

Appendix G.1

Defining Low-Income Populations

1.0 Introduction

Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, requires federal agencies to assess the potential for their actions to have disproportionately high and adverse environmental and health impacts on minority and low-income populations. This memorandum provides background documentation for how low-income populations were defined for the purposes of environmental justice analysis in the EIS/EIR for the Berth 97-109 project at the Port of Los Angeles. Although common practice among many federal agencies is to use national poverty thresholds from the U.S. Census Bureau, costs of living are sufficiently higher in southern California compared to the nation as a whole that a higher low-income threshold may be justified. Using a higher low-income threshold would result in a larger number of households being counted as low-income for the purposes of analysis under Executive Order 12898 and related environmental justice guidance.

2.0 Guidance

Environmental justice guidance issued by various federal agencies refers to several different methodologies and definitions for identifying low-income persons or households. Guidance from the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) applies to all federal agencies, and the Army Corps of Engineers also uses EPA guidance. EPA guidance is also relevant because EPA is the federal agency responsible for reviewing the environmental justice analysis for legal sufficiency.

CEQ *Environmental Justice Guidance Under NEPA* (CEQ, 1997) suggests that Census poverty thresholds should be used to identify low-income populations. Census poverty thresholds have the advantage of being defined differently for different household sizes and numbers of dependents. For example, the threshold for a two-parent family with one child is different for the threshold for a single parent with five children. However, the Census poverty thresholds do not include geographic variations (e.g., for differences in the cost of living).

USEPA guidance for identifying low-income populations recommends that analysts consider regional definitions for poverty or low-income status. For example, EPA's *Final Guidance for Incorporating Environmental Justice Concerns in EPA's NEPA Compliance Analyses* (USEPA, 1998) notes that "In conjunction with census data, the EPA NEPA analyst should also consider state and regional low-income and poverty definitions as appropriate" (USEPA 1998, Section 2.1.2). EPA's *Final Guidance for Consideration of Environmental Justice in Clean Air Act 309 Reviews* (USEPA, 1999) contains almost identical language, noting that "In addition to using U.S. Census defined parameters for measuring income and poverty, it is also important to consider state and regional low-income and poverty definitions where appropriate" (USEPA, 1999; Section 3.0 Issue Number 2). (Both USEPA guidance documents also advise using additional local resources, such as public outreach and other outreach efforts that involve community members in defining their communities.)

3.0 Review of Alternative Definitions

SAIC surveyed available literature as well as several national, state, and county agencies to explore the use of regional thresholds or guidelines to classify low-income people or households. This section provides information about the different approaches identified in this review.

Poverty or low-income status as defined by the national agencies surveyed generally is not regionalized, with the exception of Alaska and Hawaii. In other words, these agencies typically have one national standard. These national agency definitions are included, however, because they often serve as the basis for regionalized guidelines.

At the national level, there is a distinction between poverty thresholds and poverty guidelines. Poverty thresholds are the original version of the federal poverty measures as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau. The poverty threshold figures vary by household size and number of dependents, whereas the poverty guidelines vary by household size only. The poverty guidelines are a simplification of the poverty thresholds used by some agencies for administrative purposes, such as determining eligibility for federal and other programs.

The different approaches surveyed include:

- U.S. Census Bureau Poverty Thresholds
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Poverty Guidelines
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development AMI Limits
- U.S. Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Income Eligibility Guidelines
- U.S. Social Security Administration Medicare Part D Income Eligibility Guidelines
- U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services Poverty Guidelines
- California Department of Aging Title V Eligibility Criteria
- California Health and Safety Code Low and Moderate Income Definitions
- Los Angeles Department of Public Social Services Income Eligibility Guidelines
- Metropolitan Transportation Commission Equity Analysis and EJ Report
- RAND Corporation and UCLA School of Public Health poverty research publication
- Public Policy Institute of California poverty research publication

These approaches are described in more detail in the paragraphs that follow. The specific numerical guidelines, where applicable, are summarized in Table 1 at the conclusion of this section.

3.1 Census Bureau Poverty Thresholds (2006)

The U.S. Census Bureau develops a set of money income thresholds to determine who is in poverty, forming a detailed 48-cell matrix that varies by family size and composition.

The thresholds do not vary geographically, but are updated annually for inflation using the Consumer Price Index for Urban Consumers (CPI-U). Poverty thresholds were originally developed in 1963-1964 by the Social Security Administration based the portion of a family budget spent on food and U.S. Department of Agriculture economy food plans. The Census poverty thresholds are used primarily for statistical purposes and not necessarily intended as a complete description of what people and families need to live nor as eligibility criteria for public aid programs.

3.2 HHS Poverty Guidelines (2007)

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Poverty Guidelines are issued each year in the Federal Register for use in determination of program eligibility. The HHS guidelines represent the basis for many other state and regional guidelines, therefore are referenced in the following descriptions as simply the “federal poverty guidelines.” Programs using these guidelines include Head Start, the Food Stamp Program, the National School Lunch Program, the Low-Income Home Energy Assistant Program, and the Children’s Health Insurance Program. The HHS Poverty Guidelines are based on simplifications of the U.S. Census Bureau’s detailed matrix of poverty thresholds and are updated annually using Consumer Price Index data. The guidelines vary by family size, with one set of figures for the 48 contiguous states, one set for Alaska, and one set for Hawaii.

