November 8, 2018
9:30 am – 11:30 am

Policy Committee A Conference Room
SCAG’s Main Office
900 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 1700, Los Angeles, CA 90017

AGENDA

1. WELCOME AND SELF INTRODUCTIONS
   Ping Chang, Acting Manager, SCAG

2. AUGUST EJWG MEETING SUMMARY

3. EJWG FEEDBACK DISCUSSION
   Anita Au and Tom Vo, Associate Regional Planner, SCAG

4. ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE TECHNICAL ANALYSIS Q&A
   Kimberly Clark, Regional Planner Specialist, SCAG

5. EJ APPENDIX REORGANIZATION ACTIVITY
   How should we reorganize the EJ Appendix?

TO PARTICIPATE VIA WEB CONFERENCING
To join the meeting: https://zoom.us/j/880836377
Dial-In: 1 (646) 558-8656
Meeting ID: 880 836 377

TO PARTICIPATE VIA VIDEOCONFERENCING
Video conferencing will be available at SCAG’s regional offices in Imperial, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, Ventura counties and in the Palmdale videoconference site. Space is limited, so RSVP is required. Please RSVP here: https://scag.wufoo.com/forms/z1krfx8q0a4g51k/

SCAG, in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, is committed to providing special accommodations to those who are interested in participating in the workshop. SCAG is also committed to helping those with limited proficiency in the English language by providing translation services at the workshop in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. We ask that you provide your request for special accommodations or translation services at least 72 hours prior to the meeting so that SCAG has sufficient time to make arrangements. Please contact Anita Au, Associate Regional Planner, at au@scag.ca.gov or by calling (213) 236-1874.
EJWG Feedback Discussion

November 8, 2018

Anita Au, Associate Regional Planner
Tom Vo, Associate Regional Planner
EJ Outreach Process

- Who are some key stakeholders SCAG should reach out to during the 2020 TRP/SCS EJ outreach process?
  - Non-governmental organizations
  - Grassroots groups
  - Air Pollution Control Districts
  - Department of Toxic Substances Control
  - Public health departments
  - Los Angeles County Measure A stakeholders
  - City of Los Angeles Neighborhood Councils
  - Faith-based organizations
Who are some key stakeholders SCAG should reach out to during the 2020 TRP/SCS EJ outreach process? (cont.)

- Specific Groups:
  - Southeast Asian Community Alliance; Chinatown Community for Equitable Development; Sustainable Little Tokyo; Anahugh Youth Sports Association; Comite Civico Del Valle; Focus Group at LACI (on climate vulnerability)
  - Consider analyzing existing stakeholder list and fill in gaps of communities not represented
  - Consider looking into communities and cities going through climate action plans
EJ Outreach Process

- How can we expand on SCAG’s EJ outreach approach from the 2016 RTP/SCS for the 2020 RTP/SCS?
  - Consider holding **meetings in the evening**, not during work hours and in **accessible locations**
  - Consider **releasing budget on EJ outreach process** (to show how much resources SCAG can have)
  - Understand that there are food, childcare, and transit costs for participants and **consider compensation** for participants
  - Consider hosting **pop-up events** and meeting people where they are at
  - Consider **including anecdotal information** from community based organizations
How can we expand on SCAG’s EJ outreach approach from the 2016 RTP/SCS for the 2020 RTP/SCS? (cont.)

- **Provide ample time** for outreach
- Consider exploring **contingency plans** for meetings with low attendance
- Consider **expanding online presence and surveys**
EJ Outreach Process

- What are some new strategies/ideas SCAG staff can use to engage more with EJ stakeholders?
  - Consider **reframing from heavy technical language**
  - Consider **inclusion of background and process** during outreach process (Why is the outreach occurring? What’s the purpose)
What are some best practices on EJ outreach from other agencies or regions you think SCAG staff should look into for the 2020 RTP/SCS development process?

- Consider having **bilingual meetings**
- Consider having **follow-up meetings** to show community voice is heard and included in the process
- Consider including **short survey and more online presence**
- Consider or look into best practice examples of EJ policy
  - Kings County, Seattle, WA; Portland, OR; Minneapolis, MD
- Consider providing **stipend** for community participants
- Consider using **anti-displacement as a common goal** to achieving improved air quality, parks and open space, and transit access
SCAG conducted EJ analyses for the 2016 RTP/SCS at the regional, community-based, and localized levels, depending on specific performance indicators. How can these three levels of analyses be further refined or improved?

