

4.7 Environmental Justice

This section analyzes the impacts of the 2018 RTP/SCS on low-income populations, minority individuals and populations, and low mobility populations.

4.7.1 Setting

a. Overview

Environmental justice is defined in the California Government Code as “the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies” (Gov. Code § 65040.12 (e)). In May 2012, the California Attorney General’s office released a report titled “Environmental Justice at the Local and Regional Level – Legal Background,” which interprets CEQA to include considerations of environmental justice, although environmental justice is not explicitly mentioned in the State CEQA guidelines. The report defines “fairness” in this context to mean that “the benefits of a healthy environment should be available to everyone, and the burdens of pollution should not be focused on sensitive populations or on communities that already are experiencing its adverse effects.”

At the federal level, Executive Order 12898 - Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations became effective on February 11, 1994. The Executive Order directs every federal agency to make environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing the effects of all programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations. Hence, the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) issued its own order, 5680.2, to clarify and reinforce environmental justice policies related to transportation planning. A branch of the USDOT, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), has established policies for integrating environmental justice principles into existing operations. There are three main elements to FHWA’s environmental justice policy:

- Avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects, including social and economic effects on minority and low-income populations;
- Ensure full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process; and
- Prevent reduction or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority populations and low-income groups.

No new policies or regulations have been implemented as they pertain to Environmental Justice impact determinations under CEQA. Data related to environmental justice have been updated to the latest available data.

Issues of environmental justice impact low-income populations, minority individuals and populations, and low-mobility populations, as defined below, and may include, but are not limited to concerns related to human health and safety, economic development, society and culture, accessibility, and the natural environment. These populations are discussed further below.

In addition, urban development has been ongoing in the region since certification of the 2014 RTP/SCS EIR, primarily concentrated in existing urban or suburban areas.

b. Demographics

San Joaquin County consists of seven major cities: Escalon, Lathrop, Lodi, Manteca, Ripon, Stockton, and Tracy. The County contains other census designated places, and unincorporated communities. Tables 14, 15, and 16 summarize 2015 demographic information for these regions. The most recent available demographics data is from the year 2015, therefore 2015 has been used to characterize 2017 baseline conditions. For the purposes of this analysis, “communities of concern” were identified through analysis of demographic and socioeconomic data for minority, low-income, low community engagement, and low-mobility populations based on 2015 U.S. Census data, 2011-2015 American Community Survey data, SJCOG population estimates, and SJCOG employment and population projections.

Race/Ethnicity

The environmental justice analysis evaluates communities to determine their minority and low income status based on absolute and relative criteria. A community qualifies as minority or low-income if it meets either of the two criteria that apply to each designation shown in Table 21.

Table 21 Absolute and Relative Criteria used to Evaluate Environmental Justice Communities

| Designation | Absolute Criteria | Relative Criteria |
|-------------------------|---|---|
| Minority blocks | Minority population that is greater than 50 percent of the total block population | Minority population that is more than 10 percentage points higher than the surrounding area |
| Low-income block groups | Low-income population that is greater than 25 percent of the total block group population | Low-income population that is more than 10 percentage points higher than the surrounding area |

Source: Council on Environmental Quality 1997; Environmental Justice, Guidance under the National Environmental Policy Act.

The 2014 RTP/SCS defined environmental justice areas as groups which contained 60 percent or more minority populations. This analysis bases uses the Council on Environmental Quality criteria of 50 or more minority populations as communities of concern. This is a conservative assumption as the 2014 RTP/SCS analyzed 60 percent or greater minority populations.

Table 22 shows the racial and ethnic composition of San Joaquin County and cities and census designated places (CDP). In 2015, approximately 40% of all San Joaquin County residents identified themselves as Hispanic by ethnicity. The Cities of Lathrop, Manteca, and Stockton were comprised of the highest percentage Hispanic population by ethnicity in San Joaquin County, with 41.5%, 40.3%, and 42.1% Hispanic, respectively. The highest percentage of Hispanic populations in the CDPs were Garden Acres and Victor, with 77.7% and 93.9%, respectively.

There are no cities in San Joaquin County with populations composed of larger than 60 percent minorities. The CDPs with minority populations higher than 50% include the communities of Acampo, August, French Camp, Garden Acres, Kennedy, Taft Mosswood, Thornton, and Victor. These areas have minority groups that comprise greater than 50% of that communities’ total population.

