

# WICHITA FALLS URBAN STUDY AREA

## 2005 MPO Roadway Projects Environmental Justice Analysis

Final Report  
October 2005



Prepared by the Wichita Falls Metropolitan Planning Organization  
Approved by the Transportation Policy Committee: **November 16, 2005**

# CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b>	5
<b>2.0 EJ SCOPING</b>	7
<b>3.0 DETERMINING POSSIBLE ADVERSE IMPACTS</b>	8
<b>4.0 ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY</b>	8
4.1 Map the Impact Footprint	8
4.2 Identify the Community of Comparison	9
4.3 Identify the Affected Census Block Groups	9
4.4 Census Block Group Percent Less Than COC Percent	11
4.5 Census Block Group Percent Greater Than COC Percent	12
4.6 Documentation, Avoidance, Minimization, Mitigation and Enhancement	12
<b>5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE</b>	14
5.1 Baseline Demographics	14
5.2 Minority Profile	15
5.3 Low-Income Profile	20
<b>6.0 ROADWAY PROJECTS ANALYSIS</b>	25
6.1 City of Wichita Falls Projects	28
WF 0 – Langford Drive	28
WF 1 – Bacon Switch Road	29
WF 2 – Hatton Road	30
WF 3 – Covington Lane	31
WF 4 – Cypress Avenue	32
WF 5 – North Beverly Drive	33
WF 6 – Rhea Road/ Callfield Road/Lawrence Road Realignment	34
WF 7 – Lawrence Road Center Turn Lane	35
WF 8 – Kemp Street Reconstruction	36
WF 9 – Midwestern Parkway Extension	37
WF 10 – Puckett Road Extension	38
WF 11 – Maplewood (Callfield Reliever Phase I)	39
WF 12 - Maplewood (Callfield Reliever Phase II)	40
WF 13 – Gregg Road Reconstruction	41
WF 14 – Holliday Creek Hike and Bike Trail Phase III	42
WF 15 – Rathgeber Road Reconstruction Phase I	43
WF 16 – Reilly Road Widening	44
WF 17 – Taft Reconstruction	46
WF 18 – Turtle Creek Ranch Road Reconstruction	47

# CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>		<u>Page</u>
6.1	City of Wichita Falls Projects (Continued)	
	WF 19 – Rathgeber Road Reconstruction Phase II	48
	WF 20 – Lakeshore Drive Reconstruction	49
	WF 21 – Wellington Phase I	50
	WF 22 – Wellington Phase II	51
6.2	TxDOT Projects	52
	TX 0 – US 82 Direct Connect Interchange (Part 1)	52
	TX 1 – US 82 Windthorst Road Bridge	53
	TX 2 – US 82 Direct Connect Interchange (Part 2)	54
	TX 3 – FM 890, Four-lane Divided Facility	55
	TX 4 – FM 890, Four-lane Divided Facility	56
	TX 5 – Business 277A, Mill and Overlay	57
	TX 6 – State Highway 240, Hot Mix Overlay	58
	TX 7 – Interstate Highway 44, Replace Bridge and Approaches	59
	TX 8 – Spur 479, Mill and Overlay	60
	TX 9 – Interstate Highway 44, Concrete Pavement Repair	61
	TX 10 – US 287, Concrete Pavement Repair	62
	TX 11 – Loop 11, New Non-Freeway Facility	63
	TX 12 – Business 287J, Miscellaneous Work	64
6.3	Environmental Justice Project Nominations	65
	EJ 0 – Taft Blvd. Conversion	65
	EJ 1 – Kell Access Road	66
	EJ 2 – Kell and Fairway Exit Ramp	67
	EJ 3 – IH 44 South Exit at Seymour Hwy/5th Street	68
	EJ 4 – Bonny Homes Access	69
	EJ 5 – Jefferson Street	70
	EJ 6 – Bridge Street	71
	EJ 7 – Sunset Lane and Duty Lane	72
	EJ 8 – Airport Road	73
	EJ 9 – Old Iowa Park Road	74
	EJ 10 – FM 367 (Hotter N’ Hell Route)	75
	EJ 11 – Old Burkburnett Road (Hwy. 240)	76
	EJ 12 – Wenonah Street	77
	EJ 13 – North to South Barrier	78

## LIST OF APPENDICES

<b>Appendix A – Demographic Maps</b>	79
<b>Appendix B – Glossary/Acronyms</b>	83

## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
Table 4-1	TIP/POP Project Improvement Types	11
Table 5-1	Wichita County Social and Economic Characteristics	14
Table 5-2	Wichita County Minority Populations	15
Table 5-3	Wichita County Low-income Populations	20
Table 6-1	MPO/City/TxDOT Projects – FY 2005	25

## LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure/Map</u>		<u>Page</u>
Figure 5-1	Minority Percentage	18
Figure 5-2	Minority Block Groups	19
Figure 5-3	Percentage of Low-income	23
Figure 5-4	Low-income Block Groups	24
Figure 6-1	Minority Block Groups – Transportation Projects	26
Figure 6-2	Low-income Block Groups – Transportation Projects	27
Figure A-1	Census Block Groups	80
Figure A-2	Population Total Density	81
Figure A-3	Minority Populations Density	82
Figure A-3	Low-income Populations Density	83

<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>86</b>
-------------------	-----------

# 2005 MPO Roadway Projects Environmental Justice Analysis

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The following report presents the results of the Wichita Falls Metropolitan Planning Organization's Environmental Justice (EJ) analysis conducted on the City of Wichita Falls 2005-2015 Program of Projects (POP) and the 2006-2008 TxDOT Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). What is Environmental Justice? It is the process by which governmental agencies identify potentially lopsided or unbalanced high and undesirable human health or environmental effects on minority and/or low-income populations that may result from the implementation of a government funded program or project. The idea for Environmental Justice was born from an effort to establish a process that would protect minority and low-income populations from the unexpected and, sometimes, harsh effects that a federally, state or locally funded program or project might have upon the aforementioned populations. Environmental Justice is not concerned as much with protecting the physical environment, the way the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) does, but instead focuses on avoiding, minimizing or mitigating the potentially bad effects that a government funded program or project may have on populations not used to interacting with government agencies. Environmental Justice looks for ways to get these populations more involved with local and regional planning and development so that elected officials can make better informed decisions when committing to a particular program or project. The goal of Environmental Justice is to ensure that minority and low-income populations are not unequally burdened with the negative effects of a proposed project. If the adverse effects cannot be avoided, minimized or mitigated in some way, Environmental Justice strives to identify the best way of distributing them, equally, among all populations.

Transportation projects affect the environment and the way we live. Low-income and minority populations should receive an equitable distribution of proposed transportation benefits without suffering from excessively high and difficult impacts to their quality of life. The concept of environmental justice, derived from Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other civil rights statutes, was first put forward as a national policy goal by Presidential Executive Order 12898, issued in 1994, which directs "each federal agency to make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations." Executive Order 12898 was intended "to promote nondiscrimination in federal programs substantially affecting human health and the environment, and to provide minority and low-income communities' access to public information on, and an opportunity for public participation in, matters relating to human health or the environment." In response, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT), in conjunction with the City of Wichita Falls, have renewed their commitments

to assure that environmental justice is carried out in the programs and strategies they fund, including the activities of the Wichita Falls MPO<sup>1</sup>.

Analyses of project impacts on minority and low-income communities are generally conducted to adhere to EO 12898, Federal Action to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and the Department of Transportation Order to Address Environmental Justice Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (Final US DOT Order). These federal orders amplify on Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, by providing protections on the basis of income as well as race. The FHWA views environmental justice as an extension of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1984. These nondiscrimination laws require that “federal-aid recipients, sub-recipients, and contractors prevent discrimination and ensure nondiscrimination in all of their programs and activities, whether these programs and activities are federally funded or not.” The factors for discrimination include race, color, national origin, sex, disability and age. The Federal Aid Highway Act of 1970 established a further basis for equitable treatment of communities being affected by transportation projects. It requires consideration of the anticipated effects of proposed transportation projects upon residences, businesses, farms, the accessibility of public facilities, tax base, and other community resources. Social, economic and environmental factors must be considered during the evaluation of proposed project actions. Therefore, direct and indirect impacts on minority and low-income populations are to be evaluated with the proposed action alternatives. In addition, communities should have meaningful opportunities to engage in the development process of proposed transportation projects<sup>2</sup>.

As an initial step toward better integrating EJ into its Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), the Wichita Falls MPO has developed a baseline demographic profile, which presents key demographic data describing the MPO area and identifies population groups and communities to be considered for subsequent EJ analyses and activities. Consideration of minority and low-income populations was included in the MPO area evaluation criteria used in the Wichita Falls MPO 2005 project selection process. The populations specified in the President’s Order were identified for the first time in 2004 and added as EJ Target Area Map appendices to the 2004 UPWP. The EJ Target Area maps carried forward into the 2005 and 2006 UPWP’s where they have been used to help build the baseline demographic profile.

---

<sup>1</sup> Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, February 1994.

DOT Order to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, April 1997.

FHWA Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, December 1998.

FHWA and FTA Memorandum Implementing Title VI Requirements in Metropolitan and Statewide Planning, October 1999.

<sup>2</sup> Washington State Department of Transportation, Environmental Procedures Manual M31-11, September 2004.

As the next step towards integrating EJ analysis into the MPO's work program, it was determined that an analysis would focus on those projects recommended for TxDOT and City of Wichita Falls' funds, beginning with the most recent recommendations from the 2005 selection process. The analysis looked at both the geographic proximity of TIP\POP projects to the subject populations, as well as the distribution of those projects by type (e.g. new location facility, transportation enhancement, bicycle and pedestrian, etc.). The procedures and methodologies for integrating EJ into the MPO's work program will continue to be refined, and future analyses may incorporate additional data and parameters not included in the first approach.

## **2.0 EJ SCOPING**

Scoping is a part of the EJ process. It is an extra effort to identify and include minority and low-income populations in the process. The scoping process was expanded to ensure that minority and low-income populations were invited to participate, that opportunities were provided for them to become informed, and to voice their concerns. EO 12898 specifies that the public should have access to information on, and opportunities for input into, the environmental justice process. This helps identify issues of concern to minority and low-income communities, and to identify where those communities are located, so that environmental impacts can be accurately assessed and analyzed<sup>3</sup>.

Public outreach should be conducted during the beginning of the planning stage of a project and carried throughout the process. Public outreach and advertising of the process should be directed specifically toward minority and low-income groups, as well as toward the general public, to encourage these groups to identify themselves and their concerns. In an effort to reach these groups, the Wichita Falls MPO worked with federal, state, local and tribal governments and agencies; local groups; and community leaders in the local community to identify target groups and the channels (including non-English language, where necessary) that would reach these groups. All normal channels for information dissemination, through the MPO Public Involvement Process, were followed during this time. In addition, flyers in English and Spanish were distributed to area businesses and churches; posted inside all of the Wichita Falls Transit System bus shelters, as well as on-board the transit buses themselves; advertised in the local newspaper before each meeting and made available on the City of Wichita Falls' web page.

All persons, including minority and low-income populations, thus identified were specifically notified of the upcoming June 2005 public meetings if their property (parcels) were within 200 feet of a proposed roadway project. Contact was made using informational postcards conveying this message and requesting input for consideration in the planning process.

---

<sup>3</sup> Department of the Air Force, Guide for Environmental Justice Analysis with the Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP), November 1997.

### **3.0 DETERMINING POSSIBLE ADVERSE IMPACTS**

Will there be an impact caused by the proposed roadway projects? Environmental justice analysis is necessary only if the environmental impact analysis indicates that there may be impacts; if there would be no environmental impacts on human populations, then there would be no disproportionate environmental impacts on minority or low-income populations.

Will the impact be adverse? Adverse means the impact would have a negative effect on human health or the environment that is significant, unacceptable, or above generally accepted norms. Generally, an adverse impact is (a) predominately borne by a minority population and/or a low-income population or (b) suffered by the minority population and/or low-income population and is appreciably more severe or greater in magnitude than the adverse effect that would be suffered by the non-minority population and/or non-low-income population.

Environmental justice analysis need be applied only to adverse environmental impacts. Adverse human health effects include bodily impairment, infirmity, illness, or death. Adverse environmental effects may include ecological, cultural, human health, economic, or social impacts when interrelated to impacts on the natural or physical environment<sup>4</sup>.

Our research of EJ analysis methodologies indicates the No-Action Alternative represents the status quo versus the Preferred Action Alternative. The MPO cautiously used these action alternatives as guidelines for identifying appropriate mitigation measures. It is possible for the Preferred Action Alternative to have a more negative effect than the No-Action Alternative. Each project presented at the public meetings, and those submitted to the MPO during and after the meetings, were analyzed for possible adverse impacts to their respective demographic areas and can be found in Section 6.0.

