

Environmental Justice

This appendix provides a summary of the data OEA collected to evaluate the potential for the Proposed Acquisition to result in disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on potential Environmental Justice (EJ) populations.

P.1 System-wide Demographic Analysis

Table P.1-1 lists the census block groups (block group) that met the thresholds established for identifying potential minority populations. As described in *Section 3.13.1, Approach*, OEA assumed minority populations exist in the study area when either:

- At least 50 percent of the people in the block group self-identify as being of minority status; or
- The percentage of the population of minority status in the block group is at least 10 percentage points higher than for the entire county in which the population is located.

OEA identified a total of 49 block groups as areas with potential minority populations. This represented approximately 23 percent of the study area data set, which included 217 total block groups. The block groups identified as potential minority populations contained predominantly individuals who selected “Black or African American alone” on the U.S. census (approximately five percent of block groups in the data set), followed by “Asian alone” (three percent of the block groups in the data set), then “Some Other Race alone” (approximately two percent of the block groups in the data set). Approximately 14 percent of the block groups were identified as potential “Hispanic or Latino” populations.

Table P.1-2 lists the block groups that met the thresholds established for identifying potential low-income populations. As described in *Section 3.13.1, Approach*, OEA defined low-income to mean individuals with an income less than 200 percent of the federal poverty level (less than or equal to twice the federal poverty level). Consistent with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's guidance and OEA's practice in past railroad merger cases, OEA identified a block group as potentially containing low-income populations when one or both of the following conditions was met:

- At least 50 percent of the population for whom poverty status is determined in the block group qualifies as low-income; or
- The percentage of the population for whom poverty status is determined in the block group that qualifies as low-income is at least 10 percentage points higher than for the entire county in which the population is located.

OEA identified a total of 62 block groups as areas with potential low-income populations, which represents approximately 29 percent of the total block groups in the data set.

Table P.1-3 lists the census block groups in the study area that OEA identified as populations with comparatively high rates of limited English-speaking households. Although not a threshold applied to identify potential EJ populations, identifying potential populations in the study area who are limited in English proficiency enables OEA to facilitate meaningful engagement and informed participation, and to determine where it may be appropriate for OEA to provide interpretation and translation services. As described in *Section 3.13.1, Approach*, OEA identified potential block groups in the study area where limited English-speaking populations may exist by identifying block groups where:

- At least 50 percent of households in the census block group were limited English speaking; or
- The percentage of limited English-speaking households in the census block group was at least 10 percentage points higher than for the entire county in which the block group is located in.

OEA identified 12 block groups (approximately six percent of the total block groups) within the study area as potentially needing English language assistance. Among these block groups, the predominant language spoken is Spanish, with some concentrations of households speaking “Other Indo-European Languages” and “Asian and Pacific Island Languages.” The block groups identified as limited English-speaking are located in Illinois (eight of the 12 block groups), Iowa (two of the 12 block groups), and Texas (two of the 12 block groups).

Bold and italicized font in **Table P.1-1** through **Table P.1-3** is used for emphasis in displaying which EJ thresholds are exceeded.

Table P.1-1. Census Block Groups in Study Area with Potential Minority Populations

