditionally disadvantaged groups. Environmental Justice seeks to ensure equal access to transportation systems and transportation planning process inputs for everyone regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin. In the past, minority and low-income populations have been identified as the largest disenfranchised group, both in terms of equal access to transportation supply and citizen input. Recently, persons with limited English proficiency (LEP) also have been identified as a disadvantaged group.

The RRTPO Environmental Justice Guidelines provided as part of the 2035 LRTP update include maps identifying underserved communities, outreach strategies, and assessment and documentation of the effects of metropolitan transportation investments on disadvantaged populations. For the TIP, EJ analyses are accomplished through VDOT’s use of the NEPA process on a project-specific level. A regional assessment of EJ is conducted through the LRTP development and project level EJ analysis covered by the NEPA process, so an EJ component is not required at the TIP level. (See Appendix C) Note that as part of the TPO’s upcoming work on the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) update, an updated EJ analysis (which includes and LEP assessment) will be conducted. Staff plans to include this updated EJ analysis and LEP assessment as part of next year’s Title VI plan.

The RRPDC’s Title VI Coordinator is responsible for evaluating and monitoring compliance with applicable nondiscrimination authorities in all aspects of the RRTPO planning and programming process (see pages 36 – 39, Communications/Public Participation section for other duties and responsibilities for the Title VI Coordinator). As such, the Coordinator will conduct or provide oversight and direction to other staff for conducting the following:

- Ensure that all aspects of the planning and programming process operation comply with nondiscrimination authorities.
- Prepare and update a demographic profile of the region using the most current and appropriate statistical information available on race, income, and other pertinent data (see following section on community characteristics).
- Make the document available to the public and member agencies on the RRPDC website, on compact disc (CD) or in hard copy format, if requested.
- Continue to ensure that staff makes concerted efforts to involve members of all social, economic, and ethnic groups in the planning process.
• Ensure that all aspects of efforts to address Environmental Justice comply with nondiscrimination authorities.

• Ensure that RRTPO conducts an Environmental Justice analysis during the development of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan.

• Review and update the RRTPO Public Participation Plan to review current Environmental Justice guidelines and update to address any identified deficiencies.
Richmond Regional TPO Community Characteristics

NOTE: TPO Community Characteristics to be updated as part of the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and this updated information will be incorporated into the next RRTPO Title VI report.

The following section on Community Characteristics presents a demographic profile of the RRTPO. Information used in this section is from census data and is mapped on a block group scale. Map 3 (following page) is provided to help orient the reader to the TPO’s [i.e., MPO] location in the state and the Richmond Region (i.e., RRPDC) and to provide a base map of census block groups (the geographic scale at which data for most demographic profiles is presented).

Race

Shown in Map 4, racial groups have generally higher concentrations in the City of Richmond, especially central and east Richmond (north of the James River) and in east and central south Richmond (south of the James River). There are also significant concentrations along the Route 1/I-95 corridor in south Richmond and eastern Chesterfield, and substantial concentrations in other parts of suburban Henrico and Chesterfield counties. Minority populations in other parts of the Richmond Region are scattered due in part to lower population levels in these areas.

Age

Shown in Map 5, the age group for under 18 is heavily concentrated in suburban Chesterfield and Henrico counties, and in Hanover County in the Mechanicsville and inner Route 301 corridor areas. The City of Richmond has significant concentrations of the 18 to 64 age group in the west end/“Fan” area, and also in east, north and central Richmond. Those in the age 64 and above group are relatively scattered throughout the Richmond Region although with lower population densities in the Region’s rural areas, they tend to be a higher proportion of the overall population in these areas (except for Charles City and New Kent counties).

Disability

There is no block group level population data available on the individuals with disabilities for all jurisdictions in the Richmond Region. When this information becomes available, it will be reviewed and incorporated into this document.
Low Income

The definition of poverty varies based on household size (i.e., number in family), number of children in family under 18, and number in family under or over age 65 (see Table 2). To establish a benchmark number for the average household in the Richmond Region, staff calculated the average household size in the Richmond Region to be 2.54 with the corresponding median poverty level income to be $17,259 (see tables 2, 3 and 4). To determine the median household income for the Richmond Region (which is not available at the regional level, but is available by jurisdiction), staff was able to calculate the median household income for the Richmond Region to be $62,250 (see tables 3 and 4). With those two benchmarks established (i.e., poverty level at $17,259 and median household income at $62,250), staff was able to establish income ranges shown in Map 6, Median Household Income as follows:

- Below $25,000
- $25,000 to $49,999
- $50,000 to $74,999
- $75,000 to $99,999
- $100,000 to $149,000
- $150,000 and above

Note that staff established the income range for poverty level (i.e., $25,000 and below) in order to have a higher degree of users shown at this lowest income level. Also note that the two bottom ranges (i.e., below $25,000 and $25,000 to $49,999) cover all family sizes that may be in poverty (see table 2).

Tables 5 and 6 show household income by income levels/ranges and by jurisdiction (Table 5) and the overall percentage of each income range for the Richmond Region (Table 6).

Figure 6 presents the location of the median household by block group in the Richmond Region for the above noted income ranges. It shows that areas at the poverty level are located mostly in the City of Richmond and concentrated along the Route 1/I-95 corridor, both north and south of the James River. Note that one block group in Henrico County (at the City of Richmond border and near the James River) is the location of the University of Richmond with a large student population and is shown in the poverty and near poverty level range. Also, the main VCU campus, which is in Central City of Richmond on Broad Street and near Belvidere Street, also has several block groups shown in the poverty and near poverty level range. Note that the lower to low-middle income range (i.e., $25,000 to $49,999) is also largely located along the
Table 2: Poverty Thresholds for 2012 by Size of Family and Number of Related Children Under 18 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of family unit</th>
<th>Related children under 18 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One person (unrelated individual)........</td>
<td>11,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 65 years............................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over..........................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two people..................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder under 65 years..............</td>
<td>15,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder 65 years and over...........</td>
<td>13,878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three people.............................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four people..............................</td>
<td>23,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five people..............................</td>
<td>28,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six people...............................</td>
<td>32,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven people.............................</td>
<td>37,795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight people.............................</td>
<td>42,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine people or more......................</td>
<td>50,849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.
### Table 3: Calculation of Average Household Income for the Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction/ Item</th>
<th>Charles City</th>
<th>Chesterfield</th>
<th>Goochland</th>
<th>Hanover</th>
<th>Henrico</th>
<th>New Kent</th>
<th>Powhatan</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Richmond Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total HH</td>
<td>2.747</td>
<td>112.895</td>
<td>7.822</td>
<td>36.489</td>
<td>122.919</td>
<td>6.552</td>
<td>9.468</td>
<td>83.615</td>
<td>382.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Distribution of HH in the region</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>29.51%</td>
<td>2.04%</td>
<td>9.54%</td>
<td>32.14%</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
<td>2.48%</td>
<td>21.86%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median HH Income ($)</td>
<td>47,093</td>
<td>72,886</td>
<td>81,288</td>
<td>77,506</td>
<td>61,206</td>
<td>71,198</td>
<td>76,235</td>
<td>39,201</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Distribution of HH in the region * Median HH Income ($)</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>21,512</td>
<td>1,662</td>
<td>7,394</td>
<td>19,669</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>1,887</td>
<td>8,569</td>
<td>62,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weighted average household income for the region $62,250

### Table 4

#### Average Household Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Charles City</th>
<th>Chesterfield</th>
<th>Goochland</th>
<th>Hanover</th>
<th>Henrico</th>
<th>New Kent</th>
<th>Powhatan</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Richmond Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B25010
ACS 2007-2011 5-Year Estimates

#### Median Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Charles City</th>
<th>Chesterfield</th>
<th>Goochland</th>
<th>Hanover</th>
<th>Henrico</th>
<th>New Kent</th>
<th>Powhatan</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47,093</td>
<td>72,886</td>
<td>81,288</td>
<td>77,506</td>
<td>61,206</td>
<td>71,198</td>
<td>76,235</td>
<td>39,201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B19013
ACS 2007-2011 5 Year Estimates

#### Total Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Charles City</th>
<th>Chesterfield</th>
<th>Goochland</th>
<th>Hanover</th>
<th>Henrico</th>
<th>New Kent</th>
<th>Powhatan</th>
<th>Richmond</th>
<th>Richmond Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,747</td>
<td>112,895</td>
<td>7,822</td>
<td>36,489</td>
<td>122,919</td>
<td>6,552</td>
<td>9.468</td>
<td>83,615</td>
<td>382,507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B25002
ACS 2007-2011 5-Year Estimates
Table 5: Household Income in the past 12 months (in 2011 inflation adjusted dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdictions/ Households</th>
<th>Charles City</th>
<th>Chesterfield</th>
<th>Goochland</th>
<th>Hanover</th>
<th>Henrico</th>
<th>New Kent</th>
<th>Powhatan</th>
<th>Richmond Region</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less Than 25,000</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>12,287</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>4,194</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>1,253</td>
<td>28,761</td>
<td>17.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>23,102</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>6,746</td>
<td>29,702</td>
<td>1,350</td>
<td>1,679</td>
<td>21,766</td>
<td>22.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>23,076</td>
<td>1,396</td>
<td>6,751</td>
<td>24,775</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>13,455</td>
<td>19.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>18,503</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>5,366</td>
<td>17,705</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>1,534</td>
<td>7,699</td>
<td>13.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>21,785</td>
<td>1,518</td>
<td>7,615</td>
<td>17,454</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>1,981</td>
<td>6,262</td>
<td>15.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 or more</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>14,142</td>
<td>1,647</td>
<td>5,817</td>
<td>13,783</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>1,339</td>
<td>5,672</td>
<td>11.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>2,747</td>
<td>112,895</td>
<td>7,822</td>
<td>36,489</td>
<td>122,919</td>
<td>6,552</td>
<td>9,468</td>
<td>83,615</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B19001
ACS 2007-2011 5 Year Estimates
Table 6: Household Income Range in the Richmond Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range ($)</th>
<th>Percentage of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less Than 25,000</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 or more</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSULTANT CONTRACTS

The RRPDC is responsible for selection, negotiation, and administration of consultant contracts that may be required in the course of the RRTPO’s urban transportation planning work. The RRPDC operates under its internal contract procedures and all relevant federal and state laws.

The Title VI Coordinator is responsible for evaluating and monitoring compliance with nondiscrimination authorities in all aspects of the agency’s consultant contracts process.

The Coordinator will:

▪ Ensure inclusion of nondiscrimination language in contracts and Requests for Proposals (RFPs).

▪ Review consultants for compliance as described below:

▪ Ensure that all consultants verify their compliance with nondiscrimination authorities, procedures, and requirements.

▪ If a recipient or sub-recipients is found to be not in compliance with nondiscrimination authorities, the Title VI Coordinator and relevant staff will work with the recipient or sub-recipient to resolve the deficiency status and write a remedial action if necessary.