### **4.0 ANALYSIS METHODOLOGY**

#### **4.1 Map the Impact Footprint**

The first step in determining if there would be an impact was to map the “footprint” showing where each adverse impact could occur for each resource addressed in the EJ analysis. The impact footprint is the geographic area that would be adversely affected by the proposed roadway project. The area(s) of impact typically varied for each resource affected. Mapping all areas where adverse environmental impacts could occur helped define the areas where the environmental justice analysis was to be focused and to determine whether minority or low-income communities living in those affected areas might be disproportionately affected.

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

A buffer zone of 200 feet was used on all POP and TIP roadway projects for determining if any minority or low-income populations would be affected. If any portion of a parcel containing either one of these population groups came in contact with the 200 foot buffer zone then that roadway project was included in the analysis. The MPO considered the following potential environmental impacts that could result in environmental justice impacts:

- Local air quality impacts from traffic-related levels adjacent to a highway or at intersections
- Impacts to cultural or religious sites
- Noise impacts caused by increased traffic
- Changes in land use
- Adverse employment effects
- Air 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
- 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
- Denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits of DOT programs, policies, or activities
- Other possible environmental impacts

Using the previously described criteria, the MPO evaluated each POP and TIP roadway project for high or adverse effects. If an adverse effect was identified, it was documented on that project's analysis summary sheet located in Section 6.0 of this report.

#### **4.2 Identify the Community of Comparison**

The second step of our analysis was to identify the smallest political unit(s) that encompasses the impact footprint. The demographic profile of the area in which the projects were located provided the context within which the environmental justice analysis was conducted.

In order to understand whether or not environmental impacts would disproportionately affect minority or low-income populations, it is necessary first to establish an appropriate basis for comparison. This basis is the community of comparison (COC). Geopolitical units are used because (1) typically, that is how census data (which provide the demographic profile) are collected; and (2) that is how concerned constituencies are

represented, and the avenues via which their concerns can best be brought to bear influence on the federal action.

The COC is defined as the smallest governmental or geopolitical unit(s) that encompasses the impact footprint for each resource. Types of governmental units that may be identified as the COC include cities, towns, townships, counties (or portions thereof), parishes, tribal governments, or resource-specific agencies, such as air quality control boards (for the air quality resource footprint)<sup>5</sup>. The impact footprints derived from the POP and TIP roadway projects all overlie a portion of Wichita County, which also encompasses the City of Wichita Falls and is touched by the footprints; therefore, the Community of Comparison for this study is Wichita County.

### **4.3 Identify the Affected Census Block Groups**

The third step of analysis was to identify any census block groups that lie within or partially within each impact footprint. Census data describe the race and income characteristics of the residents within the defined census subdivisions. Census data for metropolitan and other densely populated urban areas are typically grouped by divisions called census tracts, which are then grouped into smaller subdivisions of census blocks and block groups. This information can help locate minority and low-income populations who live in the impacted areas<sup>6</sup>.

It was important to compare the percent minority and low-income populations in the affected block groups to the percent minority and low-income populations in the overall COC. Minority and low-income populations are two different groups, and must be analyzed separately. A census block group may have a disproportionately high minority population, but its low-income population may be below the average COC percentage for low-income residents. The percentages of minority and low-income populations within each affected census block group were compared to the corresponding percentage for the COC to determine whether the affected tract contained a disproportionately high percentage of minority or low-income residents.

Section 5.0 contains the Wichita Falls MPO *Environmental Justice Demographic Profile* (hereafter referred to as the Demographic Profile), a baseline report documenting populations of concern for EJ analysis and defining population thresholds to be used in further EJ analysis. This report was based on data from the 2000 US Census, and focuses on two population groups: minority and low-income residents. All of the data in the report was summarized using the US Census geography of census block groups, the smallest geographic units by which the Census Bureau tabulates sample data. Block groups are usually defined by visible features, such as the streets surrounding a city block. Block groups are clusters of blocks and may comprise between 300 and 3,000 people, though they have an optimal population size of 1,500. There are 103 block groups in Wichita County. A census block group is deemed to have a

---

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> Puget Sound Regional Council, 2005-2007 Regional Transportation Improvement Program, October 2003.

disproportionately high minority and/or low-income population if the census block group percentage is higher than the Sample County percentage or is at least 50 percent<sup>7</sup>.

The Demographic Profile provides a basis for the classification of census blocks as either minority or non-minority block groups. This minority classification is made on the basis of the proportion of a block group's population that defines itself as a minority. That is to say, any block group in which the minority population percentage is greater than the county average is classified a "minority block group." In the Community of Comparison (COC), which is Wichita County, minorities comprise 25.2 percent of the total population. Therefore any block group in which more than 25.2 percent of the population self-identifies as a member of a minority is deemed a "minority block group." A person is counted as a member of a minority group if he or she claimed any of the following identities in their 2000 Census return: Black or African American, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and Hispanic or Latino.

Similarly, the Demographic Profile provides a basis for a poverty classification scheme. This classification is made in much the same way as the minority classification scheme in that block groups are deemed "poverty block groups" if the proportion of their population that is in poverty is greater than the county average. Because the county poverty rate is 13.2 percent, any block group with greater than 13.2 percent of its residents living in poverty is classified as a "poverty block group." Any person whose annual income fell below the US Department of Health and Human Services Poverty Guidelines in the 2000 Census was counted "in poverty." These thresholds vary by family size and range from \$9,570 for an individual to \$35,650 per year for a family of nine or more<sup>8</sup>. Within Wichita County, 13.2 percent of the total population fell below these guidelines in the 2000 Census. In comparison, the State of Texas poverty rate is 15.4 percent as determined by the US Census Bureau<sup>9</sup>.

#### **4.4 Census Block Group Percent Less Than COC Percent**

If the percentage of minority and low-income populations in an affected census block group are less than the corresponding percentages in the COC overall and less than 50 percent, then it appears and is presumed that there are no disproportionate impacts on minority or low-income populations. Using our Geographic Information System or GIS, we were able to identify and catalog all of the census block groups, based on the Wichita County COC, that have minority and low-income populations that do not exceed the minority and poverty thresholds established by the US Census Bureau. With this information, we were able to exclude roadway projects that could have a potential environmental impact on the EO 12898 groups.

---

<sup>7</sup> Department of the Air Force, Guide for Environmental Justice Analysis with the Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP), November 1997.

<sup>8</sup> Federal Register / Vol. 70, No. 33 / Friday, February 18, 2005 / Notices / Department of Health and Human Services, Annual Update of the HHS Poverty Guidelines.

<sup>9</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, American Fact Finder, Summary File (SF-2), September 2005

That is not to say the remainder of projects were discarded from this analysis. On the contrary, they are all included in Section 6.0 of this report and are accompanied by the public comments received for each one at the June 2005 Environmental Justice Public Meetings. Documentation supporting the fact that a proposed roadway project would or would not have a disproportionately high or adverse impact on a minority or low-income population is included with each project analysis. The total number of projects analyzed for this report is 49 and are categorized in Table 4-1 below.

TABLE 4-1 TIP/POP PROJECT IMPROVEMENT TYPES	
Improvement Type	Project Count
New Location Facility	11
Transportation Enhancements	21
Preventive Maintenance and Rehabilitation	10
Safety and Landscaping	3
Replace Bridge and Approaches	3
Bicycle and Pedestrian	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>49</b>

#### **4.5 Census Block Group Percent Greater Than COC Percent**

If percentages of minority and low-income populations in an affected census block group were greater than the corresponding percentages in the COC overall or greater than 50 percent, then it was presumed that there were disproportionate impacts on minority or low-income populations. Verification was done to ensure that areas of the affected census block groups within the impact footprints were actually residential areas. Census block group data describe the demographics of an entire block group. It is not possible to know where within the block group these populations live from census data alone. Data from aerial photographs and building footprints was used to determine if an affected area contained any residential areas. Once determined, then it could be stated there were no adverse impacts to minority or low-income populations.

In order to identify affected minority and/or low-income populations, the MPO overlaid the roadway project footprints for each resource area on the GIS layer of the disproportionately high minority and low-income census block groups within the COC. If disproportionately high and adverse environmental impacts occurred in a vacant, commercial, or industrial area, then no environmental justice impacts were presumed to occur. Impacts to areas where no residential uses occur can generally be eliminated from further environmental justice analysis. Where an impact footprint overlaid a disproportionately high minority or low-income census block group, and residential uses occurred within the affected portion of the census block group, environmental justice impacts were presumed to occur.

#### **4.6 Documentation, Avoidance, Minimization, Mitigation and Enhancement**

The final step of the analysis was to document the data supporting the determinations and to identify appropriate mitigation measures. Information regarding the demographic

distribution of the affected census block groups, in comparison to the COC, is provided in the Section 5.0 Demographic Profile. Some alternatives may have a less adverse effect on minority and/or low-income populations, but are not practicable because they would either not satisfy the project needs, have more severe adverse impacts, or that the social, economic, environmental or human health impacts of the other alternatives would reach costs of extraordinary magnitudes.

There are four approaches recommended by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) for dealing with the adverse effects of an impact. The first is to avoid impacts, if possible; then minimize impacts; then mitigate unavoidable impacts. Enhancements should also be considered<sup>10</sup>. The definitions of these terms and examples are provided below:

**Avoid** – to alter a project so an impact does not occur (i.e., shift an alignment to avoid displacements, redesign a road segment as an underpass to avoid cutting off access to a community facility, etc.)

**Minimize** – to modify the project to reduce the severity of an impact (i.e., shift an alignment to reduce displacements, alter an alignment to increase the distance between the facility and residences to decrease noise impacts, phase the project to minimize impedance to business access during peak shopping periods, limit interchanges to minimize incompatible land use development, etc.)

**Mitigate** – to take an action to alleviate or offset an impact or to replace an appropriated resource (i.e., set aside land for a park or add to public recreation areas to replace lost facilities, erect sound barriers to mitigate noise impacts (consistent with FHWA/State approved noise policies), provide a bicycle/pedestrian overpass or underpass to provide access to public facilities, etc.)

**Enhance** – to add a desirable or attractive feature to the project to make it fit more harmoniously into the community; this will not replace lost resources or alleviate project impacts (i.e., construct pedestrian overpass/underpass, install or improve street lighting, rehabilitation of railroad/bus depots, signing to recognize specific cultural or historic resources, develop bicycle trails or pathways adjacent to roadways, plant trees and add park benches, add public artwork (designed by community members) or a façade to a transportation facility to match the aesthetic design goals of the community, etc.)

Keep in mind that it may be possible to eliminate, reduce or mitigate the initial disproportionate impacts to such a degree that the impacts to the EJ population are now proportional. Another important consideration is the fairness in distribution of avoidance, minimization, mitigation and enhancement measures between EJ and non-EJ communities. Taking mitigation, enhancements and project benefits into account, the MPO considered these measures carefully when comparing the EJ community to all of the projects areas, with the goal that the measures should be proportional to the level of impact on each. If none of the previously described approaches are viable then, and

---

<sup>10</sup> Environmental Justice: What You Should Know, FHWA, Washington Division Office, June 2003.

only then, can a disproportionately high and adverse effect on an EJ population be carried out. In determining whether a measure is 'practicable', the social, economic (including costs) and environmental effects of avoiding, minimizing, or mitigating the adverse effects can be taken into account.

## 5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

### 5.1 Baseline Demographics

The Wichita Falls MPO developed the following baseline demographics for use in Environmental Justice analysis of the TxDOT and City of Wichita Falls roadway project lists presented for discussion and comment at the June 2005 public meetings. The Community of Comparison is Wichita County and includes race and ethnicity. The US Census Bureau uses a different population set or "universe" when determining minority populations as compared to low-income populations. For minorities, the P8. HISPANIC OR LATINO BY RACE [71] - Universe: Total population (SF-1) 100 - Percent Data file was used to identify minority populations within Wichita County, which contains 131,664 persons. For low-income individuals, the P87. POVERTY STATUS IN 1999 BY AGE [17] Universe: Population for whom poverty status is determined (SF-3) - Sample Data file was used to identify low-income populations, which contains 120,522 persons. All calculations were made using these two universes.

Table 5-1 illustrates the overall social and economic makeup for Wichita County.

TABLE 5-1 WICHITA COUNTY SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS				
Community of Comparison (COC)	Race or Ethnicity		Income and Earnings	
	County Total	Percent of County	Median Income*	Percent Below Poverty Threshold†
Wichita County	131,664	100%	\$33,780 <sup>1</sup>	13.2% <sup>2</sup>
<b>Race</b>				
White Alone, Not Hispanic or Latino	96,490	73.3%	26,967	9.6%
Black or African American	13,243	10.1%	23,106	27.7%
American Indian and Alaskan Native	919	0.7%	25,234	22.0%
Asian, Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander	2,485	1.9%	21,771	12.8%
Some Other Race and 2 or More Races	2,430	1.8%	20,625	24.9%
<b>Ethnicity</b>				
Hispanic or Latino	16,097	12.2%	20,639	22.9%

\*Individuals 16 years and over that worked full-time, year-round in 1999.

