

APPENDIX F

SUPPLEMENTAL DATA FOR ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ANALYSIS

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement

USMCA Mitigation of Contaminated Transboundary Flows Project

Appendix F: Supplemental Data for Environmental Justice Analysis

May 25, 2022

Lead Agencies:



U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Wastewater Management
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington DC 20460



International Boundary and Water Commission
United States Section
4191 N Mesa Street
El Paso TX 79902

Prepared by:

Eastern Research Group, Inc. (ERG)

CONTENTS

	Contents.....	i
	List of Tables.....	ii
	List of Figures.....	iii
	Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Symbols.....	vii
1.	INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1	Geographic Scope of Analysis	1-1
1.2	Data Sources.....	1-2
2.	EJSCREEN 2.0 DATA	2-1
3.	CALENVIROSCREEN 4.0 DATA.....	3-1
4.	HEALTHY PLACES INDEX DATA.....	4-1
5.	REFERENCES	5-1

LIST OF TABLES

Table F-1. Population Statistics for Communities in the EJ Study Area Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data ^a	2-27
Table F-2. Population Statistics for Communities in the EJ Study Area Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data	3-24

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure F-1. Boundaries of the EJ Study Area for the Proposed Action	1-3
Figure F-2. Minority Percent of Population for Census Block Groups Near the Tijuana River Valley, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data	2-2
Figure F-3. Minority Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data	2-3
Figure F-4. Low-Income Percent of Population for Census Block Groups Near the Tijuana River Valley, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data	2-4
Figure F-5. Low-Income Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data	2-5
Figure F-6. Demographic Index Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data	2-6
Figure F-7. Unemployment Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data	2-7
Figure F-8. Linguistic Isolation Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data	2-8
Figure F-9. EJScreen 2.0 Linguistically Isolated Percent of Population Speaking Spanish for Block Groups in EJ Study Area (Legend by Quantile)	2-9
Figure F-10. EJScreen 2.0 Linguistically Isolated Percent of Population Speaking Asian and Pacific Islander Languages for Block Groups in EJ Study Area (Legend by Quantile)	2-10
Figure F-11. EJScreen 2.0 Linguistically Isolated Percent of Population Speaking Other Indo-European Languages for Block Groups in EJ Study Area (Legend by Quantile)	2-11
Figure F-12. Less than High School Education Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data	2-12
Figure F-13. Under Age 5 Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data	2-13
Figure F-14. Over Age 64 Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data	2-14
Figure F-15. Lead Paint Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data	2-15
Figure F-16. 2017 Diesel Particulate Matter Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data	2-16
Figure F-17. Fine Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5}) Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data	2-17

(Continued)

Figure F-18. Ozone Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data	2-18
Figure F-19. 2017 Air Toxics Cancer Risk Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data	2-19
Figure F-20. 2017 Air Toxics Respiratory Hazard Index Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data	2-20
Figure F-21. Traffic Proximity Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data	2-21
Figure F-22. Wastewater Discharge Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data	2-22
Figure F-23. Hazardous Waste Proximity Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data	2-23
Figure F-24. Superfund Proximity Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data	2-24
Figure F-25. Risk Management Plan Facility Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data	2-25
Figure F-26. EJScreen 2.0 Locations of Certain Environmental Indicators and Social Institutions Near the Tijuana River Valley	2-26
Figure F-27. Minority Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data	3-2
Figure F-28. Low-Income Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data	3-3
Figure F-29. Unemployment Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data	3-4
Figure F-30. Linguistic Isolation Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data	3-5
Figure F-31. Less than High School Education Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data	3-6
Figure F-32. Housing Burden Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data	3-7
Figure F-33. Low Birth Weight Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data	3-8
Figure F-34. Children's Lead Risk from Housing Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data	3-9

(Continued)

Figure F-35. Diesel Particulate Matter Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data.....	3-10
Figure F-36. Fine Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5}) Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data.....	3-11
Figure F-37. Ozone Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data.....	3-12
Figure F-38. Toxic Air Chemical Releases Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data.....	3-13
Figure F-39. Traffic Impacts Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data.....	3-14
Figure F-40. Asthma Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data.....	3-15
Figure F-41. Cardiovascular Disease Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data.....	3-16
Figure F-42. Pesticides Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data.....	3-17
Figure F-43. Impaired Water Bodies Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data.....	3-18
Figure F-44. Drinking Water Contaminants Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data.....	3-19
Figure F-45. Groundwater Threats Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data.....	3-20
Figure F-46. Solid Waste Facilities Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data.....	3-21
Figure F-47. Hazardous Waste Facilities Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data.....	3-22
Figure F-48. Cleanup Sites Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data.....	3-23
Figure F-49. Healthy Places Index Score Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on HPI 3.0 data.....	4-2
Figure F-50. Voting Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on HPI 3.0 data.....	4-3
Figure F-51. Active Commuting Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on HPI 3.0 data.....	4-4

(Continued)

Figure F-52. Automobile Access Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on HPI 3.0 data	4-5
Figure F-53. Park Access Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on HPI 3.0 data	4-6
Figure F-54. Tree Canopy Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on HPI 3.0 data	4-7
Figure F-55. Homeownership Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on HPI 3.0 data	4-8
Figure F-56. Housing Habitability Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on HPI 3.0 data	4-9
Figure F-57. Uncrowded Housing Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on HPI 3.0 data	4-10
Figure F-58. Insured Adults Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on HPI 3.0 data	4-11

ABBREVIATIONS, ACRONYMS, AND SYMBOLS

CalEPA	California Environmental Protection Agency
EJ	environmental justice
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
HPI	Healthy Places Index
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
PEIS	Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
PM	particulate matter
PM _{2.5}	fine particulate matter
USIBWC	U.S. International Boundary and Water Commission
USMCA	United States–Mexico–Canada Agreement

1. INTRODUCTION

The United States (U.S.) Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the U.S. International Boundary and Water Commission (USIBWC), as joint lead agencies, are proposing to fund and implement the United States–Mexico–Canada Agreement (USMCA) Mitigation of Contaminated Transboundary Flows Project (the Proposed Action) to reduce transboundary flows from Tijuana that cause adverse public health and environmental impacts in the Tijuana River watershed and adjacent coastal areas. EPA and USIBWC performed an environmental justice analysis in support of the Draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS), which was prepared to support an informed decision making process, consider reasonable alternatives to and review the environmental impacts of the Proposed Action, and identify and support applicable consultations.