3.3 HUD AMI Limits (HUD, 2007a)

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development develops income limits for its programs based on Median Family Income (MFI) reported from the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey, updated annually. HUD income limits are percentages of MFI, or Area Median Income (AMI), calculated in accordance with the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, as amended. There are three distinct income limits: AMI30 (Extremely Low Income, 30 percent MFI), AMI50 (Very Low Income, 50 percent MFI), and AMI80 (Low Income, 80 percent MFI). The very low-income designation (based on 50 percent of MFI) is considered to have the strongest statutory basis as, according to HUD, it has the best-defined income limits, has been subject to minimal legislative adjustments following calculation methodology review, and is tied by legislation to a number of other income limit calculations.

3.4 USDA Income Eligibility Guidelines (2007)

The U.S. Department of Agriculture establishes annual income guidelines to be used in determining eligibility for free and reduced meals and free milk programs by schools, institutions, and other relevant facilities. The USDA guidelines are based on percentages of the federal poverty guidelines as reported by HHS. Income eligibility for reduced priced meals is 185 percent of the federal guideline and eligibility for free meals is 130 percent of the federal guideline.

3.5 SSA Medicare Part D

The U.S. Social Security Administration determines the eligibility of individuals seeking Medicare Part D coverage based on income limits up to 150 percent of the federal

poverty guideline. As eligibility for Medicare is on an individual basis, the guidelines are not reported by family size and are not included in Table 1 below.

3.6 USCIS (2006)

The U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service establishes minimum income requirements for individuals filing an Affidavit of Support under the Immigration and Nationality Act. Individuals petitioning for sponsorship of their foreign national spouse or child complete the affidavit. The USCIS poverty guidelines are 125 percent of the federal poverty guidelines.

3.7 California Department of Aging (2007)

California Department of Aging administers several programs that determine eligibility based on income limits. The Senior and Community Service Employment Program (Title V) uses 125 percent (135 percent for LA County and several other counties) of the federal poverty guidelines for eligibility and reporting purposes. The Health Insurance Counseling and Advocacy Program (HICAP) determines Specified Low-Income Medicare Beneficiaries (SLMB) to be those with income up to 150 percent of the federal poverty guidelines. SLMB status is relevant in determining eligibility for certain national and state Medicare benefit programs.

3.8 California Health and Safety Code

California Health and Safety Code Section 50093 establishes that “persons and families of low or moderate income” are defined as persons and families whose income does not exceed 120 percent of area median income, adjusted for family size in accordance with HUD standards. The state may permit agencies to use higher income limitations in designated geographic areas of the state upon determination that the 120 percent limitation is too low based on area rental and home purchase prices. The code does not specify figures by family size therefore the guidelines are not included in Table 1 below.

3.9 Los Angeles County DPSS (2007)

The Los Angeles County Department of Public Social Services bases eligibility for certain county programs on a broad range of income guidelines depending on the particular program. All program eligibility guidelines however are based various percentages of the federal poverty guidelines. Eligibility criteria for various county programs range from 100 percent to 250 percent of the federal poverty guideline.

3.10 San Francisco Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Commission (2001)

The San Francisco Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Commission *2001 Regional Transportation Plan Equity Analysis and Environmental Justice Report* identifies low-income households as those with incomes up to 200 percent of federal poverty guidelines, due to the relatively high cost of living in the Bay Area. Citing the MTC report, the *Draft EIR for the Chevron USA Long Wharf Marine Oil Terminal* (February 2006) also uses 200 percent of the federal guidelines for the purposes of identifying low-income populations.

3.11 RAND Corporation and UCLA (2003)

In their report *Concentrated Poverty vs. Concentrated Affluence*, researchers from RAND Corporation and UCLA analyzed the relationship between concentrations of families in poverty and their neighborhood social environments and children's outcomes, particularly in terms of school performance. It is important to note that the focus of this paper is not on defining what threshold should be used to determine low-income status, but rather on determining how low-income status correlates with outcomes for children growing up. In a separate analysis contained in the report, low income families were identified as those with annual family income less than or equal to \$24,000 and high income families were identified as those with annual income equal to or greater than \$75,000. The report does not explain in detail the reason for using these thresholds, nor does it identify poverty thresholds or guidelines for different family sizes.

3.12 Public Policy Institute of California (2006)

The report *Poverty in California: Moving Beyond the Federal Measure* (Reed, 2006) describes and implements the method recommended in a 1995 National Academy of Sciences (NAS) study for adjusting poverty thresholds to incorporate regional housing costs. The primary objective of the study was to measure poverty levels in California incorporating the higher cost of living in California relative to the rest of the nation. As a byproduct, the study involved calculating both numerical income thresholds in California and a ratio of California poverty thresholds to national thresholds.