2019: ACS 5-Year Estimates Data Profiles (2015-2019)	Percent Black or African American alone	Percent American Indian and Alaska Native alone	Percent Asian alone	Percent Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	Percent Some Other Race alone	Percent Minority (Non-White alone)	Percent Hispanic or Latino
Illinois	14.2%	0.3%	5.5%	0.0%	5.9%	25.9%	17.1%
Carroll County	1.2%	0.1%	0.8%	0.0%	0.4%	2.5%	3.7%
Block Group 4, Tract 9603	7.3%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	12.9%	11.9%
Cook County	23.4%	0.3%	7.3%	0.0%	9.6%	40.7%	25.3%
Block Group 1, Tract 8044.06	7.8%	0.0%	17.1%	0.0%	19.5%	44.4%	48.5%
Block Group 1, Tract 8045.07	3.1%	0.0%	22.0%	0.0%	7.1%	32.2%	21.2%
Block Group 1, Tract 8045.11	6.4%	0.3%	17.1%	0.0%	17.9%	41.6%	51.9%
Block Group 1, Tract 8048.03	7.1%	4.4%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%	29.7%	0.0%
Block Group 2, Tract 8048.04	13.1%	6.6%	30.3%	0.0%	2.4%	52.4%	4.9%
Block Group 4, Tract 8048.04	0.0%	1.3%	21.7%	0.0%	0.0%	23.0%	8.5%
DeKalb County	7.9%	0.1%	2.3%	0.0%	3.3%	13.6%	11.2%
Block Group 3, Tract 1	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.1%	13.1%	30.6%
DuPage County	4.8%	0.2%	11.9%	0.0%	3.4%	20.3%	14.3%
Block Group 4, Tract 8401.01	0.3%	5.4%	5.4%	8.8%	0.0%	19.9%	27.8%
Block Group 2, Tract 8408.02	1.1%	0.0%	4.1%	0.0%	22.8%	28.0%	60.7%
Block Group 3, Tract 8408.02	5.7%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	9.3%	24.1%	42.1%
Block Group 4, Tract 8411.02	11.8%	0.0%	22.7%	0.0%	0.0%	34.6%	4.1%
Block Group 2, Tract 8411.08	21.5%	0.0%	3.1%	0.0%	5.5%	30.1%	26.9%
Block Group 1, Tract 8413.15	14.1%	0.0%	19.1%	0.0%	0.0%	33.1%	17.0%
Block Group 2, Tract 8413.15	7.0%	0.6%	18.1%	0.0%	2.3%	28.0%	29.1%
Kane County	5.5%	0.5%	4.1%	0.0%	14.0%	24.1%	31.9%
Block Group 1, Tract 8510	4.2%	7.4%	18.1%	0.0%	7.2%	36.9%	41.5%
Block Group 2, Tract 8510	12.4%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	22.0%	35.0%	33.8%
Block Group 1, Tract 8515	3.2%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	48.1%	53.7%	70.6%
Block Group 3, Tract 8516	17.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	45.5%	62.5%	58.4%
Block Group 1, Tract 8519.10	0.0%	16.4%	3.0%	0.0%	9.2%	28.7%	42.5%

Table P.1-1. Census Block Groups in Study Area with Potential Minority Populations

2019: ACS 5-Year Estimates Data Profiles (2015-2019)		Percent Black or African American alone	Percent American Indian and Alaska Native alone	Percent Asian alone	Percent Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	Percent Some Other Race alone	Percent Minority (Non-White alone)	Percent Hispanic or Latino
Block Group 3, Tract 8519.10		8.8%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	36.2%	46.6%	46.3%
Block Group 3, Tract 8546		2.9%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	18.5%	23.0%	70.3%
Rock Island County		10.4%	0.4%	2.5%	0.0%	2.7%	16.1%	12.9%
Block Group 1, Tract 245		21.8%	4.4%	4.4%	0.0%	2.7%	33.3%	22.1%
Total Number of Block Groups in Illinois Data Set with Potential Minority Populations:	23	3	1	6	0	4	10	13
Iowa		3.7%	0.4%	2.4%	0.1%	1.2%	7.9%	6.0%
Clinton County		2.8%	0.3%	0.7%	0.0%	0.2%	4.1%	3.1%
Block Group 3, Tract 1		15.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.1%	4.2%
Block Group 1, Tract 2		2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	19.7%
Block Group 1, Tract 5		9.0%	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%	5.5%	16.6%	6.8%
Louisa County		1.1%	0.9%	3.4%	0.0%	3.4%	8.8%	15.8%
Block Group 2, Tract 4501		5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.7%	7.7%	34.0%
Block Group 3, Tract 4502		3.0%	0.0%	9.7%	0.0%	2.5%	15.2%	45.7%
Muscatine County		2.5%	0.2%	0.9%	0.0%	3.2%	6.8%	17.9%
Block Group 2, Tract 507		0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	36.4%
Block Group 1, Tract 509		1.8%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	1.4%	4.5%	34.3%
Block Group 1, Tract 510		0.6%	0.0%	0.6%	0.6%	3.7%	5.6%	37.8%
Scott County		7.5%	0.3%	2.7%	0.0%	0.7%	11.3%	6.7%
Block Group 1, Tract 106		27.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	27.8%	3.1%
Block Group 2, Tract 106		22.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	23.2%	4.6%
Block Group 1, Tract 109		33.0%	1.3%	2.8%	0.0%	1.4%	38.4%	9.1%
Block Group 2, Tract 109		13.7%	1.2%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	19.4%	25.2%
Block Group 2, Tract 110		29.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	30.1%	8.5%

