

**Title VI Evaluation
Replacement of Existing Interagency Transfers
With TAP-Based Method**

This is a Title VI evaluation of the replacement of current methods of providing Interagency Transfers (IATs) with a TAP-based method. The affected operators are those Los Angeles County fixed route service providers that receive some form of formula operating subsidy from the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro)(Table 1).

**Table 1
Los Angeles County
Formula Funded Fixed Route Operators**

Antelope Valley
Beach Cities Transit
Culver City
Foothill Transit

Gardena
Long Beach
Los Angeles DOT
Metro
Montebello

Norwalk
Santa Clarita
Santa Monica
Torrance

For this evaluation the Universe of potentially impacted persons is all persons within one-quarter mile of any bus stop served by one or more of the above operators, and/or within one-half mile of any rail station. Ethnic data for this population is obtained from the 2010 US Census, and Household Income data for this population is obtained from the 2006-2010 American Consumer Survey (ACS). Because the Census data is provided at the block group level, and the ACS data is at the tract level the size of the impacted population is slightly greater for the ACS data (block groups that are more than one-quarter mile from a bus stop would be excluded from the Census data, but could be included in the ACS data if the tract containing such block groups was within that one-quarter mile of a bus stop).

For reference purposes this evaluation will refer to the Ethnic population as the Title VI data, and the Household Income population will be referred to as the Environmental Justice data. The Title VI population consists of 9,648,798 persons of whom 6,826,725 are minorities (70.8%). The Environmental Justice population consists of 9,742,481 persons of whom 1,531,488 are living in households below the federally defined Poverty income levels (15.7%).

Evaluation Methodology

The Universe of potentially impacted persons has been defined as essentially all persons who can walk to fixed route transit. Under current methods any passenger

desiring an IAT may purchase it at the time that they board a bus, or at a rail station at the time that they purchase their rail ticket. In order to be unaffected by the introduction of TAP-based IAT's a passenger must still be within walking distance of the means to purchase the IAT before taking their transit ride. Otherwise, a person would be adversely affected by the new method.

The mechanics of the proposed IAT process require that the passenger have a TAP card with a cash purse holding sufficient value to purchase an IAT. Such a rider would pay their initial fare by whatever means they normally use (either a cash deduction from the TAP card purse, or the use of whatever pass is stored on the TAP card). When the transfer boarding occurs, the cost of the transfer would be debited from the TAP card purse.

The relevant factors for this evaluation are 1) does the rider have a TAP card, or not, and 2) can the rider add value to that TAP card to ensure the ability to pay for the trip. The ability to add value to a TAP card adds an additional level of complexity to this evaluation – some of the fixed route operators have the ability to add value to a TAP card on board a bus and some do not have this capability. In the latter instance, whether a rider remains unaffected by the proposed method will depend on whether or not they are within walking distance of an alternative means of adding value to the TAP card. The alternatives consist of rail and Orange Line stations which have TVM's capable of issuing and upgrading TAP cards, or customer service outlets which can sell and/or upgrade TAP cards (there are several hundred of these). The possible combinations of these factors and nature of rider impacts are shown in Table 2.

This evaluation assumes that having to purchase a TAP card is inconsequential because the \$1-\$2 cost of the card can be amortized over its multiple year validity. Therefore, the No TAP Card riders whose only potential adverse impact would be the need to buy a TAP card are considered to be Not Impacted as long as they are otherwise able to walk to a location where they can add value to the card.

As can be seen from Table 2 there are three scenarios that result in an adverse impact for riders so situated:

1. The rider has No TAP Card and adding value to the TAP purse on the bus has no value because they are not within walking distance of a location where they could obtain the TAP card itself;
2. The rider has a TAP Card but cannot add value to it anywhere; and
3. The rider has No Tap Card and cannot add value to it or buy one.

Table 2
Rider Impact Categorizations

	<u>TAP Card</u>	<u>No TAP Card</u>
Can Add Value Can Walk to Outlet	No Impact	No Impact
Can Add Value Cannot Walk to Outlet	No Impact	Adverse Impact
Cannot Add Value Can Walk to Outlet	No Impact	No Impact
Cannot Add Value Cannot Walk to Outlet	Adverse Impact	Adverse Impact

Results of Evaluation

The next step in this evaluation was to determine the number of persons associated with each Impact Category, and for the potential Adverse Impact categories, whether or not the resulting impacts were Disparate (disproportionately affecting minorities) or imposed a Disproportionate Burden (disproportionately impacted persons in Poverty).