Table 22 Race and Ethnicity in San Joaquin County, 2015

| Location | White | Black | American Indian | Asian | Pacific Islander | Other | Two or More Races | Hispanic |
|---------------------------------------|-------|-------|-----------------|-------|------------------|-------|-------------------|----------|
| County (All) | 57% | 7.1% | 0.7% | 14.8% | 0.5% | 11.7% | 8.2% | 40.1% |
| Cities | | | | | | | | |
| City of Escalon | 91.3% | 0.0% | 0.1% | 1.1% | 0.2% | 2.8% | 4.4% | 25.4% |
| City of Lathrop | 47.6% | 8.8% | 0.2% | 22.9% | 0.3% | 10.8% | 9.3% | 41.5% |
| City of Lodi | 72.2% | 1.2% | 0.6% | 8.4% | 0.4% | 7.0% | 10.1% | 35.8% |
| City of Manteca | 68.2 | 3.9 | 0.6 | 7.7 | 0.5 | 12.7 | 6.5 | 40.3% |
| City of Ripon | 86.2 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 2.7 | 0.0 | 3.9 | 6.0 | 22.2 |
| City of Stockton | 44.2 | 11.6 | 0.7 | 21.4 | 0.7 | 13.2 | 8.2 | 42.1 |
| City of Tracy | 59.4 | 5.7 | 0.4 | 15.1 | 0.7 | 9.5 | 9.2 | 38.1 |
| Census Designated Places (CDP) | | | | | | | | |
| Acampo | 100% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 53.1 |
| August | 42.6 | 3.4 | 1.6 | 11.7 | 0.0 | 30.6 | 10.0 | 67.5 |
| Collierville | 79.8 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 17.3 | 30.8 |
| Country Club | 69.0 | 3.2 | 0.9 | 5.1 | 0.7 | 7.4 | 13.6 | 49.8 |
| Dogtown | 87.7 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9.7 | 19.1 |
| Farmington | 100 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 |
| French Camp | 62.8 | 8.6 | 1.9 | 3.2 | 0.2 | 17.1 | 6.1 | 62.0 |
| Garden Acres | 61.6 | 1.1 | 1.4 | 2.0 | 0.4 | 28.7 | 4.7 | 78.9 |
| Kennedy | 62.9 | 4.8 | 1.0 | 10.8 | 0.0 | 17.1 | 3.4 | 77.7 |
| Lincoln Village | 67.4 | 6.8 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 8.1 | 15.9 | 25.1 |
| Linden | 87.5 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 8.6 | 23.6 |
| Lockeford | 84.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 7.0 | 4.8 | 30.3 |
| Morada | 68.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 26.9 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 3.9 | 8.9 |
| Mountain House | 41.5 | 16.6 | 1.2 | 43.4 | 5.4 | 7.4 | 14.1 | 17.7 |
| Peters | 84.3 | 0.0 | 7.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 28.2 | 19.8 | 35.9 |
| Taft Mosswood | 46.1 | 12.0 | 4.1 | 19.6 | 0.0 | 25.0 | 6.8 | 66.4 |
| Terminus | 96.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.2 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 25.6 |
| Thornton | 76.4 | 0.0 | 3.1 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 16.7 | 3.3 | 69.3 |
| Victor | 10.3 | 0.0 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 89.7 | 4.2 | 93.9 |
| Waterloo | 98.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Woodbridge | 90.5 | 0.5 | 1.9 | 4.6 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 1.8 | 26.5 |

Source: U.S. Census 2011-2015 5-Year American Community Survey

Income

The average poverty rate for San Joaquin County in 2015 was 18.6%. This represents the percent of individuals who fall below the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services poverty threshold. Table 23 illustrates the median income, poverty rate, and unemployment rate for each City and census designated place in San Joaquin County. Any city/community higher than the County average was conservatively analyzed as low income compared to the standards laid out in Table 23. The City

of Stockton (21.2%) and the census designated places of August (36.6%), Taft Mosswood (18.6%), Thornton (31.2%) and Victor (44.4%) all had percentages of persons living below the poverty line in the County above the overall County rate of 18.6%.