Table P.1-1. Census Block Groups in Study Area with Potential Minority Populations

2019: ACS 5-Year Estimates Data Profiles (2015-2019)		Percent Black or African American alone	Percent American Indian and Alaska Native alone	Percent Asian alone	Percent Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	Percent Some Other Race alone	Percent Minority (Non-White alone)	Percent Hispanic or Latino
Block Group 1, Tract 123		8.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	9.5%	20.1%
Wapello County		3.6%	0.1%	1.2%	0.7%	5.1%	10.7%	10.8%
Block Group 3, Tract 9606		3.1%	0.0%	3.5%	0.0%	21.6%	28.1%	30.6%
Washington County		0.8%	0.3%	0.6%	0.0%	1.8%	3.4%	6.2%
Block Group 3, Tract 9603		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.0%	11.0%	24.2%
Block Group 4, Tract 9604		10.2%	0.0%	6.1%	0.0%	0.7%	17.0%	14.1%
Total Number of Block Groups in Iowa Data Set with Potential Minority Populations:	17	5	0	0	0	1	8	10
Louisiana		32.2%	0.6%	1.7%	0.0%	1.4%	36.0%	5.1%
Calcasieu Parish		24.9%	0.3%	1.4%	0.0%	1.0%	27.6%	3.6%
Block Group 5, Tract 24		61.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	65.3%	0.0%
Total Number of Block Groups in Louisiana Data Set with Potential Minority Populations:	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
Missouri		11.5%	0.4%	2.0%	0.1%	1.2%	15.2%	4.2%
Clay County		6.1%	0.5%	2.2%	0.2%	1.8%	10.8%	6.8%
Block Group 2, Tract 214.03		8.5%	1.1%	0.7%	0.0%	3.1%	13.4%	19.7%
Jackson County		23.3%	0.4%	1.8%	0.3%	3.9%	29.8%	9.0%
Block Group 1, Tract 155		15.2%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	12.4%	28.7%	21.4%
Block Group 2, Tract 155		2.9%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	5.8%	10.4%	54.6%
Total Number of Block Groups in Missouri Data Set with Potential Minority Populations:	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Table P.1-1. Census Block Groups in Study Area with Potential Minority Populations

2019: ACS 5-Year Estimates Data Profiles (2015-2019)		Percent Black or African American alone	Percent American Indian and Alaska Native alone	Percent Asian alone	Percent Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	Percent Some Other Race alone	Percent Minority (Non-White alone)	Percent Hispanic or Latino
Texas		12.1%	0.5%	4.8%	0.1%	5.8%	23.3%	39.3%
Jefferson County		33.7%	0.4%	3.8%	0.1%	2.1%	40.0%	20.7%
Block Group 1, Tract 17		52.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	52.9%	19.8%
Block Group 1, Tract 19		18.2%	0.0%	4.3%	0.0%	11.0%	33.5%	64.4%
Block Group 2, Tract 117		22.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%	22.9%	52.4%
Orange County		8.7%	0.3%	1.2%	0.0%	0.7%	10.9%	7.7%
Block Group 1, Tract 218		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.5%
Block Group 2, Tract 220		0.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.0%	2.0%	2.2%	17.8%
Total Number of Block Groups in Texas Data Set with Potential Minority Populations:	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	4
GRAND TOTAL NUMBER OF BLOCK GROUPS IN DATA SET WITH POTENTIAL MINORITY POPULATIONS:		49	10	1	6	0	5	20
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5-Year Estimates Data Profiles (2015-2019).								