EPA and USIBWC evaluated whether environmental inequities exist in communities that would potentially be affected by construction and operational activities under the Proposed Action. This appendix documents the geographic scope of the analysis and compiles the information obtained from a review of publicly available screening-level tools. See the Draft PEIS for discussion of the results of the environmental justice impacts analysis for the Proposed Action and the identified mitigation requirements.

1.1 Geographic Scope of Analysis

EPA and USIBWC defined the geographic scope of the environmental justice analysis in the U.S. (EJ Study Area) for the Proposed Action as a polygon that includes all census block groups and tracts falling within one of two areas (EJ Study Area 1 or EJ Study Area 2). The geographic extents of EJ Study Areas 1 and 2 are defined as follows and illustrated in Figure F-1:

- **EJ Study Area 1** includes all census block groups located (entirely or partially) within 0.5 miles of the edge of a polygon encompassing the locations of potential construction activities under the Proposed Action, excluding on-road vehicle use.¹ Communities in this area are more likely to be affected by short-term construction and long-term operation and maintenance of new infrastructure under the Proposed Action. EJ Study Area 1 covers approximately 6.36 square miles, encompassing five block groups and two census tracts.
- **EJ Study Area 2** includes all additional block groups adjacent to the potential truck hauling route to and from Otay Landfill.² Communities in this area would potentially be affected by

¹ The community located east of Interstate 5 along the U.S.-Mexico border (Block Group 060730100151; Tract 6073010015) was excluded from EJ Study Area 1. This community is, at its closest, approximately 0.3 miles from the easternmost U.S. project element under the Proposed Action—specifically, the areas under consideration for the U.S.-side river diversion (Project F). This community was excluded because 1) only a very small portion of the areas under consideration for the U.S.-side river diversion is located within 0.5 miles of this community; 2) the intervening area includes dense residential and commercial development, Interstate 5, and the San Ysidro Port of Entry, which would likely obscure the effects of any activities associated with the river diversion; and 3) this community is more than 10 miles wide and encompasses areas with environmental and social conditions that could substantially differ from those of the communities close to the Proposed Action.

² The route to Otay Landfill was chosen, rather than the route to Sycamore Landfill, because Otay Landfill is much closer and therefore a more likely destination for construction debris and other solids waste. Analyzing

increased vehicle use along highways and local roads during short-term construction and long-term operation and maintenance of new infrastructure under the Proposed Action. EJ Study Area 2 covers approximately 30 square miles, including 20 block groups and 13 census tracts.

Coastal communities were excluded from the geographic scope of analysis because the Proposed Action is expected to result in significant long-term environmental benefits for coastal communities, with no adverse construction-related impacts, due to significantly reduced marine discharges of untreated wastewater. Additionally, a rapid review of demographic and environmental burden indicators from the available screening tools (discussed below) indicates that coastal communities in southern San Diego County are generally exposed to fewer and less intense existing social and environmental burdens than the communities closer to the location of the Proposed Action.

1.2 Data Sources

EPA and USIBWC used EPA's EJScreen 2.0³ and the California Environmental Protection Agency's (CalEPA's) CalEnviroScreen 4.0⁴ as primary screening tools to assess social, economic, environmental, and demographic data for block groups and census tracts in the geographic scope of analysis. EPA and USIBWC also reviewed the Public Health Alliance of Southern California's Healthy Places Index (HPI) 3.0⁵ as an additional screening-level data source. Population statistics and other data obtained through EJScreen 2.0, CalEnviroScreen 4.0, and HPI 3.0 are provided in Sections 2, 3, and 4, respectively.

block groups adjacent to the route to Otay Landfill ensures impacts to the local community are appropriately considered, rather than having an overly broad analysis that examines all communities— including several non-burdened communities—between the Proposed Action and Sycamore Landfill. For example, the census block group that includes Sycamore Landfill is 42 percent minority and 11 percent low income, whereas the census block group that includes Otay Landfill is 85 percent minority and 14 percent low income.

³ See <https://ejscreen.epa.gov/mapper/>.

⁴ See <https://oehha.ca.gov/calenviroscreen/report/calenviroscreen-40>.

⁵ See <https://map.healthypacesindex.org/?redirect=false>.




Figure F-1. Boundaries of the EJ Study Area for the Proposed Action

2. EJSCREEN 2.0 DATA

EPA and USIBWC obtained and downloaded the EJScreen 2.0 dataset as a geodatabase and comma separated values text file (EPA, 2022a). This dataset provided the raw data values for indicators for each census block group in the U.S. as well as the indicator percentiles for each block group compared to other block groups in their respective state. The dataset also provided the “EJ Index” for 12 environmental indicators. “EJ Indexes” are pre-calculated by EJScreen 2.0 as a function of a particular environmental indicator value for the block group, the demographic index (which represents the percent of minority and percent of low-income population averaged together) for the block group compared to the demographic index for the U.S., and the population count for the block group. For this environmental justice analysis, EPA and USIBWC evaluated demographic and environmental indicators individually rather than use the “EJ Indexes” for environmental indicators. EPA and USIBWC took this approach because many of the analyzed communities have very high EJ Index scores that are driven by very high demographic index scores, not by high environmental indicator values.⁶ Therefore, EPA and USIBWC decided to evaluate, present, and discuss the demographic and environmental burden indicators individually in order to develop a more robust understanding of the intensity of individual environmental burdens.

For each indicator and census block group in San Diego County, EPA and USIBWC also calculated percentiles to indicate the degree of burden relative to that of all 1,811 census block groups in San Diego County for that particular indicator (i.e., to provide separate percentiles that use the state and the county as the comparison population). To calculate county percentiles, EPA and USIBWC clipped the geodatabase to only include block groups in San Diego County and exported the resulting attribute data to a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. For each indicator, EPA and USIBWC used the “PERCENTRANK” function to rank the indicator value for each block group relative to the indicator values for all 1,811 block groups in San Diego County for which data were provided. This function is used to evaluate the standing of a value relative to other values in a data set. For example, if a block group is in the 65th percentile for a particular indicator, it would mean that the block group has an indicator value equal to or higher than that of 65 percent of other block groups in the county.

EPA and USIBWC imported the calculated county percentile values into the EJScreen 2.0 geodatabase using ArcGIS and generated figures depicting the block group percentiles in and surrounding the EJ Study Area. Additional figures were also obtained through the EJScreen 2.0 Mapping Tool online to depict the locations of certain environmental indicators and social institutions in proximity to the Tijuana River Valley (EPA, 2022b). These figures, as well as tables showing the indicator values and both county and state percentiles for block groups in the EJ Study Area, are provided below.

