

RACIAL EQUITY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE TOOL

COMPREHENSIVE VERSION



Racial Equity
& Social Justice Initiative



Racial Equity and Social Justice Initiative

RESJ Tool: Comprehensive Version



INSTRUCTIONS

Use this tool as early as possible in the development of City policies, plans, programs and budgets.

For issues on a short timeline or with a narrow impact, you may use the RESJ Tool – Fast Track Version.

This analysis should be completed by people with different racial and socioeconomic perspectives. When possible, involve those directly impacted by the issue. Include and document multiple voices in this process.

The order of questions may be re-arranged to suit your situation.

Mission of the Racial Equity and Social Justice (RESJ) Initiative: To establish racial equity and social justice as core principles in all decisions, policies and functions of the City of Madison.

Equity is just and fair inclusion into a society in which all, including all racial and ethnic groups, can participate, prosper, and reach their full potential. Equity gives all people a just and fair shot in life despite historic patterns of racial and economic exclusion (www.policylink.org).

The persistence of deep racial and social inequities and divisions across society is evidence of bias at the individual, institutional and structural levels. These types of bias often work to the benefit of White people and to the detriment of people of color, usually unintentionally or inadvertently.

Purpose of this Tool: To facilitate conscious consideration of equity and examine how communities of color and low-income populations will be affected by a proposed action/decision of the City.

The “*What, Who, Why, and How*” questions of this tool are designed to lead to strategies to prevent or mitigate adverse impacts and unintended consequences on marginalized populations.

BEGIN ANALYSIS

Title of policy, plan or proposal:

Changes to Metro paratransit service in light of the implementation of Family Care.

Main contact name(s) and contact information for this analysis:

Nancy Senn, Metro Transit

Names and affiliations of others participating in the analysis:

Chuck Kamp, Crystal Martin, Mick Rusch, Ann Schroeder - Metro Transit

1. WHAT

a. What is the policy, plan or proposal being analyzed, and what does it seek to accomplish?

Proposed changes to paratransit service:

- *\$4.00 fare (increase .75 from \$3.25)
- *Apply \$4.00 fare to companions (now free). PCAs remain fare free.
- *change from door-to-door to curb-to-curb service based on ability
- *elimination of convenience tickets (except for Agency tickets)
- *elimination of leave attended

All of the above are dependent upon what happens with, approvals, Family Care and staff resources.

- *elimination of Metro directly operated paratransit service

This will accomplish increasing revenue and reducing costs given the loss of known MA Waiver dollars from Dane County (\$3.9 million) and facilitation of funding of transportation by Family Care at the agency rate. The paratransit fleet is at the end of its useful life. This proposal eliminates the need to replace it at a cost of \$1.5 million.

b. What factors (including existing policies and structures) associated with this issue might be affecting communities of color and/or low-income populations differently?

- *higher fare (for people not associated with another funding source)
- *elimination of other premium services could lead to decreased access for some paratransit riders
- *riders not covered by a funding program would not have access to any ticket media for paratransit

c. What do available data tell you about this issue? (See page 5 for guidance on data resources.)

- *Over 70% of paratransit trips are funded (predominately by MA Waiver funding)
- *3700 eligible paratransit riders,
- *1700 paratransit eligible riders take trips annually
- *Approximately 800 paratransit eligible riders are MA Waiver eligible; of those, 630 regularly take trips
- *MA Waiver eligible riders are 20% of Metro's paratransit eligible riders but 70% of the trip demand
- *1070 paratransit eligible riders take 30% of the trips (not covered by MA Waiver)
- *98% of 2016 trips were door-to-door based on request, not just ability
- *2000 eligible paratransit riders are not MA Waiver eligible and don't take trips
- *Metro currently has agency fare arrangements with Care Wisconsin and iCare - two of the Family Care managed care organizations (MCOs)
- *Metro has offered agency fare arrangements to all Family Care entities (5)
- *Federal funding no longer supports 80% funding of buses and garage capital equipment
- *Directly operated service has better on-time performance and fewer complaint
- *300,000 paratransit rides per year; 13 million fixed route rides per year
- *Funding: \$9 million paratransit dollars annually, \$48 million fixed route dollars annually
- *Cost of service: \$34 per paratransit ride, \$3 per fixed route ride
- *Systemwide, paratransit is 2% of the overall ridership and 16% of the budget
- *Family Care participants are not given cash for services, therefore MCOs would have to access agency tickets at the agency fare in order to use Metro paratransit if we eliminate paratransit convenience tickets

d. What data are unavailable or missing?

- *When is FTA definition of origin to destination met by curb-to-curb service
- *Socio-economic data about paratransit riders
- *data about cash handling ability of paratransit eligible riders
- *Has elimination of tickets helped secure agency fares in other counties already under Family Care

- e. Which focus area(s) will the policy, plan or proposal primarily impact?
Please add any comments regarding the specific impacts on each area:

☒ Community/Civic Engagement	☒ Food Access & Affordability
☐ Criminal Justice	☐ Government Practices
☐ Early Childhood	☒ Health
☐ Economic Development	☐ Housing
☒ Education	☐ Planning & Development
☒ Employment	☒ Service Equity
☐ Environment	☒ Transportation
☐ Other (please describe)	
Comments:	

2. WHO

- a. Who (individuals or groups) could be impacted by the issues related to this policy, plan or proposal?
Who would benefit?

