

---

**APPENDIX T**  
**Environmental Justice**



## **APPENDIX T1**

---

### **Defining Low-Income Populations**





# 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 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIS/SEIR) for the Pacific L.A. Marine Terminal Crude Oil Terminal 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 United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) guidance. USEPA guidance is also relevant because USEPA 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

1 with five children. However, the Census poverty thresholds do not include  
2 geographic variations (e.g., for differences in the cost of living).

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

## 17 **3.0 Review of Alternative Definitions**

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

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

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

33 The different approaches surveyed include:

- 34 • U.S. Census Bureau Poverty Thresholds
- 35 • U.S. Department of Health & Human Services Poverty Guidelines
- 36 • U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development Area Median Income  
37 (AMI) Limits
- 38 • U.S. Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Income Eligibility  
39 Guidelines

- U.S. Social Security Administration Medicare Part D Income Eligibility Guidelines
- U.S. Citizenship & 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 Environmental Justice 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.

**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 <sup>1</sup>	\$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								

**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

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

### 8 **3.2 HHS Poverty Guidelines (2007)**

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

### 20 **3.3 HUD AMI Limits (HUD, 2007a)**

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

### 32 **3.4 USDA Income Eligibility Guidelines (2007)**

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



1     **3.5                   SSA Medicare Part D**

2                   The U.S. Social Security Administration determines the eligibility of individuals  
3                   seeking Medicare Part D coverage based on income limits up to 150 percent of the  
4                   federal poverty guideline. As eligibility for Medicare is on an individual basis, the  
5                   guidelines are not reported by family size and are not included in Table 1 below.

6     **3.6                   USCIS (2006)**

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

12    **3.7                   California Department of Aging (2007)**

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

21    **3.8                   California Health & Safety Code**

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

30    **3.9                   Los Angeles County DPSS (2007)**

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

1     **3.10                   San Francisco Bay Area Metropolitan Transportation Commission**  
2     **(2001)**

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

10    **3.11                   RAND Corporation and UCLA (2003)**

11            In their report *Concentrated Poverty vs. Concentrated Affluence*, researchers from  
12            RAND Corporation and the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) analyzed  
13            the relationship between concentrations of families in poverty and their neighborhood  
14            social environments and children’s outcomes, particularly in terms of school  
15            performance. It is important to note that the focus of this paper is not on defining  
16            what threshold should be used to determine low-income status, but rather on  
17            determining how low-income status correlates with outcomes for children growing  
18            up. In a separate analysis contained in the report, low income families were  
19            identified as those with annual family income less than or equal to \$24,000 and high  
20            income families were identified as those with annual income equal to or greater than  
21            \$75,000. The report does not explain in detail the reason for using these thresholds,  
22            nor does it identify poverty thresholds or guidelines for different family sizes.

23    **3.12                   Public Policy Institute of California (2006)**

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

32            The approach used in this study is based on a method suggested by a NAS panel and  
33            documented in Citro and Michael (1995). The NAS report listed a series of  
34            recommendations, including the inclusion of an adjustment for geographic  
35            differences in the poverty threshold. As a first and partial step to account for cost-of-  
36            living differences across geographic areas, the NAS panel recommended that the  
37            housing component of poverty thresholds be adjusted for geographic differences in  
38            the cost of living (Short, 2001; Citro and Michael, 1995). The basic approach is to  
39            adjust the U.S. Census Poverty Threshold (federal poverty threshold) using the ratio  
40            of regional housing costs to national housing costs. This ratio is, in turn, constructed

1 from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Fair Market  
2 Rent (FMR) dataset (HUD, 2007b).<sup>1</sup>

3 FMRs determine the eligibility of rental housing units for the Section 8 Housing  
4 Assistance Payments program. FMRs are gross rent estimates – included is the  
5 shelter rent plus the cost of all utilities, except telephones. FMRs are estimated  
6 annually for 354 metropolitan areas and 2,350 nonmetropolitan county FMR areas.  
7 The current definition used is the 40th percentile rent (i.e., the dollar amount below  
8 which 40 percent of the standard-quality rental housing units are rented). The 40th  
9 percentile rent is based on the distribution of rents of all units occupied by recent  
10 movers (renter households who moved to their present residence within the past 15  
11 months). (This means that it more likely represents rents close to or at current market  
12 values, since rent controls only apply for people who stay in their unit continuously.)  
13 HUD estimates FMRs for different size units based on number of bedrooms (1 to 4  
14 bedrooms, or efficiency units). HUD develops this statistic by drawing from three  
15 sources of data: U.S. Census, the HUD American Housing Survey (AHS), and  
16 random digit dialing telephone surveys (HUD, 1995).