†Percent of population living below US Department of Health and Human Services poverty guidelines in Wichita County in 2005.

<sup>1</sup>Median household income in 1999.

<sup>2</sup>County threshold as determined by the US Census Bureau in 1999.

## 5.2 Minority Profile

This profile categorizes and identifies the minority populations in Wichita County for use in environmental justice analysis at the census block group level. The US Department of Transportation classifies EJ minorities into four main categories, which are: Black or African American; American Indian and Alaskan Native; Asian, Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander; and Hispanic or Latino.

Table 5-2 illustrates minority populations in Wichita County at the Census Block Group level. Totals for each minority in each block group are given first then their percentages. The minority population totals and percentages in the far right column are used for actual EJ analysis. Overall minority percentages are shown in Figure 5-1, while minority thresholds are shown in Figure 5-2.

Census Tract	Block Group	Black or African Am.		AIAN		Asian, NHPI		Hispanic or Latino		Total Minority Population	
		Total	%	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
010100	1	173	19.5	11	1.2	3	0.3	310	34.9	497	55.8
010100	2	375	52.5	7	1.0	7	1.0	121	16.9	510	71.3
010200	1	40	8.6	0	0.0	8	1.7	78	16.9	126	27.2
010200	2	112	12.0	9	1.0	24	2.6	337	36	482	51.5
010400	1	469	86.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	35	6.5	504	93.3
010400	2	299	47.6	2	0.3	2	0.3	250	39.8	553	88.1
010400	3	578	73.5	5	0.6	1	0.1	140	17.8	724	92.1
010400	4	500	91.1	2	0.4	0	0.0	28	5.1	530	96.5
010600	1	66	5.5	8	0.7	7	0.6	357	29.9	438	36.7
010600	2	50	3.6	13	1.0	16	1.2	294	21.4	373	27.2
010700	1	63	8.3	3	0.4	32	4.2	219	29.0	317	41.9
010700	2	70	8.3	5	0.6	8	1.0	168	19.8	251	29.6
010700	3	65	6.0	9	0.8	17	1.9	320	29.7	411	38.2
010800	1	87	6.2	19	1.4	24	1.7	405	28.9	535	38.1
010800	2	68	5.3	20	1.6	14	1.1	360	28.0	462	35.9
010900	1	70	7.5	2	0.2	17	1.8	118	12.6	207	22.1
010900	2	39	3.9	11	1.1	3	0.3	105	10.6	158	15.9
011000	1	35	4.2	5	0.6	6	0.7	243	29.2	289	34.7
011000	2	86	11.3	7	0.9	13	1.7	170	22.3	276	36.2
011000	3	71	6.6	11	1.0	23	2.1	270	25.0	375	34.7
011100	1	46	7.0	5	0.8	33	5.0	334	50.8	418	63.5
011100	2	26	4.7	4	0.7	50	9.0	330	59.4	410	73.7
011100	3	20	4.0	10	2.0	10	2.0	306	61.6	346	69.6
011200	1	294	35.4	9	1.1	3	0.4	278	33.5	584	70.3
011200	2	33	2.8	2	0.2	8	0.7	96	8.2	139	11.9
011300	1	760	56.9	10	0.8	1	0.1	78	5.8	849	63.6
011400	1	212	14.5	20	1.4	11	0.8	489	33.8	732	50.1
011400	2	118	10.3	18	1.6	18	1.6	202	17.7	356	31.2
011500	1	15	1.7	5	0.6	25	2.9	81	9.3	126	14.4

TABLE 5-2 WICHITA COUNTY MINORITY POPULATIONS (CON'T)

Census Tract	Block Group	Black or African Am.		AIAN		Asian, NHPI		Hispanic or Latino		Total Minority Population	
		Total	%	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
011500	2	11	2.1	1	0.2	1	0.2	62	11.9	75	14.4
011500	3	217	18.8	7	0.6	4	0.4	189	16.4	417	36.2
011600	1	40	3.3	11	0.9	4	0.3	405	33.0	460	37.5
011600	2	174	8.7	12	0.6	24	1.2	239	11.9	449	22.5
011700	1	15	1.2	5	0.4	21	1.7	80	6.4	121	9.7
011700	2	13	1.3	8	0.8	10	1.0	29	2.8	60	5.8
011800	1	11	1.2	6	0.6	3	0.3	32	3.4	52	5.6
011800	2	6	0.6	0	0.0	4	0.4	53	5.7	63	6.8
011900	1	36	2.4	4	0.3	32	2.2	113	7.6	185	12.4
011900	2	226	15.2	6	0.4	83	5.6	75	5.0	390	26.2
011900	3	53	4.5	10	0.9	43	3.7	58	4.9	164	14.0
012000	1	24	2.0	12	1.0	26	2.2	52	4.3	114	9.5
012000	2	98	6.8	9	0.6	95	6.6	123	8.5	325	22.5
012000	3	56	5.0	8	0.7	24	2.1	79	7.1	167	14.9
012000	4	52	5.0	9	0.9	44	4.2	70	6.7	175	16.8
012000	5	17	1.5	2	0.2	29	2.5	46	4.0	94	8.2
012100	1	25	1.7	9	0.6	16	1.1	159	10.7	209	14.0
012100	2	25	1.4	14	0.8	32	1.8	142	8.2	213	12.3
012200	1	24	1.7	10	0.7	14	1.0	81	5.6	129	8.9
012200	2	21	1.9	9	0.8	18	1.6	102	9.2	150	13.5
012200	3	40	2.9	4	0.3	41	2.9	83	6.0	168	12.1
012200	4	190	12.1	5	0.3	23	1.5	186	11.9	404	25.8
012300	1	47	2.9	11	0.7	35	2.1	137	8.3	230	13.9
012300	2	19	1.6	7	0.6	12	1.0	90	7.4	128	10.6
012300	3	91	3.4	8	0.3	88	3.3	170	6.3	357	13.3
012400	1	64	2.2	20	0.7	88	3.1	150	5.3	322	11.3
012400	2	94	4.2	10	0.5	57	2.6	240	10.8	401	18.0
012400	3	41	2.0	20	1.0	37	1.8	112	5.5	210	10.2
012600	1	13	0.9	5	0.4	24	1.7	91	6.6	133	9.6
012600	2	64	4.4	4	0.3	71	4.8	62	4.2	201	13.7
012600	3	14	1.2	3	0.3	20	1.7	106	8.8	143	11.9
012700	1	30	3.9	10	1.3	7	0.9	191	24.6	238	30.7
012700	2	19	2.2	15	1.8	3	0.4	146	17.1	183	21.4
012700	3	11	1.2	3	0.3	22	2.4	119	12.7	155	16.5
012800	1	37	4.1	8	0.9	21	2.3	87	9.5	153	16.7
012800	2	90	6.3	18	1.3	32	2.3	219	15.4	359	25.3
012800	3	41	3.2	1	0.1	50	3.9	63	4.9	155	12.1
012800	4	2	0.3	4	0.5	0	0.0	40	5.1	46	5.9
012900	1	28	1.0	6	0.2	26	1.0	274	10.1	334	12.4
013000	1	190	22.9	3	0.4	30	3.6	164	19.8	387	46.7
013000	2	238	23.2	12	1.2	25	2.4	150	14.6	425	41.3
013000	3	99	8.9	21	1.9	22	2.0	138	12.5	280	25.3
013100	1	454	45.6	2	0.2	36	3.6	119	12.0	611	61.4
013100	2	127	11.0	9	0.8	70	6.0	97	8.4	303	26.1

TABLE 5-2 WICHITA COUNTY MINORITY POPULATIONS (CON'T)											
Census Tract	Block Group	Black or African Am.		AIAN		Asian, NHPI		Hispanic or Latino		Total Minority Population	
		Total	%	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%	Total	%
013100	3	106	9.4	4	0.4	42	3.7	145	12.9	297	26.5
013100	4	1407	27.1	18	0.4	14	0.3	1175	22.6	2614	50.4
013200	1	262	18.0	9	0.6	85	5.8	89	6.1	445	30.6
013200	2	228	14.6	10	0.6	54	3.5	165	10.6	457	29.3
013200	3	150	14.0	5	0.5	43	4.0	62	5.8	260	24.3
013200	4	351	21.7	16	1.0	53	3.3	173	10.7	593	36.6
013200	5	726	74.6	3	0.3	5	0.5	84	8.6	818	84.1
013300	1	181	9.7	6	0.3	54	2.9	138	7.4	379	20.4
013400	1	1303	17.3	50	0.7	272	3.6	817	10.8	2442	32.4
013501	1	41	3.6	5	0.4	13	1.2	123	10.9	182	16.1
013501	2	66	5.7	19	1.7	4	0.4	77	6.7	166	14.4
013501	3	16	1.0	10	0.6	6	0.4	93	5.8	125	7.8
013501	4	22	2.0	11	1.0	5	0.5	76	7.0	114	10.5
013501	5	52	5.6	11	1.2	3	0.3	80	8.6	146	15.7
013502	1	52	4.6	4	0.4	4	0.4	60	5.3	120	10.7
013502	2	42	3.7	7	0.6	20	1.8	54	4.8	123	10.9
013502	3	10	0.9	10	0.9	13	1.1	51	4.4	84	7.3
013502	4	18	1.3	13	1.0	6	0.4	63	4.5	100	7.2
013600	1	4	0.6	8	1.2	2	0.3	38	5.5	52	7.6
013600	2	1	0.1	10	1.2	3	0.4	27	3.2	41	4.9
013600	3	5	0.5	7	0.6	6	0.5	30	2.7	48	4.3
013600	4	1	0.1	10	1.0	2	0.2	55	4.4	68	5.4
013600	5	0	0.0	6	0.5	5	0.4	24	2.1	35	3.1
013600	6	5	0.5	6	0.6	6	0.6	45	4.6	62	6.3
013700	1	30	2.8	14	1.3	0	0.0	80	7.6	124	11.7
013700	2	79	9.2	11	1.3	0	0.0	95	11.1	185	21.6
013700	3	35	2.8	10	0.8	2	0.2	100	8.0	147	11.8
013800	1	5	0.4	12	1.0	3	0.3	41	3.4	61	5.0
013800	2	11	1.3	7	0.8	0	0.0	46	5.2	64	7.3
013800	3	7	0.5	14	1.1	9	0.7	46	3.5	76	5.8

Definitions:

Black or African Am. = Black or African American

AIAN = American Indian and Alaskan Native

NHPI = Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander

Wichita County Minority Threshold = 25.2%

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000 Census Summary File 1 (SF-1)

### **5.3 Low-Income Profile**

This profile identifies low-income populations in Wichita County for use in environmental justice analysis at the census block group level. The US Department of Health and Human Services states the poverty threshold for 2005 for an individual to be \$9,570. Any person whose income fell below this level was counted as “in poverty.”

Table 5-3 identifies low-income populations in Wichita County at the Census Block Group level. Totals for low-income populations in each block group are given first then their percentages along with median income. County low-income percentages are shown in Figure 5-3, while low-income thresholds are shown in Figure 5-4.