▪ Review outreach activities to ensure small, disadvantaged, minority, women, and veterans with disabilities businesses have the opportunity to compete for consulting contracts.
EDUCATION AND TRAINING

All RRPDC employees are encouraged to participate in professional development and training, and RRPDC will strive to ensure employees maintain up-to-date knowledge of Title VI and other nondiscrimination statutes. The Title VI Coordinator is responsible for evaluating and monitoring compliance with Title VI requirements in all aspects of the education and training program and will:

- Identify training opportunities through FHWA, FTA, VDOT, DRPT, and other related organizations.
- Distribute information to staff on training programs regarding Title VI and related statutes.
- Ensure equal access to, and participation in, applicable courses for qualified employees.
- Track staff participation in nondiscrimination training.
- Maintain and update the RRTPO Title VI Plan as necessary, and provide it to staff.
(This page intentionally left blank.)
COMPLAINT PROCESS

As part its commitment to ensuring adherence to Title VI and other nondiscrimination authorities, the RRTPO follows a Discrimination Complaint Procedure. The RRPDC, as administrative staff to the RRTPO, handles Title VI complaints through the following process.

1. Any person who believes that he or she, individually, as a member of any specific class, or in connection with any disadvantaged business enterprise, has been subjected to discrimination prohibited by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, or any nondiscrimination authority, may file a complaint with the RRTPO. A complaint may also be filed by a representative on behalf of such a person. All complaints will be referred to the RRTPO Title VI Coordinator for review and action.

2. In order to have the complaint considered under this procedure, the complainant must file the complaint no later than 180 days after: a. The date of the alleged act of discrimination; or b. Where there has been a continuing course of conduct, the date on which that conduct was discontinued. In either case, the recipient or his/her designee may extend the time for filing or waive the time limit in the interest of justice, specifying in writing the reason for so doing.

3. Complaints shall be in writing and shall be signed by the complainant and/or the complainant’s representative. Complaints should set forth as fully as possible the facts and circumstances surrounding the claimed discrimination. In the event that a person makes a verbal complaint of discrimination to an officer or employee of the recipient, the person shall be interviewed by the Title VI Coordinator. If necessary, the Title VI Coordinator will assist the person in putting the complaint in writing and submit the written version of the complaint to the person for signature. The complaint shall then be handled in the usual manner.

4. Within 10 days, the RRTPO Title VI Coordinator shall acknowledge receipt of the allegation in writing, inform the complainant of action taken or proposed action to process the allegation, advise the respondent of their rights under Title VI and related statutes, and advise the complainant of other avenues of redress available, such as state transportation departments [Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT)], and federal transportation agencies [the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA)].

5. Within 10 days, a letter will be sent to the appropriate state and federal transportation organizations. This letter will list the names of the parties involved, the basis of the complaint, and the assigned investigator.
6. In the case of a complaint against the RRTPO, a state transportation department investigator will prepare a final investigative report and send it to the complainant, respondent (RRTPO person listed), the RRTPO Title VI Coordinator, and appropriate federal agency.

7. Generally, the following information will be included in every notification to the state transportation department: a. Name, address, and phone number of the complainant. b. Name(s) and address(es) of alleged discriminating official(s). c. Basis of complaint (i.e., race, color, national origin, sex, age, handicap/disability, income status, limited English proficiency). d. Date of alleged discriminatory act(s). e. Date of complaint received by the recipient. f. A statement of the complaint. g. Other agencies (state, local or federal) where the complaint has been filed. h. An explanation of the actions the recipient has taken or proposed to resolve the issue identified in the complaint.

8. Within 60 days, the RRTPO Title VI Coordinator will conduct and complete an investigation of the allegation and based on the information obtained, will render a recommendation for action in a report of findings to the Executive Director of the recipient of federal assistance. The complaint should be resolved by informal means whenever possible. Such informal attempts and their results will be summarized in the report of findings.

9. Within 90 days of receipt of the complaint, the RRTPO Title VI Coordinator will notify the complainant in writing of the final decision reached, including the proposed disposition of the matter. The notification will advise the complainant of his/her appeal rights with the state and federal transportation organizations, if they are dissatisfied with the final decision rendered by the RRTPO. The RRTPO’s Title VI Coordinator will also provide to the appropriate state transportation department a copy of the determination and report findings.

10. In the case a nondiscrimination complaint that was originated at the RRTPO is turned over to and investigated by a state or federal transportation organization or another agency, the RRTPO Title VI Coordinator will monitor the investigation and notify the complainant of updates, in accordance with applicable regulations and policies and procedures of state transportation departments.

11. In accordance with federal law, the RRTPO will require that applicants of federal assistance notify the RRTPO of any law suits filed against the applicant or sub-recipients of federal assistance or alleging discrimination; and a statement as to whether the applicant has been found in noncompliance with any relevant civil rights requirements.
12. The RRTPO will submit Title VI accomplishment reports to the state transportation planning departments as required by their established processes.

13. The RRTPO will collect demographic data on staff, committees, and program areas in accordance with 23 CFR, 49 CFR and state transportation departments’ established procedures and guidelines.

14. Pursuant to the Virginia Public Records Act (VPRA) § 42.1-76 et seq., the RRTPO will retain Discrimination Complaint Forms and a log of all complaints filed with or investigated by the RRTPO. The log will include the following information: Name of Complainant; Name of Respondent; Basis of Complaint (i.e., race, color, national origin, sex, age, disability, or retaliation); Date complaint received by the TPO; Date the TPO forwarded the complaint to state/federal agency’s Title VI Program Manager if so forwarded; Statement of the complaint, including specific details, relevant facts and documentation; Final disposition of the complaint.

15. Records of complaints and related data will be made available by request in accordance with the Virginia Freedom of Information Act.

16. There have been no Title VI investigations, complaints or lawsuits received by the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization prior to or since the submission of this Title VI Plan to FTA for review. *(Note: Item #16 was added based on comments received from the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) on December 28, 2015; DRPT confirmed this comment was an administrative clarification and not an amendment to the plan.)*

The complaint form, shown on the following two pages is the sample form from Appendix D of USDOT’s FTA Circular C 4702.1B.
Please provide the following information in order to process your complaint. Assistance is available upon request by contacting the RRPDC Title VI Coordinator Monday-Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. at (804) 323-2033 or by email at mshickle@richmonddregion.al.org.

### Section I:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone (Home):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Mail Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Format Requirements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section II:

Are you filing this complaint on your own behalf?  
Yes*  
No

*If you answered "yes" to this question, go to Section III.

If not, please supply the name and relationship of the person for whom you are complaining:

Please explain why you have filed for a third party:

Please confirm that you have obtained the permission of the aggrieved party if you are filing on behalf of a third party.  
Yes  
No

### Section III:

I believe the discrimination I experienced was based on (check all that apply):

[ ] Race  [ ] Color  [ ] National Origin

Date of Alleged Discrimination (Month, Day, Year): ________________________

Explain as clearly as possible what happened and why you believe you were discriminated against. Describe all persons who were involved. Include the name and contact information of the person(s) who discriminated against you (if known) as well as names and contact information of any witnesses. If more space is needed, please use the back of this form.
### Section IV
Have you previously filed a Title VI complaint with this agency?  
| Yes | No |

### Section V
Have you filed this complaint with any other Federal, State, or local agency, or with any Federal or State court?  
| Yes | No |
If yes, check all that apply:  
| Federal Agency: |  
| Federal Court | State Agency |  
| State Court | Local Agency |  
Provide information about a contact person at the agency/court where the complaint was filed.  

#### Name:  

#### Title:  

#### Agency:  

#### Address:  

#### Telephone:  

### Section VI
Name of agency complaint is against:  

#### Contact person:  

#### Title:  

#### Telephone number:  

You may attach any written materials or other information that you think is relevant to your complaint.  

Signature and date required below  

---  

Mail or deliver this completed form to:  
Title VI Administrator - Richmond Area MPO  
c/o Richmond Regional Planning District Commission  
9211 Forest Hill Avenue, Suite 200  
Richmond, VA 23235
APPENDIX A – NONDISCRIMINATION AUTHORITIES

TITLE VI AND OTHER NONDISCRIMINATION AUTHORITIES

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 Nondiscrimination in Federally Assisted Programs and Activities is one of eleven titles included in the Civil Rights Act. Section 42.104 of Title VI states “No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program” that receives federal funding. Related statutes have been enacted to expand the range and scope of Title VI coverage and applicability to ensure that no person is excluded from participation in, denied the benefit of, or subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal funding on the basis of race, color, national origin, income, gender, age, and disability.

US Department of Transportation’s Federal Transit Administration issued Circular FTA C 4702.1A dated May 13, 2007 lists the following references to use as guidance for Title VI implementation and administration:

Federal Transit Laws, as amended (49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 et seq.).


Department of Justice regulation, 28 CFR part 42, Subpart F, “Coordination of Enforcement of Nondiscrimination in Federally-Assisted Programs” (December 1, 1976, unless otherwise noted)

DOT regulation, 49 CFR part 21, “Nondiscrimination in Federally-Assisted Programs of the Department of Transportation—Effectuation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964” (June 18, 1970, unless otherwise noted)


Joint FTA/FHWA regulation, 23 CFR part 450 and 49 CFR part 613, “Planning Assistance and Standards,” (October 28, 1993, unless otherwise noted)

DOT Policy Guidance Concerning Recipients’ Responsibilities to Limited English Proficient Persons, (December 14, 2005)

Section 12 of FTA’s Master Agreement, FTA MA 13 (October 1, 2006)

**Statutory, Regulatory, or Departmental Requirements**

**The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act** of 1970 prohibits unfair and inequitable treatment of persons displaced or whose property will be acquired as a result of federal and federal-aid programs and projects.

**The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1973** states that no person shall, on the grounds of sex be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal assistance under this title or carried on under this title.

**Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973** states that no qualified handicapped person shall, solely by reason of his handicap, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity that receives or benefits from federal financial assistance. This Act protects qualified individuals from discrimination based on their disability.

**The Age Discrimination Act of 1975** states that no person shall, on the basis of age, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance. This act prohibits age discrimination in Federally Assisted Programs.

**The Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987**, P.L.100-209 clarifies that discrimination is prohibited throughout all programs and activities of federal-aid recipients, sub-recipients and contractors including those activities and programs that are not federally funded.

**The American Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990** prohibits discrimination against people with disabilities in employment, transportation, public accommodation, communications, and governmental activities.


**49 CFR Part 21** – Nondiscrimination in Federally-Assisted Programs.

**23 CFR Part 450** – Federal Highway Administration planning regulations.
This memorandum provides clarification for field offices on how to ensure that environmental justice is considered during current and future planning certification reviews. The intent of this memorandum was for planning officials to understand that environmental justice is equally as important during the planning stages as it is during the project development stages.

Executive Orders

Executive Order 12898 – Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (February 11, 1994) - presidential mandate to address equity and fairness toward low-income and minority persons/population by requiring each federal agency to make environmental justice part of its mission; to review its procedures and identify and address all programs, policies and activities that affect human health or the environment so as to identify and avoid disproportionately high and adverse effects on low-income and minority populations. Further it required federal, state, local and tribal agencies to be proactive when it comes to determining better methods to serve the public, who rely on transportation systems and services to increase their quality of life.