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

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

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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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>.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> 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

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

2 
$$(0.44) \times (\text{Regional FMR/National Average FMR}) + (0.56).$$

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

### 7 **3.13 Summary**

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

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

## 21 **4.0 Method Used**

22 From an analytical perspective, it is best to use a ratio based directly on Census  
23 poverty thresholds. The most comprehensive source of income data at a fine  
24 geographic level is the U.S. Decennial Census. For block groups (which generally  
25 contain 600 to 3,000 people), the Census provides number of households in \$5,000  
26 income categories (but not cross-tabulated by other characteristics such as household  
27 size), and the number of people with a given ratio of income to the Census poverty  
28 threshold for their household size and number of dependents (for income-to-poverty  
29 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  
30 over 2). Thus, for instance, the Census can be used to derive the number of people  
31 whose income was less than 1.5 times the Census poverty threshold for their  
32 particular situation (household size and number of dependents). The advantage of the  
33 income-to-poverty ratio data is that they use the full richness of the Census dataset on  
34 individual income and household characteristics; that is, individual people and  
35 households are evaluated with respect to their individual situations.

---

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."

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

12 SAIC then developed ratios indicating the relationship between the regional poverty  
 13 threshold (for Los Angeles County) to the national poverty thresholds using the  
 14 method described above in Section 0 (i.e.,  $0.56 + 0.44 \times \text{Regional FMR/National FMR}$ ).  
 15 Table 3 presents the resulting ratios.

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

<i>Year</i>	<i>Efficiency</i>	<i>1-bdrm</i>	<i>2-bdrm</i>	<i>3-bdrm</i>	<i>4-bdrm</i>
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

17 **Table 3. Ratio of Los Angeles County Poverty Threshold to National Poverty Threshold**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Efficiency</b>	<b>1-bdrm</b>	<b>2-bdrm</b>	<b>3-bdrm</b>	<b>4-bdrm</b>
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

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

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

## 6 5.0 References

7 California Department of Aging. 2007. Area Agencies on Aging (AAA) Business  
8 Poverty Guidelines for Older Americans Act and Older Californians Act Programs.  
9 March 2007. Online at <http://dcss.co.la.ca.us/AAA/titlevtxt.htm> and  
10 [http://www.aging.ca.gov/aaa\\_business/poverty\\_guidelines/poverty\\_guidelines.html](http://www.aging.ca.gov/aaa_business/poverty_guidelines/poverty_guidelines.html),  
11 accessed May 2007.

12 California Health & Safety Code. 2007. Section 50093: Persons and Families of Low  
13 or Moderate Income. Online at <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/calaw.html>, accessed May  
14 2007.

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

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

20 Los Angeles Department of Public Social Services. 2007. 2007 Medi-Cal Income  
21 Level Charts. April 2007. Online at  
22 [http://dpss.co.la.ca.us/dpss/health\\_care/pdf/2007\\_FPL\\_Chart.pdf](http://dpss.co.la.ca.us/dpss/health_care/pdf/2007_FPL_Chart.pdf), accessed May  
23 2007.

24 Metropolitan Transportation Commission. 2001. Equity Analysis and Environmental  
25 Justice Report. September 2001. Online at  
26 [http://www.mtc.ca.gov/library/2001\\_rtp/downloads/EJ/EquityReport.pdf](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/library/2001_rtp/downloads/EJ/EquityReport.pdf), accessed  
27 May 2007.

28 RAND Corporation. 2003. Concentrated Poverty vs. Concentrated Affluence:  
29 Effects on Neighborhood Social Environments and Children's Outcomes. May 2003.  
30 Online at <http://www.rand.org/pubs/drafts/2006/DRU2400.10.pdf>, accessed May  
31 2007.

32 Reed, Deborah. 2006. Poverty in California, Moving Beyond the Federal Measure.  
33 California Counts: Population Trends and Profiles. Public Policy Institute of  
34 California. May. Online at  
35 [http://www.pplic.org/content/pubs/cacounts/CC\\_506DRCC.pdf](http://www.pplic.org/content/pubs/cacounts/CC_506DRCC.pdf), accessed May 2007.