⁶ For example, EJScreen 2.0 identifies Block Group 060730100091 (which includes the ITP parcel) as having an ozone environmental indicator in the 20th state percentile—i.e., much lower than average. However, the block group has an extremely high ozone EJ Index (97th state percentile), due to the block group’s extremely high demographic index (99th state percentile).




Figure F-2. Minority Percent of Population for Census Block Groups Near the Tijuana River Valley, Based on EJSreen 2.0 Data




Figure F-3. Minority Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data




Figure F-4. Low-Income Percent of Population for Census Block Groups Near the Tijuana River Valley, Based on EJSreen 2.0 Data




Figure F-5. Low-Income Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data




Figure F-6. Demographic Index Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data






Figure F-8. Linguistic Isolation Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data




Figure F-9. EJScreen 2.0 Linguistically Isolated Percent of Population Speaking Spanish for Block Groups in EJ Study Area (Legend by Quantile)




Figure F-10. EJScreen 2.0 Linguistically Isolated Percent of Population Speaking Asian and Pacific Islander Languages for Block Groups in EJ Study Area (Legend by Quantile)




Figure F-11. EJSreen 2.0 Linguistically Isolated Percent of Population Speaking Other Indo-European Languages for Block Groups in EJ Study Area (Legend by Quantile)




Figure F-12. Less than High School Education Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data




Figure F-13. Under Age 5 Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data




Figure F-14. Over Age 64 Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data




Figure F-15. Lead Paint Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data





Figure F-16. 2017 Diesel Particulate Matter Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data

Figure F-17. Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}) Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data




Figure F-18. Ozone Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data




Figure F-19. 2017 Air Toxics Cancer Risk Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data




Figure F-20. 2017 Air Toxics Respiratory Hazard Index Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data




Figure F-21. Traffic Proximity Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data





Figure F-22. Wastewater Discharge Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data






Figure F-24. Superfund Proximity Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data




Figure F-25. Risk Management Plan Facility Percentile (County) for Block Groups in EJ Study Area, Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data




Figure F-26. EJSreen 2.0 Locations of Certain Environmental Indicators and Social Institutions Near the Tijuana River Valley

Table F-1. Population Statistics for Communities in the EJ Study Area Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data ^a

Census Block Group Number	Minority			Low-Income			Demographic Index			Unemployment		
	Percent of Population	County Percentile	State Percentile	Percent of Population	County Percentile	State Percentile	Value	County Percentile	State Percentile	Value	County Percentile	State Percentile
<i>EJ Study Area 1</i>												
060730100091	100%	99 th	98 th	86%	99 th	99 th	93%	99 th	99 th	9%	78 th	79 th
060730100092	95%	95 th	88 th	11%	19 th	18 th	53%	72 nd	60 th	5%	50 th	47 th
060730100093	98%	98 th	95 th	62%	94 th	90 th	80%	97 th	94 th	4%	39 th	36 th
060730100094	100%	99 th	100 th	68%	96 th	94 th	84%	98 th	97 th	13%	90 th	90 th
060730101091	85%	84 th	72 nd	14%	27 th	24 th	50%	69 th	55 th	6%	57 th	56 th
<i>EJ Study Area 2</i>												
060730100012	82%	81 st	68 th	17%	35 th	31 st	49%	69 th	54 th	8%	68 th	69 th
060730100031	97%	98 th	92 nd	16%	32 nd	28 th	57%	77 th	65 th	6%	62 nd	61 st
060730100041	92%	91 st	82 nd	48%	83 rd	78 th	70%	90 th	84 th	8%	71 st	71 st
060730100042	97%	97 th	91 st	37%	71 st	65 th	67%	88 th	80 th	16%	94 th	94 th
060730100051	98%	98 th	94 th	30%	63 rd	55 th	64%	86 th	76 th	14%	91 st	91 st
060730100053	97%	97 th	91 st	68%	96 th	94 th	82%	98 th	96 th	8%	72 nd	73 rd
060730100054	96%	96 th	90 th	79%	99 th	98 th	88%	99 th	98 th	20%	97 th	97 th
060730100121	96%	96 th	90 th	11%	19 th	17 th	54%	73 rd	61 st	4%	41 st	37 th
060730100122	100%	99 th	98 th	62%	93 rd	90 th	81%	97 th	95 th	17%	96 th	96 th
060730100123	100%	99 th	100 th	64%	94 th	91 st	82%	97 th	95 th	10%	80 th	80 th
060730100142	88%	87 th	76 th	17%	36 th	32 nd	53%	72 nd	59 th	5%	50 th	47 th
060730100151	93%	93 rd	85 th	22%	47 th	40 th	58%	79 th	67 th	4%	46 th	42 nd
060730101063	93%	93 rd	84 th	53%	88 th	83 rd	73%	93 rd	87 th	18%	97 th	96 th
060730101092	95%	96 th	89 th	36%	70 th	63 rd	66%	87 th	78 th	14%	92 nd	92 nd
060730101111	97%	97 th	92 nd	51%	86 th	81 st	74%	93 rd	89 th	10%	79 th	80 th
060730101112	92%	91 st	82 nd	57%	91 st	86 th	74%	93 rd	88 th	10%	81 st	82 nd
060730133061	91%	90 th	81 st	28%	59 th	51 st	60%	80 th	70 th	13%	91 st	91 st
060730133081	89%	89 th	79 th	48%	83 rd	78 th	69%	89 th	82 nd	18%	96 th	96 th
060730133121	87%	86 th	75 th	24%	53 rd	45 th	56%	76 th	64 th	11%	83 rd	84 th
060730133131	85%	84 th	72 nd	14%	26 th	23 rd	49%	68 th	54 th	9%	74 th	75 th

Source: (EPA, 2022a)

a – Percentages and percentiles for environmental indicators are based on the raw environmental indicator values (not the EJ Index values).