The approach used in this study is based on a method suggested by a NAS panel and documented in Citro and Michael (1995). The NAS report listed a series of recommendations, including the inclusion of an adjustment for geographic differences in the poverty threshold. As a first and partial step to account for cost-of-living differences across geographic areas, the NAS panel recommended that the housing component of poverty thresholds be adjusted for geographic differences in the cost of living (Short, 2001; Citro and Michael, 1995). The basic approach is to adjust the U.S. Census Poverty Threshold (federal poverty threshold) using the ratio of regional housing costs to national housing costs. This ratio is, in turn, constructed from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Fair Market Rent (FMR) dataset (HUD, 2007b).¹

FMRs determine the eligibility of rental housing units for the Section 8 Housing Assistance Payments program. FMRs are gross rent estimates – included is the shelter rent plus the cost of all utilities, except telephones. FMRs are estimated annually for 354 metropolitan areas and 2,350 nonmetropolitan county FMR areas. The current definition used is the 40th percentile rent (i.e., the dollar amount below which 40 percent of the standard-quality rental housing units are rented). The 40th percentile rent is based on the distribution of rents of all units occupied by recent movers (renter households who moved to their present residence within the past 15 months). (This means that it more

¹ U.S. Census Poverty Thresholds are available online at: <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/threshld.html>. HUD FMRs are available online at: <http://www.huduser.org/datasets/fmr.html>.

likely represents rents close to or at current market values, since rent controls only apply for people who stay in their unit continuously.) HUD estimates FMRs for different size units based on number of bedrooms (1 to 4 bedrooms, or efficiency units). HUD develops this statistic by drawing from three sources of data: U.S. Census, the HUD American Housing Survey (AHS), and random digit dialing telephone surveys (HUD, 1995).

The method used requires calculating the ratio of the local FMR within a specified geographic area to the national average FMR for a given unit size category (number of bedrooms). HUD does not develop the national average FMR. Reed (2006) calculated the national average FMR as a population-weighted average using population estimates from the U.S. Census (Reed, 2007).²

Having computed the national average FMR, Reed (2006) used the ratio of the regional FMR to the national FMR to calculate regionally specific poverty thresholds based on federal poverty thresholds. Since this ratio (regional FMR to national FMR) reflects only the regional difference in the cost of housing, Reed (2006) applies the ratio to the estimated proportion of income low-income families spend on housing.

The NAS panel estimated this proportion to be 0.44; that figure is based on the proportion of consumer expenditures devoted to housing for two-adult/two-child families spending at the 35th percentile of the distribution on food, housing, and clothing (from the BLS Consumer Expenditure Survey). Nonhousing costs, such as for food, clothing, and health care, also differ geographically. However, the data to adjust nonhousing costs for geographic variation generally do not exist, and the NAS panel recommends adjusting the housing component only given the current state of research.³

² To calculate the national average FMR, Reed (2006) used data from the U.S. Census Current Population Survey (CPS). Reed linked FMR data to CPS data by metropolitan area and by state for non-metropolitan area. She then computed the national average FMR using this construct dataset. This method should produce approximately the same result as using the complete FMR dataset available from HUD and linking to the population of each county, which is easier to implement primarily because it does not require using the CPS.

³ Citro and Michael (1995) state that “No adjustment has been made for spatial differences in prices, not because the adjustment is necessarily undesirable in principle, but because of the practical difficulties of adequately measuring those differences. There are no geographic area cost-of-living indexes that correspond to the Consumer Price Index: Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) produces price indexes for a limited number of metropolitan areas, but not for rural areas. Moreover, the BLS indexes are designed to allow comparison of differences in price inflation across areas; they do not permit comparison of price levels across areas. . . . At this stage of knowledge, we recommend that the adjustment be made for the housing component of the poverty thresholds. Research indicates that housing (including utilities) is the item for which prices vary most across the country, and considerable effort has been devoted to estimating interarea housing cost indexes.”

Thus, the ratio of the regional poverty threshold to the national threshold would be

$$(0.44) \times (\text{Regional FMR/National Average FMR}) + (0.56).$$

This ratio could be applied to any of the national poverty thresholds, which differ by number of people and number of adults in the household. (However, when calculating a specific numeric threshold, the analysis should take into account the relationship between number of bedrooms and household size.)

3.13 Summary

Based on the assessment of the above programs, low income definitions for administrative purposes (such as program eligibility) are generally a percentage increase over the federal poverty guidelines. These adjustments appear to reflect both broad national considerations and more regionalized economic situations (higher area cost of living). The percentage adjustment to the federal poverty guidelines is generally between 120 percent and 135 percent.

Table 1 provides a summary of low-income guidelines recommended or used by the various agencies and studies included in this paper. The first row in the table displays the U.S. Census Poverty Thresholds, which are the basis for determining the U.S. Health and Human Services 2007 Poverty Guidelines shown in the second row. The HHS Poverty Guidelines are generally the basis for the other guidelines displayed in the table, most of which are 125 percent to 135 percent of the HHS guidelines.