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

37 Short, Kathleen. 2001. Where We Live: Geographic Differences in Poverty  
38 Thresholds. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau. Online at

1                    <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/povmeas/papers/sgepaper.pdf>, accessed May  
2                    2007.

3                    U.S. Census Bureau. 2007. Preliminary Estimates of Weighted Average Poverty  
4                    Thresholds for 2006. January 2007. Online at  
5                    <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/poverty/threshld/06prelim.html>, accessed May  
6                    2007.

7                    U.S. Citizenship & Immigration Services 2007. 2007 Poverty Guidelines. April  
8                    2007. Online at <http://www.uscis.gov/files/form/I-864P.pdf>, accessed May 2007.

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

13                    U.S. Department of Health & Human Services. 2007. The 2007 HHS Poverty  
14                    Guidelines: One Version of the Federal Poverty Measure. January 2007. Online at  
15                    <http://aspe.hhs.gov/poverty/07poverty.shtml>, accessed May 2007.

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

18                    U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD). 2007a. FY2007 HUD  
19                    Income Limits Briefing Material. Office of Policy Development & Research. April  
20                    2007. Online at  
21                    <http://www.huduser.org/datasets/il/il07/IncomeLimitsBriefingMaterial.pdf>, accessed  
22                    May 2007.

23                    U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development (HUD). 2007b. Fair Market  
24                    Rents. Online at <http://www.huduser.org/datasets/fmr.html>, accessed May 2007.

25                    U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1998. Final Guidance for  
26                    Incorporating Environmental Justice Concerns in EPA’s NEPA Compliance  
27                    Analyses. April.

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

30                    U.S. Social Security Administration. 2006. Medicare Modernization Act (MMA)  
31                    FY07. February 2006. Online at  
32                    [http://www.ssa.gov/foia/piadocuments/FY07/Medicare%20Modernization%20Act%  
33                    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 T2**

---

### **Environmental Justice Data Tables**



**Table T2-1. Minority and Low-Income Characteristics in the Vicinity of the Proposed Project Site (by Block Group)**

<i>Census Tract</i>	<i>Census Block Group</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Percent Minority</i>	<i>Percent Low-Income</i>
2933.01	1	2,977	66.3	8.7
2933.02	1	1,866	52.1	5.6
2933.02	2	2,436	75.5	21.6
2933.04	1	2,467	80.6	27.0
2933.04	2	1,740	82.7	32.0
2933.05	1	1,040	81.0	35.8
2933.05	2	2,230	74.4	22.7
2933.05	3	1,390	36.0	5.8
2941.10	1	1,759	89.6	29.6
2941.10	2	1,389	91.6	14.4
2941.10	3	912	92.4	9.6
2941.20	1	637	99.2	13.6
2941.20	2	1,204	99.0	34.9
2941.20	3	688	96.7	13.9
2942	1	1,088	84.6	21.5
2942	2	1,905	88.0	27.6
2942	3	1,432	91.0	22.2
2943	1	1,330	88.9	39.1
2943	2	1,456	84.6	18.6
2943	3	2,043	90.6	26.2
2943	4	2,230	90.3	42.1
2944.10	1	796	95.5	47.6
2944.10	2	3,058	81.0	30.6
2944.20	1	1,138	96.1	24.6
2944.20	2	1,017	97.1	56.8
2944.20	3	1,115	72.0	31.6
2945.10	1	1,650	94.3	25.3
2945.10	2	2,616	96.5	43.7
2945.20	1	1,519	92.7	34.7
2945.20	2	2,090	94.5	35.5
2946.10	1	1,208	92.7	13.3
2946.10	2	2,667	93.5	35.4
2946.20	1	1,600	98.2	36.0
2946.20	2	1,581	98.1	34.5
2946.20	3	750	96.9	33.7
2947	1	12	58.3	N/A
2947	2	19	84.2	N/A
2947	3	95	52.6	12.8
2947	4	1,894	92.0	56.2
2947	5	523	99.6	60.4
2947	6	727	97.5	45.1