*City of Madison taxpayers - protected from higher tax levy and being taxed twice (federal and local share)

*Metro Transit fixed route riders (not cutting fixed route services or raising fixed route bus fares)

Who would be burdened?

*paratransit customers currently using leave attended, door-to-door services (both MA Waiver and non-MA Waiver clients)

*paratransit customers who are low income and not connected with a funding source (non-MA Waiver clients)

*paratransit customers who are low income and MA Waiver eligible who are served by IRIS/MCO that doesn't choose to sign an Agency Fare agreement with Metro

*MCOs burdened by having to maintain the financial effort to support transportation resources in Dane Co.

Are there potential disproportionate impacts on communities of color or low-income communities?

*higher fare for low-income communities

*Cuts to fixed route service would disproportionately impact people of color and people with low income who tend to be transit dependent at a higher rate

- b. Have stakeholders from different racial/ethnic and socioeconomic groups—especially those most affected—been informed, involved and represented in the development of this proposal or plan? Who is missing and how can they be engaged? (See page 6 for guidance on community engagement.)

At the public hearing, there were 91 registrants and 34 speakers. Public feedback on these topics (in opposition) from public hearing and contacts to Metro:

- *general paratransit changes - 24
- *transition to curb-to-curb - 53
- *elimination of leave attended - 18
- *fare increase - 8
- *elimination of tickets - 29
- *using contracted service only - 8

We have not specifically reached out to users of the premium services. Ideas for outreach include surveying paratransit customers, targeted outreach to list of low-income riders/riders of color potentially available through Dane County's database.

Conduct more outreach on delayed implementations (see recommendations) in 2018.

- c. What input have you received from those who would be impacted and how did you gather this information? Specify sources of comments and other input.

Convened the Metro Paratransit Medicaid Waiver Funding & Policy Review Ad Hoc Committee consisting of paratransit users, transportation professionals, policy makers and human service providers. Members: Tim Gruber, Carl DuRocher, Mary Jacobs, Jesse Kaysen, Jim Cobb, Alder Kemble, Ken Golden and Margaret Bergamini. Doug Hunt from Dane County also regularly attended meetings and provided input. This group met a dozen times between September 2016 and July 2017. This group did not consider or discuss elimination of Metro directly operated service.

3. WHY

- a. What are the root causes or factors creating any racial or social inequities associated with this issue? (Examples: Bias in process; Lack of access or barriers; Lack of inclusive engagement)

Institutionalized bias in regulatory authorities, lack of recognition of levels of service to people with disabilities to people in Dane County versus other counties; bias toward fixed route service

- b. What are potential unintended consequences? What benefits or burdens may result? (Specifically consider social, economic, health and environmental impacts.)

- *Reduced community access for people with disabilities
- *Limited access to jobs, education and other important life destinations for people with disabilities
- *Discomfort with contracted service and drivers

- c. What identified community needs are being met or ignored in this issue or decision?

Met:

- *Helping to balance Metro's budget

Ignored:

- *Certainty/stability of transportation service for people with disabilities
- *Needs of people who are not able to handle cash

4. WHERE

a. Are there impacts on geographic areas? (Select all that apply.)

- | | |
|---|--|
| ☒ All Madison neighborhoods | ☐ Park Edge/Park Ridge |
| ☐ Allied Drive | ☐ Southside |
| ☐ Balsam/Russet | ☐ East Madison (general) |
| ☐ Brentwood/Northport Corridor | ☐ North Madison (general) |
| ☐ Darbo/Worthington | ☐ West Madison (general) |
| ☐ Hammersley/Theresa | ☐ Downtown/Campus |
| ☐ Leopold/Arbor Hills | ☐ Dane County (outside Madison) |
| ☐ Owl Creek | ☐ Outside Dane County |

Comments:

5. HOW: RECOMMENDATIONS SECTION

a. Describe recommended strategies to address adverse impacts, prevent unintended negative consequences and advance racial equity (program, policy, partnership and/or budget/fiscal strategies):

- *delay fare increase (for riders and companions) - consider in 2019 budget
- *delay elimination of door-to-door service - consider in 2019 budget
- *eliminate leave attended as planned June 3, 2018
- *eliminate convenience tickets as planned June 3, 2018
- *eliminate directly operated service - phase out in 2018 based on negotiations with Union

b. Is the proposal or plan:

- ☒ Realistic?
- ☒ Adequately funded?
- ☐ Adequately resourced with personnel?
- ☐ Adequately resourced with mechanisms (policy, systems) to ensure successful implementation and enforcement?
- ☒ Adequately resourced with provisions to ensure ongoing data collection, public reporting, stakeholder participation and public accountability?