U.S. DOT Order 5610.2 (April 15, 1997) expands upon Executive Order 12898 requirements to include all policies, programs, and other activities that are undertaken, funded, or approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), or other U.S. DOT components; and describes the process for incorporating Environmental Justice principles into DOT programs, policies, and activities.

FHWA Order 6640.23 (December 2, 1998) – FHWA Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations - mandates the FHWA and all its subsidiaries to implement the principles of Executive Order 12898 and U.S. DOT Order 5610.2 into all of its programs, policies and activities.
Executive Order 13166 – Limited English Proficiency (August 11, 2000), a presidential directive to federal agencies to ensure people who have limited English proficiency have meaningful access to services. Executive Order 13166 ensures federal agencies and their recipients to improve access for persons with Limited English Proficiency to federally-conducted and federally assisted programs and activities.
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Disclaimer

The contents of this report reflect the views of the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization. The Richmond Regional Planning District Commission is responsible for the facts and accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT), the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), or the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission (RRPDC). This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

Title VI Notice

NONDISCRIMINATION

The Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO) fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes and regulations in all programs and activities. The RRTPO will strive to provide reasonable accommodations and services for persons who require special assistance to participate in this public involvement opportunity. For more information on meeting accessibility, or to obtain a Title VI Complaint Form, see www.richmondregional.org or call the Title VI Coordinator at 804-323-2033.

NO DISCRIMINACIÓN

Aviso de Título VI abreviado al publicó: El Organización de Planeación Regional de Transporte de Richmond (RRTPO) cumple con el Título VI de la Ley de los Derechos Civiles de 1964 y con los estatutos y regulaciones relacionadas en todos los programas y actividades. RRTPO se esforzara en proveer acomodaciones razonables y servicios para personas que requieran asistencia especial para participar en esta oportunidad pública. Para más información sobre accesibilidad a la reunión o para obtener los documentos de reclamación del Título VI, entre a la página web (www.richmondregional.org) o llame al Coordinador del Título VI en 804-323-2033.
Preface

This Public Participation Plan has been developed in consultation with interested parties as required by federal rules and regulations. Prior to its adoption, this Public Participation Plan was the subject of a formal presentation to the RRTPO Technical Advisory Committee, Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee, and TPO Board and a public notification process and comment period (minimum 45 days). The resulting public input has been addressed and incorporated as appropriate into this plan with a detailed list of comments received included in the Appendix (Appendix C).

Intent:

The intent of the Public Participation Plan is to provide meaningful citizen input for the metropolitan transportation planning and programming process through effective citizen involvement activities, open and accessible information, and opportunities for participation. The Plan also outlines standard procedures for various programs that require public participation and documentation of efforts for public outreach and engagement. As such, this requires a process for providing reasonable opportunities for involvement by the following:

- citizens
- affected public agencies
- representatives of public transportation employees
- freight shippers
- providers of freight transportation services
- private providers of transportation
- representatives of users of public transportation
- representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities
- representatives of the elderly and individuals with disabilities
- agencies or entities responsible for safety/security operations
- providers of non-emergency transportation services receiving financial assistance from a source other than title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53
- other interested parties
Background

The Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) maintains a public participation process for the development of regional transportation plans and programs. These procedures for public participation have been formally reviewed and certified as being in compliance with all applicable federal rules and regulations. The Richmond Regional TPO includes nine local jurisdictions: the Town of Ashland, the counties of Charles City, Chesterfield, Goochland, Hanover, Henrico, New Kent, Powhatan, and the City of Richmond within its boundaries (see Figure One for TPO jurisdictions and study area). The voting members include representatives from each jurisdiction as well as the Capital Region Airport Commission, GRTC Transit System, Richmond Metropolitan Transportation Authority, and the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT). The TPO Board includes non-voting members from the Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC), Elderly and Disabilities Advisory Committee (EDAC), Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, Ridefinders, Inc., Virginia Department of Aviation, and Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (see Table One for list of TPO voting and non-voting member organizations).

The TPO took final action at its October 2, 2014 board meeting to amend its bylaws, changing its name (for informal use) from the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO). The term MPO is based on federal and state regulations. Members of the TPO generally felt that changing its name to the RRTPO would be more effective and transparent in identifying the TPO as the forum for cooperative transportation decision-making in the Richmond Region. Note that there are places in this document where the term MPO is used which is the name that was in use at that time, prior to the October 2, 2014 MPO/TPO board meeting and its action to change its name for informal use.

Changes to certain aspects of public participation in the metropolitan planning process emanate from federal rules following the passage of federal legislation in 2005 (i.e., SAFETEA-LU) reauthorizing the federal-aid transportation program. The mandated changes in the public participation process place an increased emphasis on particular elements. For instance, an increased emphasis is placed on consultation with resource agencies responsible for natural resource management and historic preservation. Formal coordination with these agencies will help to identify effective mitigation strategies for potential impacts of projects included in the TPO’s Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) also referred to as the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) under federal planning regulations.

Other elements of this Public Participation Plan address methods for coordinating the MTP with interested parties (e.g., elderly and persons with disabilities). Even though this type of outreach always has been an essential aspect of the planning process, new federal rules emphasize making
documents available electronically, ensuring that public meetings are held in a convenient and accessible manner, and that visualization techniques are employed to help convey information.
TABLE ONE

RICHMOND REGIONAL
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION (TPO)

MEMBERSHIP

Voting Member Organizations (Number of votes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Governments:</th>
<th>Agencies:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Town of Ashland (1)</td>
<td>• Capital Region Airport Commission (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• County of Charles City (1)</td>
<td>• GRTC Transit System (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• County of Chesterfield (4)</td>
<td>• Richmond Metropolitan Transportation Authority (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• County of Goochland (2)</td>
<td>• Virginia Department of Transportation (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• County of Hanover (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• County of Henrico (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• County of New Kent (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• County of Powhatan (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• City of Richmond (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of votes = 27

Non-voting Member Organizations

• Federal Highway Administration
• Federal Transit Administration
• RideFinders
• Virginia Department of Aviation
• Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation
• TPO Chairman’s Citizen Appointees
• Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee Chairman
• Elderly and Disability Advisory Committee Chairman

* NOTE: TPO and MPO –

On 10/2/14, the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) changed its name (for informal use) to Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO). The term MPO is used under federal code and regulations, and the Richmond Regional TPO is in the process of changing its logo, reports, documents and studies to reflect its new name.
Federal Requirements

In accordance with 23 CFR Part 450, public participation procedures are developed for citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of transportation agency employees, private providers of transportation, and other interested parties have a reasonable notice of and opportunity to comment on proposed plans and programs. The “Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act” (MAP-21) was signed into law on July 6, 2012 and became effective on October 1, 2012, building on previous legislation (ISTEA, TEA-21, SAFETEA-LU) as the federal guidelines for requirements regarding public involvement processes and procedures.

MAP-21 legislation continues previous requirements for metropolitan planning organizations to provide individuals, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of public transportation, users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of those with disabilities, and other interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to be included in the metropolitan transportation planning process and to comment on transportation plans, studies, or other related programs.

This updated Public Participation Plan builds upon proven components of the TPO’s public participation process and expands on procedures and activities that were provided under SAFETEA-LU. Note that MAP-21 provides new requirements for a performance-based planning and programming process. As these new requirements are implemented under federal regulations, changes to the Public Participation Plan may be needed in order to accommodate these new regulations.

Main Street Station and Use of the RRTPO Public Participation Plan for Meeting Federal Requirements

The City of Richmond is designated by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) as a designated recipient and charged with administering certain federal funds that go towards the reconstruction of Main Street Station as a multi-modal transportation facility. Based on the City’s standing as a designated recipient of federal funds that come directly to the City from FTA, and the City’s use of the TPO’s public participation process to meet federal requirements for public participation, the RRPDC staff has been advised that the TPO’s public participation plan (PPP) must be updated to include language in this document that states that the TPO’s TIP document meets FTA Program of Projects (POP) requirements. In addition, all public notices advertising public hearings for the TPO’s TIP should include a statement that the notice satisfies the POP requirements of the Urbanized Area Formula Program of the Federal Transit Administration. Details for the FTA requirements that are specific to the City of Richmond Main Street Station Project are provided in the TPO Public Participation Plan Procedures portion of the PPP Update (in Section C. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), see pages 15-16).
**TPO Board and Committees**

The following section reviews the TPO’s organization structure (see Figure Two) and briefly describes important elements of public participation by the TPO Board and its two citizen advisory committees: the Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) and the Elderly and Disability Advisory Committee (EDAC), and a recent special purpose committee.

Note that all TPO board and committee meetings have public comment periods at or near the beginning of each meeting. Anyone can request to be added to the email/mailing list for upcoming TPO board and committee meetings. Also, all TPO board and committee meeting agendas are posted on the RRPDC’s website.

TPO Board: Elected officials from each TPO area local government serve as policy board voting members on the TPO. These local elected officials account for 23 of the TPO’s 27 votes and are directly accountable to citizens from their various districts. They serve as the primary means of citizen input for the TPO. These local elected officials are authorized to act on behalf of their governing bodies on TPO plans, programs, studies, and other matters related to the TPO planning and programming process. Public participation on the TPO board also includes the following:

- The CTAC and EDAC Chairman serve as non-voting TPO board members. All resolutions passed by CTAC and EDAC are reported to the TPO for their review and consideration.
- Public comment periods are on all TPO board meeting agendas, usually at the beginning of each meeting.
- The TPO Chairman may appoint up to two citizens to serve a one-year term as a non-voting TPO board member. Citizen TPO appointees may also be reappointed by the incoming TPO Chairman.

Citizen Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC): The CTAC is composed of 12 members from the TPO’s nine jurisdictions (one or two members per jurisdiction) and up to 12 members from at-large organizations that represent diverse organizations with recognized transportation planning concerns. CTAC serves as a forum for citizen input into the TPO process fostering discussion and awareness among the jurisdictions’ citizen members and members from various at-large organizations with a prominent interest in transportation in the Richmond Region. CTAC advises the TPO on plans and other matters necessary and appropriate for providing viable and reasonable citizen input. Resolutions approved by CTAC are presented to the TPO. The TPO’s response to these resolutions is reported to CTAC.

Elderly and Disabilities Advisory Committee (EDAC): The EDAC is composed of up to 18 members from at-large organizations and individuals appointed by the TPO Chairman, with balanced representation for groups, organizations and individuals representing the elderly, persons with disabilities, and low-income populations. EDAC serves as a forum
FIGURE TWO

TPO Organization Structure
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for citizen input into the TPO process and to GRTC, fostering discussion and awareness among prominent groups and organizations in the Richmond Region that deal with the needs of the elderly, persons with disabilities, and low-income populations. EDAC advises the TPO on plans and other matters concerning the TPO’s urban transportation planning process responsibility to conduct special efforts to plan public transportation facilities and services that can be effectively utilized by the elderly and individuals with mobility limitations. Resolutions approved by EDAC are presented to the TPO. The TPO’s response to these resolutions is reported to EDAC.