TABLE 5-3 WICHITA COUNTY LOW-INCOME POPULATIONS						
Census Tract	Block Group	Total Population	Persons In Poverty	Percent In Poverty	Median Income* (Census Tract)	
					Male	Female
010100	1	686	200	29.2	25,615	15,556
010100	2	786	280	35.6		
010200	1	323	87	26.9	25,774	17,679
010200	2	983	256	26.0		
010400	1	578	277	47.9	22,813	16,378
010400	2	606	219	36.0		
010400	3	719	329	45.8		
010400	4	539	145	26.9		
010600	1	1143	264	23.1	29,844	25,455
010600	2	1423	254	17.9		
010700	1	755	117	15.5	22,758	19,500
010700	2	814	62	7.6		
010700	3	1085	173	15.9		
010800	1	1424	279	19.6	22,569	19,028
010800	2	1268	208	16.4		
010900	1	931	102	11.0	28,319	20,682
010900	2	920	42	4.6		
011000	1	857	153	17.9	22,303	21,417
011000	2	684	143	20.9		
011000	3	1021	211	20.7		
011100	1	709	194	27.4	20,852	18,571
011100	2	524	117	22.3		
011100	3	523	170	32.5		
011200	1	823	454	55.2	28,636	22,708
011200	2	1123	200	17.8		
011300	1	1336	314	23.5	21,827	26,293
011400	1	1524	336	22.1	25,121	20,586
011400	2	1062	200	18.8		
011500	1	853	97	11.4	29,185	24,583
011500	2	533	18	3.4		
011500	3	729	222	30.5		

TABLE 5-3 WICHITA COUNTY LOW-INCOME POPULATIONS (CON'T)						
Census Tract	Block Group	Total Population	Persons In Poverty	Percent In Poverty	Median Income* (Census Tract)	
					Male	Female
011600	1	1187	244	20.6	26,692	19,798
011600	2	2025	388	19.2		
011700	1	1228	96	7.8	39,837	22,837
011700	2	1012	38	3.8		
011800	1	931	91	9.8	35,750	26,729
011800	2	964	5	0.5		
011900	1	1474	124	8.4	40,536	27,217
011900	2	1461	341	23.3		
011900	3	1204	196	16.3		
012000	1	1259	63	5.0	50,357	27,148
012000	2	845	99	11.7		
012000	3	1033	161	15.6		
012000	4	1022	110	10.8		
012000	5	1063	21	2.0		
012100	1	1378	219	15.9	28,810	20,673
012100	2	1842	211	11.5		
012200	1	1491	114	7.7	31,902	24,490
012200	2	994	65	6.5		
012200	3	1400	75	5.4		
012200	4	1317	357	27.1		
012300	1	1624	244	15.0	35,039	24,660
012300	2	1277	171	13.4		
012300	3	2634	127	4.82		
012400	1	2842	93	3.3	36,917	26,220
012400	2	2145	223	10.4		
012400	3	2038	73	3.6		
012600	1	1397	215	15.4	39,338	23,750
012600	2	1509	65	4.3		
012600	3	1199	97	8.1		
012700	1	723	90	12.5	27,823	19,519
012700	2	820	98	12.0		
012700	3	970	116	12.0		
012800	1	920	98	10.7	42,143	26,080
012800	2	1416	149	10.5		
012800	3	1268	10	0.8		
012800	4	773	70	9.1		
012900	1	2478	162	6.5	31,055	25,492
013000	1	794	309	38.9	24,881	21,797
013000	2	1035	387	37.4		
013000	3	1093	111	10.2		
013100	1	999	134	13.4	26,254	21,083
013100	2	1107	115	10.4		
013100	3	1165	20	1.7		
013100	4	1510	141	9.3		

TABLE 5-3 WICHITA COUNTY LOW-INCOME POPULATIONS (CON'T)						
Census Tract	Block Group	Total Population	Persons In Poverty	Percent In Poverty	Median Income* (Census Tract)	
					Male	Female
013200	1	1497	105	7.0	29,369	22,500
013200	2	1607	107	6.7		
013200	3	1056	44	4.2		
013200	4	1601	251	15.7		
013200	5	888	131	14.8		
013300	1	1842	85	4.6	34,375	22,171
013400	1	2815	210	7.5	20,703	18,231
013501	1	1089	216	19.8	30,500	20,091
013501	2	1111	74	6.7		
013501	3	1646	77	4.7		
013501	4	1113	63	5.7		
013501	5	906	203	22.4		
013502	1	1091	172	15.8	38,971	26,431
013502	2	1110	63	5.7		
013502	3	1084	107	9.9		
013502	4	1465	40	2.7		
013600	1	648	25	3.9	31,990	22,038
013600	2	786	36	4.6		
013600	3	993	60	6.0		
013600	4	1341	143	10.7		
013600	5	1187	257	21.7		
013600	6	982	91	9.3		
013700	1	1055	206	19.5	26,303	18,864
013700	2	854	276	32.3		
013700	3	1215	162	13.3		
013800	1	1329	121	9.1	34,107	24,073
013800	2	846	76	9.0		
013800	3	1212	36	3.0		

\*Note: INCOME IN 1999

Males and females 15 years and over with income

Full-time, year-round workers, median income in dollars

Wichita County Low-income Threshold = 13.2%

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000 Census Summary File 3 (SF-3)

## 6.0 ROADWAY PROJECTS ANALYSIS

Table 6-1 contains all of the TxDOT and City of Wichita Falls roadway projects presented at the June 2005 Environmental Justice Public Meetings along with all of the new roadway project nominations from those meetings. In Sections 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3, each project is analyzed separately and presented with all comments gathered from each meeting. Documentation supporting environmental justice impacts is included, as well as, documentations of no impact. Figure 6-1, Minority Block Groups, and Figure 6-2, Low-income Block Groups, illustrate the location of each project listed below.

**Table 6-1  
MPO/City/TxDOT Projects – FY 2005**

### WICHITA FALLS PROJECTS 2005-2015

ID NO	Location	Description	Cost	Roadway	MTP ID
WF 0	Langford Drive from Barnett Rd. (FM 1634) to Gregg Rd.	Widen and Install Curb and Gutter	\$ 515,875.00	Langford Drive	WFS WF-19
WF 1	Bacon Switch Rd. from .25 miles west of IH-44 to SH 240	Widen to 4 Lanes	\$ 840,400.00	Bacon Switch Road	WFS WF-20
WF 2	Hatton Rd. from US 281 to Hammon Rd.	Widening of Existing Street	\$ 2,200,000.00	Hatton Road	WFS WF-23
WF 3	Covington Lane from Old Iowa Park Road (BUS 287) to US 287	Reconstruction of Existing Street	\$ 792,000.00	Covington Lane	WFS WF-22
WF 4	Cypress Avenue from North Shore Drive to Lake Shore Drive	Construction of 2 Lane Street	\$ 385,000.00	Cypress Avenue	WFS WF-21
WF 5	N. Beverly Drive from Loop 11 to Old Iowa Park Road (BUS 287)	Reconstruct and Widen to 4 Lanes	\$ 1,540,000.00	N. Beverly Drive	WFS WF-18
WF 6	From Rhea Road to Lawrence Road	Realignment of Existing Intersection	\$ 2,010,000.00	Rhea Rd/Catfield Rd/Lawrence Rd Realgn.	WFS WF-13
WF 7	Lawrence Rd. from Kell Freeway to Call Field Rd.	Lawrence Road Center Turn Lane	\$ 975,000.00	Lawrence Road Center Turn Lane	WFS WF-7
WF 8	Kemp Blvd. from Catfield Road to FM 369	Reconstruction of Existing Road w/Drainage Improv.	\$ 1,200,000.00	Kemp Street Reconstruction	WFS WF-5
WF 9	Midwestern Pkwy. from US 281 to Hammon Rd.	Construction of 4 Lane Street	\$ 3,902,000.00	Midwestern Parkway Extension	WFS WF-9
WF 10	Puckett Rd. from IH 44 to Hooper Dr.	Construction of Widening of Existing Street	\$ 462,000.00	Puckett Road Extension	WFS WF-9
WF 11	From Kemp/Maplewood to Lawrence Road	Construction of 4 Lane Street	\$ 2,072,000.00	Maplewood (Catfield Reliever Phase I)	WFS WF-1
WF 12	From Lawrence Road to McNeil	Construction of 4 Lane Street	\$ 2,966,000.00	Maplewood (Catfield Reliever Phase II)	WFS WF-2
WF 13	Gregg Road from FM 369 to Lake Wichita	Widening of Existing Street and Drainage Improv.	\$ 1,309,000.00	Gregg Road Reconstruction	WFS WF-3
WF 14	Holiday Creek from East Scott Street to Hamilton Park	Construction of Bicycle/Pedestrian Trail	\$ 1,200,000.00	Holiday Creek Hike and Bike Trail Phase III	WFS WF-4
WF 15	Rathgeber Road from SH 79 to Stonelake Blvd	Widening of Existing Street	\$ 380,000.00	Rathgeber Road Reconstruction Phase I	WFS WF-10
WF 16	Relly Road from IH 44 to John Tower Road	Widening of Existing Street	\$ 750,000.00	Relly Road Widening	WFS WF-12
WF 17	Taft from FM 369 to FM 2380	Widening of Existing Street and Drainage Improv.	\$ 1,000,000.00	Taft Reconstruction	WFS WF-14
WF 18	Turtle Creek Road from Ridgmont to US 277 Business	Widening of Existing Street and Drainage Improv.	\$ 3,315,000.00	Turtle Creek Ranch Road Reconstruction	WFS WF-15
WF 19	Rathgeber Road from Stonelake Blvd. to FM 2380	Widening of Existing Street	\$ 1,604,800.00	Rathgeber Road Reconstruction Phase II	WFS WF-11
WF 20	Lakeshore Drive from Fairway to Barnett	Widening of Existing Street and Drainage Improv.	\$ 1,350,000.00	Lakeshore Drive Reconstruction	WFS WF-6
WF 21	Wellington from FM 367 to US 287 Business	Widening of Existing Street	\$ 1,300,000.00	Wellington	WFS WF-15
WF 22	Wellington from US 287 J Business to US 287	Widening of Existing Street	\$ 1,100,000.00	Wellington	WFS WF-17

Project list developed by the City of Wichita Falls and included in the Wichita Falls Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2005-2030

### TIP PROJECTS 2006-2008

ID NO	PROJECT LISTING	WORK DESCRIPTION	PROGRAM AMOUNT	Roadway	LETTING DATE	FUNDING CATEGORY
TX 0	US 82 at US 281	Construct Direct Connect Interchange	\$ 5,981,536	US 82	9/1/2007	11PA - Federal
TX 1	At US 82/287 Under Windhorst Rd.	Rehabilitate Bridge and Approaches	\$ 726,315	US 82	9/1/2007	6-Federal
TX 2	US 82 at US 281	Construct Direct Connect Interchange	\$ 17,200,000	US 82	9/1/2007	11, 3A-Federal
TX 3	IH 44 to SP 325	Non-Freeway Facility - Widen to 4-Lane Divided Facility	\$ 1,164,000	FM 890	9/1/2007	11-Federal
TX 4	SP 325 to SH 240	Non-Freeway Facility - Widen to 4-Lane Divided Facility	\$ 2,731,550	FM 890	9/1/2007	11-Federal
TX 5	Brook Street to US 287/IH 44	Rehabilitation of Existing Roadway - Mill and Overlay	\$ 140,525	BU 277A	10/1/2005	1
TX 6	Missile Road to SP 325	Asphaltic Concrete Pavement Overlay - Hot Mix Overlay	\$ 101,378	SH 240	9/1/2007	11
TX 7	at FM 890	Replace Bridge and Approaches	\$ 1,336,000	IH 44	9/1/2007	6 On - Federal
TX 8	US 287/IH 44 to Broad Street	Rehabilitation of Existing Roadway - Mill and Overlay	\$ 140,525	SPUR 479	10/1/2005	1
TX 9	BU 277A Exit Ramp to 6th Street	Rehabilitation of Existing Roadway - Conc. Pavement Repair	\$ 281,050	IH 44	10/1/2005	1
TX 10	8th Street to 6th Street	Rehabilitation of Existing Roadway - Conc. Pavement Repair	\$ 281,050	US 287	10/1/2005	1
TX 11	IH 44 to US 287 Frontage Road	New location non-freeway facility	\$ 1,400,000	LP 11	4/1/2007	11-Federal
TX 12	LP 11 to 0.3 Miles West of IH 44	Miscellaneous Work - Widen Drainage Structures	\$ 31,900	BU 287J	6/1/2006	8, 1-Federal

### EJ PROJECTS 2005

ID NO	Location	Description	Cost	Roadway	MPO ID
EJ 0	Taft Blvd. from Hampstead to Kell Fwy.	Widen to 4 Lanes With Center Turn Lane	TBD	Taft Blvd.	TBD
EJ 1	Kell Fwy. W. Access Rd. from Fairway Blvd. to RR Tracks	Extend and Construct Street (Access Road)	TBD	Kell Fwy. West Access Rd.	TBD
EJ 2	Kell Fwy. West Exit at Fairway Blvd.	Realignment and Reconstruct of Existing Exit	TBD	Kell Fwy. West Exit	TBD
EJ 3	IH 44 South Exit at Seymour Hwy.	Realignment of Existing Exit and Intersection	TBD	IH 44 South Exit	TBD
EJ 4	Bonny Homes Subdivision and Surrounding Area	Improve access to Henry S Grace Fwy.	TBD	TBD	TBD
EJ 5	Jefferson Street at Scott St. Bridge	Misc. - Improve Lighting and Drainage	TBD	Jefferson Street	TBD
EJ 6	Bridge at the North End of Bridge Street	Rehabilitation / Reconstruction of Bridge	TBD	Bridge Street	TBD
EJ 7	Sunset Lane & Duty Lane	Repair Streets and Bar Ditches, Add Curb & Gutter	TBD	Sunset Lane & Duty Lane	TBD
EJ 8	Airport Road from City View to Loop 11	Rehabilitation of Existing Roadway	TBD	Airport Road	TBD
EJ 9	Old Iowa Park Road at Central Fwy. d Exit Ramps	Misc. - Improve Signage	TBD	Old Iowa Park Road	TBD
EJ 10	FM 367 from Loop 11 to Western MPO Boundary	Widen to 4 Lanes With Shoulders	TBD	FM 367	TBD
EJ 11	Old Burkumett Rd. from Spur 327 to Missile Rd.	Widen to 4 Lanes With Turn Lane, Reduce Speed	TBD	Old Burkumett Road	TBD
EJ 12	Wenonah Street from US 82/277 to Catfield Reliever	Construction of Street	TBD	Wenonah Street	TBD
EJ 13	Wichita Falls	Improve access and connectivity (NW to SW)	TBD	TBD	TBD