- Consider **communities under AB1550**
- Consider **identifying ways to combine multiple EJ areas** to create new EJ area by combining their indices
- Consider **community proposed projects**
- Consider **analyzing benefits and burdens on all people**
- Consider **adding numerical disparities** in park access, health vulnerabilities, and exposure to toxins
EJ Technical Analysis

- How can we improve or enhance on the existing 18 performance indicators of the 2016 RTP/SCS EJ Appendix?
  - Consider Healthy Places Index, MATES IV study from AQMD, LA County Health Profile, Riverside County Climate Adaptation Plan; develop an inventory of Health Impact Study in the region to identify the gap
  - Consider expanding more on “Gentrification and Displacement” analysis to non-transit areas
  - Consider expanding on traffic safety to include collisions involving trucks
  - Consider examining industries impacted by sea level rise
  - Consider providing more detail of substandard housing
  - Consider race, educational attainment, rent vs. homeowners as indicators to determine communities vulnerable to gentrification and displacement
What are some new performance indicators that we should consider in addition to the existing 18 performance indicators for the 2020 RTP/SCS EJ Appendix?

- Consider providing an **Emerging Categories** that involves certain ports, truck routes, storage yards, etc.
- Consider including **Heat island effects** (consider Urban Heat Islands (UHI) Index maps on CalEPA’s website)
- Consider including **Seismic risk, liquefaction, and disaster resilience**
EJ Technical Analysis

- How can we make the EJ Appendix more user-friendly for local jurisdictions and stakeholders (i.e. organization of performance indicators, format of appendix, etc.)?
  
  • Consider providing **funding information/sources** as it relates to specific EJ topics
  • Consider **reorganizing indicators** into categories
  • Consider creating **interactive application**
  • Consider **utilizing matrices** to better show results of EJ analyses
SCAG’s Environmental Justice Appendix for the 2016 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS)

Kimberly Clark
Research & Analysis Department
SCAG
Identifying EJ Population Groups

**Minority:**
- A person who is African American, Hispanic or Latino, Asian American, American Indian, Alaskan Native, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander

**Low-Income:**
- A person whose median income is at or below the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) poverty guidelines

**Other Groups:**
- Non-English speakers, Households without vehicles, Population without a high school degree or equivalent, Disabled individuals, Seniors - ages 65 and over, Young children
SCAG Demographic Profile (2016 – 2040 RTP/SCS)

Sources: SCAG, American Community Survey 2009–13 5 Year Estimates
SCAG Socioeconomic Profile (2016 – 2040 RTP/SCS)

- Households in Poverty: 14%
- Foreign Born Population: 33%
- Non-English Speaking Population: 5%
- Seniors (65+): 11%
- Young Children (Ages 5 and Under): 8%
- Individuals without High School Diploma or Equivalent: 12%

Sources: SCAG, American Community Survey 2009–13 5 Year Estimates
Regional Analysis:
- Appropriate when determining system-wide impacts (e.g. Financial Benefits and Burdens)

Localized Analysis:
- Appropriate for determining adverse impacts at the community level (emissions, noise, etc.)

Community Analysis:
- Appropriate for tabulating impacts of the RTP/SCS in selected places according to a “Communities of Concern” approach
Performance Indicators

- Benefits and burdens analysis
  - RTP revenue sources in terms of tax burdens
  - Share of transportation system usage
  - RTP/SCS investments
- Distribution of travel time savings and travel distance reductions
- Geographic distribution of transportation investments (NEW in 2016)
- Jobs–housing imbalance or jobs–housing mismatch
- Impacts from funding through mileage–based user fees
- Accessibility to employment and services
- Accessibility to parks and schools
- Gentrification and displacement
- Emissions impacts
- Emissions impacts along freeways
- Active transportation hazards (NEW in 2016)
- Aviation noise impacts
- Roadway noise impacts
- Public health impacts (NEW in 2016)
- Rail–related impacts
- Climate vulnerability (NEW in 2016)
Performance Indicators (Current Conditions Analysis)

- Benefits and burdens analysis
  - RTP revenue sources in terms of tax burdens
  - Share of transportation system usage
  - RTP/SCS investments
- Distribution of travel time savings and travel distance reductions
- Geographic distribution of transportation investments (NEW in 2016)
- Jobs-housing imbalance or jobs-housing mismatch
- Impacts from funding through mileage-based user fees