**Table 1
Comparison of Low-Income Guidelines (2007 except as noted)**

Organization	Number of Persons in Household							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
US Census (2006)	\$10,295	\$13,166	\$16,079	\$20,615	\$24,375	\$27,544	\$31,225	\$34,694
US HHS ¹	\$10,210	\$13,690	\$17,170	\$20,650	\$24,130	\$27,610	\$31,090	\$34,570
US HUD AMI30	\$15,550	\$17,750	\$20,000	\$22,200	\$24,000	\$25,750	\$27,550	\$29,300
US HUD AMI50	\$25,900	\$29,600	\$33,300	\$37,000	\$39,950	\$42,900	\$45,900	\$48,850
US HUD AMI80	\$41,450	\$47,350	\$53,300	\$59,200	\$63,950	\$68,650	\$73,400	\$78,150
USDA Free Meal	\$13,273	\$17,797	\$22,321	\$26,845	\$31,369	\$35,893	\$40,417	\$44,941
USDA Reduced Meal	\$18,889	\$25,327	\$31,765	\$38,203	\$44,641	\$51,079	\$57,517	\$63,955
USCIS	NA	\$17,120	\$21,470	\$25,820	\$30,170	\$34,520	\$38,870	\$43,220
CA Title V	\$12,763	\$17,113	\$21,463	\$25,813	\$30,163	\$34,513	\$38,863	\$43,213
CA Title V (L.A.)	\$13,785	\$18,485	\$23,180	\$27,880	\$32,580	\$37,275	\$41,975	\$46,670
CA HICAP	\$15,315	\$20,535	\$25,755	\$30,975	\$36,195	\$41,415	\$46,635	\$51,855
LA DPSS 100%	\$10,210	\$13,690	\$17,170	\$20,650	\$24,130	\$27,610	\$31,090	\$34,570
LA DPSS 250%	\$25,525	\$34,225	\$42,925	\$51,625	\$60,325	\$69,025	\$77,725	\$86,425

1. U.S. Health and Human Services Federal Poverty Guidelines

4.0 Method Used

From an analytical perspective, it is best to use a ratio based directly on Census poverty thresholds. The most comprehensive source of income data at a fine geographic level is the U.S. Decennial Census. For block groups (which generally contain 600 to 3,000 people), the Census provides number of households in \$5,000 income categories (but not cross-tabulated by other characteristics such as household size), and the number of people with a given ratio of income to the Census poverty threshold for their household size and number of dependents (for income-to-poverty ratios of 0-0.5, 0.5-0.75, 0.75-1, 1-1.25, 1.25-1.5, 1.5-1.75, 1.75-1.85, 1.85-2, and over 2). Thus, for instance, the Census can be used to derive the number of people whose income was less than 1.5 times the Census poverty threshold for their particular situation (household size and number of dependents). The advantage of the income-to-poverty ratio data is that they use the full richness of the Census dataset on individual income and household characteristics; that is, individual people and households are evaluated with respect to their individual situations.

Because the papers from the Public Policy Institute of California (Reed, 2006) and the National Academy of Sciences (Citro and Michael, 1995) have the best developed approach to identifying regional low-income thresholds, SAIC developed poverty thresholds following the method described in these papers. Thus, SAIC calculated the ratio of the FMR for Los Angeles County to the national average FMR. To calculate the national average FMR, SAIC used a population-weighted average, using population data from the FMR dataset constructed by HUD and representing population estimates from the 2000 U.S. Census within a specified FMR area. For comparison purposes, SAIC computed the ratio of the Los Angeles County FMR to the national average FMR for all years between 1999 and 2007. The computed index values are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2
Ratio of Los Angeles County FMR to National FMR**

Year	Efficiency	1-bdrm	2-bdrm	3-bdrm	4-bdrm
1999	1.17	1.19	1.22	1.24	1.28
2000	1.17	1.18	1.21	1.23	1.28
2001	1.13	1.14	1.17	1.19	1.23
2002	1.13	1.14	1.17	1.19	1.23
2003	1.26	1.27	1.30	1.32	1.37
2004	1.30	1.31	1.34	1.36	1.41
2005	1.31	1.40	1.46	1.49	1.58
2006	1.36	1.45	1.52	1.56	1.64
2007	1.39	1.49	1.55	1.59	1.68

SAIC then developed ratios indicating the relationship between the regional poverty threshold (for Los Angeles County) to the national poverty thresholds using the method described above in Section 3.12 (i.e., $0.56 + 0.44 \times \text{Regional FMR/National FMR}$). Table 3 presents the resulting ratios.

Table 3
Ratio of Los Angeles County Poverty Threshold to National Poverty Threshold

Year	Efficiency	1-bdrm	2-bdrm	3-bdrm	4-bdrm
1999	1.08	1.08	1.10	1.10	1.12
2000	1.07	1.08	1.09	1.10	1.12
2001	1.06	1.06	1.08	1.08	1.10
2002	1.06	1.06	1.08	1.08	1.10
2003	1.11	1.12	1.13	1.14	1.16
2004	1.13	1.14	1.15	1.16	1.18
2005	1.14	1.17	1.20	1.22	1.25
2006	1.16	1.20	1.23	1.25	1.28
2007	1.17	1.21	1.24	1.26	1.30

The year-over-year increases in the ratio of the implied Los Angeles County poverty threshold to the national threshold suggest that in recent years, the degree to which the regional cost of living exceeds the national average has increased. However, the ratios are all between 1.06 and 1.30, and most are under 1.25. This suggests that using Census data on the number of people with income-to-poverty-threshold ratio of either less than 1, or less than 1.25, would be an appropriate regional definition for low-income populations.