**Table T2-1. Minority and Low-Income Characteristics in the Vicinity of the Proposed Project Site (by Block Group)**

<i>Census Tract</i>	<i>Census Block Group</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Percent Minority</i>	<i>Percent Low-Income</i>
2948.10	1	1,936	96.8	25.2
2948.10	2	2,103	98.6	57.1
2948.20	1	2,084	96.1	53.6
2948.20	2	1,471	97.6	48.1
2948.30	1	2,097	98.0	47.5
2948.30	2	1,177	92.6	49.3
2949	1	1,316	92.8	21.1
2949	2	1,946	97.6	69.9
2949	3	0	N/A	N/A
2951.01	1	370	50.0	0.0
2951.01	2	4,455	27.8	4.8
2951.01	3	363	96.1	54.6
2961	1	184	20.7	31.0
2961	2	1,241	75.4	N/A
2961	9	9	11.1	N/A
2962.10	1	1,361	94.7	43.3
2962.10	2	374	75.4	30.5
2962.10	3	1,123	95.0	46.7
2962.20	1	989	98.2	54.9
2962.20	2	2,117	91.9	63.1
2962.20	3	499	74.3	72.6
2963	1	1,424	67.8	22.6
2963	2	2,924	44.6	8.8
2964	1	428	61.0	19.5
2964	2	1,139	56.8	9.9
2964	3	1,251	51.4	5.4
2964	4	1,146	34.2	12.8
2964	5	2,330	32.2	6.3
2965	1	1,316	88.9	33.3
2965	2	1,621	84.7	23.4
2965	3	859	81.6	19.9
2966	1	1,406	91.0	47.1
2966	2	1,274	75.7	45.2
2966	3	1,028	73.0	30.6
2966	4	1,492	75.6	25.2
2969	1	1,360	72.4	33.1
2969	2	2,183	79.8	38.9
2969	3	1,935	67.8	31.0
2969	4	889	48.5	14.3
2969	5	1,883	48.0	17.6
2970	1	1,026	21.2	3.3

**Table T2-1. Minority and Low-Income Characteristics in the Vicinity of the Proposed Project Site (by Block Group)**

<i>Census Tract</i>	<i>Census Block Group</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Percent Minority</i>	<i>Percent Low-Income</i>
2970	2	666	25.5	15.6
2970	3	1,240	40.6	11.9
2970	4	1,671	38.8	16.8
2970	5	879	26.3	7.3
2971.10	1	2,109	73.0	51.0
2971.10	2	2,438	85.0	45.8
2971.20	1	44	15.9	24.4
2971.20	2	1,714	83.3	40.1
2971.20	3	1,600	73.3	39.5
2972	1	2,162	66.7	30.1
2972	2	1,424	54.6	17.0
2972	3	1,602	45.9	13.5
2972	4	1,422	43.0	15.3
2972	5	1,401	41.0	9.0
2973	1	743	23.4	5.0
2973	2	1,229	35.6	5.4
2973	3	914	29.4	11.5
2974	1	1,028	16.3	0.9
2974	2	387	19.9	0.0
2974	3	2,200	15.0	2.6
2975	1	1,553	38.7	14.8
2975	2	676	20.7	4.4
2975	3	1,095	21.9	2.0
2976	1	774	32.6	11.2
2976	2	893	33.0	15.5
2976	3	1,328	34.1	8.1
2976	4	1,249	39.6	12.3
2976	5	883	47.5	30.2
2976	9	1,445	49.6	7.2
5436.02	2	4,141	70.5	10.1
5436.03	1	4,116	62.4	9.0
5436.04	1	3,120	86.4	6.0
5436.04	2	2,040	86.3	8.6
5436.04	3	2	100.0	N/A
5437.02	2	2,256	92.8	13.8
5437.02	3	906	81.1	18.7
5437.02	4	1,319	82.0	6.1
5437.03	1	3,617	84.3	11.1
5439.04	1	1,617	93.3	19.5
5439.04	2	2,806	97.5	30.2
5439.04	3	0	N/A	N/A