- Accessibility to employment and services
- Accessibility to parks and schools
- Gentrification and displacement
- Emissions impacts
- Emissions impacts along freeways
- Active transportation hazards (NEW in 2016)
- Aviation noise impacts
- Roadway noise impacts
- Public health analysis (NEW in 2016)
- Rail-related impacts
- Climate vulnerability (NEW in 2016)
Share of Retail & Gasoline Taxes Paid & RTP Investments by Ethnicity

- Examines who will pay for the RTP/SCS and who will benefit from the Plan

### FIGURE 23: Share of Households and Taxes Paid by Ethnicity (2012-2040 Average)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Share of Households</th>
<th>Share of Retail &amp; Gasoline Tax Paid</th>
<th>Share of Income Tax Paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Race</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### FIGURE 27: RTP/SCS Transportation Investments by Ethnicity

- Hispanic: 34%
- White: 15%
- African American: 9%
- Native American: 4%
- Asian/Pacific Islander: 2%
- Other Race: 7%

Source: 2010-2012 Household Travel Survey, 2009 National Household Travel Survey.
Performance Indicators – Travel Time Savings

- Examines the potential savings in travel time that results from the 2016 RTP/SCS based on each group’s usage of the transportation system.
Performance Indicators – Geographic Distribution of Transportation Investments

- Examines where transportation investments will occur throughout the region and in communities of concern.
Performance Indicators – Job Housing Balance

- Looks at the travel behavior of commuters and their relative incomes
- Also the distribution of low wage jobs and affordable housing throughout the region
Performance Indicators – Job Housing Imbalance

EXHIBIT 11: Ratio of All Jobs-to-All Housing Units

EXHIBIT 12: Ratio of Low Wage Jobs-to-Affordable Rental Units

(Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Regional Change Report 2018)
Examines the regressive impact of the gasoline tax on low income households and compares the mileage-based user fee.
Performance Indicators – Accessibility to Employment and Services

- Looks at the accessibility to employment, shopping destinations, and hospitals within a 30 minute travel area by car and 45 minute travel area by transit (rail and bus), also looks at the share of destinations within a 1 and 2 mile travel distance by EJ group.

Photos: Metro, OCBC
Performance Indicators – Accessibility to Parks and Schools

- Looks at the accessibility to local and regional parks within a 45 minute travel area by car and transit (rail and bus), also looks at the share of population within 1 and 2 miles travel distance of the region’s parks and schools.

Photos: ClimateResolve.org, National Park Service
Performance Indicators – Gentrification and Displacement

- Examines historical trends in high quality transit areas and neighborhoods in close proximity to rail transit stations.
Performance Indicators – Emissions Impacts

- Examines air quality impacts for particulate matter and carbon monoxide of the RTP/SCS at the regional level and for SCAG’s environmental justice areas.
Performance Indicators – Air Quality Impacts Along Highways

- Examines air quality impacts of the RTP/SCS for areas in close proximity to highways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Pollutant</th>
<th>Emissions within 500-Foot of Freeways (Tons per Day)</th>
<th>Emissions in the SCAG Region (Tons per Day)</th>
<th>Decrease in Emissions within 500-Foot Freeways</th>
<th>Decrease in Emissions in the SCAG Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2040 Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM10</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>-28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>-6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2040 Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SCAG

Photos: SCAG, latimes.com
Performance Indicators – Aviation Noise Impacts

- Examines population in areas incurring aviation noise at or above 65 dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL), a measure of noise that takes into account both the number and the timing of flights, as well as the mix of aircraft types.

**TABLE B4** EJ Variables within the Aviation 65-dB Noise Impacted Areas for 2016 RTP/SCS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012 Base Year</th>
<th>2040 Baseline</th>
<th>2040 Plan</th>
<th>Plan - Baseline</th>
<th>Percent Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>91,928</td>
<td>156,253</td>
<td>134,277</td>
<td>(21,976)</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>50,773</td>
<td>86,253</td>
<td>74,965</td>
<td>(11,288)</td>
<td>-13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>12,873</td>
<td>20,004</td>
<td>17,622</td>
<td>(2,383)</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>23,096</td>
<td>30,563</td>
<td>24,711</td>
<td>(5,852)</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian &amp; PI</td>
<td>3,73</td>
<td>14,343</td>
<td>12,647</td>
<td>(1,697)</td>
<td>-12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Races</td>
<td>1,855</td>
<td>4,558</td>
<td>3,954</td>
<td>(604)</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure: Qantas
Performance Indicators – Roadway Noise Impacts