Project list developed from the June 2005 Environmental Justice Public Meetings

## **6.1 City of Wichita Falls Projects**

### **WF 0 – Langford Drive**

Project limits: *from Barnett Road (FM 1634) to Gregg Road*

Description: *widen and install curb and gutter*

Cost: *\$515,875*

MPO ID: *WFS WF-19*

Public Comments Received: *None*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Group 012300-3 underlies the Langford Drive impact footprint and has minority populations that are less than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are less than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). No environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, widening of the existing road and installation of curb and gutter.*

*Members of these block groups may need to be consulted in the early planning stages of this project, and appropriate mitigation measures identified, in order to avoid any adverse effects to the non-minority and non-low-income populations living there. Establishing a community oversight committee to monitor progress and identify potential community concerns may also be needed.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## **WF 1 – Bacon Switch Road**

Project limits: *from .25 miles west of IH-44 to State Highway 240*

Description: *widen existing roadway to 4 lanes*

Cost: *\$840,400*

MPO ID: *WFS WF-20*

Public Comments Received:

- *Traffic on this road needs to be compared with the traffic on Barnett Road between Old Iowa Park Road and FM 367 to determine if available funding would be better utilized in that area instead of on Bacon Switch Road*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 013100-4 and 013200-1 underlie the Bacon Switch Road impact footprint and have minority populations greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), but low-income populations that are less than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are not present under the impact footprint. No environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, widening of the existing roadway to 4 lanes. Therefore, we conclude that minority populations in these block groups would not bear a disproportionate share of any adverse impacts.*

*Public comment indicates that funding for this project would be better spent in an alternate location (Barnett Road) and that a comparison between the two should be done. The recommendation has been noted and will be further examined.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is far away from any residential areas; however, noise and air emissions may have an effect on workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## WF 2 – Hatton Road

Project limits: *from US 281 to Hammon Road*

Description: *widening of existing street*

Cost: *\$2,200,000*

MPO ID: *WFS WF-23*

Public Comments Received:

- *Proposed WF2 project (widening of Hatton Road) will make Bonny Homes Addition very hard to enter and exit.*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 011500-2 and 011500-3 underlie the Hatton Road impact footprint and have minority populations greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations greater than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are not present under the impact footprint. No environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, widening of the existing street. Therefore, we conclude that minority and low-income populations in these block groups would not bear a disproportionate share of any adverse impacts.*

*Public comment did reveal that some individuals feel this project would hinder traffic in and out of the Bonny Homes addition. Further study of this area may be required to determine if this is true. This will be taken into consideration during the development of the traffic control plan.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

### **WF 3 – Covington Lane**

Project limits: *from Old Iowa Park Road (BUS 287) to US 287*

Description: *reconstruction of existing street*

Cost: *\$792,000*

MPO ID: *WFS WF-22*

Public Comments Received:

- *Residents along this road want to know if curb and gutter work will be done and if they will have to pay for it.*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 013000-3, 013100-2 and 013100-3 underlie the Covington Lane impact footprint and have minority populations greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), but low-income populations that are less than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint. There would be a larger proportion of minority people receiving the adverse effects of this project than in the COC. Thus, there could be disproportionate impacts to the minority populations in these block groups. Environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, reconstruction of the existing street.*

*Public comment revealed concerns over curb and gutter work and who will pay. If required to pay, then members of the affected block groups should be informed and assistance provided to ensure they receive at least their fair (i.e. proportional) share of the anticipated benefits of the proposed reconstruction of the existing street (e.g. community infrastructure improvements).*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## **WF 4 – Cypress Avenue**

Project limits: *from North Shore Drive to Lake Shore Drive*

Description: *construction of 2-lane street*

Cost: *\$385,000*

MPO ID: *WFS WF-21*

Public Comments Received:

- *This project should be built by the developers and the subdivision owners and not by the City of Wichita Falls*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Group 012300-1 underlies the Cypress Avenue impact footprint and has minority populations that are less than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), but low-income populations that are greater than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Block Group 012300-3 also underlies the impact footprint, but minority and low-income populations are both below the minimum COC levels. Our review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint for Block Group 012300-1. There would be a larger proportion of low-income people receiving the adverse effects of this project than in the COC. Thus, there could be disproportionate impacts to the low-income populations in these block groups. Environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, construction of a 2-lane street.*

*Public comment revealed concerns over the City of Wichita Falls paying for the construction of this project. Establishment of a community oversight committee to provide input on financing options and monitor project progress may be needed. Furthermore, non-minority and low-income members of these block groups should be consulted in the early planning stages of the project in order to identify appropriate mitigation measures for potential adverse effects. Further study of this area may be required and public concerns should be taken into consideration during the development of the traffic control plan.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## WF 5 – North Beverly Drive

Project limits: *from Loop 11 to Old Iowa Park Road (BUS 287)*

Description: *reconstruct and widen to 4 lanes*

Cost: *\$1,540,000*

MPO ID: *WFS WF-18*

Public Comments Received:

- *Widening of this road is NOT needed. It would be a waste of funds*
- *Repair this road only*
- *Reduce speed limit to 35 mph*
- *WF5 (widening of North Beverly Drive) is not needed*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 013000-2, 013100-1 and 013100-2 underlie the North Beverly Drive impact footprint and have minority populations greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations greater than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint. There would be a larger proportion of minority and low-income people receiving the adverse effects of this project than in the COC. Thus, there could be disproportionate impacts to the minority and low-income populations in these block groups. Environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, reconstruct and widen to 4 lanes.*

*Public comment revealed that residents living near this project feel funding would be better utilized in repairs only, and that the speed limit should be reduced to a maximum of 35 miles per hour in order to slow down traffic along this road. Modifications to the project may need to be made in order to reduce the severity of the impact to the minority and low-income populations in these block groups. For example, reexamine traffic counts to determine if there is justification for widening this street to 4 lanes. If traffic counts do support the proposed project then members of the affected block groups should be consulted and effective mitigation measures identified, fully analyzed and compared. Such measures may include: relocation of affected individuals upon their request or with their concurrence; establishment of a community oversight committee to monitor progress and identify potential community concerns; and changing the timing of the impact to reduce effects on the minority and low-income populations.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## **WF 6 – Rhea Road/ Callfield Road/Lawrence Road Realignment**

Project limits: *from Rhea Road to Lawrence Road*

Description: *realignment of existing intersection*

Cost: *\$2,010,000*

MPO ID: *WFS WF-13*

Public Comments Received: *None*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 012600-3 and 012100-2 underlie the Rhea/Callfield/Lawrence Road Realignment impact footprint and have minority populations that are less than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are less than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Census Block Group 012100-1 also underlies the impact footprint and contains only low-income populations that are greater than 13.2% of the COC. Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are not present under the impact footprint, only retail and commercial businesses. No environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, realignment of the existing intersection.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## **WF 7 – Lawrence Road Center Turn Lane**

Project limits: *from Kell Freeway to Callfield Road*

Description: *construct center turn lane*

Cost: *\$975,000*

MPO ID: *WFS WF-7*

Public Comments Received: *None*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 012100-2, 012600-3 and 012700-2 underlie the Lawrence Road Center Turn Lane impact footprint and have minority populations that are less than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are less than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Census Block Group 012600-1 also underlies the impact footprint and contains only low-income populations that are greater than 13.2% of the COC. Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are not present under the impact footprint, only retail and commercial businesses. No environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, construction of a center turn lane. Therefore, we conclude that low-income populations in these block groups would not bear a disproportionate share of the adverse impacts.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located entirely within the right-of-way of the impact footprint. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## **WF 8 – Kemp Street Reconstruction**

Project limits: *from Callfield Road to Southwest Parkway (FM 369)*

Description: *reconstruction of existing road with drainage improvements*

Cost: *\$1,200,000*

MPO ID: *WFS WF-5*

Public Comments Received: *None*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 012000-2, 012000-5, 012200-3 and 012600-3 underlie the Kemp Street Reconstruction impact footprint and have minority populations that are less than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are less than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Census Block Groups 012000-3 and 012100-1 also underlie the impact footprint and contain only low-income populations that are greater than 13.2% of the COC. Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are not present under the impact footprint, only retail and commercial businesses. No environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, reconstruction of the existing road with drainage improvements. Therefore, we conclude that low-income populations in these block groups would not bear a disproportionate share of the adverse impacts.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Traffic detours may also develop creating bottlenecks during construction. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## **WF 9 – Midwestern Parkway Extension**

Project limits: *from US 281 to Hammon Road*

Description: *construction of 4 lane street*

Cost: *\$3,902,000*

MPO ID: *WFS WF-8*

Public Comments Received: *None*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 011500-3 and 011600-1 underlie the Midwestern Parkway Extension impact footprint and have minority populations greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations greater than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are not present under the impact footprint. No environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, construction of a 4 lane street. Therefore, we conclude that minority and low-income populations in these block groups would not bear a disproportionate share of the adverse impacts.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is far away from any residential areas; however, noise and air emissions may have an effect on workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## **WF 10 – Puckett Road Extension**

Project limits: *from IH 44 to Hooper Drive*

Description: *construction and widening of existing street*

Cost: *\$462,000*

MPO ID: *WFS WF-9*

Public Comments Received: *None*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Group 013200-2 underlies the Puckett Road Extension impact footprint and has minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), but low-income populations that are less than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Census Block Group 013300-1 also underlies the impact footprint, but has minority and low-income populations that are below the COC threshold. Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are not present under the impact footprint. No environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, construction and widening of the existing street. Therefore, we conclude that minority populations in these block groups would not bear a disproportionate share of the adverse impacts.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## **WF 11 – Maplewood (Callfield Reliever Phase I)**

Project limits: *from Kemp/Maplewood to Lawrence Road*

Description: *construction of 4 lane street*

Cost: *\$2,072,000*

MPO ID: *WFS WF-1*

Public Comments Received:

- *Inform the public and get the project done as quickly as possible*
- *Will there be north access on Garfield when the Callfield Reliever goes through?*
- *Make Avenue Z one-way westbound and Arizona Street one-way eastbound and connect them inside the TESCO park*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 012000-2 and 012600-3 underlie the Maplewood (Callfield Reliever Phase I) impact footprint and have minority populations that are less than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are less than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint. However, because minority and low-income populations are below the COC thresholds no environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, construction of a 4 lane street.*

*Public comment indicates support for the project. However, non-minority and non-low-income members of these block groups should be consulted in the early planning stages of the project in order to identify appropriate mitigation measures for potential adverse effects.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## **WF 12 - Maplewood (Callfield Reliever Phase II)**

Project limits: *from Lawrence Road to McNiel*

Description: *Construction of 4 lane street*

Cost: *\$2,966,000*

MPO ID: *WFS WF-2*

Public Comments Received: *Same as in WF 11*

- *Inform the public and get the project done as quickly as possible*
- *Will there be north access on Garfield when the Callfield Reliever goes through?*
- *Make Avenue Z one-way westbound and Arizona Street one-way eastbound and connect them inside the TESCO park*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 012100-2, 012200-1 and 012600-3 underlie the Maplewood (Callfield Reliever Phase II) impact footprint and have minority populations that are less than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are less than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint. However, because minority and low-income populations are below the COC thresholds no environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, construction of a 4 lane street.*

*Public comment indicates support for the project. However, non-minority and non-low-income members of these block groups should be consulted in the early planning stages of the project in order to identify appropriate mitigation measures for potential adverse effects.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## WF 13 – Gregg Road Reconstruction

Project limits: *from Southwest Parkway (FM 369) to Lake Wichita*

Description: *widening of existing street and drainage improvement*

Cost: *\$1,309,000*

MPO ID: *WFS WF-3*

Public Comments Received:

- *This project should be built by the developers and the subdivision owners and not by the City of Wichita Falls*
- *Reduce the speed limit to keep teenagers from racing late at night*
- *From Southwest Parkway to Natchez Trace, trouble with people parking during soccer season. East side of Gregg Road is packed with cars and families with children during Soccer Saturdays making it difficult for people living on Laci Lane and Sandy Hill to get in and out of their subdivision*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Group 012300-3 underlies the Gregg Road Reconstruction impact footprint and has minority populations that are less than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are less than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint. However, because minority and low-income populations are below the COC thresholds no environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, widening of the existing street and drainage improvement.*