Table F-1. Population Statistics for Communities in the EJ Study Area Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data (Continued) ^a

Census Block Group Number	Linguistic Isolation			Less than High School Education			Under Age 5			Over Age 64			Lead Paint		
	Percent of Population	County Percentile	State Percentile	Percent of Population	County Percentile	State Percentile	Value	County Percentile	State Percentile	Percent of Population	County Percentile	State Percentile	Value (% Pre-1960 Housing)	County Percentile	State Percentile
<i>EJ Study Area 1</i>															
060730100091	26%	95 th	91 st	47%	97 th	93 rd	13%	94 th	94 th	2%	2 nd	2 nd	0%	0 th	11 th
060730100092	9%	74 th	61 st	18%	73 rd	61 st	8%	72 nd	69 th	6%	12 th	12 th	0%	0 th	11 th
060730100093	22%	93 rd	88 th	38%	93 rd	87 th	4%	33 rd	28 th	11%	40 th	44 th	11%	44 th	39 th
060730100094	41%	99 th	98 th	30%	86 th	78 th	17%	98 th	99 th	11%	39 th	43 rd	0%	0 th	11 th
060730101091	4%	51 st	37 th	12%	62 nd	49 th	8%	76 th	73 rd	16%	61 st	66 th	0%	0 th	11 th
<i>EJ Study Area 2</i>															
060730100012	10%	77 th	65 th	24%	80 th	70 th	9%	80 th	79 th	14%	53 rd	58 th	4%	30 th	26 th
060730100031	6%	64 th	49 th	15%	69 th	56 th	10%	88 th	87 th	16%	64 th	69 th	1%	18 th	15 th
060730100041	18%	90 th	83 rd	37%	93 rd	86 th	1%	9 th	6 th	19%	72 nd	78 th	5%	34 th	30 th
060730100042	3%	49 th	34 th	16%	70 th	58 th	11%	91 st	90 th	13%	49 th	54 th	15%	51 st	44 th
060730100051	17%	89 th	81 st	30%	87 th	79 th	10%	84 th	83 rd	12%	42 nd	47 th	8%	40 th	35 th
060730100053	35%	98 th	96 th	44%	96 th	91 st	13%	95 th	95 th	13%	49 th	54 th	12%	46 th	40 th
060730100054	37%	99 th	97 th	45%	97 th	92 nd	3%	25 th	21 st	15%	60 th	65 th	5%	34 th	29 th
060730100121	13%	83 rd	72 nd	41%	95 th	89 th	1%	11 th	8 th	10%	34 th	39 th	0%	0 th	11 th
060730100122	36%	99 th	97 th	45%	96 th	92 nd	11%	90 th	89 th	6%	14 th	15 th	11%	44 th	39 th
060730100123	42%	99 th	98 th	39%	94 th	87 th	6%	59 th	55 th	10%	31 st	34 th	11%	45 th	39 th
060730100142	9%	75 th	62 nd	15%	68 th	54 th	8%	75 th	72 nd	9%	28 th	32 nd	0%	15 th	11 th
060730100151	13%	82 nd	71 st	23%	80 th	69 th	9%	79 th	78 th	8%	20 th	22 nd	7%	38 th	33 rd
060730101063	35%	98 th	96 th	44%	96 th	91 st	5%	46 th	42 nd	14%	54 th	58 th	6%	35 th	31 st
060730101092	18%	90 th	83 rd	29%	86 th	77 th	5%	47 th	43 rd	15%	59 th	64 th	7%	37 th	32 nd
060730101111	14%	85 th	75 th	36%	91 st	84 th	7%	61 st	57 th	13%	49 th	55 th	13%	48 th	42 nd
060730101112	28%	96 th	93 rd	35%	91 st	84 th	6%	55 th	50 th	12%	42 nd	47 th	0%	0 th	11 th
060730133061	7%	67 th	52 nd	27%	84 th	74 th	6%	61 st	56 th	10%	34 th	38 th	11%	44 th	39 th
060730133081	17%	89 th	81 st	17%	71 st	60 th	9%	81 st	79 th	5%	9 th	9 th	4%	31 st	27 th
060730133121	6%	65 th	50 th	19%	76 th	63 rd	6%	49 th	45 th	12%	45 th	50 th	5%	33 rd	29 th
060730133131	6%	63 rd	47 th	7%	46 th	34 th	8%	75 th	73 rd	7%	19 th	20 th	1%	18 th	15 th

Source: (EPA, 2022a)

a – Percentages and percentiles for environmental indicators are based on the raw environmental indicator values (not the EJ Index values).

Table F-1. Population Statistics for Communities in the EJ Study Area Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data (Continued) ^a