Table 23 Income and Poverty Rate in San Joaquin County, 2015

| Location | Household Income | Poverty Rate - All people | % Unemployed |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| County (All) | \$53,274 | 18.6% | 13.7% |
| Cities | | | |
| City of Escalon | \$52,125 | 8.8% | 3.4% |
| City of Lathrop | \$62,267 | 11.0% | 11.9% |
| City of Lodi | \$49,316 | 13.8% | 12.1% |
| City of Manteca | \$62,364 | 9.8% | 14.7% |
| City of Ripon | \$80,374 | 7.1% | 5.3% |
| City of Stockton | \$50,151 | 21.2% | 15.2% |
| City of Tracy | \$76,310 | 6.9% | 11.1% |
| Census Designated Places (CDP) | | | |
| Acampo | \$152,713 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| August | \$31,763 | 36.6 | 17.8 |
| Collierville | \$49,375 | 17.5 | 23.7 |
| Country Club | \$44,106 | 12.9 | 18.2 |
| Dogtown | \$73,333 | 3.6 | 11.3 |
| Farmington | n/a | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| French Camp | \$35,313 | 15.4 | 17.7 |
| Garden Acres | \$39,375 | 18.2 | 19.5 |
| Kennedy | \$38,088 | 18.2 | 18.5 |
| Lincoln Village | \$55,221 | 3.7 | 15.7 |
| Linden | \$84,239 | 7.6 | 9.3 |
| Lockeford | \$44,244 | 15.7 | 12.3 |
| Morada | \$105,658 | 1.9 | 5.3 |
| Mountain House | \$106,976 | 5.5 | 17.4 |
| Peters | \$112,679 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Taft Mosswood | \$26,149 | 18.6 | 20.9 |
| Terminus | \$52,750 | 0.0 | 8.7 |
| Thornton | \$33,036 | 31.2 | 17.9 |
| Victor | n/a | 44.4 | 25.8 |
| Waterloo | \$109,485 | 0.0 | 6.9 |
| Woodbridge | \$77,000 | 6.2 | 9.0 |

Source: U.S. Census 2011-2015 5-Year American Community Survey

Mobility

Mobility refers to the movement of people via multiple modes, including individual cars, public transit, walking, and cycling, among others. Mobility can be an important indicator of quality of life, as mobility is correlated with accessibility, which is the ease with which individuals can reach their destinations. Enhanced mobility is a means to increase accessibility of desired goods or destinations. Low-mobility populations are limited in their ability to access needed goods and services or the means by which they reach their destination are relatively expensive or inconvenient. Auto-oriented municipalities and communities with few safe or reliable transportation alternatives are mobility-limiting, leaving the individual without a choice in means of transportation. Limited public transit options, few cycling infrastructure improvements, or lack of pedestrian safety measures limit individual mobility. Low-income populations may be faced with restricted mobility if they do not have access to a private vehicle. Elderly populations are frequently limited in individual mobility in auto-oriented transportation systems. As aging populations lose their ability to drive privately-owned vehicles, it is increasingly important to address multiple modes of transportation to prevent isolation, economic hardship, or reduced quality of life of the expanding senior population.

Table 24 lists demographic factors that may affect mobility within the County, cities, and communities in San Joaquin County. All cities and communities in the County have roughly similar commuting patterns, with single-occupancy vehicles being the most common choice. The communities of Farmington, Terminous, and Waterloo have considerably higher population percentages of elderly individuals aged 65 and above (above 25%). These communities may face a greater need for alternative modes of transportation to ensure elderly populations remain mobile. The City of Stockton (10.0%) and Lodi (8.0%) have the highest percentages of households without a vehicle. The majority of Cities and census designated places within San Joaquin County have relatively low percentages of households without a vehicle, which could be due to the long commute distances that homeowners travel to work. This can be conversely applied to the fact that the majority of Cities have a higher percentage of households without vehicles, as urban cities are denser, with increased transit oriented development.