Table P.1-2. Census Block Groups in Study Area with Potential Low-Income Populations

2019: ACS 5-Year Estimates Data Profiles (2015-2019)	Individuals with Income Below 200% of Poverty Level	Total Population for Whom Poverty Status is Determined	Percent of Individuals with Income Below 200% of Poverty Level
Illinois	3,275,515	12,474,842	26.3%
Carroll County	4,003	14,070	28.5%
Block Group 4, Tract 9601	225	580	38.8%
Block Group 3, Tract 9603	307	688	44.6%
DuPage County	153,932	916,059	16.8%
Block Group 4, Tract 8401.01	688	1,657	41.5%
Block Group 2, Tract 8408.02	581	1,309	44.4%
Block Group 1, Tract 8409.01	526	1,674	31.4%
Block Group 2, Tract 8413.15	731	2,335	31.3%
Kane County	128,755	525,417	24.5%
Block Group 1, Tract 8510	1,060	2,685	39.5%
Block Group 1, Tract 8515	465	1,163	40.0%
Block Group 3, Tract 8516	289	774	37.3%
Block Group 3, Tract 8519.10	457	1,186	38.5%
Rock Island County	44,263	138,884	31.9%
Block Group 1, Tract 245	458	808	56.7%
Total Number of Census Block Groups in Illinois Data Set with Potential Low-Income Populations:			11
Iowa	859,137	3,040,184	28.3%
Appanoose County	4,730	12,294	38.5%
Block Group 3, Tract 9505	506	1,002	50.5%
Clinton County	14,744	45,776	32.2%
Block Group 1, Tract 1	825	1,249	66.1%
Block Group 3, Tract 1	458	648	70.7%
Block Group 1, Tract 2	191	228	83.8%
Block Group 3, Tract 2	503	1,026	49.0%
Block Group 4, Tract 4	359	510	70.4%
Block Group 3, Tract 7	669	975	68.6%
Block Group 2, Tract 8	793	1,344	59.0%
Louisa County	3,303	11,039	29.9%
Block Group 2, Tract 4501	388	697	55.7%
Block Group 3, Tract 4502	570	1,144	49.8%
Monroe County	2,108	7,681	27.4%
Block Group 2, Tract 702	464	1,097	42.3%
Muscatine County	12,836	42,090	30.5%
Block Group 1, Tract 504	733	1,772	41.4%

Table P.1-2. Census Block Groups in Study Area with Potential Low-Income Populations

2019: ACS 5-Year Estimates Data Profiles (2015-2019)	Individuals with Income Below 200% of Poverty Level	Total Population for Whom Poverty Status is Determined	Percent of Individuals with Income Below 200% of Poverty Level
Block Group 3, Tract 507	730	1,587	46.0%
Block Group 1, Tract 509	393	714	55.0%
Block Group 2, Tract 509	398	891	44.7%
Block Group 1, Tract 510	826	1,698	48.6%
Block Group 2, Tract 510	1,013	1,660	61.0%
Scott County	45,677	168,966	27.0%
Block Group 1, Tract 106	678	1,416	47.9%
Block Group 2, Tract 106	981	1,393	70.4%
Block Group 1, Tract 109	487	894	54.5%
Block Group 2, Tract 109	450	688	65.4%
Block Group 2, Tract 110	1,211	1,819	66.6%
Block Group 1, Tract 123	169	379	44.6%
Block Group 2, Tract 134	797	1,776	44.9%
Wapello County	13,464	34,348	39.2%
Block Group 2, Tract 9602	846	1,449	58.4%
Block Group 3, Tract 9606	873	1,469	59.4%
Washington County	6,383	21,709	29.4%
Block Group 4, Tract 9602	244	506	48.2%
Block Group 1, Tract 9603	617	1,412	43.7%
Block Group 3, Tract 9603	579	1,468	39.4%
Block Group 4, Tract 9604	453	834	54.3%
Wayne County	2,589	6,313	41.0%
Block Group 1, Tract 703	815	1,497	54.4%
Block Group 2, Tract 703	320	608	52.6%
Total Number of Census Block Groups in Iowa Data Set with Potential Low-Income Populations:			32
Louisiana	1,767,448	4,532,714	39.0%
Calcasieu Parish	74,095	198,097	37.4%
Block Group 2, Tract 24	803	1,222	65.7%
Block Group 3, Tract 24	512	935	54.8%
Total Number of Census Block Groups in Louisiana Data Set with Potential Low-Income Populations:			2
Missouri	1,903,266	5,922,570	32.1%
Clay County	53,641	239,395	22.4%
Block Group 5, Tract 216	443	1,075	41.2%
Block Group 1, Tract 217.01	624	1,592	39.2%