Census Block Group Number	Diesel PM			Fine Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})			Ozone			Air Toxics Cancer Risk			Air Toxics Respiratory Hazard Index		
	Value (µg/m ³)	County Percentile	State Percentile	Value (µg/m ³)	County Percentile	State Percentile	Value (ppb)	County Percentile	State Percentile	Value (lifetime risk per million)	County Percentile	State Percentile	Value	County Percentile	State Percentile
<i>EJ Study Area 1</i>															
060730100091	0.290	48 th	45 th	9.69	11 th	15 th	39.2	3 rd	20 th	40	94 th	98 th	0.4	53 rd	66 th
060730100092	0.290	48 th	45 th	9.69	11 th	15 th	39.2	3 rd	20 th	40	94 th	98 th	0.4	53 rd	66 th
060730100093	0.290	48 th	45 th	9.69	11 th	15 th	39.2	3 rd	20 th	40	94 th	98 th	0.4	53 rd	66 th
060730100094	0.290	48 th	45 th	9.69	11 th	15 th	39.2	3 rd	20 th	40	94 th	98 th	0.4	53 rd	66 th
060730101091	0.213	16 th	28 th	9.56	5 th	14 th	38.6	0 th	19 th	50	99 th	99 th	0.4	53 rd	66 th
<i>EJ Study Area 2</i>															
060730100012	0.345	66 th	56 th	9.79	19 th	16 th	40.0	10 th	23 rd	40	94 th	98 th	0.4	53 rd	66 th
060730100031	0.319	59 th	51 st	9.78	18 th	16 th	40.1	11 th	23 rd	40	94 th	98 th	0.4	53 rd	66 th
060730100041	0.324	61 st	52 nd	9.75	15 th	16 th	39.7	7 th	22 nd	50	99 th	99 th	0.4	53 rd	66 th
060730100042	0.324	61 st	52 nd	9.75	15 th	16 th	39.7	7 th	22 nd	50	99 th	99 th	0.4	53 rd	66 th
060730100051	0.318	58 th	51 st	9.75	14 th	16 th	39.6	6 th	21 st	50	99 th	99 th	0.4	53 rd	66 th
060730100053	0.318	58 th	51 st	9.75	14 th	16 th	39.6	6 th	21 st	50	99 th	99 th	0.4	53 rd	66 th
060730100054	0.318	58 th	51 st	9.75	14 th	16 th	39.6	6 th	21 st	50	99 th	99 th	0.4	53 rd	66 th
060730100121	0.307	54 th	49 th	9.73	13 th	16 th	39.3	4 th	21 st	50	99 th	99 th	0.4	53 rd	66 th
060730100122	0.307	54 th	49 th	9.73	13 th	16 th	39.3	4 th	21 st	50	99 th	99 th	0.4	53 rd	66 th
060730100123	0.307	54 th	49 th	9.73	13 th	16 th	39.3	4 th	21 st	50	99 th	99 th	0.4	53 rd	66 th
060730100142	0.255	35 th	37 th	9.75	14 th	16 th	42.0	39 th	31 st	50	99 th	99 th	0.4	53 rd	66 th
060730100151	0.284	47 th	44 th	9.66	9 th	15 th	42.2	41 st	32 nd	60	100 th	99 th	0.4	53 rd	66 th
060730101063	0.321	59 th	52 nd	9.72	12 th	16 th	39.3	3 rd	20 th	40	94 th	98 th	0.4	53 rd	66 th
060730101092	0.213	16 th	28 th	9.56	5 th	14 th	38.6	0 th	19 th	50	99 th	99 th	0.4	53 rd	66 th
060730101111	0.308	54 th	49 th	9.71	12 th	15 th	39.2	3 rd	20 th	50	99 th	99 th	0.4	53 rd	66 th
060730101112	0.308	54 th	49 th	9.71	12 th	15 th	39.2	3 rd	20 th	50	99 th	99 th	0.4	53 rd	66 th
060730133061	0.333	63 rd	54 th	9.84	22 nd	17 th	40.8	17 th	25 th	40	94 th	98 th	0.4	53 rd	66 th
060730133081	0.338	64 th	55 th	9.81	20 th	17 th	40.2	12 th	24 th	40	94 th	98 th	0.4	53 rd	66 th
060730133121	0.318	58 th	51 st	9.83	22 nd	17 th	40.9	19 th	26 th	40	94 th	98 th	0.4	53 rd	66 th
060730133131	0.260	37 th	39 th	9.81	20 th	17 th	42.2	41 st	31 st	40	94 th	98 th	0.4	53 rd	66 th

Source: (EPA, 2022a)

^a – Percentages and percentiles for environmental indicators are based on the raw environmental indicator values (not the EJ Index values).

Table F-1. Population Statistics for Communities in the EJ Study Area Based on EJScreen 2.0 Data (Continued) ^a

Census Block Group Number	Traffic Proximity			Wastewater Discharge			Hazardous Waste Proximity			Superfund Proximity			RMP Facility Proximity		
	Value (daily traffic count/distance to road)	County Percentile	State Percentile	Value	County Percentile	State Percentile	Value (facility count/km distance)	County Percentile	State Percentile	Value	County Percentile	State Percentile	Value (facility count/km distance)	County Percentile	State Percentile
<i>EJ Study Area 1</i>															
060730100091	2,013	78 th	82 nd	2.6	91 st	83 rd	1.0	8 th	17 th	0.011	0 th	0 th	0.17	25 th	15 th
060730100092	639	59 th	62 nd	3.6	91 st	85 th	0.7	6 th	13 th	0.011	0 th	0 th	0.15	20 th	13 th
060730100093	1,225	71 st	74 th	1.7	91 st	79 th	0.9	8 th	16 th	0.011	0 th	1 st	0.14	18 th	12 th
060730100094	3,081	85 th	87 th	3.7	91 st	85 th	0.9	8 th	16 th	0.011	0 th	0 th	0.18	30 th	17 th
060730101091	666	60 th	63 rd	1.8	91 st	79 th	2.1	24 th	31 st	0.012	1 st	1 st	0.17	28 th	17 th
<i>EJ Study Area 2</i>															
060730100012	235	42 nd	43 rd	0.0	0 th	0 th	3.6	45 th	48 th	0.012	3 rd	1 st	0.23	45 th	27 th
060730100031	4,256	91 st	91 st	0.0	0 th	0 th	2.6	29 th	37 th	0.012	1 st	1 st	0.17	25 th	15 th
060730100041	1,118	69 th	72 nd	0.4	84 th	66 th	2.3	26 th	33 rd	0.012	1 st	1 st	0.16	24 th	15 th
060730100042	2,147	79 th	83 rd	0.7	87 th	70 th	3.2	40 th	44 th	0.012	1 st	1 st	0.18	33 rd	19 th
060730100051	2,525	81 st	85 th	0.6	86 th	69 th	2.1	23 rd	30 th	0.012	1 st	1 st	0.16	22 nd	14 th
060730100053	1,142	70 th	73 rd	0.8	88 th	72 nd	1.9	20 th	28 th	0.012	0 th	1 st	0.16	21 st	14 th
060730100054	2,316	80 th	84 th	0.9	89 th	73 rd	2.0	22 nd	30 th	0.012	1 st	1 st	0.16	25 th	15 th
060730100121	496	55 th	57 th	1.1	90 th	75 th	2.0	22 nd	29 th	0.012	1 st	1 st	0.16	23 rd	15 th
060730100122	1,492	74 th	77 th	1.3	90 th	76 th	1.6	16 th	25 th	0.012	0 th	1 st	0.15	20 th	13 th
060730100123	2,408	81 st	84 th	1.4	90 th	77 th	1.3	11 th	21 st	0.011	0 th	1 st	0.15	18 th	12 th
060730100142	1,042	68 th	71 st	0.0	0 th		2.3	27 th	34 th	0.012	1 st	1 st	0.30	57 th	34 th
060730100151	2,165	80 th	83 rd	0.8	87 th	71 st	1.6	15 th	24 th	0.011	0 th	1 st	0.25	50 th	30 th
060730101063	5,593	94 th	93 rd	1.0	89 th	73 rd	3.9	48 th	50 th	0.012	1 st	1 st	0.19	35 th	21 st
060730101092	2,938	84 th	87 th	1.9	91 st	80 th	1.9	20 th	28 th	0.012	0 th	1 st	0.16	24 th	15 th
060730101111	2,830	83 rd	86 th	1.2	90 th	76 th	2.2	26 th	33 rd	0.012	1 st	1 st	0.17	26 th	16 th
060730101112	4,191	90 th	90 th	1.4	90 th	77 th	2.3	27 th	34 th	0.012	1 st	1 st	0.17	27 th	16 th
060730133061	3,981	89 th	90 th	0.0	0 th	0 th	3.3	41 st	45 th	0.012	4 th	1 st	0.20	37 th	22 nd
060730133081	5,188	93 rd	92 nd	0.0	0 th	0 th	2.9	34 th	41 st	0.012	3 rd	1 st	0.19	35 th	21 st
060730133121	3,449	87 th	88 th	0.0	0 th	0 th	3.5	43 rd	47 th	0.012	4 th	1 st	0.17	29 th	17 th
060730133131	250	44 th	45 th	0.0	0 th	0 th	1.8	18 th	27 th	0.012	4 th	1 st	0.22	44 th	26 th