Table 24 Factors that Affect Mobility in San Joaquin County, 2015

| | Age 65 and Over | No vehicle | Drive Alone | Carpool | Public Transit | Walk | Other | Work at Home |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|------------|-------------|---------|----------------|------|-------|--------------|
| County (All) | 9.7% | 6.7% | 76.6% | 14.8% | 1.5% | 1.9% | 1.6% | 3.7% |
| Cities | | | | | | | | |
| City of Escalon | 15.5 | 5.0% | 89.9% | 1.3% | 2.2% | 1.5% | 2.6% | 2.5% |
| City of Lathrop | 7.5 | 5.3% | 76.9% | 14.4% | 2.2% | 0.6% | 1.0% | 4.8% |
| City of Lodi | 14.2 | 8.0% | 77.4% | 14.1% | 0.6% | 2.2% | 1.9% | 3.9% |
| City of Manteca | 11.0 | 4.4% | 78.5% | 13.2% | 1.8% | 1.5% | 1.6% | 3.5% |
| City of Ripon | 13.1 | 2.2% | 81.6% | 11.8% | 0.7% | 1.2% | 1.0% | 3.8% |
| City of Stockton | 11.0 | 10.0% | 76.7% | 15.9% | 1.4% | 1.4% | 1.7% | 2.9% |
| City of Tracy | 8.0 | 3.5% | 75.2% | 14.7% | 2.8% | 1.6% | 1.8% | 3.7% |
| Census Designated Places (CDP) | | | | | | | | |
| Acampo | 0.0 | 0.0 | 35.6 | 39.8 | 0.0 | 8.0 | 9.3 | 7.3 |
| August | 5.4 | 5.0 | 67.5 | 26.9 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 3.0 | 1.4 |
| Collierville | 6.7 | 0.0 | 75.6 | 13.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.3 | 5.5 |
| Country Club | 15.0 | 2.7 | 82.1 | 14.2 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 0.8 |
| Dogtown | 22.8 | 1.8 | 81.1 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.0 | 12.2 |
| Farmington | 66.3 | 0.0 | 76.3 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 13.8 |
| French Camp | 5.8 | 1.6 | 69.0 | 23.0 | 0.4 | 2.1 | 0.0 | 5.5 |
| Garden Acres | 8.4 | 4.6 | 71.0 | 23.8 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 3.2 |
| Kennedy | 8.8 | 5.2 | 81.7 | 10.2 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.9 |
| Lincoln Village | 16.6 | 2.1 | 82.0 | 8.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.7 |
| Linden | 15.9 | 1.0 | 84.8 | 8.7 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 4.0 |
| Lockeford | 13.1 | 6.7 | 80.7 | 9.0 | 0.0 | 3.7 | 1.1 | 5.5 |
| Morada | 24.5 | 0.0 | 80.5 | 14.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.9 |
| Mountain House | 5.3 | 1.9 | 75.4 | 16.2 | 1.8 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 5.8 |
| Peters | 11.2 | 0.0 | 68.1 | 31.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Taft Mosswood | 12.7 | 0.0 | 63.4 | 29.0 | 0.0 | 4.8 | 0.0 | 2.9 |
| Terminus | 36.4 | 0.0 | 69.9 | 15.8 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 0.0 | 8.9 |
| Thornton | 13.4 | 0.0 | 69.3 | 14.1 | 0.0 | 3.4 | 0.0 | 13.2 |
| Victor | 4.2 | 0.0 | 65.8 | 34.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Waterloo | 28.6 | 0.0 | 85.6 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.8 |
| Woodbridge | 19.4 | 0.9 | 73.1 | 21.1 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 3.9 |

Source: U.S. Census 2011-2015 5-Year American Community Survey

Communities of Concern

For the purposes of this analysis, “communities of concern” were identified through analysis of demographic and socioeconomic data for minority, low-income, and low-mobility populations based on 2015 U.S. Census data, 2011-2015 American Community Survey data, SJCOG population estimates, and SJCOG employment and population projections (see above discussion).

In addition to the identified places above, the 2018 RTP/SCS included defined environmental justice areas which are areas of low income and high minority regions living throughout San Joaquin County. Other factors included in the identification of communities of concern were households within 500 feet of a major transportation facility, and transportation accessibility.

c. Regulatory Setting

Federal

SJCOG receives funding from federal agencies such as the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration for some of its programs and activities. Therefore, SJCOG conducts its federally funded programs and activities in accordance with guidance issued by the federal agencies pursuant to federal laws, executive orders, and regulations (discussed above).

State

California Government Code Section 65040.12

Senate Bill 115 of 1999 and Senate Bill 89 of 2000 (Section 65040.12 of the Government Code) required the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to:

- Consult with the Secretaries of the California Environmental Protection Agency, the Resources Agency, and the Business, Transportation, and Housing Agency, the Working Group on Environmental Justice established pursuant to Section 72002 (now Section 71113) of the Public Resources Code, any other appropriate State agencies, and all other interested members of the public and private sectors in this State.
- Coordinate OPR's efforts and share information regarding environmental justice programs with the Council on Environmental Quality, the United States Environmental Protection Agency, the General Accounting Office, the Office of Management and Budget, and other federal agencies.
- Review and evaluate any information from federal agencies that is obtained as a result of their respective regulatory activities under federal Executive Order 12898, and from the Working Group on Environmental Justice established pursuant to Section 72002 of the Public Resources Code.