Ad Hoc MPO Committee on Increasing TPO Public Awareness and Accessibility:

At the November 7, 2013 MPO (TPO) meeting, the MPO took consensus action to establish an ad hoc MPO Committee on Increasing MPO Public Awareness and Accessibility. The purpose of this ad hoc committee (with members appointed by the MPO Chairman) was to provide recommendations to the MPO on ways to increase public awareness of the MPO and ways to increase public accessibility to the MPO. The ad hoc committee’s report was presented and discussed at the May 1, 2014 MPO board meeting and it was approved at the June 5, 2014 MPO meeting (see Appendix D for copy of the MPO’s resolution approving the report and the final report document).

RRPDC Website and Social Media

The Richmond Regional Planning District Commission (RRPDC) maintains a website for public information and engagement, featuring the Richmond Regional TPO within the website. The TPO section of the website provides up-to-date information on TPO plans, programs, meetings, and other appropriate information. The RRPDC website is also where draft documents, plans, and programs subject to the TPO public review process are posted for public review and comment. Some public comments have mentioned some difficulty in finding information on the TPO through the website and the several links to pages needed to reach a desired plan or program. In an effort to increase public awareness and transparency, staff will work on creating a standalone Richmond Regional TPO website for easier dissemination of information related to the TPO.

Staff is also researching the use of social media such as creating and maintaining a Facebook page to engage different demographic groups similar to the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission (RRPDC) page. The Facebook page could provide a different medium for meetings, news related to the TPO and projects, and regional transportation issues.
TPO Public Participation Plan Procedures

A. General Public Outreach

The TPO conducts a series of meetings to obtain public comments for consideration in developing various plans and programs including the MTP and TIP. Information meetings are also held in response to requests from business and civic groups, organizations, and state and local elected officials. Outreach activities will be conducted to inform minority and low-income groups and limited English-speaking groups of availability of these meetings as well.

Whenever possible, the public involvement process shall coordinate with statewide public involvement processes in order to enhance public consideration of issues, plans, and programs, to reduce redundancies and costs, and to maximize citizen involvement.

In developing the MTP and TIP, the TPO shall consult, as appropriate, with agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities within the Richmond area that are affected by transportation. To coordinate the planning functions to the maximum extent practicable, such consultation shall compare the MTP and TIP as they are being developed, with the plans, maps, inventories, and planning documents developed by other agencies. This consultation shall include, as appropriate, contacts with state, local, and private agencies responsible for planned growth, economic development, environmental protection, airport operations, freight movements, land-use management, natural resources, conservation, and historic preservation.

The MTP and TIP shall be developed with due consideration of other related planning activities within the Richmond area, including consideration given for the design and delivery of transportation services within the area that are provided by:

- recipients of assistance under title 49, U.S.C., Chapter 53;
- governmental agencies and nonprofit organizations (including representatives of the agencies and organizations) that receive federal assistance from a source other than the U.S. Department of Transportation to provide non-emergency transportation service; and
- recipients of assistance under 23 U.S.C. 204.

The TPO shall involve federal land management agencies in the development of the MTP and TIP. To the extent possible, a documented process that outlines roles, responsibilities, and key decision points for consulting with other governmental agencies should be developed early in the MTP and TIP development process.
Periodic Review and Adoption of Public Participation Plan

The “Public Participation Plan for the Metropolitan Transportation Planning and Programming Process; Richmond Regional TPO” (i.e., TPO Public Participation Plan) replaces the TPO’s previously adopted “Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (TPO) Guidelines for Public Participation,” first adopted on July 14, 1994 and revised on October 9, 1997, July 21, 2004 and April 12, 2007. The review process for the Public Participation Plan includes:

1. A minimum of 45 days shall be provided for public review and comment before the initial adoption or revision of elements in the TPO Public Participation Plan.

2. The TPO shall periodically review the overall effectiveness of the public involvement process in order to ensure that the process is providing meaningful citizen input. Mechanisms shall be in place to gauge the effectiveness of certain participation activities and results of such review shall be reported to the TPO.

3. The best representative from the TPO staff will be sent to each event in order to address issues, answer questions, and help clarify any technical jargon.

The TPO will maintain available documentation of its Public Participation Plan for request or public viewing via the RRPDC website and hard copies at the RRPDC offices.

Public Notice, Review, and Open Access

Public notice for each TPO meeting shall be provided to the local news media at least one week in advance, and for TPO committee meetings, at least three days in advance. A calendar year schedule for regularly scheduled TPO and TPO committee meetings is posted and maintained (updated) on the RRPDC web site. The TPO will also make reasonable efforts to address identified language barriers in order to provide meaningful access to information on its plans and programs.

At least two weeks’ notice shall be provided for public review meetings with notice provided in at least one local newspaper of general circulation and in at least one local newspaper serving area minority populations. Consideration shall also be given to providing notice for such meetings in other area local newspapers and radio. Such notice shall be prominently displayed as paid advertisements in these newspapers. Citizens may submit comments following a public review meeting with consideration and staff response given to written comments that are received within one week (i.e., seven calendar days) after such meetings. Such written comments with staff’s response shall be submitted for TPO consideration.
There shall be opportunity for public input during each TPO and TPO committee meeting to gather timely information about transportation issues and processes from interested citizens, groups and organizations. The TPO shall consider and respond in a timely fashion and appropriate manner to resolutions submitted to the TPO by CTAC and EDAC.

TPO board and TPO committee meetings and public review meetings shall be held at a location and time that is convenient and accessible. When there are a series (i.e. four or more) of public review meetings being held throughout the region on a certain plan or program, at least two of these meetings shall be held at a time and location that is accessible by public transportation.

Copies of final draft MTPs and TIPs shall be made available at various locations throughout the region for public review and comment two weeks in advance of the deadline for submission of comments. Copies of such final draft plans and programs shall also be posted on the RRTPDC website. When significant written and oral comments are received on the draft MTP, draft TIP, or other draft item as a result of the public involvement process or the interagency consultation process required under the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s conformity regulations, a summary, analysis and report on the disposition of comments shall be made part of the final MTP/TIP document.

If there are significant changes to the substance of final draft MTP, TIP, or document from the one made available for public comment, an additional opportunity will be provided for public comment on the revised changes. The TPO chairman shall determine when changes are significant and warrant additional opportunity for public comments.

In addition to the public participation efforts for the MTP update and the TIP, the Richmond Regional TPO will work to engage different organizations, agencies, and the general public through a variety of events and activities throughout the year. Staff will aim to participate in a minimum of three events every year, engaging various target groups as time and resources are available. Potential events for staff attendance are identified on page 13.

Staff will also maintain a public participation activity log that documents activities conducted and input received from meetings with area groups and organizations, and through town hall type meetings (see Appendix A). Staff will review and consider the input provided from these activities as part of the MTP and TIP update development processes, and as part of the annual UWP development process.

The table below outlines an example of tracking which target groups are engaged in a public participation process or consulted with for the TPO or TPO committees. The TPO maintains and provides for CTAC and EDAC with representation for both committees including at-large member organizations with recognized transportation planning concerns and groups, organizations and/or individuals representing the elderly, those
with disabilities, and low-income. These organizations and groups are also part of the
groups involved in our public participation and outreach efforts. Notice will be provided
to known interested parties that include representatives for the following
groups/organizations:

- public transportation employees
- freight shippers
- providers of freight transportation services
- private providers of transportation
- users of public transportation
- users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle facilities
- individuals with disabilities
- elderly
- low-income
- limited English-speaking populations
- providers of non-emergency transportation services receiving financial assistance from a source other than title 49, U.S.C., Chapter 53.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year 201X Public Outreach Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTP Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Richmond Region Festivals and Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>Jewish Food Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dragon Boat Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Down Home Family Reunion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Virginia Wine Expo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ChinaFest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Shamrock the Block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VCU French Film Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Church Hill Irish Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easter on Parade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>VCU Intercultural Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French Food Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earth Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Que Pasa Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian American Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts in the Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lebanese Food Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greek Food Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Broad Appetit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richmond Vegetarian Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dogwood Dell Festival of the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Dogwood Dell Festival of the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Dogwood Dell Festival of the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Filipino Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dogwood Dell Festival of the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Festival of India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>43rd Street Festival of the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic Parade and Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chester Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Armenian Food Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Benedict Oktoberfest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publick Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Benedict Oktoberfest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Peace Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richmond Italian Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>2nd Street Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richmond Folk Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richmond Oktoberfest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imagine Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harvest Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central VA Celtic Festival and Highland Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th Annual Hull Street Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shocktoberfest Folk Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Brunswick Stew Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dia de los Muertos Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foods and Feasts of Colonial Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Capital City Kwanzaaz Festival</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)

The 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) (i.e. previous term used for the MTP) documented the Citizen Participation and Public Outreach process in Chapter 3 of the LRTP document. The primary mechanism for on-going public input to the MTP is the TPO’s Metropolitan Transportation Plan Advisory Committee (MTPAC), composed of members from the TPO’s Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) and the Elderly and Disability Advisory Committee (EDAC), as well as GRTC Transit System, VDOT and DRPT. The MTP Advisory Committee provided notices for all meetings on the RRPDC website with meeting agendas sent to area news media and interested citizens and each meeting included an open comment period at the beginning of the meeting.

A website will be developed for the 2040 MTP update, providing information about committee members, schedule, meeting agendas and meeting summaries, scope of work and information about public engagement. An interactive map using ArcGIS Online on the website is planned and will allow the public to identify projects proposed/included in the 2040 MTP.

The standard process for the MTP update includes the following steps:

1. Appointments to the MTP Advisory Committee and are made by the TPO.
2. The MTP-AC reviews and ranks projects as the public are invited to view and comment on the proposed list of candidate projects for the MTP.
3. Invitation for public comment advertised in regional newspapers, through the RRPDC website, notices to interested parties, and through other available opportunities (webcasts, articles, etc.)
   a. Email and mail notices
      i. TPO Advisory Committees (TPO, TAC, CTAC, EDAC, members, alternates and interested parties)
      ii. Nonprofit, human service and civic service agencies and organizations
      iii. Miscellaneous public and private transportation providers
      iv. Federal and state resource agencies
      v. Other interested parties
   b. Email memo, ad or Executive Summary of MTP to Richmond area news media
      i. Newspapers, TV stations, radio stations, magazines, newsletters
c. Paid advertisements in Richmond Area Newspapers  
   i. Richmond Times-Dispatch, Richmond Free Press  
   ii. Typical ad size: 3 col x 6.5 inches  

d. Post notice of public review period on RRPDC website  

4. Public review of the draft MTP document through planned public meetings (typically three) and access to the document at community libraries, RideFinders, the Greater Richmond Chamber and RRPDC offices and website  

C. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)  

The TIP is an agreed-upon list of priority projects, which include projects anticipated to receive federal funds and non-federally funded projects that are regionally significant. The Richmond Regional TPO’s TIP is updated every three years and incorporated as adopted by the TPO into Virginia’s State TIP (STIP). The TIP schedule usually takes ten months for review, development, completion of draft list of projects, public review, revisions and approval.  