Source: (EPA, 2022a)

^a – Percentages and percentiles for environmental indicators are based on the raw environmental indicator values (not the EJ Index values).

3. CALENVIROSCREEN 4.0 DATA

EPA and USIBWC obtained and downloaded the CalEnviroScreen 4.0 dataset as a geodatabase, shapefile, and Microsoft Excel spreadsheet (CalEPA, 2021). This dataset provided the raw data values for indicators for each census tract in California as well as the indicator percentiles for each tract relative to those of all tracts in the state.

For each indicator and census tract in San Diego County, EPA and USIBWC also calculated percentiles to indicate the degree of burden relative to that of all 627 census tracts in San Diego County for that particular indicator (i.e., to provide separate percentiles that use the state and the county as the comparison population). To calculate county percentiles, EPA and USIBWC selected census tracts in only San Diego County from the spreadsheet. For every indicator, EPA and USIBWC used the “PERCENTRANK” function to rank the indicator value for each census tract relative to all the indicator values for all 627 tracts in San Diego County for which data were provided. This function is used to evaluate the standing of a value relative to other values in a data set. For example, if a census tract is in the 65th percentile for a particular indicator, it would mean that the tract has an indicator value equal to or higher than that of 65 percent of other tracts in the county.

EPA and USIBWC imported the calculated county percentile values into the CalEnviroScreen 4.0 geodatabase using ArcGIS and generated figures depicting the census tract percentiles in and surrounding the EJ Study Area. These figures, as well as tables showing the indicator values and both county and state percentiles for census tracts in the EJ Study Area, are provided below.




Figure F-27. Minority Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data




Figure F-28. Low-Income Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data




Figure F-29. Unemployment Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data




Figure F-30. Linguistic Isolation Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data




Figure F-31. Less than High School Education Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data




Figure F-32. Housing Burden Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data




Figure F-33. Low Birth Weight Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data




Figure F-34. Children's Lead Risk from Housing Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data




Figure F-35. Diesel Particulate Matter Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data




Figure F-36. Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}) Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data




Figure F-37. Ozone Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data




Figure F-38. Toxic Air Chemical Releases Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data




Figure F-39. Traffic Impacts Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data




Figure F-40. Asthma Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data




Figure F-41. Cardiovascular Disease Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data




Figure F-42. Pesticides Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data




Figure F-43. Impaired Water Bodies Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data




Figure F-44. Drinking Water Contaminants Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data




Figure F-45. Groundwater Threats Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data




Figure F-46. Solid Waste Facilities Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data




Figure F-47. Hazardous Waste Facilities Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data




Figure F-48. Cleanup Sites Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data

Table F-2. Population Statistics for Communities in the EJ Study Area Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data

Census Tract Number	Minority ^a		Low-Income			Unemployment		
	Percent of Population	County Percentile	Percent of Population	County Percentile	State Percentile	Percent of Population	County Percentile	State Percentile
EJ Study Area 1								
6073010009	98%	99 th	62%	96 th	93 rd	7%	68 th	70 th
6073010109 ^b	92%	93 rd	28%	57 th	50 th	11%	90 th	89 th
EJ Study Area 2								
6073010001	85%	83 rd	17%	31 st	28 th	8%	76 th	78 th
6073010003	91%	92 nd	24%	47 th	42 nd	10%	85 th	85 th
6073010004	95%	96 th	41%	78 th	71 st	13%	95 th	94 th
6073010005	97%	98 th	49%	86 th	81 st	12%	92 nd	92 nd
6073010012	99%	100 th	54%	90 th	86 th	13%	95 th	94 th
6073010014	82%	81 st	18%	32 nd	28 th	5%	42 nd	43 rd
6073010015	93%	95 th	22%	43 rd	38 th	4%	35 th	36 th
6073010106	93%	95 th	55%	91 st	87 th	14%	96 th	96 th
6073010111	94%	96 th	54%	90 th	86 th	10%	86 th	85 th
6073013306	90%	90 th	30%	61 st	54 th	14%	96 th	95 th
6073013308	92%	93 rd	42%	79 th	72 nd	15%	97 th	96 th
6073013312	87%	85 th	24%	48 th	43 rd	11%	89 th	88 th
6073013313	85%	83 rd	14%	18 th	19 th	9%	78 th	79 th

Source: (CalEPA, 2021)

a – The CalEnviroScreen 4.0 dataset did not include readily available state percentiles for minority populations. State percentiles for tracts are therefore not included in this table.

b – A portion of Census Tract 6073010109 also falls within the boundaries of EJ Study Area 2.

Table F-2. Population Statistics for Communities in the EJ Study Area Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data (Continued)