SB 89 also required the formation of an advisory committee, California Environmental Justice Advisory Committee (CEJAC), to provide information and assistance to the Secretary of the CalEPA and Interagency Working Group on Environmental Justice (IWG) in establishing and implementing an intra-agency strategy to achieve environmental justice. In 2004, the CalEPA released its Environmental Justice Strategy and Action Plan based on the IWG recommendations for identifying and addressing any gaps in existing programs, policies, or activities that may impede the achievement of environmental justice and suggested procedures for collecting, maintaining, analyzing, and coordinating information relating to its environmental justice strategy.

California Government Code Section 11135

California Government Code Section 11135 states that no person in the State of California shall, on the basis of race, national origin, ethnic group identification, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, color, or disability, be unlawfully denied full and equal access to the benefits of, or be unlawfully subjected to discrimination under, any program or activity that is conducted, operated, or

administered by the State or by any State agency, is funded directly by the State, or receives any financial assistance from the State.

4.7.2 Impact Analysis

a. Methodology and Significance Thresholds

A significant impact is defined as “a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in the environment” (CEQA Section 21068). Based on the information provided above, an impact is significant if it would cause disproportionately high and adverse environmental and public health effect and interrelated difficult social and/or economic effect for minority or low-income populations. Therefore, the 2018 RTP/SCS would have a significant impact on a community of concern if:

- 1 Implementation of 2018 RTP/SCS would lead to disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental impacts to the minority populations, low-income populations, low community engagement populations and/or populations with low mobility in the SJCOG region.
- 2 The mobility benefits derived from 2018 RTP/SCS in terms of travel times and accessibility by transit and/or single-occupancy vehicle would be substantially less for minority populations, low-income populations, low community engagement populations, and/or populations with low mobility in the SJCOG region.

b. Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section describes generalized impacts associated with proposed transportation improvements and the future land use scenario envisioned under the 2018 RTP/SCS.

IMPACT EJ-1 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECTS CONTAINED IN THE 2018 RTP/SCS MAY CAUSE ADVERSE EFFECTS ON A MINORITY OF LOW-INCOME POPULATION; HOWEVER, THESE POTENTIAL IMPACTS WOULD NOT BE DISPROPORTIONATELY HIGH AS PER EXECUTIVE ORDER 12898 REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE. IMPACTS WOULD BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT.

Short-Term Impacts

During construction of some transportation improvement projects and future infill and TOD under 2018 RTP/SCS, some minority and/or low-income populations may be affected. The potentially significant improvement projects may have short-term impacts on surrounding communities related to construction; including impacts related to air quality, noise and traffic (refer to Sections 4.3 *Air Quality* and 4.13 *Noise* and 4.14 *Transportation and Circulation*). Specific air quality impacts could include exposure to dust due to the operation of construction vehicles (e.g., scrapers, loaders, dump trucks), and clearing and grading activities. Other air quality impacts include short-term exposure to hazardous air emissions, including diesel emissions from construction equipment. Construction noise impacts from clearing, grading, and laying asphalt could expose nearby receptors to levels up to 88 decibels at 50 feet from the source. Minority populations may be exposed to these impacts; however, such impacts would be mitigated to a less than significant level after implementation of the mitigation measures listed in Section 4.3 *Air Quality* and 4.13 *Noise*. Temporary traffic impacts include delays during road closures or other disturbances from construction activities; however, due to their temporary nature, traffic delay impacts would not be considered significant.

While it is likely that numerous construction sites of individual improvement projects may experience temporary air quality, noise and construction impacts, mitigation measures have been identified to minimize potential impacts and protect sensitive receptors or special populations located near the individual improvement sites, including low-income or minority communities (refer to Sections 4.3 *Air Quality* and 4.13 *Noise*, and 4.14 *Transportation and Circulation*). These temporary impacts would be distributed to all communities within proximity to the project construction site. All municipalities and unincorporated communities may experience periods of temporary dust, hazardous air emissions, elevated noise levels, and increased traffic congestion prior to the completion of the roadway, circulation, infrastructure, or transit improvement. As discussed above, minority and/or low-income communities would not be disproportionately affected. As a result, short-term impacts are considered less than significant.