*Public comment indicates concern over financing for this project and who will ultimately pay for it. Issues of parking, vehicle racing and blocked entrances in and out of the subdivision were also brought to attention. Non-minority and non-low-income members of these block groups should be consulted in the early planning stages of the project in order to identify appropriate mitigation measures for potential adverse effects. For example: installation of speed bumps, signage stating severe penalties will be enforced for racing and stepping up police patrols in that area.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## WF 14 – Holliday Creek Hike and Bike Trail Phase III

Project limits: *from East Scott Street to Hamilton Park*

Description: *construction of bicycle/pedestrian trail*

Cost: *\$1,200,000*

MPO ID: *WFS WF-4*

Public Comments Received:

- *Support for project by the cycling community, but questions as to how it may be financed*
- *Could become a TxDOT enhancement project*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 010100-2, 010600-1, 011400-2, and 011600-1 underlie the Holliday Creek Hike and Bike Trail Phase III impact footprint and have minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are greater than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Census Block Group 011900-1 also underlies the impact footprint, but has minority and low-income populations that are below the COC thresholds. Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint. There would be a larger proportion of minority and low-income people receiving the adverse effects of this project than in the COC. Thus, there could be disproportionate impacts to the minority and low-income populations in these block groups. Environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, construction of a bicycle/pedestrian trail.*

*Public opinion indicates support for this project, more so, if it becomes a TxDOT enhancement project. Therefore, even though this project is classified as having “adverse” effects upon the minority and low-income populations in these block groups, the opposite is true. This project should actually be considered an enhancement because it will provide an attractive and desirable feature that will fit harmoniously into the community. Therefore, we conclude that minority and low-income populations in these block groups would not bear a disproportionate share of the adverse impacts.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## **WF 15 – Rathgeber Road Reconstruction Phase I**

Project limits: *from State Highway 79 to Stonelake Blvd.*

Description: *widening of existing street*

Cost: *\$380,000*

MPO ID: *WFS WF-10*

Public Comments Received: *None*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 011600-2 and 012200-4 underlie the Rathgeber Road Reconstruction Phase I impact footprint and have minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are greater than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint. There would be a larger proportion of minority and low-income people receiving the adverse effects of this project than in the COC. Thus, there could be disproportionate impacts to the minority and low-income populations in these block groups. Environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, widening of the existing street.*

*No public comments were received concerning this project, which is located in an area of sparse residential development. However, establishment of a community oversight committee to monitor progress and identify potential community concerns may be needed.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## WF 16 – Reilly Road Widening

Project limits: *from IH 44 to John Tower Road*

Description: *widening of existing street*

Cost: *\$750,000*

MPO ID: *WFS WF-12*

Public Comments Received:

- *Support for widening of this road*
- *Project nomination to include this section of Reilly Road for upgrade and major repair*
- *An apartment complex and new homes are being built that will increase usage of road*
- *A shopping complex is being built between Reilly and Missile Road that will also increase usage*
- *No changes need to made to this road other than dropping the speed limit to 25 MPH*
- *Widening of this road is NOT needed. It will give people another place to race their vehicles*
- *Only time traffic is a problem is at the beginning and the end of school*
- *Lower the speed limit to 20 mph and do routine road maintenance*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 013100-4 and 013200-2 underlie the Reilly Road Widening impact footprint and have minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), but low-income populations that are less than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint. There would be a larger proportion of minority people receiving the adverse effects of this project than in the COC. Thus, there could be disproportionate impacts to the minority populations in these block groups. Environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, widening of the existing street.*

*Public opinion is both for and against this project. Economic development along this road has been cited as a good reason for its construction, while providing another place for young people to race their vehicles has been cited as a bad reason for widening the road. In order to avoid adverse impacts on minority populations within these block groups, alterations to construction may be needed. For example: add speed bumps to reduce vehicle velocities, add signage that clearly states individuals caught breaking the speed limit will be severely fined and, finally, step up police patrols in this area to discourage racing. Before construction begins, members of the affected block groups should be consulted and effective mitigation measures identified, fully analyzed and compared to find the best solution for dealing with the “race track” scenario.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a*

*residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## **WF 17 – Taft Reconstruction**

Project limits: *from Southwest Parkway (FM 369) to FM 2380*

Description: *widening of existing street and drainage improvements*

Cost: *\$1,000,000*

MPO ID: *WFS WF-14*

Public Comments Received: *None*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Group 012000-5 underlies the Taft Reconstruction impact footprint and has minority populations that are less than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are less than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint. However, because minority and low-income populations are below the COC thresholds no environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, widening of the existing street and drainage improvements.*

*No public comments were received concerning this project, which is located in a residential area. However, establishment of a community oversight committee to monitor progress and identify potential community concerns may be needed.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## WF 18 – Turtle Creek Ranch Road Reconstruction

Project limits: *from Ridgemont to US 277 Business*

Description: *widening of existing street and drainage improvements*

Cost: *\$3,315,000*

MPO ID: *WFS WF-15*

Public Comments Received:

- *Road is too narrow, too rough, too noisy and falling apart*
- *Road needs major repairs, is not wide enough and drainage is not good*
- *Received a petition of 85 signatures for work to be done on this road*
- *Consider removing the jog in the road when this project begins*
- *Is there enough ROW to do the job?*
- *Will Eminent Domain be used to complete this job?*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 012400-1, 012600-2, 012800-3 and 012800-4 underlie the Turtle Creek Ranch Road Reconstruction impact footprint and have minority populations that are less than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are less than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint. However, because minority and low-income populations are below the COC thresholds no environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, widening of the existing street and drainage improvements.*

*Strong public support indicates the project would be well received. Concerns over right-of-way and eminent domain issues may necessitate the need to consult with block group populations in order to identify appropriate mitigation measures. Formation of a community oversight committee to monitor progress and identify potential community concerns may also be needed.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## **WF 19 – Rathgeber Road Reconstruction Phase II**

Project limits: *from Stonelake Blvd. to FM 2380*

Description: *widening of existing street*

Cost: *\$1,604,800*

MPO ID: *WFS WF-11*

Public Comments Received: *None*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 011600-2 and 012200-4 underlie the Rathgeber Road Reconstruction Phase II impact footprint and have minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are greater than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint. There would be a larger proportion of minority and low-income people receiving the adverse effects of this project than in the COC. Thus, there could be disproportionate impacts to the minority and low-income populations in these block groups. Environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, widening of the existing street.*

*No public comments were received concerning this project, which is located in an area of sparse residential development. However, establishment of a community oversight committee to monitor progress and identify potential community concerns may be needed.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## **WF 20 – Lakeshore Drive Reconstruction**

Project limits: *from Fairway to Barnett*

Description: *widening of existing street and drainage improvements*

Cost: *\$1,350,000*

MPO ID: *WFS WF-6*

Public Comments Received: *None*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 012200-3 and 012300-3 underlie the Lakeshore Drive Reconstruction impact footprint and have minority populations that are less than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are less than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint. However, because minority and low-income populations are below the COC thresholds no environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, widening of the existing street and drainage improvements.*

*No public comments were received concerning this project. However, non-minority and non-low-income members of these block groups should be consulted in the early planning stages of the project in order to identify appropriate mitigation measures for potential adverse effects.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## WF 21 – Wellington Phase I

Project limits: *from FM 367 to US 287 Business*

Description: *widening of existing street*

Cost: *\$1,300,000*

MPO ID: *WFS WF-16*

Public Comments Received:

- *Support for these projects (widening of existing street) because of lack of north and south connectors other than FM 369*
- *Road is already heavily used and is too narrow*
- *Road is not wide enough*
- *Will there be curb and gutter work on this road and who will pay?*
- *How much wider will the road become?*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 012900-1 and 013100-4 underlie the Wellington Phase I impact footprint and have minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), but low-income populations that are less than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint. There would be a larger proportion of minority people receiving the adverse effects of this project than in the COC. Thus, there could be disproportionate impacts to the minority populations in these block groups. Environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, widening of the existing street.*

*Public opinion indicates support for this project due to the lack of north/south connectors in this region. Concerns over curb and gutter work, project financing and the ultimate width of the road may necessitate the need to consult with minority block group populations in order to ensure the affected community receives at least its fair (i.e. proportional) share of the anticipated benefits of the proposed project (e.g. community infrastructure improvements). Formation of a community oversight committee to monitor progress and identify potential community concerns may also be needed.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## WF 22 – Wellington Phase II

Project limits: *from US 287J Business to US 287*

Description: *widening of existing street*

Cost: *\$1,100,000*

MPO ID: *WFS WF-17*

Public Comments Received: *same as in WF 22 Phase I*

- *Support for these projects (widening of existing street) because of lack of north and south connectors other than FM 369*
- *Road is already heavily used and is too narrow*
- *Road is not wide enough*
- *Will there be curb and gutter work on this road and who will pay?*
- *How much wider will the road become?*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 012900-1 and 013100-4 underlie the Wellington Phase II impact footprint and have minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), but low-income populations that are less than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint. There would be a larger proportion of minority people receiving the adverse effects of this project than in the COC. Thus, there could be disproportionate impacts to the minority populations in these block groups. Environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, widening of the existing street.*

*Public opinion indicates support for this project due to the lack of north/south connectors in this region. Concerns over curb and gutter work, project financing and the ultimate width of the road may necessitate the need to consult with minority block group populations in order to ensure the affected community receives at least its fair (i.e. proportional) share of the anticipated benefits of the proposed project (e.g. community infrastructure improvements). Formation of a community oversight committee to monitor progress and identify potential community concerns may also be needed.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## **6.2 TxDOT Projects**

### **TX 0 – US 82 Direct Connect Interchange (Part 1)**

Project limits: *US 82 at US 281*

Description: *construct Direct Connect Interchange (Falls Flyover)*

Cost: *\$5,981,536*

MPO ID: *WFS CAT 11-2*

Public Comments Received: *None*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 010100-1, 010100-2, 010200-2, 010600-1, 011400-2 and 011600-1 underlie the US 82 Direct Connect Interchange (Part 1) impact footprint and have minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are greater than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are not present under the impact footprint, only retail and commercial businesses. No environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, construction of the Direct Connect Interchange. Therefore, we conclude that minority and low-income populations in these block groups would not bear a disproportionate share of any adverse impacts.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located entirely within the right-of-way of the impact footprint. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## TX 1 – US 82 Windthorst Road Bridge

Project limits: *At US 82/287 under Windthorst Road*

Description: *rehabilitate bridge and approaches*

Cost: *\$725,315*

MPO ID: *WFS BR-3*

Public Comments Received: *None*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 011400-1, 011400-2 and 011500-3 underlie the US 82 Windthorst Road Bridge impact footprint and have minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are greater than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are not present under the impact footprint, only retail and commercial businesses. No environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, rehabilitation of the bridge and approaches. Therefore, we conclude that minority and low-income populations in these block groups would not bear a disproportionate share of any adverse impacts.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located entirely within the right-of-way of the impact footprint. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## TX 2 – US 82 Direct Connect Interchange (Part 2)

Project limits: *US 82 at US 281*

Description: *construct Direct Connect Interchange (Falls Flyover)*

Cost: *\$17,200,000*

MPO ID: *WFS CAT 3-1*

Public Comments Received: *None*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 010100-2, 010200-2, 010600-1, 010600-2, and 010700-3 underlie the US 82 Direct Connect Interchange (Part 2) impact footprint and have minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are greater than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are not present under the impact footprint, only retail and commercial businesses. No environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, construction of the Direct Connect Interchange. Therefore, we conclude that minority and low-income populations in these block groups would not bear a disproportionate share of any adverse impacts.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located entirely within the right-of-way of the impact footprint. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

### TX 3 – FM 890, Four-lane Divided Facility

Project limits: from *Interstate Highway 44 to Spur 325*  
Description: *non-freeway facility – widen to 4-lane divided facility*  
Cost: *\$1,164,000*  
MPO ID: *WFS CAT 11-4*  
Public Comments Received: *None*  
Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 013100-4, and 013200-4 underlie the FM 890, Four-lane Divided Facility impact footprint and have minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are greater than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint. There would be a larger proportion of minority and low-income people receiving the adverse effects of this project than in the COC. Thus, there could be disproportionate impacts to the minority and low-income populations in these block groups. Environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, construct a new non-freeway facility – widen to 4-lane divided facility.*

*No public comments were received concerning this project. However, minority and low-income members of these block groups should be consulted in the early planning stages of the project in order to identify appropriate mitigation measures for potential adverse effects.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## **TX 4 – FM 890, Four-lane Divided Facility**