Table P.1-2. Census Block Groups in Study Area with Potential Low-Income Populations

2019: ACS 5-Year Estimates Data Profiles (2015-2019)	Individuals with Income Below 200% of Poverty Level	Total Population for Whom Poverty Status is Determined	Percent of Individuals with Income Below 200% of Poverty Level
Block Group 5, Tract 217.02	921	1,901	48.4%
Block Group 6, Tract 217.02	524	723	72.5%
Jackson County	224,782	684,855	32.8%
Block Group 1, Tract 155	413	691	59.8%
Block Group 2, Tract 155	290	584	49.7%
Livingston County	5,204	13,842	37.6%
Block Group 1, Tract 4803	239	485	49.3%
Block Group 2, Tract 4803	449	916	49.0%
Block Group 1, Tract 4805	1,195	1,732	69.0%
Total Number of Census Block Groups in Missouri Data Set with Potential Low-Income Populations:			9
Texas	9,491,111	27,637,858	34.3%
Jefferson County	90,190	237,578	38.0%
Block Group 1, Tract 17	324	560	57.9%
Block Group 1, Tract 19	708	1,054	67.2%
Block Group 2, Tract 117	692	1,394	49.6%
Newton County	6,348	13,743	46.2%
Block Group 2, Tract 9504	287	518	55.4%
Orange County	24,429	82,867	29.5%
Block Group 2, Tract 212	695	1,622	42.8%
Block Group 2, Tract 217	584	1,276	45.8%
Block Group 1, Tract 219	432	686	63.0%
Block Group 3, Tract 220	933	1,887	49.4%
Total Number of Census Block Groups in Texas Data Set with Potential Low-Income Populations:			8
GRAND TOTAL NUMBER OF CENSUS BLOCK GROUPS IN DATA SET WITH POTENTIAL LOW-INCOME POPULATIONS:			62

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5-Year Estimates Data Profiles (2015-2019)

Table P.1-3. Census Block Groups in Study Area with Potential Limited-English Speaking Populations

2019: ACS 5-Year Estimates Data Profiles (2015-2019)	Total Number of Households	Limited English-Speaking Households Speaking Spanish	Limited English-Speaking Households Speaking Other Indo-European Languages	Limited English-Speaking Households Speaking Asian and Pacific Island Languages	Limited English-Speaking Households Speaking Other Languages	Total Number of Limited English-Speaking Households	Percent Limited English-Speaking Households
Illinois	4,846,134	106,366	63,909	36,368	10,029	216,672	4.5%
Cook County	1,972,108	70,657	48,465	23,788	8,005	150,915	7.7%
Block Group 1, Tract 8045.11	613	95	20	-	-	115	18.8%
Block Group 2, Tract 8048.04	1,051	16	62	137	-	215	20.5%
DeKalb County	38,150	526	102	118	86	832	2.2%
Block Group 3, Tract 1	1,019	141	-	-	-	141	13.8%
DuPage County	342,791	5,060	5,884	3,393	392	14,729	4.3%
Block Group 4, Tract 8401.01	534	68	27	-	-	95	17.8%
Block Group 2, Tract 8408.02	455	187	54	-	-	241	53.0%
Kane County	179,637	7,587	649	532	174	8,942	5.0%
Block Group 1, Tract 8515	384	58	-	-	3	61	15.9%
Block Group 3, Tract 8516	282	34	12	-	-	46	16.3%
Block Group 3, Tract 8546	244	53	-	-	-	53	21.7%
Total Number of Census Block Groups in Illinois Data Set with Potential Limited English-Speaking Households:							8
Iowa	1,265,473	11,067	4,055	6,547	2,831	24,500	1.9%
Louisa County	4,335	161	-	118	-	279	6.4%
Block Group 3, Tract 4502	423	86	-	36	-	122	28.8%
Washington County	8,832	67	22	28	-	117	1.3%
Block Group 4, Tract 9604	393	34	-	28	-	62	15.8%