To be conservative (i.e., include more people in the low-income category), SAIC used 1.25 times the Census poverty threshold to measure low-income populations for this analysis. The use of this higher threshold is also consistent with the concepts used by various federal and state agencies, as described in Section 3, which involve using 1.25 to 1.35 times the HHS poverty guidelines.

5.0 References

California Department of Aging. 2007. *Area Agencies on Aging (AAA) Business Poverty Guidelines for Older Americans Act and Older Californians Act Programs*. March 2007. Online at <http://dcss.co.la.ca.us/AAA/titlevtxt.htm> and http://www.aging.ca.gov/aaa_business/poverty_guidelines/poverty_guidelines.html. Accessed May 2007.

California Health and Safety Code. 2007. *Section 50093: Persons and Families of Low or Moderate Income*. Online at <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/calaw.html>. Accessed May 2007.

Citro, C.F., and R.T. Michael. 1995. *Measuring Poverty: A New Approach*. National Academy of Sciences. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). 1997. *Council on Environmental Quality Environmental Justice Guidance Under the National Environmental Policy Act*. December 10.

Los Angeles Department of Public Social Services. 2007. *2007 Medi-Cal Income Level Charts*. April 2007. Online at http://dpss.co.la.ca.us/dpss/health_care/pdf/2007_FPL_Chart.pdf. Accessed May 2007.

Metropolitan Transportation Commission. 2001. *Equity Analysis and Environmental Justice Report*. September 2001. Online at http://www.mtc.ca.gov/library/2001_rtp/downloads/EJ/EquityReport.pdf. Accessed May 2007.

RAND Corporation. 2003. *Concentrated Poverty vs. Concentrated Affluence: Effects on Neighborhood Social Environments and Children's Outcomes*. May 2003. Online at <http://www.rand.org/pubs/drafts/2006/DRU2400.10.pdf>. Accessed May 2007.

Reed, Deborah. 2006. *Poverty in California, Moving Beyond the Federal Measure. California Counts: Population Trends and Profiles*. Public Policy Institute of California. May. Online at http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/cacounts/CC_506DRCC.pdf. Accessed May 2007.

Reed, Deborah. 2007. E-mail Correspondence. April 18.

Short, Kathleen. 2001. *Where We Live: Geographic Differences in Poverty Thresholds*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. Online at <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/povmeas/papers/sgpaper.pdf>. Accessed May 2007.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2007. *Preliminary Estimates of Weighted Average Poverty Thresholds for 2006*. January 2007. Online at <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/threshld/06prelim.html>. Accessed May 2007.

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services 2007. *2007 Poverty Guidelines*. April 2007. Online at <http://www.uscis.gov/files/form/I-864P.pdf>. Accessed May 2007.

U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2007. "Child Nutrition Programs—Income Eligibility Guidelines." Federal Register. Volume 72 No. 38. February 2007. Online at <http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/Governance/notices/iegs/IEGs07-08.pdf>. Accessed May 2007.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 2007. *The 2007 HHS Poverty Guidelines: One Version of the Federal Poverty Measure*. January 2007. Online at <http://aspe.hhs.gov/poverty/07poverty.shtml>. Accessed May 2007.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). 1995. *Fair Market Rents for the Section 8 Housing Assistance Payments Program*. October.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). 2007a. *FY2007 HUD Income Limits Briefing Material*. Office of Policy Development and Research. April 2007. Online at <http://www.huduser.org/datasets/il/il07/IncomeLimitsBriefingMaterial.pdf>. Accessed May 2007.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). 2007b. *Fair Market Rents*. Online at <http://www.huduser.org/datasets/fmr.html>. Accessed May 2007.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1998. *Final Guidance for Incorporating Environmental Justice Concerns in EPA's NEPA Compliance Analyses*. April.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1999. *Final Guidance for Consideration of Environmental Justice in Clean Air Act 309 Reviews*. July 1999.

U.S. Social Security Administration. 2006. *Medicare Modernization Act (MMA) FY07*. February 2006. Online at [http://www.ssa.gov/foia/piadocuments/FY07/Medicare%20Modernization%20Act%20\(MMA\)%20FY07.htm](http://www.ssa.gov/foia/piadocuments/FY07/Medicare%20Modernization%20Act%20(MMA)%20FY07.htm). Accessed May 2007.