**Table T2-1. Minority and Low-Income Characteristics in the Vicinity of the Proposed Project Site (by Block Group)**

<i>Census Tract</i>	<i>Census Block Group</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Percent Minority</i>	<i>Percent Low-Income</i>
5439.04	4	3	100.0	N/A
5722.01	2	1,141	84.0	19.1
5722.01	3	1,958	81.7	3.0
5722.02	1	753	85.5	14.7
5722.02	2	677	76.7	16.1
5722.02	3	831	74.4	4.1
5722.02	4	1,452	80.0	13.6
5723.01	2	1,732	92.9	31.3
5723.02	1	864	95.4	16.6
5723.02	2	791	94.3	21.8
5723.02	3	1,847	92.1	35.1
5725	1	3,700	78.5	49.7
5726	1	1,382	94.1	17.5
5726	2	1,644	95.6	10.5
5726	3	1,423	93.8	18.9
5726	4	681	93.2	13.2
5727	1	1,125	95.6	12.1
5727	2	1,095	95.5	25.1
5727	3	1,455	97.0	20.8
5727	4	1,820	93.8	21.4
5728	1	262	87.8	71.9
5728	2	0	N/A	N/A
5728	3	1	100.0	N/A
5729	1	1,803	96.9	37.1
5729	2	2,106	98.1	55.2
5729	3	1,204	95.9	21.2
5730.01	1	1,770	93.0	55.0
5730.01	2	2,142	91.2	53.9
5730.01	3	1,846	85.5	28.5
5730.01	4	1,350	82.1	42.3
5730.02	1	1,917	95.8	63.3
5730.02	2	2,263	97.1	67.7
5731	1	1,788	92.1	32.9
5731	2	3,335	88.7	39.8
5731	3	1,417	81.2	28.8
5731	4	751	83.6	19.8
5732.01	1	2,316	95.1	46.3
5732.01	2	2,740	94.5	48.1
5732.02	1	1,568	98.0	56.6
5732.02	2	2,059	96.0	35.5
5732.02	3	2,070	97.1	52.9

**Table T2-1. Minority and Low-Income Characteristics in the Vicinity of the Proposed Project Site (by Block Group)**

<i>Census Tract</i>	<i>Census Block Group</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Percent Minority</i>	<i>Percent Low-Income</i>
5733	1	3,069	97.5	51.5
5733	2	1,186	97.0	42.3
5734.01	1	1,407	65.4	16.5
5734.02	1	1,706	82.4	42.0
5734.02	2	1,041	70.0	26.9
5734.02	3	3,445	63.9	15.1
5734.02	4	24	50.0	0.0
5734.03	1	1,715	42.3	12.4
5735	1	0	N/A	N/A
5735	2	1	0.0	N/A
5735	3	0	N/A	N/A
5742.02	2	1,309	30.7	6.3
5750.01	2	1,771	53.1	14.5
5751.01	1	2,890	94.3	64.4
5751.01	2	2,306	84.9	29.5
5751.02	1	2,606	95.5	70.4
5751.02	2	2,204	91.7	44.6
5751.03	1	3,485	82.4	49.1
5751.03	2	1,995	75.7	40.5
5752.01	1	1,348	96.6	60.4
5752.01	2	1,519	97.4	55.5
5752.01	3	2,218	95.7	52.3
5752.02	1	2,225	96.8	52.3
5752.02	2	1,873	99.2	68.5
5752.02	3	1,249	95.7	66.7
5753	1	1,140	99.3	58.3
5753	2	1,752	94.8	56.0
5753	3	2,089	94.9	44.1
5754.01	1	782	86.1	54.6
5754.01	2	616	99.2	68.4
5754.01	3	1,362	93.9	57.3
5754.01	4	2,716	98.0	67.9
5754.02	1	2,957	98.1	67.0
5754.02	2	801	93.3	72.1
5755	1	49	98.0	62.5
5755	2	2	0.0	N/A
5755	3	16	81.3	N/A
5755	4	180	73.3	51.2
5755	5	5	80.0	N/A
5756	1	11	45.5	N/A
5756	2	2	50.0	0.0

**Table T2-1. Minority and Low-Income Characteristics in the Vicinity of the Proposed Project Site (by Block Group)**

<i>Census Tract</i>	<i>Census Block Group</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Percent Minority</i>	<i>Percent Low-Income</i>
5756	3	33	100.0	N/A
5756	9	0	N/A	N/A
5758.01	1	1,704	92.4	45.6
5758.01	2	1,017	95.5	65.5
5758.02	1	2,807	95.0	59.1
5758.02	2	2,626	87.6	62.9
5758.03	1	1,868	82.0	63.2
5758.03	2	1,100	74.5	56.8
5759.01	1	1,235	82.3	54.9
5759.01	2	1,196	85.8	45.4
5759.01	3	739	87.4	31.3
5759.01	4	655	87.2	37.4
5759.02	1	1,757	59.0	38.3
5759.02	2	1,444	65.7	48.6
5759.02	3	1,907	82.3	50.9
5760	1	440	60.5	33.2
5760	2	2	0.0	N/A
5760	3	3	100.0	N/A
5761	1	826	48.5	46.9
5761	2	1,096	26.7	7.7
5761	3	747	44.7	31.5
5762	1	1,553	86.7	42.4
5762	2	1,290	73.8	44.7
5762	3	1,283	68.3	35.5
5762	4	1,502	79.0	36.3
5762	5	11	100.0	N/A
5762	6	13	100.0	N/A
5763	1	1,955	96.5	63.4
5763	2	1,471	93.0	51.8
5763	3	1,148	86.8	61.2
5763	4	1,140	85.3	39.9
5763	5	990	79.9	43.0
5763	6	1,204	93.4	29.3
5763	7	1,004	86.5	58.6
5764.01	1	2,013	97.7	67.9
5764.01	2	3,053	94.1	62.7
5764.02	1	2,568	96.2	65.1
5764.02	2	3,007	93.5	47.4
5764.03	1	2,665	92.8	57.5
5764.03	2	3,417	93.1	63.6
5765.01	1	2,275	86.8	61.5