The standard process for the development of the TIP includes the following steps:  

1. Staff develops draft schedule for VDOT, FHWA and TPO review. Presentation of the draft TIP schedule to the TAC for review and recommendation.  
2. Presentation of the draft TIP schedule and TAC’s recommendation to the TPO for review and action.  
3. Request for TPO member jurisdiction and agency input on projects and obligation schedule for the four year fiscal year program cycle.  
4. TPO staff develops the draft TIP in collaboration with VDOT for information on previous obligations, estimates by phase and project schedule information for projects as requested by the TPO.  
5. Draft TIP is provided to the TAC with a request to authorize release of the document for public review.  
6. Public review of the Richmond Regional TPO TIP (45 day period) and staff review and response to public comments.  
7. TAC review and action to recommend the draft TIP to the TPO.  
8. TPO review and action on the draft TIP.  
9. Submission of TIP to VDOT for incorporation into the Statewide TIP, including VDOT submission to FHWA and FTA for approval; anticipate approval of TIP within 60 days of TPO action.  

The TIP is also used by the City of Richmond in meeting federal requirements which arise from its status as a “designated recipient” of FTA funds for the Main Street Station Multimodal Transportation Center project. The following applies to the TIP in order to be able for it to serve as the City of Richmond’s FTA Program of Projects:
As required by federal law and guidance, a Program of Projects (POP) for FTA projects must be developed by the Designated Recipient of FTA funds. The POP is a list of proposed FTA funded projects that must undergo a public review process. Guidance provided by FTA allows the Federal Transportation Improvements Program (FTIP) to function as the POP as long as the public is notified through TPO’s public notice that the FTIP public review process satisfies the public participation requirements of the POP. Once the FTIP is approved, the document will function as the POP for recipients of FTA funds in the TPO’s region. RRTPO’s public participation process for the FTIP is intended to satisfy FTA Section 5307 funding recipients’ (i.e. City of Richmond) public participation process for the POP.

In addition, the following language must be included in all public notices advertising public hearings for the TPO’s TIP in order to meet FTA requirements related to the City of Richmond’s designated recipient status for the Main Street Station Multimodal Transportation Center project:

“This notice satisfies the program-of-projects requirements of the Urbanized Area Formula Program of the Federal Transit Administration.”

**Recommended Strategies and Implementation**

The following identifies recommended strategies and activities for improvements in the public participation process. Staff will work towards including these recommended strategies and activities in the Unified Work Program and carry them out as appropriate.

1. Establish the TPO’s website separate from the RRPDC’s website for easier access to information such as meeting agendas, draft documents, and work programs.
2. Hold routine/frequent public outreach and community engagement activities (e.g., meetings, festivals, events, etc.). Set a target of at least five such meetings or events every year, plus additional meetings when conducting the MTP and TIP process.
3. Schedule orientation meetings on an annual or semi-annual basis for new TPO board and committee members and others who may benefit from such training.
4. Allow EDAC representation to be more flexible (i.e., reduce meeting quorum requirements) and consider revising EDAC to a workgroup and to broad its level of participation to include groups and organizations that help the TPO meet Federal Title VI, Environmental Justice (EJ) and Limited English Proficiency (LEP) requirements.
5. Connect TPO public review meetings with other events to increase public participation and attendance. For example, MTP public meetings could be held immediately before local planning commission meetings.
6. Periodically hold TPO board meetings in different parts of the region to provide opportunities for more local exposure.
7. Continue the TPO Regional Transportation Agencies Forum/Roundtable on an annual basis to increase awareness of regional transportation challenges and opportunities.

8. Hold annual citizen input meeting for the TPO (as a joint TPO/CTAC/EDAC meeting with invitation for public input) with a primary purpose to receive general public comments on regional transportation plans, programs and issues. It would serve as the initial step in the TPO’s annual Unified Work Program (UWP) process.

9. Continued participation in the Capital Region Collaborative Transportation Work Group to promote the work of the TPO and establish collaborative partners to advance regional transportation initiatives.

10. Expanded development and use of TPO background information/fact sheets and reports for distribution to the public.

11. Consideration for funding a dedicated RRPDC staff position for public participation activities and Title VI, Environmental Justice, and Limited English Proficiency compliance.

12. The TPO shall establish joint technical and citizen special purpose committees as appropriate to review, advise and recommend work conducted in development of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and other plans and studies. Such joint technical/citizen committees shall provide for ongoing citizen involvement.

13. The TPO should annually conduct a citizen input meeting to obtain public comments for consideration in developing the MTP, Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and Unified Work Program (UWP). Such meetings shall be held at various locations throughout the region. At least one-quarter of these meetings should be held in minority and/or low income areas.

14. Information meetings on TPO plans and programs are conducted in response to requests from business and civic groups, organizations, and state and local elected officials. Outreach activities are conducted to inform minority and low-income groups and limited English-speaking groups of availability of this service.

15. Visualization techniques are utilized as appropriate to enhance the public’s understanding of TPO plans and programs. Such techniques are used in an appropriate manner when presenting and describing TPO plans and programs.

16. Whenever possible, the public involvement process shall coordinate with the statewide public involvement processes in order to enhance public consideration of issues, plans, and programs, to reduce redundancies and costs, and to maximize citizen involvement.

17. The TPO will assess the distribution of impacts on low-income and minority groups for investments identified in the MTP.
APPENDIX A

DRAFT PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND OUTREACH ACTIVITY Log FOR FY 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach Effort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATIONS/ GROUPS REACHED</th>
<th>TOPICS DISCUSSED</th>
<th>STAFF PRESENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUMMARY OF ACTIVITY**

**INPUT RECEIVED**
FREQUENTLY USED TPO TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

**Attainment**
A term that means an area is in compliance with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and/or the Clean Air Act (CAA). There are six atmospheric pollutants covered under the CAA. The Richmond area (i.e., Cities of Richmond, Colonial Heights, Hopewell, and Petersburg, and the counties of Charles City, Chesterfield, Hanover, Henrico and Prince George) is designated as a nonattainment area for ozone air quality standards.

**Highway Trust Fund (HTF)**
Provides dedicated funding for federal highway and mass transit programs. Revenues placed in the HTF come from the federal gasoline tax plus other user fees. The HTF consists of separate highway and mass transit accounts.

**RRTPO (TPO)**
Metropolitan Planning Organization. MPO’s, established under federal legislation, serves as the policy board of an organization created and designated to carry out the metropolitan planning process (see 23USC Part 450). The Richmond Area MPO’s membership includes the following local governments and agencies: Ashland, Charles City, Chesterfield, Goochland, Hanover, Henrico, New Kent, Powhatan, Richmond, CRAC, GRTC, RMTA, VDOT, RideFinders, FHWA, FTA, and VDA; The MPO serves as the forum for cooperative transportation decision making in the Richmond area. Note that the MPO’s bylaws were amended in October, 2014 to change the MPO’s name, to be referred to (for informal use) as the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (i.e. TPO). The Richmond Area MPO remains as the official name for use in the MPO’s designation letter, memorandum of understanding, and other legal documents.

**MTP**
Metropolitan Transportation Plan. Serves as the initial step and framework in developing a regionally based network of transportation facilities and services that meets travel needs in the most efficient and effective manner possible. The current MTP is the 2035 long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) that was adopted by the TPO in July 2012 (see Transportation Plan below).
**NAAQS**  National Ambient Air Quality Standards; defined by EPA.

**Obligations**  Commitments made by USDOT agencies to pay out money for federal-aid transportation projects. The TIP serves as the TPO’s program of transportation projects for which federal funds have been obligated.

**Regionally Significant**  
Term used for air quality conformity analysis to define highway and rail facilities covered by this analysis. Regionally significant projects are those projects on a facility that serves regional transportation needs and would normally be included in the modeling of a metropolitan area’s transportation network. This includes, as a minimum, all principal arterial highways and all fixed guide-way transit facilities that offer a significant alternative to regional highway travel.

**SIP**  State Implementation Plan; identifies control measures and process for achieving and maintaining NAAQS; eligible for CMAQ funding.

**Study Area**  The area projected to become urbanized within the next 20 years; defines the area for TPO plans, programs, and studies.

**TPO**  Transportation Planning Organization. Serves as the policy board charged with conducting federal transportation planning and programming requirements under 23USC Part 450. TPO is the term or name used for general reference purposes for the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (see MPO above).

**"3-C" Process**  ("Continuing, Cooperative and Comprehensive") Language from federal legislation establishing MPOs/TPOs and used in reference to the regional transportation planning and programming process.

**TCM**  Transportation Control Measures (for Air Quality Control); eligible for CMAQ funding.

**TDM**  Transportation Demand Management; various transportation control strategies and measures used in managing highway demand.

**TIP**  Transportation Improvement Program; a staged, multiyear, intermodal program of transportation projects that is consistent with the transportation plan.
Transportation Plan

The TPO’s adopted Long-Range Transportation Plan or LRTP (under federal MPO/TPO planning regulations, referred to as the Metropolitan Transportation Plan or “MTP”); serves as the initial step and framework in developing a regionally based network of transportation facilities and services that meets travel needs in the most efficient and effective manner possible. The 2035 LRTP is the TPO’s current transportation plan, adopted by the TPO in July 2012.

TAZ (Transportation or Traffic Analysis Zone)

Generally defined as areas of homogeneous activity served by one or two major highways. TAZs serve as the base unit for socioeconomic data characteristics used in various plans and studies.

Urbanized Area

Term used by the U.S. Census Bureau to designate urban areas. These areas generally contain overall population densities of at least 1,000 persons per square mile in a continuously built-up area of at least 50,000 persons. Factors such as commercial and industrial development, and other types and forms of urban activity centers are also considered.

UWP

Unified Work Program; TPO’s program of work activities noting planning priorities, assigned staffs, work products, budgets, and funding sources.

VOC

Volatile Organic Compounds; emissions from cars, power plants, etc; when VOCs react with oxides of nitrogen (NOx) in the presence of heat and sunlight to produce ground level ozone or smog.
TPO STANDING COMMITTEES

CTAC  Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee
EDAC  Elderly and Disability Advisory Committee
TAC   Technical Advisory Committee

FEDERAL STATE AND REGIONAL AGENCIES

CRAC  Capital Region Airport Commission
DRPT  Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation
EPA   Environmental Protection Agency
FAA   Federal Aviation Administration
FHWA  Federal Highway Administration
FRA   Federal Railroad Administration
FTA   Federal Transit Administration
GRTC  GRTC Transit System (formerly Greater Richmond Transit Company)
MRAQC Metropolitan Richmond Air Quality Committee
RideFinders A public nonprofit corporation that provides carpool/vanpool matching and other commuter and transportation services; also, a division of GRTC Transit System
MARAD Maritime Administration
RMTA  Richmond Metropolitan Transportation Authority
RRPDC Richmond Regional Planning District Commission; also referred to as the Richmond Region or Planning District 15 (PD-15)
USDOT United States Department of Transportation
VCTIR Virginia Center for Transportation Innovation and Research
VDA   Virginia Department of Aviation
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VDEQ  Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
VDOT  Virginia Department of Transportation

FEDERAL LEGISLATION

ADA of 1990  Americans with Disabilities Act
CAAA of 1990  Clean Air Act Amendments
ISTEA  Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act; passed in 1991; reauthorized federal surface transportation programs for highways, highway safety and transit for a six-year period, 1992 to 1997. ISTEA provided for significant expansion of MPO planning and programming authority and responsibilities. Replaced by TEA-21.
TEA-21  Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century; signed into law on June 9, 1998 (replaced ISTEA). Authorizes federal funds for highways, highway safety, transit, and other surface transportation programs for the next 6 years. Builds on and continues many of the initiatives established in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991. Replaced by SAFETEA-LU.
MAP-21  Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century; federal transportation legislation reauthorization signed into law on July 6, 2012 and went into effect on October 1, 2012.