Census Tract Number	Linguistic Isolation			Less than High School Education			Housing Burden			Low Birth Weight			Children's Lead Risk from Housing		
	Percent of Population	County Percentile	State Percentile	Percent of Population	County Percentile	State Percentile	Percent of Population	County Percentile	State Percentile	Value (% of births)	County Percentile	State Percentile	Value	County Percentile	State Percentile
<i>EJ Study Area 1</i>															
6073010009	23%	96 th	90 th	35%	93 rd	85 th	17%	49 th	49 th	4.61%	48 th	41 st	43.24	54 th	42 nd
6073010109 ^a	12%	81 st	69 th	23%	79 th	69 th	13%	29 th	29 th	4.36%	41 st	35 th	35.95	45 th	32 nd
<i>EJ Study Area 2</i>															
6073010001	10%	73 rd	60 th	28%	85 th	77 th	14%	33 rd	33 rd	5.67%	77 th	68 th	26.21	28 th	19 th
6073010003	9%	72 nd	57 th	23%	81 st	70 th	16%	46 th	45 th	4.7%	50 th	44 th	44.44	57 th	44 th
6073010004	10%	76 th	63 rd	25%	83 rd	74 th	20%	64 th	62 nd	5.11%	63 rd	55 th	43.82	56 th	43 rd
6073010005	27%	98 th	94 th	37%	93 rd	87 th	13%	29 th	29 th	4.91%	58 th	50 th	43.69	55 th	43 rd
6073010012	35%	100 th	98 th	43%	97 th	92 nd	25%	84 th	81 st	4.1%	33 rd	29 th	44.12	57 th	43 rd
6073010014	9%	73 rd	59 th	19%	73 rd	63 rd	13%	29 th	29 th	5.45%	71 st	63 rd	29.42	33 rd	23 rd
6073010015	13%	82 nd	71 st	23%	81 st	70 th	13%	26 th	27 th	3.39%	16 th	14 th	30.64	36 th	25 th
6073010106	25%	97 th	93 rd	40%	96 th	90 th	20%	63 rd	62 nd	5.78%	78 th	71 st	48.07	64 th	49 th
6073010111	22%	95 th	89 th	36%	93 rd	86 th	24%	80 th	77 th	4.92%	58 th	50 th	43.24	54 th	42 nd
6073013306	6%	59 th	41 st	25%	83 rd	73 rd	25%	83 rd	80 th	4.98%	60 th	52 nd	45.85	60 th	46 th
6073013308	14%	84 th	74 th	21%	76 th	66 th	20%	64 th	62 nd	3.9%	28 th	24 th	57.77	78 th	63 rd
6073013312	6%	63 rd	45 th	20%	74 th	64 th	18%	57 th	56 th	6.73%	92 nd	87 th	35.76	45 th	31 st
6073013313	6%	60 th	42 nd	8%	41 st	32 nd	13%	25 th	26 th	4.22%	36 th	32 nd	16.09	12 th	9 th

Source: (CalEPA, 2021)

^a – A portion of Census Tract 6073010109 also falls within the boundaries of EJ Study Area 2.

Table F-2. Population Statistics for Communities in the EJ Study Area Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data (Continued)

Census Tract Number	Diesel PM			Fine Particulate Matter (PM _{2.5})			Ozone			Air Toxic Releases from Facilities			Traffic Impacts		
	Value (tons/year)	County Percentile	State Percentile	Value (µg/m3)	County Percentile	State Percentile	Value (ppm)	County Percentile	State Percentile	Value	County Percentile	State Percentile	Value (traffic volume/amount of roadway)	County Percentile	State Percentile
<i>EJ Study Area 1</i>															
6073010009	0.301	78 th	77 th	15.06	100 th	99 th	0.043	5 th	30 th	1106.23	97 th	66 th	11371	99 th	100 th
6073010109 ^a	0.058	19 th	21 st	13.06	99 th	94 th	0.043	5 th	30 th	796.64	92 nd	60 th	45752	100 th	100 th
<i>EJ Study Area 2</i>															
6073010001	0.187	61 st	60 th	12.11	97 th	85 th	0.043	5 th	30 th	1190.70	98 th	68 th	1233	75 th	70 th
6073010003	0.445	90 th	87 th	12.85	98 th	93 rd	0.043	5 th	30 th	1312.63	99 th	70 th	1763	91 st	83 rd
6073010004	0.328	81 st	79 th	13.44	99 th	95 th	0.043	5 th	30 th	1157.06	98 th	68 th	650	30 th	32 nd
6073010005	0.505	92 nd	90 th	14.45	99 th	98 th	0.043	5 th	30 th	1156.64	97 th	68 th	731	38 th	39 th
6073010012	0.341	82 nd	80 th	14.03	99 th	98 th	0.043	5 th	30 th	1046.98	96 th	65 th	855	50 th	48 th
6073010014	0.109	41 st	40 th	12.52	98 th	91 st	0.044	41 st	35 th	2618.50	99 th	83 rd	694	33 rd	36 th
6073010015	0.104	39 th	39 th	12.82	98 th	93 rd	0.045	57 th	40 th	4595.21	99 th	91 st	5129	99 th	100 th
6073010106	0.299	77 th	76 th	12.45	97 th	91 st	0.043	5 th	30 th	945.24	95 th	63 rd	855	50 th	48 th
6073010111	0.377	85 th	83 rd	13.01	99 th	94 th	0.043	5 th	30 th	973.83	95 th	63 rd	821	47 th	46 th
6073013306	0.604	94 th	93 rd	11.74	96 th	67 th	0.043	5 th	30 th	1345.21	99 th	71 st	1870	93 rd	85 th
6073013308	0.381	86 th	84 th	11.61	95 th	64 th	0.043	5 th	30 th	1279.38	98 th	70 th	994	60 th	57 th
6073013312	0.200	63 rd	62 nd	11.77	96 th	69 th	0.043	5 th	30 th	1450.20	99 th	72 nd	1419	83 rd	76 th
6073013313	0.069	25 th	26 th	11.71	96 th	67 th	0.044	30 th	32 nd	1538.71	99 th	74 th	1041	64 th	61 st

Source: (CalEPA, 2021)

^a – A portion of Census Tract 6073010109 also falls within the boundaries of EJ Study Area 2.

Table F-2. Population Statistics for Communities in the EJ Study Area Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data (Continued)

