INDYGO 2027 TRANSIT NETWORK TITLE VI SERVICE EQUITY ANALYSIS VERSION 2 MEMO

As a result of a review of Version 1, it was noted that blocks from the current route structure were missing from the analysis. Because of this, Version 2, has been created to update the analysis to include the blocks in the current route structure and those in the 2027 recommendations. Version 2 has revised the below tables and figures.

Revisions

- ♦ Updated ES-2: High Minority and High Poverty Blocks Receiving Reduced Trips.
 - Areas that will have no service with the proposed 2027 recommendations were added to the map.
 - Blocks along the existing Route 10 along Rockville Rd/US Route 36 in the Tremont and Keystone Manor areas were added to the analysis. Those minority and poverty blocks will see a reduction of 310 trips per week.
 - Blocks along the existing Route 19 along Allisonville Rd were added to the analysis. Those poverty blocks will see a reduction of 387 trips per week.
 - Blocks along the existing Route 4 along N Shadeland Ave were added to the analysis. Those minority blocks will see a reduction of 31 trips per week.
 - The minority blocks along the existing Route 26, Route 12, and Route 13 near E Raymond St, S Keystone Ave, and Perkins Ave were added to the analysis. Those blocks will not receive service with the new routing of Route 13 and will see a reduction of 377 trips per week.
 - The minority blocks along the existing Route 10 on Cunningham Rd in the Speedway area were added to the analysis and will not receive service with the new routing of Route 10. Those blocks will see a reduction of 310 trips per week.
 - Blocks north of Route 86 in the northwest portion of Marion County. The area north of W 86th St has high minority blocks and will see a reduction of 220 trips per week.
 - Blocks along the existing Route 11 along E 16th St and N Franklin Rd were added to the analysis. Those minority blocks will see a reduction of 219 trips per week.
- ♦ Figure 5: Change in Weekly Trips to Blocks and Recommended 2027 Transit Network was updated to include those blocks that will no longer receive service due to the proposed 2027 recommendations. A few blocks were added to the analysis that will receive more trips due to including proposed bus stops in those areas.
 - Blocks along the existing Route 10 along Rockville Rd/US Route 36 in the Tremont and Keystone Manor areas were added to the analysis. Those blocks will see a reduction of 310 trips per week.
 - Blocks along the existing Route 10 on Cunningham Rd in the Speedway area were added to the analysis and will not receive service with the new routing of Route 10. Those blocks will see a reduction of 310 trips per week.
 - Blocks along the existing Route 25 on Meadowood Dr and Moller Rd in the Speedway area will see a reduction of 249 trips per week.
 - Blocks along the existing Route 26, Route 12, and Route 13 near E Raymond St, S
 Keystone Ave, and Perkins Ave were added to the analysis. Those blocks will not receive

- service with the new routing of Route 13 and will see reductions between 242 and 377 trips per week.
- Blocks along the existing Route 19 along E 56th St were added to the analysis. Those blocks will see a reduction of 387 trips per week.
- Blocks along the existing Route 19 along Allisonville Rd were added to the analysis. Those blocks will see a reduction of 387 trips per week.
- Blocks along the existing Route 4 along N Shadeland Ave were added to the analysis.
 Those blocks will see a reduction of 31 trips per week.
- O Blocks along the existing Route 4 along E 46th St and N Arlington Ave were added to the analysis. Those blocks will see an additional 556 trips per week.
- Blocks north of Route 86 and W 86th St in the northwest portion of Marion County will see a reduction of 220 trips per week.
- O Blocks along the existing Route 11 along E 16th St and N Franklin Rd were added to the analysis. Those blocks will see reductions between 184 and 449 trips per week.
- ♦ Table 6 was updated to include those blocks that will no longer receive service due to the proposed 2027 recommendations.
 - Due to the addition of blocks to the analysis, the existing and proposed trips to blocks increase for each demographic (High Minority, Non-High Minority, High Poverty, Non-High Poverty, and All Habitable Blocks).
 - This caused a change from Version 1 to Version 2 in the amount of change from the existing route structure and the 2027 recommendations. High Minority blocks saw a 48% increase in trips compared to 49% in Version 1. High Poverty blocks still saw a 47% increase in trips in Version 2.
 - The acceptable ranges for disparate impact and disproportionate burden also slightly changed. The acceptable range for minority populations increased to 34% 51% while the range for poverty populations increased to 35% 52%. While the ranges and total trips changed, the overall impacts stayed within the acceptable ranges and thus do not show a disparate impact or disproportionate burden.
- ♦ Table 7 was updated to include those blocks that will no longer receive service due to the proposed 2027 recommendations.
 - Due to the addition of blocks to the analysis, the existing and proposed average trips to blocks decrease for each demographic (High Minority, Non-High Minority, High Poverty, Non-High Poverty, and All Habitable Blocks).
 - This caused a change from Version 1 to Version 2 in the amount of change from the
 existing route structure and the 2027 recommendations. High Minority blocks saw a
 48% increase in trips compared to 49% in Version 1. High Poverty blocks still saw a 47%
 increase in trips in Version 2.
 - The acceptable ranges for disparate impact and disproportionate burden also slightly changed. The acceptable range for minority and poverty populations decreased to 32% 48%. While the ranges and average total trips changed, the overall impacts stayed within the acceptable ranges and thus do not show a disparate impact or disproportionate burden.
- ♦ Table 8 was updated to include those blocks that will no longer receive service due to the proposed 2027 recommendations.
 - Due to the addition of blocks to the analysis, the existing and proposed trips to blocks weighted by population increased for High Minority and High Poverty populations but decreased for Non-High Minority, Non-High Poverty, and All Habitable Blocks).