FUNDING PROGRAMS

SPR  State Planning and Research; federal funds allocated to VDOT in support of MPO program activities.
Local Match  Funds required by recipients of PL and Section 5303 funds for matching federal and state grant funds. Section 5303 and PL funds require a 10% match, with VDOT/DRPT providing 10% and the remaining 80% provided by the federal source.
RRPDC Funds from the RRPDC (state appropriations and local dues) provided in addition to required local match funds (sometimes noted as RRPDC overmatch). The RRPDC provides local match funds for RRPDC staff work activities.

PL Planning funds available from FHWA for TPO program activities.

Section 5303 Planning funds available from the FTA for TPO program activities.

CMAQ Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality; federal funding program created under ISTEA (1991). Directs funding to projects that contribute to meeting National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) in areas that are currently or previously designated by EPA as nonattainment or maintenance areas for NAAQS. CMAQ funds generally may not be used for projects that result in the construction of new highway capacity for single occupant vehicles. CMAQ funds may be available for eligible activities that lead to and result in project implementation (i.e. funds cannot be used for planning studies).

RSTP Regional Surface Transportation Program; Federal funding program created under ISTEA (1991). Federal funds apportioned based on the Richmond Urbanized Area decennial census population and allocated to the Richmond TPO and Tri-Cities MPO with 86.5 percent allocated to the Richmond TPO and 13.5 percent allocated to the Tri-Cities MPO (as per the TPO’s April 4, 2013 action and agreed to by the Tri-Cities MPO and VDOT). Projects eligible for RSTP funding include highway and bridge construction and rehabilitation (for roads functionally classified as collector or higher; maintenance is not eligible); transit capital improvements; car and vanpool programs; bicycle and pedestrian facilities; safety and hazard elimination projects; traffic management systems; transportation enhancement/alternatives; wetlands and environmental mitigation; and TPO transportation planning activities.

TEIF Transportation Efficiency Improvement Fund; purpose of program is to reduce traffic congestion by supporting transportation demand management programs designed to reduce use of single occupant vehicles and increase use of high occupancy vehicle modes; operated by the Commonwealth Transportation Board.
OTHER TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ADT       Average Daily Traffic; used in conjunction with current and projected traffic volumes.
CAO       Chief Administrative Officer
CARE      Community Assisted Ride Enterprise; program operated by GRTC providing demand-response paratransit service for the elderly and disabled in the City of Richmond and Henrico County.
CMP       Congestion Management Process
CHSMP     Coordinated Human Services Mobility Plan
COA       Comprehensive Operational Analysis (for transit studies)
CTB       Commonwealth Transportation Board
CRC       Capital Region Collaborative; Cooperative planning process conducted by the RRPDC and the Greater Richmond Chamber of Commerce.
EJ        Environmental Justice
FFY       Federal Fiscal Year (October 1 to September 30)
FY        State Fiscal Year (July 1 to June 30).
GIS       Geographic Information System
I/M       Inspection and Maintenance
LEP       Limited English Proficiency
MSA       Metropolitan Statistical Area. The Richmond/Petersburg 2010 MSA includes the cities of Colonial Heights, Hopewell, Petersburg, and Richmond; the counties of Amelia, Caroline, Charles City, Chesterfield, Dinwiddie, Goochland, Hanover, Henrico, King William, New Kent, Powhatan, Prince George, Sussex; and the Town of Ashland.
NHPP      National Highway Performance Program
NHS       National Highway System
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NHTS</td>
<td>National Household Transportation Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>Nitrogen Oxides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVi</td>
<td>Richmond Electric Vehicle Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFP</td>
<td>Request for Proposal; process used for reviewing and selecting proposals for consultant study activities. (Goods and non-professional services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFQ</td>
<td>Request for Qualifications (Consultant Services).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP</td>
<td>State Implementation Plan (for attainment and maintenance of national ambient air quality standards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>Single Occupant Vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP</td>
<td>Surface Transportation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYIP</td>
<td>Six Year Improvement Program; annual document approved by the CTB. Provides the state’s list of federal and state funded transportation projects and programs administered by VDOT and DRPT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDP</td>
<td>Transit Development Plan; DRPT requirement for all public transit service operators. GRTC Transit System’s TDP was approved by the GRTC Transit System board in October 2011, and it was accepted as work received by the TPO on November 11, 2011. Note that GRTC submits annual updates to the TDP to DRPT and these updates are available for TPO review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMA</td>
<td>Transportation Management Area (i.e., TPOs greater than 200,000 in population).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAMPO</td>
<td>Virginia Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT</td>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX C

List of Comments Received on the Draft RRTPO Public Participation Plan

Comments from VDOT Richmond District TMPD staff

Staff received comments from VDOT Richmond District’s Transportation and Mobility Planning Division (TMPD) on March 12, 2015. These comments were implemented into the public participation plan by staff where applicable and will work on developing a consistent public review
period for all TPO work programs and documents and updating the TPO website for easier public access to information.

1. Inserting a general pledge or reference(s) to Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) in the PPP including
   • Change to providing public notice from local news media to the public at least 3 working days in advance of any public meeting by a public body to avoid FOIA violation (FOIA reference: § 2.2-3707C)

2. Clarification on certain features for all public review and public review meetings for all TPO draft product-material documents such as draft public participation plans, draft long range plans, or draft TIPs
   • Page 12 states that “at least two weeks’ notice shall be provided for public review meetings with notice provided in at least one local newspaper of general circulation and in at least one local newspaper serving area minority populations. Consideration shall also be given to providing notice for such meetings in other area local newspapers and radio. Such notice shall be prominently displayed as paid advertisements in these newspapers. Citizens may submit comments following a public review meeting with consideration and staff response given to written comments that are received within one week (i.e., seven calendar days) after such meetings. Such written comments with staff’s response shall be submitted for TPO consideration.”
   • However, other places in the draft mention different lengths of time for public review periods such as 45 days for PPPs, 14 days for MTPs and TIPs, and 45 days for TIP. Need to make edits for consistency among all documents.

3. Statement in the draft PPP explaining that the TPO website will convey access to the MPO’s key approved product documents such as the current UPWP, CLRP, TIP, and bylaws. PPP provisions, and the TPO webpages, should additionally provide information and links to the current UPWP, CLRP, TIP, and bylaws as well as a map of the TPO’s metro planning area. More detail on page 10 of the draft PPP on the information provided on the TPO website besides general language and discussion.

4. Page 6 TPO board membership table updated.
5. Clarification on page 8 that this section addresses public participation aspects of the TPO Board and committees.
Comments from the March 19, 2015 CTAC Meeting

Staff presented the draft RRTPO Public Participation Plan at the March 19, 2015 Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) and members present provided feedback after the presentation. These comments and suggestions will be addressed and implemented by staff in TPO work programs and activities through collaboration with TPO committees. A list of commonly used acronyms in RRTPO related programs and documents is included in the Public Participation Plan in the Appendix as well.

1. Break down the barrier created by acronyms by making a poster with brief, simple definitions for key acronyms.
2. Have a vocabulary list of acronyms, what they stand for and why they’re important available for distribution at events.
3. Provide an information table at events sponsored by the Richmond Foundation [possibly add to the table of events on page 14 of the PPP].
4. Take reasonable efforts to insure that transportation funding is being utilized to provide services and facilities in low-income areas and that there is increased public outreach to organizations and events that involve low-income and minority populations.
5. Be more inclusive of minority and low-income communities and make more of an effort to participate in events and organizations that cover these communities to learn what their transportation needs and deficiencies are.
6. Don’t use acronyms or even the spelled out names of many of the more technical terms and jargon, but talk in layman’s terms about what the transportation needs are perceived to be by transportation consumers.
7. Send representatives to these events who are able to cut through the acronyms and technical jargon and are able to address the issues and answer the questions in a common sense citizen oriented manner.
8. When participating in an event in a particular jurisdiction, inform and invite participation by the representatives from that region serving on TPO and TPO standing committees who are familiar with local issues and can explain what may be a problem or what may proposed for that particular area. This person may be more likely to know the citizens who will attend an event.
9. Be able to explain to citizens how funding is acquired for certain projects and how they may influence how funding is spent by talking to the appropriate representatives in their area.
10. Seek input from particular segments of the community who use a particular transportation system, i.e., talk to transit riders about transit services for their input.
11. Have a list available telling consumers where to call for particular transportation problems they’re experiencing in their area of the Richmond Region.
Comments from the April 2, 2015 TPO Board meeting

At the April 2, 2015 TPO Board meeting, staff presented the draft Public Participation Plan to authorize the document to begin its 45 day public comment period. TPO Board members provided the following comments, which will be implemented by staff as future work tasks.

1. Providing a list of current projects that we’ve approved funding for and provide basic information about each project such as what it is about, who is running it, and how much will it cost, and also include a justification or need for the project and why it is being done without providing too much detailed data.

2. Not to use so many acronyms and technical jargon not known to the general public.

3. Request that staff develop a booklet listing Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) projects being funded with information about the projects and its purpose. This booklet will also be available on the TPO website.

4. Additional request for staff to develop a regional map for projects to be included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). This interactive map would be available on the TPO website and list details of projects.

Comments from the April 7, 2015 to May 22, 2015 Public Review Period

Staff received one comment, by email (on May 22, 2015) during the 45 day public review period for the final draft PPP document (see attached email from Ms. A. Georgiana Ball). Staff wishes to thank Ms. Ball for commenting on the draft Public Participation Plan which states that she believes “...efforts to receive comments on the part of the public are fine in your plan”. As to her comments on helping to guide public comments by providing information about “...whether regional transportation is available and where” and for areas addressing public transportation, bicycle and pedestrian paths, plans to reduce congestion, toll roads versus roads without tolls, and the poor status of the region’s overall public transportation system and greenway system, staff will provide these comments to the TPO’s recently established 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)/Congestion Management Process (CMP) Advisory Committee for their review, consideration, and discussion. The 2040 MTP/CMP Advisory Committee is in the early stages of development for the 2040 MTP/CMP, and their consideration of Ms. Ball’s comments at this time is very timely and appropriate.
APPENDIX C – ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE – LRTP

Chapter 18 - Environmental Justice

NOTE: Environmental Justice analysis included in Appendix C is from the RRTPO’s 2035 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP); adopted by the TPO in July 2012. An updated Environmental Justice analysis included as part of the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) update (currently underway) will be included in next year’s Title VI plan.

Background

Environmental Justice is a regulatory framework within Title VI regulations which directs every federal agency to identify and address the effects of all programs, policies and activities on traditionally disadvantaged groups. Environmental Justice seeks to ensure equal access to transportation systems and transportation planning process inputs for everyone regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin. In the past, minority and low-income populations have been identified as the largest disenfranchised group, both in terms of equal access to transportation supply and citizen input. Recently persons with limited English proficiency (LEP) have been added to the disadvantaged groups.

