

Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal Project

SOCIAL/CULTURAL EFFECTS EVALUATION (Community Inventory)

The evaluation of the social/cultural effects of the populations around each of the four intermodal terminals in southeastern Michigan will be evaluated through the following methodology. The results will be used to assess the effect of the proposed Detroit Intermodal Freight Terminal Project (DIFT) on the affected populations in terms of environmental, social and related impacts. A separate, stand-alone report will be prepared as an appendix to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), and its results will be included in the DEIS.

Step 1: Analyze Data

Beginning with the maps shown on Figures 1, 2 and 3, populations in the footprint for each existing intermodal terminal will be studied beginning with an examination of the year 2000 U.S. Census data. Secondary sources, such as leaders of religious and educational institutions, nonprofit organizations and social service agencies, will also be consulted in this effort. The areas shown in Figures 1 through 3 will be modified (expanded or contracted) as a result of the further work discussed below.

Based on the analysis of the data collected for all populations, those with a population equal to or greater than two percent of the populations in the Detroit Urbanized Area (Figure 4) will be the focus of continuing analysis.

Step 2: Inventory/Map Community/Cultural Facilities

Using the GIS database of Wayne County (for the Livernois-Junction Yard, CP/Expressway terminal, and CP/Oak terminal) and Oakland County (CN/Moterm terminal), various facilities that define the social/cultural, as well as the economic fabric of the areas will be mapped. These facilities include religious institutions, schools, parks, shopping centers, community/recreational

centers, libraries, hospitals, fire stations, police stations, groceries, laundromats, and banks. These will be field verified, to the extent possible.

Step 3: Review Preliminary Findings

The preliminary findings of Items 1 and 2 will be presented to MDOT, FHWA and the DIFT Steering Committee, Local Agency Group and Local Advisory Council. These groups represent the local governments/communities/private sector familiar with the terminal areas. Their involvement will be used to further point to specific groups and/or databases that will allow the key populations to be defined completely. Those additional groups will be consulted, to the extent possible. Likewise, public meetings on the DIFT will include a presentation of the information developed in this analysis to solicit additional input/comment.

Based upon the activities mentioned above, resources in the community that represent various organizations/individuals with an understanding of the cultural/historical significance of the area will be consulted, mostly one-on-one. The analysis of the history of each terminal area and its cultural resources (historic/archaeologic) being conducted by Commonwealth Cultural Resources Group will also be used in this effort.

Based on the above activities, the areas defined in Figures 1 through 3 will be appropriately modified to reflect the affected populations.

Step 4: Conduct Evaluation

The following impacts will be defined for those populations that are equal to or greater than two percent of the Detroit Urbanized Area population based upon their definition in Step 1 and mapping of community resources in Step 2:

Traffic effects – based upon the analysis of the street network around each terminal, and by using the SYNCHRO model, the traffic changes due to intermodal activity on the streets serving the key populations and defined in the mapping of Step 2 will be determined.

Availability of services – the ability to provide adequate transit, police/fire and other emergency services to the key populations/institutions will be determined by relating the degree to which traffic developments (volume of traffic, street closures, and the like) will affect the provision of these services.

Air quality analysis – based upon the traffic effects discussed above, the CAL3QHC model will be used to determine the impact of carbon monoxide (CO) hot spots on key streets serving the community facilities.

Noise/vibration analysis – the potential noise/vibration impact on the key populations and their cultural facilities of rail and road improvements will be determined.

Displacements – based upon the proposed improvements to each intermodal terminal, and connections to it by road and rail, a determination will be made of the degree to which people will be displaced from housing and/or business establishments. Assessment will also include the degree to which replacement housing is available in the cultural influence area of the population affected.

Disruption of community cohesion/economic viability – based upon the traffic and CO hot spot analyses, an assessment will include the degree to which key populations will have their pedestrian access to community facilities altered.