Metro has defined a Disparate Impact as an adverse impact affecting a group having an absolute 5% greater minority share than the overall population (Universe) (in this instance, $70.8\% + 5\% = 75.8\%$ or greater) or a 20% greater share ($70.8\% \times 1.20 = 85.0\%$). This evaluation uses the lesser threshold of 75.8%. A Disproportionate Burden has been defined as an adverse impact affecting a group having an absolute 5% greater Poverty share ($15.7\% + 5\% = 20.7\%$), or a 20% greater Poverty share than the overall population (in this instance, greater than $15.7\% \times 1.20 = 18.8\%$ or greater). This evaluation uses the lesser share of 18.8%.

The first adversely impacted group consists of those riders who do not have a TAP card, but could add value to it if they did. This is the non-TAP card portion of the second group in Table 3. The minority share of this group (75.9%) exceeds the Disparate Impact threshold (75.8%) so this group is **Disparately Impacted**. The Poverty share (14.7% is less than the threshold for Disproportionate Burden (18.8%) so there is no Environmental Justice consequence for this group.

Table 3

**Intra Agency Transfer Tap Proposal
Title VI and Environmental Justice Analysis Results**

Scenario	Sub Categories	Title VI			Environmental Justice		
		Total Population	Minority Population	% Minority	Total Population	Poverty Population	% Poverty
Existing Universe		9,648,798	6,826,725	70.8%	9,742,481	1,531,488	15.7%
Existing Conditions							
	Can add value Can walk to Tap Local	1,968,742	1,553,530	78.9%	2,553,977	533,158	20.9%
	Can add value Can't walk to Tap Local	2,874,232	2,181,275	75.9%	3,220,858	473,102	14.7%
	Can't add value Can walk to Tap Local	3,990,023	3,060,150	76.7%	4,901,898	970,510	19.8%
	Can't add value Can't walk to Tap Local	8,270,940	5,816,187	70.3%	8,492,017	1,364,653	16.1%

Notes

1. Title VI is performed at the census block group level using 2010 Census Data
2. Environmental Justice is performed at the census tract level using 2010 5 Year American Community Survey Data
3. Transit buses and stations where one can add value to the tap card - AVTA, Foothill, Gardena, Montebello, Torrance and Metro Orange Line and Rail
4. Transit buses where one can't add value to the tap card - Metro buses, Beach Cities, Culver City, Long Beach, LADOT, Norwalk, Santa Monica and SCVTA
5. Used quarter mile buffers for bus stops and half mile buffers for rail stations.

The remaining two adversely impacted groups comprise the totality of the fourth category in Table 3 (whether or not they have a TAP card, they have no way to add value to it). Both the minority share (70.3% compared with 75.8%) and the Poverty share (16.1% compared with 18.8%) are less than the thresholds for Disparate Impact and Disproportionate Burden, respectively, so there are no Title VI or Environmental Justice consequences for these groups.

Findings

The group of riders having no TAP card, and not within walking distance of a place to obtain one (though they could add value to it if they had one) was found to be **Disparately Impacted** by the proposed TAP-based IAT. The most recently processed Customer Satisfaction Survey indicates that about 72% of Metro riders have a TAP card (probably a higher percentage now as this data is over a year old). This yields a group of approximately 800,000 people who are constituents of Antelope Valley, Foothill Transit, Gardena, Montebello, and Torrance (those affording the opportunity to add value to the TAP purse at the trip origin). This group constitutes about 8.3% of all persons within walking distance of fixed route transit.

The proposed TAP-based IAT should be pursued given that more than 91% of the population would not be Disparately Impacted nor Disproportionately Burdened by the program. Customer convenience for those having to transfer would be improved with faster boarding times, and not having to carry added cash for transfer charges. It is clearly in Metro's interest to pursue improved multi-operator coordination and the provision of seamless fare mechanisms for riders which the proposed program would accomplish. Given the significant investment in TAP, there is no other cost-effective mechanism for providing a consistent multi-operator transfer program without printed fare media than the proposed TAP program.