Each MPO receiving federal funds needs to examine that all future transportation plans address the following environmental justice principles.

- To ensure the level and quality of transportation service is provided without regard to race, color or national origin.
- To avoid or minimize high and adverse human health and environmental effects on low income and minority population.
- To ensure the full and fair participation by low income and minority population.
- To prevent the denial of benefit to low income and minority population.
- To ensure meaningful access to programs and activities by persons with limited English proficiency.

Identification of Disadvantaged Population & Concentration Areas

Disadvantaged populations (Low income, Minority & LEP) have been identified in Chapter 6 of this document (see Maps 5-10 through 5-12). Based on the calculations in these tables the Richmond Region has 40% Minority Population, 11% Low Income Population and 2.25% LEP Population. This information is summarized in Map 18-1.

Disadvantaged population concentration area or predominantly Minority Area (for Minority population) or predominantly Low Income Area (for low income Population) or predominantly LEP area (For LEP population) means a geographical area (Census Tracts in our case), where the proportion
of disadvantaged persons (minority, low income or LEP) residing in that area exceeds the average proportion of disadvantaged population in the service area (Richmond Region is our case).

Figure 18-1: Disadvantaged Group Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disadvantaged Group</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Total Population/Total Households</th>
<th>Criteria / Exclusion</th>
<th>Disadvantaged Group Population/Households</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEP</td>
<td>2006 - 2010 ACS 5-Year Estimates</td>
<td>920,731</td>
<td>Population 5 And above</td>
<td>20,611</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority 2010</td>
<td>Census 2010 Summary file 1</td>
<td>1,002,696</td>
<td>100 Percent population</td>
<td>398,344</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>2006 - 2010 ACS 5-Year Estimates</td>
<td>950,015</td>
<td>Population for whom Poverty is determined (except institutionalized population)</td>
<td>102,487</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with 1 car or Less</td>
<td>2006 - 2010 ACS 5-Year Estimates</td>
<td>378,477</td>
<td>Except 1 person household with 1 car</td>
<td>70,727</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Map 18-1 shows the concentration of all disadvantaged population in the Richmond Region. In the map, the red hatched areas indicate predominantly low income areas, beige areas show LEP population concentration areas whereas the grey dotted areas indicate predominantly minority areas. The green thick line shows the RRTPO (i.e., TPO) Area.

The map indicates that the highest concentrations of minority population occur in the City of Richmond, Charles City County, northern Chesterfield County adjoining Richmond and eastern Henrico County and some parts of Southern Chesterfield near the Tri-Cities. Most census tracts that have predominantly minority population are located in the City and its adjacent census tracts, especially to the north and east.

Similarly, the majority of predominantly low-income areas are located within the City of Richmond. With the exception of the area west of downtown, most census tracts within the City show a concentration of low-income population. Portions of eastern and western Henrico County and areas
immediately around I-95 in Chesterfield County also show a high concentration of low-income population. Most of the predominantly low-income areas are within the predominantly minority areas.

The majority of LEP population is located in South Richmond and adjoining Chesterfield County along Route 1, Route 60 and Route 360 corridors. Some concentration of LEP population can be located in western Henrico County, upper portions of town of Ashland and some census tracts in Hanover County.

Some census tracts in South Richmond, east and west Henrico adjacent to the city and North Chesterfield adjacent to the city show concentrations of all the three disadvantaged populations. Since cross tabulated data for minority, low income and LEP population is not available at census at this time, we are not able to identify the population which falls in two or all three disadvantaged groups.

In order to see the relationship between disadvantaged group and low automobile ownership (households with one or less automobiles which do not include one person household with one automobile) in the Richmond Region both of the categories were overlaid and mapped. Map 18-2 shows this spatial analysis. Beige areas are predominantly disadvantaged group areas (low income or minority or LEP) whereas red hatched areas are areas having low automobile ownership. Areas with low automobile ownership include almost all of Richmond City, adjacent areas of Henrico and Chesterfield Counties and northern Ashland. The map indicates that concentrated areas of low auto ownership are almost within the predominantly disadvantaged group areas.
Map 18-1: Concentration of Minority, Low Income & LEP Population in the Richmond Region
Map 18.2: Automobile Ownership: Minority, Low Income & LEP Population

Legend
- Richmond MPO
- Jurisdictional Boundary
- River / Lake
- Minority or Low Income or LEP Population (at or above regional average of 41%, 12% and 2.5% respectively)
- Household with 1 or less Automobile (at and above regional average of 20%)

Data by Census Tracts
Data Source:
- Census 2010 Summary File 1
- Table P9 for Minority Population
- 2006-2010 ACS 5-Year Estimates
- Table B17001 for Low Income Population
- Table B16006 for LEP Population
- Table S08201 for Households with 1 or less Automobiles

*Household with 1 or less automobiles do not include 1 person households with 1 automobile
Allocation of Funds to Predominantly Disadvantaged Population Concentration Areas

An analysis was performed in conjunction with the spatial analysis identifying traditionally disadvantaged groups to determine what level of investment these areas would receive in terms of transportation spending as part of the 2035 LRTP Update. Only candidate projects are subject to Environmental Justice (EJ) analysis. Private/local funded projects are not subject to EJ analysis since these projects are not federally funded.

Richmond Area MPO (i.e., TPO) staff possesses neither the expertise nor specific project knowledge to properly assess the environmental impacts of the candidate projects beyond the investment of funding in disadvantaged population areas. As these projects move through the construction process, they will be subject to project-specific NEPA review that will appropriately assess any negative environmental (human or otherwise) impacts these projects might have on neighboring populations.

As noted in Chapter 17, “Financially Constrained Plan,” the amount of funding forecast to be available to the Richmond area from state and federal sources during the time period FY18 to FY35 is approximately $1.546 billion. As explained in Chapter 18, some of these funds (about $253 million) will be needed to pay the balance-to-complete for projects currently in the adopted VDOT Six-Year Improvement Program (SYIP). Also, it is anticipated that funding the 2035 LRTP’s candidate project list will leave a remaining balance of approximately $87 million. Therefore, the amount devoted to funding the candidate projects is $1,205,497,000.

Summing the current construction cost estimates for all of the candidate projects (i.e., if all candidate projects were immediately implemented) equals approximately $900 million. The difference between the $900 million and the actual estimated cost (about $1.2 billion) is due to the 2.5 percent annual inflation factor applied to the project costs as they come on line between FY18 and FY35. From this information it can be determined that, on average, any candidate project will cost 1.3408 times as much as its initial cost estimate. By using this average cost escalation, the proportion of the total available state and federal funds to be applied in disadvantaged population concentration areas is as shown in Figure 18-2 on the following page.
**Figure 18-2 - Allocation of Funds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disadvantaged Group</th>
<th>Regional Disadvantaged Population (As % of Total Regional Population)</th>
<th>Total LRTP Funding (X1,000$)</th>
<th>LRTP Funding Estimate Allocated to Areas with Disadvantaged Population Concentrations (X1,000$)</th>
<th>Percentage of LRTP Funding Estimate Allocated to Areas with Disadvantaged Population Concentrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$551,567</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>$1,205,497</td>
<td>$490,208</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited English Proficiency (LEP)</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$280,355</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Disadvantaged Groups</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>$783,333</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures 18-3 through 18-5 show which projects are located in each disadvantaged group area, or would serve each area, and what spending would be accounted for in each area. Funding amounts included with the project description are the same as used in the financially constrained projects list provided earlier in the chapter.
### 2035 LRTP Constrained Projects in Minority Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Termin</th>
<th>Cost Estimate (K'000)</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>ProjectID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional #1 Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>Cathedral Walk</td>
<td>Urban Trail Linkage</td>
<td>Cary St. to Dock St.</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>I-95</td>
<td>Capacity and Safety Improvements</td>
<td>Bryan Park to James River</td>
<td>$19,874</td>
<td>VDOT</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Transfer Center</td>
<td>Transfer Center (PE Only)</td>
<td>Central Business District</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>GRTC</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Broad St. Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Service</td>
<td>Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)</td>
<td>Broad St.</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>DRPT</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Rt. 5</td>
<td>Phase 1 (Widen Rt. 5 - 3 ft. each side)</td>
<td>Hanover/Charles City CL to James City County/Charles City CL</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>Charles City</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Pavement Preservation*</td>
<td>Paving - Resurfacing</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>$67,100</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>East Richmond Rd. Bridge</td>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>Over Gillespie Creek</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>EDAC</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>Va Capitol Trail</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Great Ship Lock Park to Richmond CL</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>Rt. 623 - Capital Trail Extension</td>
<td>VA Capital Trail Extension</td>
<td>Rt. 5 to Rivers Rest Dr.</td>
<td>$4,080</td>
<td>Charles City</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>Mayo Bridge</td>
<td>Long-Term Repair to Existing Bridge Structure</td>
<td>Over James River</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>I-64*</td>
<td>Widening</td>
<td>EB Rt. 288 On Ramp to Staples Mill Rd.</td>
<td>$32,198</td>
<td>VDOT</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>I-95 and I-64 East Junction</td>
<td>Modification</td>
<td>Interchange at I-64/I-64 E</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>I-95 and I-64 West Junction</td>
<td>Modification</td>
<td>Interchange at I-64/I-64 W</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimodal</td>
<td>Port of Richmond</td>
<td>Marine Highway Project</td>
<td>Richmond to Hampton Roads</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimodal</td>
<td>Franklin Street</td>
<td>Multimodal Improvements</td>
<td>14th St. to 18th St.</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>CTAC</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Electric Vehicle Charging Stations - 2</td>
<td>Electrical Vehicle Charging Stations</td>
<td>Main St. Station and Downtown</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)*</td>
<td>ITS Improvements</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>$610</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>ATMS Phase 2*</td>
<td>Signal System and ITS</td>
<td>Courtwide</td>
<td>$3,010</td>
<td>Henrico</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>New Market Rd</td>
<td>Widening</td>
<td>LeBunnen Ave. to Dismoor Ave.</td>
<td>$17,800</td>
<td>Henrico</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Rt. 602</td>
<td>Widening</td>
<td>Adkins Rd. to Courthouse Rd.</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>Charles City</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Park &amp; Ride Facilities*</td>
<td>Park &amp; Ride Facilities</td>
<td>Various Locations</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>GRTC</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>15th St. Improvements</td>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>Main St. to Dock St.</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $411,372

*Cost estimate is for portion of project estimated to impact disadvantaged population