Table P.1-3. Census Block Groups in Study Area with Potential Limited-English Speaking Populations

2019: ACS 5-Year Estimates Data Profiles (2015-2019)	Total Number of Households	Limited English-Speaking Households Speaking Spanish	Limited English-Speaking Households Speaking Other Indo-European Languages	Limited English-Speaking Households Speaking Asian and Pacific Island Languages	Limited English-Speaking Households Speaking Other Languages	Total Number of Limited English-Speaking Households	Percent Limited English-Speaking Households
Total Number of Census Block Groups in Iowa Data Set with Potential Limited English-Speaking Households:							2
Louisiana	1,739,497	20,171	6,347	6,004	952	33,474	1.9%
Total Number of Census Block Groups in Louisiana Data Set with Potential Limited English-Speaking Households:							0
Missouri	2,414,521	10,885	5,624	8,496	2,993	27,998	1.2%
Total Number of Census Block Groups in Missouri Data Set with Potential Limited English-Speaking Households:							0
Texas	9,691,647	630,078	28,689	73,917	16,527	749,211	7.7%
Jefferson County	92,988	3,779	230	693	20	4,722	5.1%
Block Group 1, Tract 19	321	45	-	5	-	50	15.6%
Block Group 2, Tract 117	469	115	-	-	-	115	24.5%
Total Number of Census Block Groups in Texas Data Set with Potential Limited English-Speaking Households:							2
GRAND TOTAL NUMBER OF CENSUS BLOCK GROUPS IN DATA SET WITH POTENTIAL LIMITED ENGLISH-SPEAKING HOUSEHOLDS:							12

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 5-Year Estimates Data Profiles (2015-2019).

P.2 Direct Outreach to Community Leaders

In addition to the public outreach during the scoping process for this EIS, OEA conducted direct outreach to local, county, and regional planning organizations, community-based organizations (for example, churches and civic groups), and government representatives to identify local concentrations of potential minority and low-income populations at the scale of neighborhoods or specific developments. Additionally, OEA conducted direct outreach to identify representatives of those groups in support of project notifications and engagements. **Table P.2-1** lists these locations, including their names, locations, and use types. After collecting contact information from the local, county, and regional planning organizations and government representatives, OEA conducted direct outreach to community leaders, which included representatives of community centers, food pantries, shelters, police stations, fire stations, worship leaders, principals and other school representatives within areas with minority and low-income populations. OEA attempted to contact 225 community leaders from Illinois to Texas. The aim of these engagements was to make sure they were familiar with the Proposed Acquisition, inform them of the environmental and comment process, and collect information on their concerns for use in the EJ analysis.

Table P.2-1. EJ Populations Provided by Community Leaders

Name	Address	City/Town/Village	State	Zip Code	Type	Within Identified EJ Block Group from Desktop Analysis?	Within Noise Impact Area?
Cedar Heights Mobile Home Park	1720 S. Washington Blvd.	Camanche	IA	52730	Mobile Home Park	Yes	No
Spring Lake Mobile Home Estates	100 First Ave.	Bartlett	IL	60103	Mobile Home Park	No	No
Lindon Towers	24 S. Addison St.	Bensenville	IL	60106	Apartments	Yes	Yes
Pebblewood Court Apartments (11 buildings)	2290 Breezewood Ln.	Hanover Park	IL	60133	Apartments	Yes	No
Glendale Terrace Apartments	2360 Glendale Terrace	Hanover Park	IL	60133	Apartments	Yes	No
Mark Thomas Lane Apartment	2520 Mark Thomas Ln.	Hanover Park	IL	60133	Apartments	Yes	No
Orchard Hill Apartments	1920 Elm Court	Hanover Park	IL	60133	Apartments	Yes	No
South Westline Apartments	1700 Ontarioville Rd.	Hanover Park	IL	60133	Apartments	Yes	No
515-521 Main Street (Various apartment buildings)	519 W. Main St.	Bensenville	IL	60106	Apartments	Yes	Yes
Regents Park Apartments	930 Irving Park Rd.	Bensenville	IL	60106	Apartments	Yes	Yes
Oretta Community	291 North St.	Singer	LA	70660	Community	No	No
Persimmon Grove and Persimmon Heights	110 Persimmon Dr.	Excelsior Springs	MO	64024	Neighborhood of Single-Family Homes	Yes	Yes