- Examines population in areas incurring noise along roadways at or above 65 dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL), which accounts for traffic volume, speed, and vehicle types including heavy duty trucks.
Performance Indicators – Active Transportation Hazards

- Examines population in areas that experience the highest levels of bicycle and pedestrian collisions in recent periods.
Performance Indicators – Public Health Impacts

- Examines existing public health conditions throughout the region based on Cal/EPA's CalEnviroScreen data
### Performance Indicators – Rail Related Impacts

Examine population living in close proximity to freight/commuter rail lines, along with future grade separations.

**TABLE 90: Distribution of Environmental Justice Demographic Groups in the Railroaded Adjacent Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Within 500-Foot of Railroads</th>
<th>SCAG Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base Year 2012</td>
<td>2040 Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Races</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 91: Distribution of Environmental Justice Demographic Groups in the Areas Adjacent to Grade Separation Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Within 500-Foot of Grade Separation Projects</th>
<th>SCAG Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base Year 2012</td>
<td>2040 Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian &amp; PI</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Races</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Photo: Port of Long Beach
Performance Indicators – Climate Vulnerability

- Examines conditions in environmental justice communities related to potential climate vulnerability (e.g. sea level rise, wildfire risk)
### Summary of Technical Analysis - Environmental Justice

- Pages 12 to 15 show summarized findings at the regional level and by community of concern (as applicable) for each indicator.

#### TABLE 3: Comparison of EJ Performance Measures between 2040 Plan and 2040 Baseline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EJ Topic</th>
<th>EJ Performance Measures</th>
<th>Regional Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2016 RTP/SCS Revenue Sources in Terms of Tax Burdens</td>
<td>Improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Share of Transportation System Usage</td>
<td>Improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2016 RTP/SCS Investments vs. Benefits</td>
<td>Improve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EJ Topic</th>
<th>EJ Performance Measures</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>EJA</th>
<th>DAC</th>
<th>CbC</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Distribution of Transit Distance Savings Reductions (30 Minute Auto)</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Does Not Improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Distribution of Transit Time Reductions (30 Minute Auto)</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Distribution of Transit Time Reductions (45 Minute All Transit)</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Distribution of Travel Time Reductions (45 Minute Local Bus)</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Geographic Distribution of Transportation Investments in Bicycling (by assemblage)</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Geographic Distribution of Transportation Investments in Transit (by mile)</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Geographic Distribution of Transportation Investments in Highway (by lane mile)</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Current Conditions Analysis</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Impacts from Funding Through Mileage-Based User Fee</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
<td>Improve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary of Technical Analysis - Environmental Justice

Pages 12 to 15 show summarized findings at the regional level and by community of concern (as applicable) for each indicator.
Summary of Technical Analysis - Environmental Justice

Pages 12 to 15 show summarized findings at the regional level and by community of concern (as applicable) for each indicator.
Pages 12 to 15 show summarized findings at the regional level and by community of concern (as applicable) for each indicator.
Thank you
Community-Based Analysis

- **Environmental Justice Areas** — *Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZs)*, which are similar to block groups, that have a *higher concentration of minority OR low income households* than is seen in the region as a whole. The inclusion of this geography helps to fulfill SCAG’s Title VI requirements, along with other state and federal environmental justice guidelines.

- **SB 535 Disadvantaged Areas** — *Census tracts* that have been identified by *Cal/EPA as Disadvantaged Communities* based on the requirements set forth in SB 535, which seek to identify areas disproportionately burdened by and vulnerable to multiple sources of pollution.

- **Communities of Concern** — *Census Designated Places (CDPs) and City of Los Angeles Community Planning Areas (CPAs)* that fall in the upper 1/3rd of all communities in the SCAG Region for having the *highest concentration of minority population AND low income households*. 
Draft Proposed Environmental Justice Areas

Qualifying Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZs)

Environmental Justice Areas are Tier 2 TAZs that have a higher percentage of minority population OR households in poverty than is seen in the greater SCAG region.

SB 535 Disadvantaged Communities in the SCAG Region

Census tracts that have been identified by CalEPA as Disadvantaged Communities based on the requirements set forth in SB 535, which seek to identify areas disproportionately burdened by and vulnerable to multiple sources of pollution.