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix G.2
Minority and Low income Population in Block Group near Port of Los Angeles

Area	Total population	Percent Minority Population	Population for whom poverty status is determined	Ratio of income in 1999 to poverty level; less than or equal to 1.24	Percent of Population Below Poverty
Long Beach City	461,522	66.87	453,065	134,986	29.79
Los Angeles City	3,694,820	70.25	3,622,606	1,053,683	29.09
Los Angeles County	9,519,338	68.91	9,349,771	2,235,042	23.90
Census Tract 2933.01	2,977	66.27	2,969	257	8.66
Block Group 1	2,977	66.27	2,969	257	8.66
Census Tract 2933.02	4,302	65.34	4,269	652	15.27
Block Group 1	1,866	52.14	1,683	94	5.59
Block Group 2	2,436	75.45	2,586	558	21.58
Census Tract 2933.04	4,207	81.46	4,199	1,228	29.25
Block Group 1	2,467	80.58	2,301	621	26.99
Block Group 2	1,740	82.70	1,898	607	31.98
Census Tract 2933.05	4,660	64.42	4,641	952	20.51

Environmental Justice – Berth 97-109 Terminal Project

Block Group 1	1,040	80.96	1,146	410	35.78
Block Group 2	2,230	74.44	2,005	455	22.69
Block Group 3	1,390	35.97	1,490	87	5.84
Census Tract 2941.10	4,060	90.91	4,078	792	19.42
Block Group 1	1,759	89.60	1,681	497	29.57
Block Group 2	1,389	91.58	1,357	195	14.37
Block Group 3	912	92.43	1,040	100	9.62
Census Tract 2941.20	2,529	98.42	2,498	588	23.54
Block Group 1	637	99.22	653	89	13.63
Block Group 2	1,204	99.00	1,156	403	34.86
Block Group 3	688	96.66	689	96	13.93
Census Tract 2942	4,425	88.11	4,396	1,070	24.34
Block Group 1	1,088	84.56	1,102	237	21.51
Block Group 2	1,905	87.98	1,859	514	27.65
Block Group 3	1,432	90.99	1,435	319	22.23
Census Tract 2943	7,059	88.94	7,017	2,287	32.59
Block Group 1	1,330	88.95	1,406	550	39.12
Block Group 2	1,456	84.62	1,328	247	18.60

Block Group 3	2,043	90.55	1,969	515	26.16
Block Group 4	2,230	90.27	2,314	975	42.13
Census Tract 2944.10	3,854	84.02	3,836	1,315	34.28
Block Group 1	796	95.48	828	394	47.58
Block Group 2	3,058	81.03	3,008	921	30.62
Census Tract 2944.20	3,270	88.23	3,528	1,341	38.01
Block Group 1	1,138	96.13	1,191	293	24.60
Block Group 2	1,017	97.15	1,229	698	56.79
Block Group 3	1,115	72.02	1,108	350	31.59
Census Tract 2945.10	4,266	95.64	4,236	1,562	36.87
Block Group 1	1,650	94.30	1,567	396	25.27
Block Group 2	2,616	96.48	2,669	1,166	43.69
Census Tract 2945.20	3,609	93.77	3,580	1,259	35.17
Block Group 1	1,519	92.69	1,434	498	34.73
Block Group 2	2,090	94.55	2,146	761	35.46
Census Tract 2946.10	3,875	93.24	3,866	1,069	27.65
Block Group 1	1,208	92.72	1,353	180	13.30
Block Group 2	2,667	93.48	2,513	889	35.38

Environmental Justice – Berth 97-109 Terminal Project

Census Tract 2946.20	3,931	97.91	3,901	1,364	34.97
Block Group 1	1,600	98.19	1,550	558	36.00
Block Group 2	1,581	98.10	1,642	567	34.53
Block Group 3	750	96.93	709	239	33.71
Census Tract 2947	3,270	93.15	3,242	1,716	52.93
Block Group 1	12	58.33	-	-	Unknown
Block Group 2	19	84.21	-	-	Unknown
Block Group 3	95	52.63	117	15	12.82
Block Group 4	1,894	92.03	1,978	1,112	56.22
Block Group 5	523	99.62	470	284	60.43
Block Group 6	727	97.52	677	305	45.05
Census Tract 2948.10	4,039	97.72	3,997	1,715	42.91
Block Group 1	1,936	96.80	1,779	449	25.24
Block Group 2	2,103	98.57	2,218	1,266	57.08
Census Tract 2948.20	3,555	96.71	3,561	1,834	51.50
Block Group 1	2,084	96.07	2,197	1,178	53.62
Block Group 2	1,471	97.62	1,364	656	48.09
Census Tract 2948.30	3,274	96.09	3,205	1,542	48.11

Environmental Justice – Berth 97-109 Terminal Project

Block Group 1	2,097	98.04	2,134	1,014	47.52
Block Group 2	1,177	92.61	1,071	528	49.30
Census Tract 2949	3,262	95.65	3,262	1,642	50.34
Block Group 1	1,316	92.78	1,310	277	21.15
Block Group 2	1,946	97.58	1,952	1,365	69.93
Block Group 3	-	Unknown	-	-	Unknown
Census Tract 2951.01	5,188	34.14	5,146	438	8.51
Block Group 1	370	50.00	340	-	0.00
Block Group 2	4,455	27.77	4,390	211	4.81
Block Group 3	363	96.14	416	227	54.57
Census Tract 2961	1,434	67.99	155	48	30.97
Block Group 1	184	20.65	155	48	30.97
Block Group 2	1,241	75.42	-	-	Unknown
Block Group 9	9	11.11	-	-	Unknown
Census Tract 2962.10	2,858	92.30	2,904	1,247	42.94
Block Group 1	1,361	94.71	1,473	638	43.31
Block Group 2	374	75.40	370	113	30.54
Block Group 3	1,123	95.01	1,061	496	46.75