If you answered "no" to any of the above, what resources or actions are needed?

There are uncertainties as to whether we are adequately staffed with personnel in that we don't know if we have adequate capacity among contract providers to meet demand considering the recommended delays. We have to make estimations about ridership levels.

There may be a surge in ridership as the MA Waiver waiting list is eliminated that could cause us not to be adequately resourced with mechanisms to ensure successful implementation and enforcement of these recommendations.

c. Who is accountable for this decision?

Chuck Kamp, Metro Transit General Manager, Crystal Martin, Deputy Transit General Manager, Nancy Senn, Paratransit Program Manager.

- d. How will impacts be documented and evaluated? What are the success indicators and progress benchmarks?

Monthly ridership reports, monthly Family Care participation reports, monthly financial reports, feedback reports, number of Agency Fare agreements, on-time performance reports.

- e. How will those impacted by this issue be informed of progress and impacts over time?

Regular reports to Transit Utility's governing body, paratransit newsletter, Rider Alerts, Metro Website, direct mailings.

DATA RESOURCES FOR RACIAL EQUITY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE IMPACT ANALYSIS

City of Madison

- Neighborhood Indicators (UW Applied Population Lab and City of Madison):
<http://madison.apl.wisc.edu>
- Open Data Portal (City of Madison):
<https://data.cityofmadison.com>
- Madison Measures (City of Madison):
www.cityofmadison.com/finance/documents/madisonmeasures-2013.pdf
- Census reporter (US Census Bureau):
<http://censusreporter.org/profiles/06000US5502548000-madison-city-dane-county-wi>

Dane County

- Geography of Opportunity: A Fair Housing Equity Assessment for Wisconsin's Capital Region (Capital Area Regional Planning Commission):
www.capitalarearpc.org
- Race to Equity report (Wisconsin Council on Children and Families):
<http://racetoequity.net>
- Healthy Dane (Public Health Madison & Dane County and area healthcare organizations):
www.healthydane.org
- Dane Demographics Brief (UW Applied Population Lab and UW-Extension):
www.apl.wisc.edu/publications/Dane_County_Demographics_Brief_2014.pdf

State of Wisconsin

- Wisconsin Quickfacts (US Census):
<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/55000.html>
- Demographics Services Center (WI Dept of Administration):
www.doa.state.wi.us/section_detail.asp?linkcatid=11&linkid=64&locid=9
- Applied Population Laboratory (UW-Madison):
www.apl.wisc.edu/data.php

Federal

- American FactFinder (US Census):
<http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>
- 2010 Census Gateway (US Census):
www.census.gov/2010census

CITY OF MADISON RACIAL EQUITY AND SOCIAL JUSTICE COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT CONTINUUM

Adapted from *Community Engagement Guide: A tool to advance Equity & Social Justice in King County*

The continuum provides details, characteristics and strategies for five levels of community engagement. The continuum shows a range of actions from county-led information sharing that tends to be shorter-term to longer-term community-led activities. The continuum can be used for both simple and complex efforts. As a project develops, the level of community engagement may need to change to meet changing needs and objectives.

The level of engagement will depend on various factors, including program goals, time constraints, level of program and community readiness, and capacity and resources. There is no one right level of engagement, but considering the range of engagement and its implications on your work is a key step in promoting community participation and building community trust. Regardless of the level of engagement, the role of both the City of Madison and community partners as part of the engagement process should always be clearly defined.

Levels of Engagement				
City Informs City of Madison initiates an effort, coordinates with departments and uses a variety of channels to inform community to take action	City Consults City of Madison gathers information from the community to inform city-led projects	City engages in dialogue City of Madison engages community members to shape city priorities and plans	City and community work together Community and City of Madison share in decision-making to co-create solutions together	Community directs action Community initiates and directs strategy and action with participation and technical assistance from the City of Madison
Characteristics of Engagement				
- Primarily one-way channel of communication - One interaction - Term-limited to event - Addresses immediate need of City and community	- Primarily one-way channel of communication - One to multiple interactions - Short to medium-term - Shapes and informs city projects	- Two-way channel of communication - Multiple interactions - Medium to long-term - Advancement of solutions to complex problems	- Two-way channel of communication - Multiple interactions - Medium to long-term - Advancement of solutions to complex problems	- Two-way channel of communication - Multiple interactions - Medium to long-term - Advancement of solutions to complex problems
Strategies				
Media releases, brochures, pamphlets, outreach to vulnerable populations, ethnic media contacts, translated information, staff outreach to residents, new and social media	Focus groups, interviews, community surveys	Forums, advisory boards, stakeholder involvement, coalitions, policy development and advocacy, including legislative briefings and testimony, workshops, community-wide events	Co-led community meetings, advisory boards, coalitions and partnerships, policy development and advocacy, including legislative briefings and testimony	Community-led planning efforts, community-hosted forums, collaborative partnerships, coalitions, policy development and advocacy, including legislative briefings and testimony

NOTES