Long-Term Impacts

Minority populations located in close proximity to major highways, particularly State Route 4, and Interstate 5 and Interstate 205, may be exposed to hazardous criteria pollutants. However, as discussed in Section 4.3 *Air Quality*, diesel PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀ and NO_x emissions under 2018 RTP/SCS would be notably lower than existing conditions and future conditions without the projects listed in the 2018 RTP/SCS. As a result, impacts to minority populations that may occur in close proximity to major freeways would be less than significant. In addition, ambient noise throughout the region, particularly in urbanized areas, would increase due to an overall increase in vehicle activity. Mitigation measures identified in Section 4.13 *Noise* would reduce these potential impacts to a less than significant level. It is also important to note that while some minority populations may be exposed to these conditions, there are many other non-minority populations that may be exposed as well, as non-minority populations also live within close proximity to major highways, particularly along State Route 120, Interstate 580 and State Route 99. The projects contained in the 2018 RTP/SCS are dispersed throughout the region. The dispersion of projects is shown on the project location map (Figures 3) in Section 2.0 *Project Description*. One example includes the Caltrans Mainline Improvement Project (SJ18-1001), which proposes to widen State Route 99, and includes reconstruction of interchanges and pedestrian crossings. A variety of populations reside along this corridor. Therefore, minority populations would not be disproportionately impacted.

In addition, the 2018 RTP/SCS envisions a land use scenario that encourages infill and TOD, which would locate people closer to existing goods and services, as well as transportation hubs. As a result, this land use scenario would locate people closer to areas with increased concentrations of air pollutants, elevated noise levels and increased light and glare. These specific impacts are discussed in Sections 4.1 *Aesthetics*, 4.3 *Air Quality* and 4.13 *Noise*. While future residents of infill and TOD projects could include minority populations, this land use scenario would not disproportionately impact minority populations, as future infill and TOD projects would serve a wide array of the population and would be dispersed throughout urbanized areas. In addition, transportation system improvements, as well as the land use scenario envisioned by 2018 RTP/SCS, would provide greater mobility for low-income and minority groups.

The communities of Acampo, August, French Camp, Garden Acres, Kennedy, Taft Mosswood, Thornton, and Victor were identified through demographic and economic analysis summarized above as communities of concern. In general, transportation improvement projects in the 2018 RTP/SCS are not prioritized in these areas, as little existing TOD occurs in these areas. In turn, transportation improvement projects would therefore not disproportionately affect these areas. The identified communities contain various minority populations and may be impacted by 2018

RTP/SCS projects, but would not be disproportionately impacted as other non-minority populations have the potential to be impacted by similar projects included in 2018 RTP/SCS.

In addition, SJCOG has explicitly outlined policies and supportive strategies to address equity and health and safety in the RTP/SCS in compliance with EO 12898, including:

- Policy-Maximize Mobility and Accessibility. Strategy #5: Optimize Public Transportation System to Provide Efficient and Convenient Access for Users at All Income Levels.
- Policy-Promote Interagency Coordination and Public Participation for Transportation Decision Making and Planning Efforts. Strategy #19: Provide Equitable Access to Transportation Planning and Strategy 21: Use a Variety of Methods to Engage the Public, Encouraging Representation from Diverse Income and Ethnic Backgrounds.
- Policy-Improve the Quality of Life for Residents: Strategy 25: Encourage Transportation Investments that Support a Greater Mix of Housing Options at All Income Levels.

Therefore, based on the analysis above and proposed policies, the 2018 RTP/SCS would not disproportionately expose minority populations, low-income population or low-mobility populations to adverse environmental impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No Mitigation Measures are required.

Significance After Mitigation

Impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

IMPACT EJ-2 THE BENEFITS DERIVED FROM THE 2018 RTP/SCS IN TERMS OF TRAVEL TIMES AND ACCESSIBILITY BY TRANSIT, SINGLE-OCCUPANCY VEHICLES, BICYCLING OR WALKING AND ACCESS AND AVAILABILITY OF HOUSING OPTIONS WILL NOT BE SUBSTANTIALLY LESS IN ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE COMMUNITIES IN THE SJCOG REGION. IMPACTS WOULD BE LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT.