Table P.2-1. EJ Populations Provided by Community Leaders

Name	Address	City/Town/Village	State	Zip Code	Type	Within Identified EJ Block Group from Desktop Analysis?	Within Noise Impact Area?
Sylvan Heights	936 Williams St.	Excelsior Springs	MO	64024	Neighborhood of Single-Family Homes	No	Yes
Coates Country Estates	1011 Miss Belle Street	Excelsior Springs	MO	64024	Neighborhood of Single-Family Homes	Yes	Yes
Franklin Elementary School	201 W. Mill	Liberty	MO	64068	School	No	No
-	Between W. Mississippi St. and N. Morse Ave. and Gallatin St.	Liberty	MO	64068	Single Family	No	No
-	South of Mill St.	Liberty	MO	64068	Single Family	Yes	Yes

P.3 Community Analysis

OEA also examined the distribution of receptors that would experience adverse noise impacts as a result of the Proposed Acquisition at the community scale.¹ OEA identified a total of 70 incorporated areas within the EJ study area and then determined the percentage of adversely affected receptors in each of those 70 communities that were located within EJ block groups within. For some communities—including Bensenville, Elgin, Savannah, and Lanark in Illinois; Columbus Junction, Fredonia, Muscatine, Seymour, and Washington in Iowa; Chillicothe and Excelsior Springs in Missouri; and Deweyville, Rose City, and Vidor in Texas—most of the adversely affected receptors are located within EJ block groups. However, for the vast majority of communities (56 out of 70 communities or 80 percent of the total), most of the adversely affected receptors are located in non-EJ block groups. **Table P-3.1** provides a table showing the 70 communities with receptors subject to adverse noise impacts under the Proposed Acquisition and the distribution of adversely affected receptors within each community in EJ and non-EJ block groups.

¹ Incorporated areas were the unit of analysis in this community-based analysis; unincorporated areas were not included.

Table P.3-1. Communities in the Study Area with Receptors Subject to Adverse Noise Impacts (65 dBA Ldn and 3 dBA Increase) under the Proposed Acquisition (Receptors within (65 dBA Ldn) under Existing Conditions, No Action, and Proposed Acquisition Provided for Context)