**Note:**
- LRTP Funding Allocated to Minority Areas multiplied by Inflation Factor of 1.3408 = $551,567
- Regionwide LRTP Project Cost Estimate = $1,206,467
- % of LRTP Project Funding Allocated to Minority Areas = 46%
## 2035 LRTP Constrained Projects in Low-Income Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Termini</th>
<th>Cost Estimate (X1000)</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>ProjectID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional #1 Projects</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>Cathedral Walk</td>
<td>Urban Trail Linkage</td>
<td>Cary St. to Dock St.</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>I-95</td>
<td>Capacity and Safety Improvements</td>
<td>Bryan Park to James River</td>
<td>$19,674</td>
<td>VDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Transfer Center</td>
<td>Transfer Center (PE Only)</td>
<td>Central Business District</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>GRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Broad St. Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Service</td>
<td>Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)</td>
<td>Broad St.</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>DRPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Pavement Preservation*</td>
<td>Paving - Resurfacing</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>East Richmond Rd. Bridge</td>
<td>Replacement</td>
<td>Over Gillies Creek</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>EDAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Projects</td>
<td>Bike/Ped</td>
<td>Va Capitol Trail</td>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>Great Ship Lock Park to Richmond CL</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>Mayo Bridge</td>
<td>Long-Term Repair to Existing Bridge Structure</td>
<td>Over James River</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>I-64*</td>
<td>Widening</td>
<td>EB Lt 288 On Ramp to Staples Mill Rd.</td>
<td>$48,785</td>
<td>VDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>I-95 and I-64 East Junction</td>
<td>Modification</td>
<td>Interchange at I-95/I-64 E</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>I-95 and I-64 West Junction</td>
<td>Modification</td>
<td>Interchange at I-95/I-64 W</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multimodal</td>
<td>Port of Richmond</td>
<td>Marine Highway Project</td>
<td>Richmond to Hampton Roads</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multimodal</td>
<td>Franklin Street</td>
<td>Multimodal Improvements</td>
<td>14th St. to 18th St.</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>CTAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Electric Vehicle Charging Stations - 2</td>
<td>Electrical Vehicle Charging Stations</td>
<td>Main St. Station and Downtown</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)*</td>
<td>ITS Improvements</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>ATMS Phase 2*</td>
<td>Signal System and ITS</td>
<td>Countwide</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>Henrico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>New Market Rd</td>
<td>Widening</td>
<td>Laburnum Ave., to Osborne Tpke.</td>
<td>$17,800</td>
<td>Henrico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Park &amp; Ride Facilities*</td>
<td>Park &amp; Ride Facilities</td>
<td>Various Locations</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>GRTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>15th St. Improvements</td>
<td>Improvements</td>
<td>Main St. to Dock St.</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$385,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cost estimate is for portion of project estimated to impact disadvantaged population

LRTP Funding Allocated to Low-Income Areas multiplied by inflation factor of 1.3408

Regionalwide LRTP Project Cost Estimate: $490,208

% of LRTP Project Funding Allocated to Low Income Areas: 41%
## 2035 LRTP Constrained Projects in Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Termini</th>
<th>Cost Estimate (X1000)</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>ProjectID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional #1 Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Shady Grove Rd.</td>
<td>Widening</td>
<td>Twin Hickory Rd to Old Nuckols Rd.</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
<td>Henrico</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Hill Carter Pkwy Ext.</td>
<td>New 2/4 lane facility + I-66 Exit Ramp - PE</td>
<td>Kitty Hamilton Ln. to Quarles Rd/IBD w location of Exit Ramp</td>
<td>$19,900</td>
<td>Ashland</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Cedar Ln.</td>
<td>New Alignment</td>
<td>Rt. 1 to Cedar Ln.</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Pavement Preservation*</td>
<td>Paving - Resurfacing</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>Cox Rd. Bridge</td>
<td>Bridge Widening/Rehabilitation</td>
<td>at I-64</td>
<td>$8,100</td>
<td>Henrico</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>I-65*</td>
<td>Widening</td>
<td>Henrico CL to Caroline CL</td>
<td>$36,604</td>
<td>VDOT</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate</td>
<td>I-64</td>
<td>Widening</td>
<td>EB Rt. 288 On Ramp to Staples Mill Rd.</td>
<td>$97,569</td>
<td>VDOT</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimodal</td>
<td>Port of Richmond</td>
<td>Marine Highway Project</td>
<td>Richmond to Hampton Roads</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)*</td>
<td>ITS Improvements</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>ATMS Phase 2*</td>
<td>Signal System and ITS</td>
<td>Countywide</td>
<td>$210</td>
<td>Henrico</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Williamsburg Rd.</td>
<td>Widening and Streetscape</td>
<td>Airport Dr to Beulah Rd.</td>
<td>$23,100</td>
<td>Henrico</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Luks Ln.*</td>
<td>Widening to 4 Lanees</td>
<td>Speno Rd to Route 288</td>
<td>$2,882</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Rt. 606 &amp; Rt. 643 Intersection</td>
<td>Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>At Rural Point Rd.</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Ashland Rd.*</td>
<td>Shoulder Wedge</td>
<td>Hanover/Gouchland Cl to Ashcake Rd. (Rt. 55)</td>
<td>$499</td>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cost estimate is for portion of project estimated to impact disadvantaged population

| Total          | $209,095       | |
| LRTF Funding Allocated to LEP Areas multiplied by inflation factor of 1.3408 | $280,355 | |
| Regionwide LRTF Project Cost Estimate | $1,205,407 | |
| % of LRTF Project Funding Allocated to LEP Areas | 23% | |
Communication with the Disadvantaged Population

One of the major elements of environmental justice is communication with the disadvantaged population. The whole process of 2035 LRTP update was done keeping in mind the principles and objectives of environmental justice. Special efforts have been made to reach out to minority, low-income and LEP population groups within the Richmond Region. These outreach efforts were focused on local community newspapers, community radio and TV stations, and access to public workshops.

Outreach for the 2035 LRTP (discussed in detail in chapter 4) was done in three phases. Communication with the disadvantaged population was part of this three phrased approach.

The first phase of communication was the early input through the Capital Region Collaborative (CRC) "Strawman" where CRC met with ten diverse groups (including minority and low-income groups) to receive input on important community priorities for the Richmond region.

The second phase of communication was the public review of candidate projects. A memo, advertisement and executive summary were e-mailed to two minority newspapers and four minority radio stations (including two Hispanic stations). Similarly the e-mail was also sent to various minority and LEP business and cultural organizations including the Virginia Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, Asian American Society of Virginia, Asian American Society of Central Virginia and Virginia Asian Chamber of Commerce. These contacts helped in disseminating the information provided in the email to their respective communities. To reach out a much greater percentage of the minority population, paid ads were run in Richmond Free Press, a minority newspaper, on November 10.

The third phase of communication was the public review of the draft 2035 LRTP document from May 14, 2012 to June 10, 2012. The draft 2035 LRTP document was made available for public comments in 15 libraries throughout the Richmond Region. The electronic version of the document was also available in RRPDC’s website. The public review of the draft 2035 LRTP document also included three planned public meetings, open for public comments.

In addition, the MPO received comments from the Elderly and Disability Advisory Committee (EDAC) and Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC). Resolutions approved by EDAC and CTAC were presented to the MPO, and regular updates of the 2035 LRTP update were presented in these committees.

EDAC advises the MPO on issues, plans, and studies affecting the region’s elderly and persons with disabilities. This includes special efforts to plan public transportation facilities and services that can be effectively utilized by the elderly and persons with disabilities. EDAC is comprised of 14 member organizations with generally balanced representation for the elderly, persons with disabilities and low income persons. Organizations having a focus on low income population include Capital Area Partnership Uplifting People; Goodwill of Central Virginia and United Way of Greater Richmond & Petersburg.
Similarly CTAC advises the MPO on issues, plans, studies, and other matters necessary and appropriate for providing viable and reasonable citizen input. Membership on CTAC consists of local government representatives and eight at-large member organizations appointed by the MPO. Organizations having a focus on minority population include National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP).
Appendix D: Environmental Justice/Title VI
Environmental Justice/Title VI

Introduction

In compliance with requirements associated with civil rights and the planning and programming of federal funds in the MPO’s Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), the MPO maintains and annually updates the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Title VI Plan. This plan describes the measures incorporated into the MPO’s urban transportation planning and programming process to assure compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and applicable non-discrimination requirements including federal executive orders for Environmental Justice (EJ) and Limited English Proficiency (LEP) requirements. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, prohibits discrimination based upon race, color, and national origin. EJ regards identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of federal related programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations. LEP regards providing persons, including those with limited proficiency in English, with meaningful access to federally conducted and federally funded programs and activities. Certain other nondiscrimination requirements for federal programs apply as well, such as for disabled and/or older persons.

The MPO’s Title VI Plan update was approved at the June 5, 2014 MPO meeting and is incorporated by reference. The MPO also must regularly certify that the transportation planning process associated with the TIP is being carried out in accord with all applicable requirements, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. The following provides a brief description of how Title VI/EJ requirements are addressed for the federally funded projects and programs that are included in the adopted TIP.

Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)

The MPO member agencies and local governments work collaboratively in developing the LRTP, which includes the identification of disadvantaged groups (i.e. LEP, minority, low-income and households with less than one car), an analysis to identify areas in the region where there are significant concentrations of these groups, and an analysis of the spatial allocation of funds to proposed projects to determine if these areas are receiving a relatively fair share of project funding. The
LRTP’s EJ analysis shows that the percentage of LRTP funds available for projects and programs exceeds the percentage of disadvantaged populations residing within areas of significant concentrations of minority, low-income, and LEP groups. The LRTP does not discriminate against disadvantaged groups when it comes to the review and selection of proposed projects and programs included for funding in the adopted LRTP. The LRTP is developed in consultation with state and/or local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation for the purpose of comparison of the transportation plan to State and/or local conservation plans or maps, if available, and inventories of natural, cultural/historic and/or other resources, if available. The LRTP also discusses potential environmental mitigation activities. Regards public involvement, the LRTP identifies the ways in which the MPO conducted outreach efforts to communicate and obtain input from disadvantaged groups on the proposed MPO plan, programs and projects, consistent with the approved MPO Public Participation Plan process. The MPO Public Participation Plan provides that the MPO provide LEP information and assistance on request.

**TIP Level**

As has been the past practice approved by the MPO, state and federal partners, the analysis conducted in the MPO’s Title VI Plan update, the analysis conducted in the LRTP, and project level EJ/LEP analysis covered by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, the MPO process has been shown to be sufficient for TIP review and approval purposes. Concurrent with update of the TIP and STIP at least every four years, the MPO and state certify that the transportation planning process is being carried out in accord with all applicable requirements, including Title VI of the Civil rights Act.

Detailed/project level NEPA/EJ/LEP analysis is not required at the LRTP or TIP level. Projects listed in the TIP are based on the MPO’s adopted LRTP and have met the initial level of assessment required.
Project Level

Detailed analysis is conducted consistent with federal requirements at the NEPA project level. The NEPA process that is completed by VDOT, GRTC, or local project administration, addresses project specific EJ/LEP analysis and documentation requirements. As a recommendation progresses in the LRTP and TIP, the transportation proposal eventually undergoes stages of environmental screening as a part of preliminary project development to identify and note to possibly avoid or minimize the potential impacts which include potential EJ and other community impact concerns. Potential environmental concerns may include wetlands, streams, agricultural/forest districts, cultural/historic resources, conservation lands, Virginia Outdoor Foundation easements, threatened and endangered species and, of course, any potential community impacts including Environmental Justice. As a MPO cooperatively approved project approaches and eventually enters into the NEPA study stage, a project’s design concept and scope, schedule(s), funding and impact-mitigation-cost-estimates are refined with the use of greater detail on the proposed project, closer reviews, further interagency consultation and public involvement.
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