Project limits: from *Spur 325 to State Highway 240*

Description: *non-freeway facility – widen to 4-lane divided facility*

Cost: *\$2,731,550*

MPO ID: *WFS CAT 11-3*

Public Comments Received: *None*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 011200-2, and 013200-5 underlie the FM 890, Four-lane Divided Facility impact footprint and have minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are greater than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are not present under the impact footprint, only retail and commercial businesses. No environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, construction of a non-freeway facility – widen to 4-lane divided facility. Therefore, we conclude that minority and low-income populations in these block groups would not bear a disproportionate share of any adverse impacts.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## **TX 5 – Business 277A, Mill and Overlay**

Project limits: *from Baylor Street to US 287/IH 44*

Description: *rehabilitation of existing roadway – mill and overlay*

Cost: *\$140,525*

MPO ID: *TBD*

Public Comments Received: *None*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 010200-1, 011000-1 and 011000-2 underlie the Business 277A, Mill and Overlay impact footprint and have minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are greater than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are not present under the impact footprint, only retail, commercial and institutional buildings. No environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, rehabilitation of the existing roadway – mill and overlay. Therefore, we conclude that minority and low-income populations in these block groups would not bear a disproportionate share of any adverse impacts.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## TX 6 – State Highway 240, Hot Mix Overlay

Project limits: *from Missile Road to Spur 325*

Description: *asphaltic concrete pavement overlay – hot mix overlay*

Cost: *\$101,376*

MPO ID: *WFS PM-9*

Public Comments Received: *None*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 011200-2, 013200-2, 013200-3, 013200-4, 013200-5 and 013400-1 underlie the State Highway 240, Hot Mix Overlay impact footprint and have minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are greater than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Census Block Group 013300-1 also underlies the impact footprint but has minority and low-income populations that are below the COC thresholds. Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint. There would be a larger proportion of minority and low-income people receiving the adverse effects of this project than in the COC. Thus, there could be disproportionate impacts to the minority and low-income populations in these block groups. Environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, asphaltic concrete pavement overlay – hot mix overlay.*

*Although an adverse impact to minority and low-income populations in these block groups has been identified, this is a standard preventive maintenance project designed to upgrade and enhance an existing roadway. Once complete, the project would benefit all populations within these block groups. Detours around the work area may create an inconvenience for motorists and persons living in the area, but the impact would be temporary at worst. Therefore, we conclude that minority and low-income populations in these block groups would not bear a disproportionate share of the adverse impacts.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located entirely within the right-of-way of the impact footprint. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## TX 7 – Interstate Highway 44, Replace Bridge and Approaches

Project limits: *at FM 890*

Description: *replace bridge and approaches*

Cost: *\$1,336,000*

MPO ID: *WFS BR-4*

Public Comments Received: *None*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 013100-4 and 013200-4 underlie the Interstate Highway 44, Replace Bridge and Approaches impact footprint and have minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are greater than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are not present under the impact footprint; only a freeway facility is located there. No environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, replace bridge and approaches. Therefore, we conclude that minority and low-income populations in these block groups would not bear a disproportionate share of any adverse impacts.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located entirely within the right-of-way of the impact footprint. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## TX 8 – Spur 479, Mill and Overlay

Project limits: *from US 287/IH 44 to Broad Street*

Description: *rehabilitation of existing roadway – mill and overlay*

Cost: *\$140,525*

MPO ID: *TBD*

Public Comments Received: *None*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 010200-1, 011000-1 and 011000-2 underlie the Spur 479, Mill and Overlay impact footprint and have minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are greater than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are not present under the impact footprint, only retail, commercial and institutional buildings. No environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, rehabilitation of the existing roadway – mill and overlay. Therefore, we conclude that minority and low-income populations in these block groups would not bear a disproportionate share of any adverse impacts.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## **TX 9 – Interstate Highway 44, Concrete Pavement Repair**

Project limits: *from Business 277A Exit Ramp to 5<sup>th</sup> Street*

Description: *rehabilitation of existing roadway – concrete pavement repair*

Cost: *\$281,050*

MPO ID: *WFS PM-10*

Public Comments Received: *None*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 010200-1, 011000-1 and 011000-2 underlie the Interstate Highway 44, Concrete Pavement Repair impact footprint and have minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are greater than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint. There would be a larger proportion of minority and low-income people receiving the adverse effects of this project than in the COC. Thus, there could be disproportionate impacts to the minority and low-income populations in these block groups. Environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, rehabilitation of the existing roadway – concrete pavement repair.*

*Although an adverse impact to minority and low-income populations in these block groups has been identified, this is a standard preventive maintenance project designed to upgrade and enhance an existing roadway. Once complete, the project would benefit all populations within these block groups. Detours around the work area may create an inconvenience for motorists and persons living in the area, but the impact would be temporary at worst. Therefore, we conclude that minority and low-income populations in these block groups would not bear a disproportionate share of the adverse impacts.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located entirely within the right-of-way of the impact footprint. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## TX 10 – US 287, Concrete Pavement Repair

Project limits: *from 8<sup>th</sup> Street to 6<sup>th</sup> Street*

Description: *rehabilitation of existing roadway – concrete pavement repair*

Cost: *\$281,050*

MPO ID: *WFS PM-11*

Public Comments Received: *None*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Group 010200-1 underlies the US 287, Concrete Pavement Repair impact footprint and has minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are greater than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are not present under the impact footprint, only retail, commercial and institutional buildings. No environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, rehabilitation of existing roadway – concrete pavement repair. Therefore, we conclude that minority and low-income populations in these block groups would not bear a disproportionate share of any adverse impacts.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located entirely within the right-of-way of the impact footprint. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## TX 11 – Loop 11, New Non-Freeway Facility

Project limits: *from Interstate Highway 44 to US 287 Frontage Road*

Description: *new location, non-freeway facility*

Cost: *\$1,400,000*

MPO ID: *WFS CAT 11-1*

Public Comments Received:

- *Create a connector from Loop 11 to Wal-Mart*
- *It should coordinate with the City's Thoroughfare Plan*
- *Will the overpass on IH-44 be widened?*
- *Going toward Kell East, the loop back on 287 and IH-44, north toward SAFB is a very dangerous crossover (NOTE: this comment was taken directly from the tape recording at the meeting and is included here because the speaker was referring back and forth between Loop 11 and US 287 . We can only assume this person was referring to eastbound traffic on US 287 as it comes into the traffic exchange containing the circular loop exit going north on IH-44 towards Oklahoma)*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Group 013100-4 and 013200-4 underlie the Loop 11, New Non-Freeway Facility impact footprint and have minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are greater than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are not present under the impact footprint, only retail and commercial businesses. No environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, new location, building a non-freeway facility. Therefore, we conclude that minority and low-income populations in these block groups would not bear a disproportionate share of any adverse impacts.*

*Public comment shows support for the project and indicates that further roadway infrastructure development, in this area, may be needed and desirable. Safety issues and cohesiveness with the City's Thoroughfare Plan also appear to be a concern with citizens.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is far away from any residential areas; therefore, noise and air emissions should not have any effect on residents, only on the workers; however, these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## TX 12 – Business 287J, Miscellaneous Work

Project limits: *from Loop 11 to 0.3 miles west of Interstate Highway 44*

Description: *miscellaneous work – widen drainage structures*

Cost: *\$31,900*

MPO ID: *WFS SF-7*

Public Comments Received: *None*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Group 013000-1, 013000-2 and 013000-3 underlie the Business 287J, Miscellaneous Work impact footprint and have minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are greater than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Census Block Group 012900-1 also underlies the impact footprint but has minority and low-income populations that are below the COC thresholds. Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint. There would be a larger proportion of minority and low-income people receiving the adverse effects of this project than in the COC. Thus, there could be disproportionate impacts to the minority and low-income populations in these block groups. Environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, miscellaneous work – widen drainage structures.*

*Although an adverse impact to minority and low-income populations in these block groups has been identified, this is a standard preventive maintenance project designed to upgrade and enhance an existing roadway. Once complete, the project would benefit all populations within these block groups. Detours around the work area may create an inconvenience for motorists and persons living in the area, but the impact would be temporary at worst. Therefore, we conclude that minority and low-income populations in these block groups would not bear a disproportionate share of the adverse impacts.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

### **6.3 Environmental Justice Project Nominations**

In order to solicit public comment on area transportation issues, project nomination forms were handed out at the June 2005 Environmental Justice Transportation Projects public meetings. MPO staff has taken this raw data and processed it into a useable GIS format for use in analyzing adverse impacts to minority and low-income populations. All projects should be considered to be in the conceptual stage for this study. None of these projects have MPO I.D. numbers or allocated funding at this time.

#### **EJ 0 – Taft Blvd. Conversion**

Project limits: *from Hampstead to Kell Freeway*

Description: *widen to 4 lanes with a center turn lane*

Cost: *To Be Determined*

MPO ID: *To Be Determined*

Public Comments Received:

- *Convert to 4 lane street with center turn lane*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 011900-1, 012000-1 and 012000-2 underlie the Taft Blvd. Conversion impact footprint and have minority populations that are less than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are less than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint. However, because minority and low-income populations are below the COC thresholds no environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, converting this section of Taft Blvd. into a 4 lane street with a center turn lane.*

*Members of these block groups may need to be consulted in the early planning stages, and appropriate mitigation measures identified, in order to avoid any adverse effects to the non-minority and non-low-income populations living there. Establishing a community oversight committee to monitor progress and identify potential community concerns may also be needed.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## **EJ 1 – Kell Access Road**

Project limits: *from Fairway West to the Railroad Track*

Description: *provide BelAir Addition access from Kell Access Road*

Cost: *To Be Determined*

MPO ID: *To Be Determined*

Public Comments Received:

- *Provide access to the BelAir Addition from the Kell Access Road*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 012400-1 and 012400-2 underlie the Kell Access Road impact footprint and have minority populations that are less than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are less than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are not present under the impact footprint. No environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action; provide the BelAir Addition access from the Kell Access Road.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## **EJ 2 – Kell and Fairway Exit Ramp**

Project limits: *at the Fairway Exit Ramp on Kell Freeway West*

Description: *address known safety issues concerning this ramp*

Cost: *To Be Determined*

MPO ID: *To Be Determined*

Public Comments Received:

- *Ramp is too close to Fairway*
- *Alter to reduce possibility of accidents*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 012600-2 and 012600-3 underlie the Kell and Fairway Exit Ramp impact footprint and have minority populations that are less than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are less than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are not present under the impact footprint. No environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action; address known safety issues concerning this ramp.*

*Public comment indicates that further mitigation measures need to be investigated in order to reduce the possibility of accidents when exiting Kell West using this ramp.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

### **EJ 3 – IH 44 South Exit at Seymour Hwy/5<sup>th</sup> Street**

Project limits: *at Seymour Road and 5<sup>th</sup> Street*

Description: *realign the Interstate Highway 44 exit ramp with Seymour Hwy/5<sup>th</sup> Street*

Cost: *To Be Determined*

MPO ID: *To Be Determined*

Public Comments Received:

- Project nomination to realign the off ramp at I-44 south intersecting 5<sup>th</sup> Street/Seymour Hwy.
- Signage at this intersection should be examined

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 010200-1, 011000-1 and 011000-2 underlie the Seymour Road Exit at 5th Street impact footprint and have minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are greater than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint. There would be a larger proportion of minority and low-income people receiving the adverse effects of this project than in the COC. Thus, there could be disproportionate impacts to the minority and low-income populations in these block groups. Environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action; realign the Interstate Highway 44 exit ramp with Seymour Hwy/5<sup>th</sup> Street.*

*Public comments mirror actions already under consideration in Section 6.2 – TxDOT Roadway Projects as stated in project **TX 9 – Interstate Highway 44, Concrete Pavement Repair**. “Once complete, the project would benefit all populations within these block groups. Detours around the work area may create an inconvenience for motorists and persons living in the area, but the impact would be temporary at worst. Therefore, we conclude that minority and low-income populations in these block groups would not bear a disproportionate share of the adverse impacts.”*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## **EJ 4 – Bonny Homes Access**

Project limits: *Southbound on Henry S. Grace Freeway*

Description: *provide better access to the Bonny Homes addition from southbound Henry S. Grace Freeway*

Cost: *To Be Determined*

MPO ID: *To Be Determined*

Public Comments Received:

- *Limited access in and out of Bonny Homes area*
- *Proposed WF2 project (widening of Hatton Road) will make Bonny Homes Addition very hard to enter*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 011500-1 and 011500-2 underlie the Bonny Homes Access impact footprint and have minority populations that are less than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are less than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint. However, because minority and low-income populations are below the COC thresholds, no environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, providing better access to the Bonny Homes addition from southbound Henry S. Grace Freeway.*