Census Tract Number	Asthma			Cardiovascular Disease			Pesticide Use			Impaired Water Bodies			Drinking Water Contaminants		
	Value (people per 10,000)	County Percentile	State Percentile	Value (people per 10,000)	County Percentile	State Percentile	Value (pounds active ingredient / square mile)	County Percentile	State Percentile	Value	County Percentile	State Percentile	Value	County Percentile	State Percentile
<i>EJ Study Area 1</i>															
6073010009	59	84 th	68 th	15	96 th	69 th	0	0	0	20	97 th	98 th	313	22 nd	29 th
6073010109 ^a	44	70 th	47 th	11	67 th	38 th	0.37	83 rd	35 th	30	99 th	100 th	317	61 st	30 th
<i>EJ Study Area 2</i>															
6073010001	37	59 th	36 th	9	37 th	19 th	0	0	0	2	15 th	24 th	301	13 th	24 th
6073010003	48	73 rd	53 rd	12	76 th	45 th	0	0	0	2	15 th	24 th	329	62 nd	31 st
6073010004	37	60 th	37 th	9	47 th	25 th	0	0	0	0	0	0	313	22 nd	29 th
6073010005	69	90 th	78 th	18	99 th	80 th	0	0	0	0	0	0	313	22 nd	29 th
6073010012	69	90 th	78 th	18	99 th	80 th	0	0	0	0	0	0	313	22 nd	29 th
6073010014	42	67 th	44 th	10	59 th	32 nd	0	0	0	2	15 th	24 th	298	11 th	24 th
6073010015	38	61 st	38 th	10	50 th	27 th	0	0	0	20	97 th	98 th	303	13 th	24 th
6073010106	36	58 th	35 th	9	44 th	23 rd	0	0	0	0	0	0	301	12 th	24 th
6073010111	69	90 th	78 th	18	99 th	80 th	0	0	0	20	97 th	98 th	313	22 nd	29 th
6073013306	64	87 th	73 rd	12	83 rd	50 th	0	0	0	2	15 th	24 th	303	13 th	24 th
6073013308	56	81 st	64 th	11	67 th	38 th	0	0	0	2	15 th	24 th	303	13 th	24 th
6073013312	64	87 th	73 rd	12	83 rd	50 th	0	0	0	2	15 th	24 th	265	5 th	17 th
6073013313	24	30 th	15 th	7	21 st	10 th	0	0	0	2	15 th	24 th	265	5 th	17 th

Source: (CalEPA, 2021)

^a – A portion of Census Tract 6073010109 also falls within the boundaries of EJ Study Area 2.

Table F-2. Population Statistics for Communities in the EJ Study Area Based on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Data (Continued)

Census Tract Number	Groundwater Threats			Solid Waste Facilities			Hazardous Waste			Cleanup Sites		
	Value	County Percentile	State Percentile	Value	County Percentile	State Percentile	Value	County Percentile	State Percentile	Value	County Percentile	State Percentile
<i>EJ Study Area 1</i>												
6073010009	1.0	25 th	7 th	0.25	51 st	12 th	0.11	26 th	19 th	0	0	0
6073010109 ^a	3.5	39 th	23 rd	4.00	83 rd	70 th	0.01	7 th	2 nd	9.4	85 th	59 th
<i>EJ Study Area 2</i>												
6073010001	4.5	43 rd	28 th	11.50	96 th	93 rd	0.60	77 th	75 th	0.5	45 th	8 th
6073010003	0.0	0	0	1.00	60 th	36 th	0.21	42 nd	38 th	0	0	0
6073010004	10.0	57 th	47 th	0.00	0	0	0.10	20 th	17 th	0	0	0
6073010005	2.5	34 th	17 th	0.50	54 th	22 nd	0.10	20 th	17 th	0	0	0
6073010012	2.5	34 th	17 th	0.00	0	0	0.10	20 th	17 th	0	0	0
6073010014	29.7	88 th	79 th	18.85	98 th	98 th	1.19	88 th	88 th	9	84 th	58 th
6073010015	23.0	84 th	72 nd	8.00	93 rd	87 th	1.33	90 th	89 th	10	86 th	61 st
6073010106	10.0	57 th	47 th	0.70	58 th	25 th	0.05	14 th	7 th	0	0	0
6073010111	5.0	44 th	31 st	0.00	0	0	0.10	20 th	17 th	0	0	0
6073013306	1.5	29 th	11 th	3.00	79 th	64 th	0.15	32 nd	27 th	0.4	42 nd	6 th
6073013308	15.0	70 th	60 th	13.80	97 th	95 th	0.73	83 rd	79 th	5	72 nd	43 rd
6073013312	2.4	34 th	15 th	13.50	97 th	95 th	0.22	43 rd	39 th	0	0	0
6073013313	52.0	95 th	91 st	19.75	99 th	98 th	0.40	65 th	60 th	18.5	94 th	80 th

Source: (CalEPA, 2021)

^a – A portion of Census Tract 6073010109 also falls within the boundaries of EJ Study Area 2.

4. HEALTHY PLACES INDEX DATA

EPA and USIBWC obtained data for certain indicators from the HPI 3.0 Online Map, excluding indicators related to data previously obtained through EJScreen 2.0 or CalEnviroScreen 4.0 (Public Health Alliance, 2022). EPA and USIBWC used the “Rank Geographies” tool on the online mapper to obtain indicator county percentiles for census tracts in the EJ Study Area relative to that of other tracts in San Diego County for that particular indicator, as well as the raw data indicator values. For example, if a tract is in the 65th percentile for its HPI Score, that would indicate that the tract has overall healthier conditions than 65 percent of other tracts in the county.

EPA and USIBWC imported the HPI 3.0 data into a geodatabase using ArcGIS and generated figures depicting the census tract percentiles in the EJ Study Area. These figures are provided below.




Figure F-49. Healthy Places Index Score Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on HPI 3.0 data




Figure F-50. Voting Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on HPI 3.0 data




Figure F-51. Active Commuting Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on HPI 3.0 data




Figure F-52. Automobile Access Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on HPI 3.0 data




Figure F-53. Park Access Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on HPI 3.0 data




Figure F-54. Tree Canopy Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on HPI 3.0 data




Figure F-55. Homeownership Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on HPI 3.0 data




Figure F-56. Housing Habitability Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on HPI 3.0 data




Figure F-57. Uncrowded Housing Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on HPI 3.0 data




Figure F-58. Insured Adults Percentile (County) for Census Tracts in EJ Study Area, Based on HPI 3.0 data

5. REFERENCES

- CalEPA. (2021). *CalEnviroScreen 4.0 Geodatabase and Shapefile 2021*. Retrieved from <https://oehha.ca.gov/calenviroscreen/maps-data/download-data>
- EPA. (2022a). *EJSCREEN 2021 StatePctile Dataset (Geodatabase and Comma Separated Values [CSV] text file)*. Retrieved from <https://gaftp.epa.gov/EJSCREEN/2021/>
- EPA. (2022b, April 20). *EJScreen: EPA's Environmental Justice Screening and Mapping Tool (Version 2.0)*. Retrieved from <https://ejscreen.epa.gov/mapper/>
- Public Health Alliance. (2022). *Healthy Places Index*. Retrieved from <https://www.healthypacesindex.org/>