**Table T2-1. Minority and Low-Income Characteristics in the Vicinity of the Proposed Project Site (by Block Group)**

<i>Census Tract</i>	<i>Census Block Group</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Percent Minority</i>	<i>Percent Low-Income</i>
5765.01	2	1,394	55.0	37.0
5765.02	1	3,072	85.8	59.3
5765.02	2	1,167	73.8	37.3
5765.02	3	853	50.3	25.3
5765.03	1	2,889	79.4	46.1
5765.03	2	1,834	60.3	32.5
5766.01	1	2,345	40.3	18.7
5766.01	2	938	52.9	15.7
5766.01	3	1,112	56.7	30.7
5766.02	1	776	38.5	20.4
5766.02	2	1,145	35.3	11.4
5766.02	3	932	43.0	19.6
5766.02	4	1,021	48.6	20.6
5767	1	1,355	30.8	14.4
5767	2	721	27.5	6.8
5767	3	1,775	32.7	8.8
5768.01	1	1,338	74.1	22.0
5768.01	2	955	26.8	24.0
5768.01	3	2,389	65.5	35.4
5768.02	1	2,314	57.7	22.3
5768.02	2	1,848	42.1	20.1
5769.01	1	2,269	94.9	60.7
5769.01	2	2,108	82.0	29.9
5769.01	3	2,002	92.3	60.4
5769.02	1	2,134	82.9	32.7
5769.02	2	3,585	72.2	34.1
5769.02	3	2,158	86.9	45.0
5770	1	1,819	56.3	21.5
5770	2	2,199	53.4	35.4
5770	3	1,423	48.1	24.5
5770	4	1,012	46.7	14.4
5771	3	943	22.2	4.6
5771	4	1,564	36.1	17.1
5771	5	1,458	44.7	14.6
5772	2	1,175	22.0	7.4
5772	3	1,214	23.9	9.1
5772	4	1,960	24.8	14.5
6099	1	1,023	70.6	20.4
6099	2	655	58.5	19.8
6510.01	3	1,770	49.4	11.2
6510.01	4	975	40.2	4.9

**Table T2-1. Minority and Low-Income Characteristics in the Vicinity of the Proposed Project Site (by Block Group)**

<i>Census Tract</i>	<i>Census Block Group</i>	<i>Population</i>	<i>Percent Minority</i>	<i>Percent Low-Income</i>
6510.02	3	1,064	50.0	4.4
6510.02	4	1,039	46.2	4.2
6511.01	2	2,201	47.8	5.5
6514	1	1,150	28.7	5.2
6700.01	1	1,646	43.4	11.8
6700.01	2	1,598	42.4	10.8
6700.02	1	1,260	53.7	11.8
6700.02	2	2,513	48.1	15.8
6700.03	1	786	45.0	19.1
6700.03	2	1,526	40.9	5.1
6700.03	3	1,366	39.5	4.9
6700.03	4	2,359	44.4	17.5
6701	1	689	40.6	18.3
6701	2	2,003	44.4	23.6
6701	3	3,792	51.2	17.8
6702.01	1	3,889	25.7	2.3
6707.01	1	2,631	40.3	11.4
6707.01	2	1,879	25.3	0.3
6707.01	3	1,224	33.7	0.3
6707.01	4	1,043	27.3	3.7
6707.02	1	1,363	23.2	1.9
6707.02	2	1,163	23.4	1.8
6707.02	3	382	16.2	5.3
6707.02	4	2,185	21.2	2.5
6707.02	5	264	20.1	0.0

N/A = Not applicable.

Source : U.S. Census Bureau 2000