Environmental Justice – Berth 97-109 Terminal Project

Census Tract 2962.20	3,605	91.21	3,559	2,231	62.69
Block Group 1	989	98.18	925	508	54.92
Block Group 2	2,117	91.92	1,985	1,252	63.07
Block Group 3	499	74.35	649	471	72.57
Census Tract 2963	4,348	52.21	4,316	571	13.23
Block Group 1	1,424	67.77	1,383	312	22.56
Block Group 2	2,924	44.63	2,933	259	8.83
Census Tract 2964	6,294	42.79	6,181	553	8.95
Block Group 1	428	60.98	441	86	19.50
Block Group 2	1,139	56.80	1,060	105	9.91
Block Group 3	1,251	51.40	1,253	68	5.43
Block Group 4	1,146	34.21	1,185	152	12.83
Block Group 5	2,330	32.19	2,242	142	6.33
Census Tract 2965	3,796	85.46	3,774	993	26.31
Block Group 1	1,316	88.91	1,395	464	33.26
Block Group 2	1,621	84.70	1,614	377	23.36
Block Group 3	859	81.61	765	152	19.87
Census Tract 2966	5,200	79.29	5,161	1,898	36.78

Environmental Justice – Berth 97-109 Terminal Project

Block Group 1	1,406	91.04	1,311	618	47.14
Block Group 2	1,274	75.75	1,304	590	45.25
Block Group 3	1,028	72.96	913	279	30.56
Block Group 4	1,492	75.60	1,633	411	25.17
Census Tract 2969	8,250	65.10	8,216	2,352	28.63
Block Group 1	1,360	72.35	1,335	442	33.11
Block Group 2	2,183	79.75	2,116	824	38.94
Block Group 3	1,935	67.75	2,053	637	31.03
Block Group 4	889	48.48	846	121	14.30
Block Group 5	1,883	48.01	1,866	328	17.58
Census Tract 2970	5,482	32.29	5,208	574	11.02
Block Group 1	1,026	21.15	1,075	35	3.26
Block Group 2	666	25.53	720	112	15.56
Block Group 3	1,240	40.56	1,164	138	11.86
Block Group 4	1,671	38.84	1,319	221	16.76
Block Group 5	879	26.28	930	68	7.31
Census Tract 2971.10	4,547	79.44	4,117	1,981	48.12
Block Group 1	2,109	73.02	1,831	934	51.01

Environmental Justice – Berth 97-109 Terminal Project

Block Group 2	2,438	84.99	2,286	1,047	45.80
Census Tract 2971.20	3,358	77.64	3,501	1,388	39.65
Block Group 1	44	15.91	45	11	24.44
Block Group 2	1,714	83.31	1,856	745	40.14
Block Group 3	1,600	73.25	1,600	632	39.50
Census Tract 2972	8,011	51.70	7,875	1,428	18.13
Block Group 1	2,162	66.74	2,105	634	30.12
Block Group 2	1,424	54.63	1,376	234	17.01
Block Group 3	1,602	45.88	1,610	217	13.48
Block Group 4	1,422	42.97	1,471	225	15.30
Block Group 5	1,401	41.04	1,313	118	8.99
Census Tract 2973	2,886	30.53	3,032	225	7.42
Block Group 1	743	23.42	720	36	5.00
Block Group 2	1,229	35.64	1,247	67	5.37
Block Group 3	914	29.43	1,065	122	11.46
Census Tract 2974	3,615	15.91	3,527	66	1.87
Block Group 1	1,028	16.34	928	8	0.86
Block Group 2	387	19.90	390	-	0.00

Block Group 3	2,200	15.00	2,209	58	2.63
Census Tract 2975	3,324	29.51	3,243	280	8.63
Block Group 1	1,553	38.70	1,572	232	14.76
Block Group 2	676	20.71	587	26	4.43
Block Group 3	1,095	21.92	1,084	22	2.03
Census Tract 2976	6,572	40.02	6,422	854	13.30
Block Group 1	774	32.56	768	86	11.20
Block Group 2	893	33.03	914	142	15.54
Block Group 3	1,328	34.11	1,412	115	8.14
Block Group 4	1,249	39.55	1,208	149	12.33
Block Group 5	883	47.45	912	275	30.15
Block Group 9	1,445	49.62	1,208	87	7.20
Census Tract 5436.02	4,141	70.47	4,047	410	10.13
Block Group 2	4,141	70.47	4,047	410	10.13
Census Tract 5436.03	4,116	62.39	4,106	368	8.96
Block Group 1	4,116	62.39	4,106	368	8.96
Census Tract 5436.04	5,162	86.38	5,135	362	7.05
Block Group 1	3,120	86.41	3,031	182	6.00