*Public comment reveals support for the project. All members of these block groups should be consulted during the early planning stages in order to identify appropriate mitigation measures for potential adverse effects.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## EJ 5 – Jefferson Street

Project limits: *at Scott Street Bridge*

Description: *improve lighting and drainage at the Scott Street Bridge*

Cost: *To Be Determined*

MPO ID: *To Be Determined*

Public Comments Received:

- *Inadequate lighting and drainage at the Scott Street Bridge*
- *Area is unsafe for pedestrians and vehicles*
- *Rehabilitate area with lighting and landscaping*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 011100-1 and 011100-2 underlie the Jefferson Street impact footprint and have minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are greater than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are not present under the impact footprint, only commercial businesses. Therefore, we conclude that minority and low-income populations in these block groups would not bear a disproportionate share of the adverse impacts, but would, in fact, benefit directly from the project.*

*Public comment indicates a need for work to be done in this area to improve safety for pedestrians and vehicles by rehabilitating the area with lighting, landscaping and improved drainage. All members of these block groups should be consulted during the early planning stages in order to identify appropriate mitigation measures for potential adverse effects.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## EJ 6 – Bridge Street

Project limits: *bridge at north end of Bridge Street*

Description: *repair the bridge*

Cost: *To Be Determined*

MPO ID: *To Be Determined*

Public Comments Received:

- *Are there plans to repair the bridge?*
- *NOTE: this could possibly become a TxDOT enhancement project due to the age and historical nature of the bridge*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 011100-2 and 010400-2 underlie the Bridge Street impact footprint and have minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are greater than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are not present under the impact footprint, only commercial businesses. Therefore, we conclude that minority and low-income populations in these block groups would not bear a disproportionate share of the adverse impacts, but would, in fact, benefit directly from the project.*

*Public comment, especially from the bicycling community, has indicated a need for this bridge to be repaired and put back into service. It would provide another link across the Little Wichita River for bicyclists and pedestrians. All members of these block groups should be consulted during the early planning stages in order to identify appropriate mitigation measures for potential adverse effects.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## EJ 7 – Sunset Lane and Duty Lane

Project limits: on Sunset Lane and Duty Lane

Description: *streets and bar ditches need repair, no curb and gutter*

Cost: *To Be Determined*

MPO ID: *To Be Determined*

Public Comments Received:

- *Bar ditches in this area are hard to maintain*
- *Improvements to streets, in this area, never seem to happen*
- *Will there ever be curb and gutter work done on these two streets?*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 013100-2 and 013000-3 underlie the Sunset Lane and Duty Lane impact footprint and have minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), but low-income populations that are less than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint. There would be a larger proportion of minority people receiving the adverse effects of this project than in the COC. Thus, there could be disproportionate impacts to the minority populations in these block groups. Environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, repair streets and bar ditches, install curb and gutters on Sunset Lane and Duty Lane.*

*Public comment indicates support for almost any type of street improvement in this area. However, the cost for curb and gutter work may impose an adverse effect on minority populations in these block groups. Assistance may need to be provided to the affected community to ensure that it receives at least a fair (i.e., proportional) share of the anticipated benefits of the proposed project (e.g., community infrastructure improvements). Clearly defined financing should be identified before the outset of the project to ensure fair and equitable distribution of project costs along with monitoring of the project for effectiveness.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## EJ 8 – Airport Road

Project limits: *from City View to Loop 11*

Description: *road needs major repairs*

Cost: *To Be Determined*

MPO ID: *To Be Determined*

Public Comments Received:

- *Road is falling apart*
- *What is being done to fix the road between City View and IH-44?*
- *Not enough traffic counts are being done*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Group 013100-4 underlies the Airport Road impact footprint and has minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), but low-income populations that are less than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint. There would be a larger proportion of minority people receiving the adverse effects of this project than in the COC. Thus, there could be disproportionate impacts to the minority populations in these block groups. Environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, road needs major repairs.*

*Although an adverse impact to minority populations in these block groups has been identified, this would be a standard preventive maintenance project designed to upgrade and enhance an existing roadway. Once complete, the project would benefit all populations within these block groups. Detours around the work area may create an inconvenience for motorists and persons living in the area, but the impact would be temporary at worst. Therefore, we conclude that minority populations in these block groups would not bear a disproportionate share of the adverse impacts, they would in fact benefit from the project. Public comment confirms the need for this project along with more traffic analysis along this roadway.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## **EJ 9 – Old Iowa Park Road**

Project limits: *on Old Iowa Park road at Central Freeway north entrance and exit ramps*

Description: *dangerous intersection, inadequate signage at ramps*

Cost: *To Be Determined*

MPO ID: *To Be Determined*

Public Comments Received:

- *Inadequate signage for left turning lane onto Central Freeway service road. Drivers try to turn onto the off ramp creating a dangerous intersection*
- *NOTE: TxDOT addressed this problem in early July, 2005*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 011100-1, 011100-3 and 013000-1 underlie the Old Iowa Park Road impact footprint and have minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are greater than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Census Block Group 012900-1 also underlies the impact footprint but has minority and low-income populations that are below the COC thresholds. Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are not present under the impact footprint, only retail and commercial businesses. Therefore, we conclude that minority and low-income populations in these block groups would not bear a disproportionate share of the adverse impacts, but would in fact benefit directly from the project.*

*Public comment indicates there are safety issues that need to be rectified concerning the signage at the entrance and exit ramps of this intersection on Central Freeway north. No ground disturbance, noise or air emissions are anticipated with this project. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## **EJ 10 – FM 367 (Hotter N’ Hell Route)**

Project limits: *from Loop 11 to the western MPO boundary*

Description: *widening of existing road*

Cost: *To Be Determined*

MPO ID: *To Be Determined*

Public Comments Received:

- *Shoulders need to be widened because wide loads use these routes*
- *Supports area lake traffic to Lake Kickapoo and Lake Diversion*
- *No shoulders on this road*
- *This route is used to go to Electra, Lake Diversion and FM 368*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 012800-3, 012800-4 and 012900-1 underlie the FM 367 (Hotter N’ Hell Route) impact footprint and have minority populations that are less than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are less than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint. However, because minority and low-income populations are below the COC thresholds, no environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, widening of the existing road.*

*Public comment indicates strong support for this project. Non-minority and non-low-income members of these block groups should be consulted in the early planning stages of this project in order to identify any adverse effects that would require mitigation measures.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## **EJ 11 – Old Burkburnett Road (Hwy. 240)**

Project limits: *from Spur 327 to Missile Road*

Description: *widen existing road, reduce speed limit and add left turning lanes*

Cost: *To Be Determined*

MPO ID: *To Be Determined*

Public Comments Received:

- *Left turn lanes needed where Fairfax Ave. and Pucket Rd. intersect*
- *ROW is needed for Pucket Road extension*
- *There are numerous rear-end collisions at this intersection*
- *Speed limit of 45 is too dangerous and needs to be lowered*
- *Road is too narrow past Trigg Lane*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 013200-1, 013200-3, 013200-4, 013200-5 and 013400-1 underlie the Old Burkburnett Road (Hwy. 240) impact footprint and have minority populations that are greater than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are greater than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Census Block Group 013400-1 also underlies the impact footprint but has minority and low-income populations that are below the COC thresholds. Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are present under the impact footprint. There would be a larger proportion of minority and low-income people receiving the adverse effects of this project than in the COC. Thus, there could be disproportionate impacts to the minority and low-income populations in these block groups. Environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, widen the existing road, reduce the speed limit and add left turning lanes.*

*Public comment indicates support for this project due to safety issues along this road. Minority and low-income populations in these block groups should be consulted in the early planning stages of this project in order to identify any adverse effects that would require mitigation measures. Establishment of a community oversight committee to monitor progress and identify potential community concerns may be needed.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## **EJ 12 – Wenonah Street**

Project limits: *from US 82/277 to Callfield Reliever*

Description: *construction of new connecting street*

Cost: *To Be Determined*

MPO ID: *To Be Determined*

Public Comments Received:

- *Extend Wenonah Street from the US 82/277 eastbound frontage road south to connect with the proposed Callfield Reliever project (Maplewood/Kemp to Lawrence Road to McNiel Road)*
- *Include this extension in a future MPO roadway study*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*Census Block Groups 012600-3 and 012700-2 underlie the Wenonah Street impact footprint and have minority populations that are less than 25.2% of the COC (see Table 5-2), and low-income populations that are less than 13.2% of the COC (see Table 5-3). Review of aerial photographs confirmed that residential areas are not present under the impact footprint. However, because minority and low-income populations are below the COC thresholds no environmental impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed action, construction of a new connecting street.*

*Public comment indicates future economic development in this area will create a need for this project so that expansion can occur. The MPO has received a recommendation to include this proposed street in future transportation studies. This street has also been included in the City of Wichita Falls new Tax Increment Financing (TIF) District 2 for future construction considerations.*

*The project would result in ground disturbance located within the right-of-way of the impact footprint and possibly further out. The site of the new construction is near a residential area; therefore, noise and air emissions may have an effect on residents and workers, but these effects would be short-term and temporary. Standard construction practices would be implemented to minimize dust and hazardous substances would be handled using approved OSHA and MSDS procedures.*

## **EJ 13 – North to South Barrier**

Project limits: *Unknown*

Description: *build a north to south connector in the northwest/southwest part of the city*

Cost: *To Be Determined*

MPO ID: *To Be Determined*

Public Comments Received:

- *There is no north to south connector between the northwest part of the city and the southwest part of the city.*

Environmental Justice Impact:

*No analysis can be done at this time due to the fact there are no project limits. Therefore, no determination of environmental impact can be ascertained. This project is in the conceptual stage only and will need further research to find a suitable area for construction. Public comment does indicate support for this type of project.*

**APPENDIX A**

**DEMOGRAPHIC MAPS**

## APPENDIX B

### GLOSSARY/ACRONYMS

#### GLOSSARY

**Adverse Impact** – An impact that would have a deleterious effect on human health or the environment that is significant, unacceptable, or above generally accepted norms. Such effects may include ecological, cultural, human health, economic, or social impacts when interrelated with the natural or physical environment.

**Block Numbering Area (BNA)** – A census jurisdictional boundary used to subdivide a number of non-metropolitan counties in census tract-type number ranges.

**Census Tract** – Small, relatively permanent statistical subdivisions of a county that are delineated for all metropolitan areas and other densely populated counties.

**Community of Comparison (COC)** – The smallest political unit(s) that encompasses the impact areas of an environmental resource. The COC provides a more regional context for comparison of minority and low-income population percentages in individual affected census tracts to help determine whether impacts would be disproportionate.

**Disproportionately high minority and/or low-income area** – a census tract or block numbering area in which the percentage of minority and/or low-income population is greater than that of the community of comparison as a whole.

**Environmental Justice** – An identification of potential disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority and/or low-income populations that may result from proposed-federal undertakings (required by Executive Order 12898).

**Executive Order 12898** – Issued by the President on February 11, 1994, this Executive Order requires federal agencies to develop implementation strategies, identify minority and low-income populations that may be disproportionately impacted by proposed federal actions, and solicit the participation of minority and low-income populations.

**Impact Footprint** – The area of projected adverse impacts for a resource, based on environmental analysis of a proposed activity.

**Low-income Population** – Persons below the poverty level, designated as 19,350 for a family of four in 2005 by the US Department of Health and Human Services.

**Minority Population** – Persons designated as Black or African American; American Indian and Alaskan Native; Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander; and Hispanic or Latino in census data.

## **ACRONYMS**

COC	Community of Comparison
EJ	Environmental Justice
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
GIS	Geographic Information System
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
MSDS	Material Safety Data Sheets
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
OSHA	Occupational and Safety Health Administration
POP	Program of Projects
TIP	Transportation Improvement Program
TxDOT	Texas Department of Transportation
UPWP	Unified Planning Work Program

## REFERENCES

Department of the Air Force, Guide for Environmental Justice Analysis with the Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP), November 1997.

DOT Order to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, April 1997.

Environmental Justice: What You Should Know, FHWA, Washington Division Office, June 2003.

Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, February 1994.

Federal Register / Vol. 70, No. 33 / Friday, February 18, 2005 / Notices / Department of Health and Human Services, Annual Update of the HHS Poverty Guidelines.

FHWA Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, December 1998.

FHWA and FTA Memorandum Implementing Title VI Requirements in Metropolitan and Statewide Planning, October 1999.

Puget Sound Regional Council, 2005-2007 Regional Transportation Improvement Program, October 2003.

U.S. Census Bureau, American Fact Finder, Summary File (SF-2), September 2005.

Washington State Department of Transportation, Environmental Procedures Manual M31-11, September 2004.