- This caused a change from Version 1 to Version 2 in the amount of change from the
 existing route structure and the 2027 recommendations. High Minority blocks stayed
 the same at a 46% increase in trips while High Poverty blocks decreased to a 46%
 increase in trips in Version 2.
- The acceptable ranges for disparate impact and disproportionate burden also slightly changed. The acceptable range for minority populations decreased to 30% 46% while the range for poverty populations decrease to 30% 46%. While the ranges and total trips changed, the overall impacts stayed within the acceptable ranges and thus do not show a disparate impact or disproportionate burden.
- ♦ Updated Figure 6: High Minority and High Poverty Blocks Receiving Reduced Trips.
 - Same changes as ES-2

The following tables are the difference between Version 2 (Revised) and Version 1 (Original). As shown in the updated tables (captured in the report), the percent change was minimal but significant enough for staff to ensure a revised analysis.

Change

Table 6: Results of Total Transit Vehicle Trips to Blocks Analysis

					(E) Acceptable	Disparate
					Range of	Impact or
	(A) Existing Trips to	(B) Proposed Trips	(C) Change in Trips to	(D) Percent	Change in +/-	Disproportion
Census Blo	Blocks	to Blocks	Blocks	Change	20% of (D)	ate Burden
High Minor	23,640	23,513	-127	-1%		
Non-High I	65,883	18,024	-47,859	-2%		
High Pover	15,129	17,521	2,392	0%		
Non-High F	74,394	24,016	-50,378	-3%		
All Habitab	89,523	41,537	-47,986	-1%		

Table 7: Results of Average Transit Vehicle Trips to Blocks Analysis

Census Blo	(A) Average Existing Trips to Blocks Served	(B) Average Proposed Trips to Blocks Served	(C) Average Change in Trips to Blocks Served	(D) Percent Change in Average Trips to Blocks	(E) Acceptable Range +/- 20% of (D)	Disparate Impact or Disproportion ate Burden
Census bid	Served	biocks Served	Serveu	DIOCKS	(ט) וט	ate burden
High Minor	-10	-17	-7	-1%		
Non-High I	-26	-57	-31	-2%		
High Pover	-7	-12	-5	0%		
Non-High F	-28	-63	-35	-3%		
All Habitab	-18	-37	-19	-1%		

Table 8: Analysis of Transit Vehicle Trips Weighted by Population

Census Blo	(A) Existing TVTWxP	(B) Proposed TVTWxP	(C) Change in TVTWxP	(D) Percent Change in TVTWxP	(E) Threshold for DI/DB +/- 20% of (D)	Disparate Impact or Disproportion ate Burden
High Minor	2,451,150	3,414,447	963,297	0%		
Non-High I	6,132,192	2,222,770	-3,909,422	-3%		
High Pover	1,755,310	2,277,487	522,177	-1%		
Non-High F	6,828,032	3,359,730	-3,468,302	-3%		
All Habitab	8,583,342	5,637,217	-2,946,125	-1%		