Disruption of manmade or natural resources – based upon the proposed improvements associated with modifications to a terminal, and external connectors to it (road and rail), a determination will be made of any significant manmade and/or natural resources that may be altered. This includes parks and park-like facilities, wetlands, monuments/shrines, etc.

Visual features impact – based on the proposed improvements associated with modifications to a terminal and external connectors to it (road and rail), an assessment of the change in the visual character of the area will be made. This includes the removal/addition of landscaping, clutter, blight, etc.

Water pollution – will assess the impact to the drainage and wastewater facilities resulting from proposed improvements to the terminals, the rail lines and the roads feeding them.

Secondary and Cumulative Effects – those effects that may be removed in time and distance from the terminal areas where the key populations reside, but otherwise are triggered by the project or other projects in the area, will be defined in all the above categories that are applicable. Past, present and reasonably foreseeable future community projects and their associated impacts will be identified.

Step 5: Define Mitigation

Based upon the impacts cited above, mitigation measures will be proposed, as appropriate. The nature of this mitigation, as it relates to maintaining the social/cultural fabric of the key populations, will be cited. Likewise, the cost of such mitigation actions will be determined.

L:\Projects\2846-A\WP\reports\Cultural Resources\Effects-AgnPkts.doc

Table 1
POPULATION AND TOTAL HOUSEHOLDS BY TERMINAL AREA (EXAMPLE)

Population Category	Detroit Urbanized Area		CP/Oak (Zips 223,227,228)		Livernois-Junction/ CP/Expressway (Zips 120, 126, 208, 209, 210, 216, 217)		CN/Moterm (Zips 030, 202, 220, 221)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Population	3,903,682	100.0%	164,450	100.0%	163,784	100.0%	141,286	100.0%
Black or African American Alone	1,009,953	25.6%	134,248	81.6%	43,211	26.4%	91,688	64.9%
American Indian & Alaskan Native Alone	13,636	0.3%	474	0.3%	1,291	0.8%	508	0.4%
Asian Alone	99,805	2.6%	899	0.6%	1,608	1.0%	1,277	0.9%
Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander	883	0.0%	5	0.0%	142	0.1%	61	0.0%
Hispanic/Latino	116,770	3.0%	3,026	1.8%	39,640	24.2%	1,339	0.9%
TOTAL	1,232,047	31.6%	138,052	84.3%	85,892	52.5%	94,868	67.1%
Total Households	1,498,537	100.0%	57,301	100.0%	54,963	100.0%	53,698	100.0%
Households w/Income < Poverty Level	156,397	10.4%	12,219	21.3%	15,195	27.6%	10,078	18.8%

Source: U.S. 2000 Census

Table 2
POPULATIONS BY TERMINAL AREA (EXAMPLE)

Population Category	Detroit Urbanized Area		CP/Oak (Zips 223,227,228)		Livernois-Junction/ CP/Expressway (Zips 120, 126, 208, 209, 210, 216, 217)		CN/Moterm (Zips 030, 202, 220, 221)	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Population	3,903,682	100.0%	164,450	100.0%	163,784	100.0%	141,286	100.0%
Arab ¹	91,230	2.3%	3,023	1.8%	29,977	18.3%	1,494	1.1%
English ¹	290,385	7.4%	1,589	1.0%	3,028	1.8%	4,902	3.5%
French (except Basque) ¹	155,626	4.0%	1,152	0.7%	1,719	1.0%	2,851	2.0%
German ¹	607,611	15.6%	3,493	2.1%	6,435	3.9%	8,995	6.4%
Irish ¹	390,824	10.0%	2,974	1.8%	5,824	3.6%	7,204	5.1%
Italian ¹	256,025	6.6%	1,472	0.9%	3,431	2.1%	2,324	1.6%
Polish ¹	424,362	10.9%	4,689	2.9%	8,047	4.9%	5,179	3.7%
Scottish ¹	85,154	2.2%	584	0.4%	794	0.5%	1,451	1.0%

Source: U.S. 2000 Census

¹Percent of those who reported ancestry in one or more categories. Not all persons reported ancestry.