Environmental Justice – Berth 97-109 Terminal Project

Block Group 2	2,040	86.32	2,104	180	8.56
Block Group 3	2	100.00	-	-	Unknown
Census Tract 5437.02	6,354	85.19	6,324	890	14.07
Block Group 1	812	81.40	863	51	5.91
Block Group 2	2,256	92.82	2,195	304	13.85
Block Group 3	906	81.13	945	177	18.73
Block Group 4	1,319	81.96	1,279	78	6.10
Block Group 5	1,061	79.36	1,042	280	26.87
Census Tract 5437.03	3,617	84.30	3,584	398	11.10
Block Group 1	3,617	84.30	3,584	398	11.10
Census Tract 5439.04	4,426	96.00	4,362	1,139	26.11
Block Group 1	1,617	93.32	1,665	324	19.46
Block Group 2	2,806	97.54	2,697	815	30.22
Block Group 3	-	Unknown	-	-	Unknown
Block Group 4	3	100.00	-	-	Unknown
Census Tract 5727	1,820	93.79	1,679	359	21.38
Block Group 4	1,820	93.79	1,679	359	21.38
Census Tract 5728	263	87.83	292	210	71.92

Environmental Justice – Berth 97-109 Terminal Project

Block Group 1	262	87.79	292	210	71.92
Block Group 2	-	Unknown	-	-	Unknown
Block Group 3	1	100.00	-	-	Unknown
Census Tract 5729	3,310	97.31	3,273	1,382	42.22
Block Group 2	2,106	98.10	2,022	1,117	55.24
Block Group 3	1,204	95.93	1,251	265	21.18
Census Tract 5755	252	78.17	208	111	53.37
Block Group 1	49	97.96	40	25	62.50
Block Group 2	2	0.00	-	-	Unknown
Block Group 3	16	81.25	-	-	Unknown
Block Group 4	180	73.33	168	86	51.19
Block Group 5	5	80.00	-	-	Unknown
Census Tract 5756	46	84.78	2	-	0.00
Block Group 1	11	45.45	-	-	Unknown
Block Group 2	2	50.00	2	-	0.00
Block Group 3	33	100.00	-	-	Unknown
Block Group 9	-	Unknown	-	-	Unknown
Census Tract 6099	1,678	65.85	1,624	328	20.20

Environmental Justice – Berth 97-109 Terminal Project

Block Group 1	1,023	70.58	1,019	208	20.41
Block Group 2	655	58.47	605	120	19.83
Census Tract 6510.01	975	40.21	978	48	4.91
Block Group 4	975	40.21	978	48	4.91
Census Tract 6514	1,150	28.70	1,198	62	5.18
Block Group 1	1,150	28.70	1,198	62	5.18
Census Tract 6700.01	3,244	42.88	3,131	354	11.31
Block Group 1	1,646	43.38	1,595	188	11.79
Block Group 2	1,598	42.37	1,536	166	10.81
Census Tract 6700.02	3,773	50.01	3,750	542	14.45
Block Group 1	1,260	53.73	1,273	150	11.78
Block Group 2	2,513	48.15	2,477	392	15.83
Census Tract 6700.03	6,037	42.47	6,037	710	11.76
Block Group 1	786	45.04	854	163	19.09
Block Group 2	1,526	40.89	1,504	77	5.12
Block Group 3	1,366	39.46	1,376	68	4.94
Block Group 4	2,359	44.38	2,303	402	17.46
Census Tract 6701	6,484	47.96	6,474	1,271	19.63

Block Group 1	689	40.64	695	127	18.27
Block Group 2	2,003	44.38	1,987	469	23.60
Block Group 3	3,792	51.19	3,792	675	17.80
Census Tract 6702.01	3,889	25.74	3,889	90	2.31
Block Group 1	3,889	25.74	3,889	90	2.31
Census Tract 6705	1,871	23.46	1,869	24	1.28
Block Group 1	1,871	23.46	1,869	24	1.28
Census Tract 6706	4,576	27.97	4,607	131	2.84
Block Group 1	2,896	27.94	2,910	14	0.48
Block Group 3	1,680	28.04	1,697	117	6.89
Census Tract 6707.01	6,777	32.95	6,748	345	5.11
Block Group 1	2,631	40.25	2,612	297	11.37
Block Group 2	1,879	25.33	1,909	6	0.31
Block Group 3	1,224	33.74	1,205	4	0.33
Block Group 4	1,043	27.33	1,022	38	3.72
Census Tract 6707.02	5,357	21.77	5,355	120	2.24
Block Group 1	1,363	23.18	1,404	26	1.85
Block Group 2	1,163	23.39	1,084	20	1.85

Environmental Justice – Berth 97-109 Terminal Project

Block Group 3	382	16.23	399	21	5.26
Block Group 4	2,185	21.19	2,150	53	2.47
Block Group 5	264	20.08	318	-	0.00

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2000, Summary File 1 and Summary File 2; Compiled by ICF Jones and Stokes, July 2008