Sources: SCAG, 2014, 2009-2013 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, U.S. Census Bureau

6.4 Million People
35% of Region

Percentage of Minority Population: 88%
Percentage of Households in Poverty: 25%
4.2 Million People
23% of Region
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imperial County</th>
<th>Los Angeles County</th>
<th>Los Angeles County (Con't)</th>
<th>Orange County</th>
<th>San Bernardino County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brawley</td>
<td>Alondra Park</td>
<td>Maywood</td>
<td>Midway City</td>
<td>Adelanto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calexico</td>
<td>Arleta - Pacoima</td>
<td>Mission Hills - Panorama City - North Hills</td>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>Baker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calipatria</td>
<td>Azusa</td>
<td>Northeast Los Angeles</td>
<td>Stanton</td>
<td>Bloomington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Shores</td>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>Paramount</td>
<td>Riverside County</td>
<td>Colton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Centro</td>
<td>Bell Gardens</td>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>Coachella</td>
<td>Montclair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heber</td>
<td>Boyle Heights</td>
<td>Rosemead</td>
<td>Garnet</td>
<td>Muscoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holtville</td>
<td>Central City North</td>
<td>South El Monte</td>
<td>Good Hope</td>
<td>Rialto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niland</td>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>South Gate</td>
<td>Highgrove</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeley</td>
<td>Compton</td>
<td>South Los Angeles</td>
<td>Home Gardens</td>
<td>Ventura County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmorland</td>
<td>Cudahy</td>
<td>Southeast Los Angeles</td>
<td>Indio Hills</td>
<td>Santa Paula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterhaven</td>
<td>East Los Angeles</td>
<td>Sun Valley - La Tuna Canyon</td>
<td>Mead Valley</td>
<td>Saticoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East Rancho Dominguez</td>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>Mecca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>El Monte</td>
<td>Walnut Park</td>
<td>Mesa Verde</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Florence-Graham</td>
<td>West Adams - Baldwin Hills - Leimert</td>
<td>North Shore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harbor Gateway</td>
<td>West Athens</td>
<td>Oasis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaiian Gardens</td>
<td>West Rancho Dominguez</td>
<td>Perris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawthorne</td>
<td>Westlake</td>
<td>Ripley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huntington Park</td>
<td>Westmont</td>
<td>Thermal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inglewood</td>
<td>Willowbrook</td>
<td>Vista Santa Rosa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lennox</td>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lynwood</td>
<td>Wilmington - Harbor City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17.9 Million People
98% of Region
434,000 People
2% of Region

Environmental Justice
Urban and Rural Areas in the SCAG Region

(Source: SCAG, 2015; Calculated, U.S. Census Bureau)
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Example #1 – Categories

Transportation Related Impacts
- Share of Transportation System Usage
- Distribution of Travel Time Savings & Travel Distance Reduction
- Active Transportation Hazards
- Rail-Related Impacts

Land Use Related Impacts
- Accessibility to Employment and Services
- Jobs-Housing Imbalance or Jobs-Housing Mismatch

Economic Related Impacts
- 2016 RTP/SCS Revenue Sources in Terms of Tax Burdens
- 2016 RTP/SCS Investments
- Geographic Distribution of Transportation Investments
- Impacts from Funding Through Mileage-Based User Fees

Health Related Impacts
- Accessibility to Parks and Natural Lands
- Regional Emissions Impacts Analysis
- Impacts Along Freeways and Highly Traveled Corridors
- Aviation Noise Impacts
- Roadway Noise Impacts
- Public Health Analysis

Special Topics
- Gentrification and Displacement
- Climate Vulnerability
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example #2 – General Plan Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Accessibility to Employment and Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rail-related Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Jobs-Housing Imbalance or Jobs-Housing Mismatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gentrification and Displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Distribution of Travel Time Savings &amp; Travel Distance Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Geographic Distribution of Transportation Investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rail-Related Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Share of Transportation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Regional Emissions Impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Impacts Along Freeways and Highly Travelled Corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Climate Vulnerability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Aviation Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Roadway Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Active Transportation Hazard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Climate Vulnerability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Public Health Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Accessibility to Parks and Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>XX</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Accessibility to Employment and Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Revenue Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Impacts from Funding Through Mileage-Based User Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gentrification and Displacement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Your Input Needed

What Categories do you want?

How would you divide the levels of analyses?

How would you format the EJ Appendix?

How many categories would you suggest?

Or is there another format we haven’t thought of?