The 2018 RTP/SCS identifies several performance measures to evaluate the effectiveness of the SCS at achieving SJCOG's planning goals and objectives. Performance measures related to social equity and mobility include but are not limited to:

- Average travel time driving alone and carpooling (minutes)
- Work-related trips less than 30 minutes driving alone or carpooling
- Average travel time for public transit (minutes)
- Average travel time for walking (minutes)
- Average travel time for bicycling (minutes)
- Household transit access within 0.5 miles

Transit Accessibility

An equity analysis was performed for the 2018 RTP/SCS bus transit investments, which analyzed both EJ vs. non-EJ for both households and employment for high quality transit areas as defined by SB 375. For San Joaquin County, this includes all rail stations, bus transit hubs and transfer stations, and BRT (also called express bus) routes within the City of Stockton. The percentage of the total EJ population within a half-mile walking distance of a transit stop, relative to the percentage of

households and employment for within EJ communities, was calculated. The results indicated that the EJ community percentages, both in terms of households and employment within walking distance of transit, are significantly higher than the percentages calculated for non-EJ communities. Just over 50 percent of the households located in EJ communities have access to high-quality transit compared to only 12 percent for non-EJ areas. These findings are similar for employment access to high quality transit in the EJ communities versus non-EJ communities, with nearly 64 percent of jobs in EJ communities in proximity to high-quality transit versus 24 percent for non-EJ communities. Based on these results, equitable if not more favorable benefits resulting from transit investments can be inferred for EJ communities. As discussed in the 2018 RTP/SCS, this is likely attributed to EJ communities being more geographically concentrated within developed areas of the county where transit service provision is the greatest. As such, transit accessibility for communities of concern would not disproportionately affected by the 2018 RTP/SCS, and impacts would be less than significant.

Households Within 500 Feet of a Major Transportation Facility

Given that the proximity to major transportation facilities can increase population exposure to health based emissions and particulate matter from vehicles, an equity analysis was performed for the 2018 RTP/SCS to compare the number and percentage of general population households relative to EJ households located within 500 feet of a major transportation facility. Taking into account total countywide households, 4.2 percent of all households are within 500 feet of any major facility versus 4.0 percent for households in EJ communities. Overall, households in EJ areas represent 31.8 percent of households located near major transportation facilities, compared to 33.8 percent of total households in San Joaquin County. New household growth as forecasted by the land use patterns envisioned by the 2018 RTP/SCS would focus 32 percent of EJ households within 500 feet of a major roadway, and 70 percent for non-EJ communities. As such, the 2018 RTP/SCS would not disproportionately place EJ communities within major transportation facilities, and impacts would be less than significant.

Roadway Expenditure Benefits

To gauge the extent to which EJ communities proportionately benefit from roadway improvement expenditures compared to the general population, an equity analysis was performed as part of the 2018 RTP/SCS. Using the SJCOG travel demand model, a select link analysis was performed on regionally significant roadways identified for capacity improvements in the 2018 RTP/SCS. The analysis yields the percentage of vehicle demand whose origin is in an EJ community versus a non-EJ community. Results indicate that approximately 31.5 percent of daily vehicle trips utilizing these improved roadways originate from EJ communities. This indicates that a significant proportion of EJ communities will benefit from future roadway investments resulting from the Plan. While this share is slightly less than the countywide percentage of total EJ households, 33.8 percent, the difference is relatively small at 2.3%.

Based on the evaluation of the transportation improvement projects and future land use patterns envisioned by the 2018 RTP/SCS, mobility benefits would not be significantly less for communities of concern populations compared to effects for the total population. Overall, the 2018 RTP/SCS would improve mobility benefits for minority populations and communities of concern, as well as non-minority populations. In areas of increase, communities of concern would not be impacted in a disproportionate manner compared to the total population. Impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

Significance After Mitigation

Impacts would be less than significant without mitigation.

c. Cumulative Impacts

This chapter evaluates the environmental justice impacts of the 2018 RTP/SCS on identified communities of concern in San Joaquin County through the year 2042. Although identified communities of concern may be exposed to environmental impacts such as air quality contaminants, and noise, identified communities of concern would not be impacted in a disproportionate manner compared to the total population. The 2018 RTP/SCS would improve mobility benefits for minority populations and communities of concern, as well as non-minority populations through 2042. In addition, as discussed in Impact EJ-2, the 2018 RTP/SCS would not disproportionately expose minority populations, low-income population or low-mobility populations to adverse environmental impacts. The 2018 RTP/SCS's contribution to environmental justice impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.