Community	EXISTING CONDITIONS Receptors within 65 dBA (Ldn)				NO ACTION Receptors within 65 dBA (Ldn)				PROPOSED ACQUISITION Receptors within 65 dBA (Ldn)				PROPOSED ACQUISITION Receptors Subject to an Adverse Noise Impact (65 dBA and 3 dBA Increase)			
	TOTAL	Within EJ Block Groups	Outside EJ Block Groups	Percent within EJ Block Groups	TOTAL	Within EJ Block Groups	Outside EJ Block Groups	Percent within EJ Block Groups	TOTAL	Within EJ Block Groups	Outside EJ Block Groups	Percent within EJ Block Groups	TOTAL	Within EJ Block Groups	Outside EJ Block Groups	Percent Within EJ Block Groups
ILLINOIS													1,187	185	1,002	16%
<i>Unincorpor.</i>	128	5	123	4%	156	5	151	3%	307	15	292	5%	290	15	275	5%
Bartlett	26	12	14	46%	36	15	21	42%	140	41	99	29%	1	0	1	0%
Bensenville	19	19	0	100%	28	28	0	100%	54	54	0	100%	50	50	0	100%
Byron	24	0	24	0%	29	0	29	0%	59	0	59	0%	44	0	44	0%
Davis Junction	59	0	59	0%	63	0	63	0%	97	0	97	0%	82	0	82	0%
Elgin	48	47	1	98%	60	59	1	98%	126	124	2	98%	9	8	1	89%
Genoa	28	5	23	18%	35	8	27	23%	93	35	58	38%	93	35	58	38%
Hampshire	19	0	19	0%	20	0	20	0%	52	0	52	0%	52	0	52	0%
Hanover Park	5	0	5	0%	8	1	7	13%	22	4	18	18%	22	4	18	18%
Itasca	11	3	8	27%	20	3	17	15%	53	11	42	21%	42	3	39	7%
Kingston	40	0	40	0%	48	0	48	0%	98	0	98	0%	98	0	98	0%
Kirkland	14	0	14	0%	24	0	24	0%	64	0	64	0%	64	0	64	0%
Lanark	34	20	14	59%	38	22	16	58%	80	46	34	58%	80	46	34	58%
Leaf River	29	0	29	0%	30	0	30	0%	48	0	48	0%	48	0	48	0%
Monroe Center	47	0	47	0%	50	0	50	0%	87	0	87	0%	87	0	87	0%
Mount Carroll	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	2	0	2	0%	2	0	2	0%
Pingree Grove	9	0	9	0%	25	0	25	0%	53	0	53	0%	53	0	53	0%
Roselle	30	5	25	17%	30	5	25	17%	44	6	38	14%	20	6	14	30%
Savanna	11	11	0	100%	16	16	0	100%	30	29	1	97%	19	18	1	95%
Stillman Valley	19	0	19	0%	20	0	20	0%	31	0	31	0%	31	0	31	0%
IOWA													3,351	990	2,361	30%
<i>Unincorpor.</i>	272	26	246	10%	334	30	304	9%	648	83	565	13%	616	83	533	13%
Ainsworth	35	0	35	0%	38	0	38	0%	80	0	80	0%	80	0	80	0%
Bettendorf	24	3	21	13%	39	7	32	18%	88	35	53	40%	88	35	53	40%

Table P.3-1. Communities in the Study Area with Receptors Subject to Adverse Noise Impacts (65 dBA Ldn and 3 dBA Increase) under the Proposed Acquisition (Receptors within (65 dBA Ldn) under Existing Conditions, No Action, and Proposed Acquisition Provided for Context)

Community	EXISTING CONDITIONS Receptors within 65 dBA (Ldn)				NO ACTION Receptors within 65 dBA (Ldn)				PROPOSED ACQUISITION Receptors within 65 dBA (Ldn)				PROPOSED ACQUISITION Receptors Subject to an Adverse Noise Impact (65 dBA and 3 dBA Increase)			
	TOTAL	Within EJ Block Groups	Outside EJ Block Groups	Percent within EJ Block Groups	TOTAL	Within EJ Block Groups	Outside EJ Block Groups	Percent within EJ Block Groups	TOTAL	Within EJ Block Groups	Outside EJ Block Groups	Percent within EJ Block Groups	TOTAL	Within EJ Block Groups	Outside EJ Block Groups	Percent Within EJ Block Groups
Blakesburg	14	0	14	0%	18	0	18	0%	67	0	67	0%	67	0	67	0%
Buffalo	36	0	36	0%	40	0	40	0%	62	0	62	0%	62	0	62	0%
Camanche	180	2	178	1%	194	2	192	1%	312	7	305	2%	312	7	305	2%
Clinton	133	61	72	46%	142	65	77	46%	260	131	129	50%	252	123	129	49%
Columbus Junction	5	5	0	100%	6	6	0	100%	21	21	0	100%	21	21	0	100%
Cotter	3	0	3	0%	4	0	4	0%	15	0	15	0%	15	0	15	0%
Davenport	7	4	3	57%	10	4	6	40%	66	18	48	27%	66	18	48	27%
Fairport	49	0	49	0%	49	0	49	0%	74	0	74	0%	74	0	74	0%
Fredonia	25	25	0	100%	27	27	0	100%	51	51	0	100%	51	51	0	100%
Fruitland	26	0	26	0%	30	0	30	0%	91	0	91	0%	91	0	91	0%
Le Claire	148	0	148	0%	175	0	175	0%	273	0	273	0%	273	0	273	0%
Letts	24	0	24	0%	30	0	30	0%	71	0	71	0%	71	0	71	0%
Montpelier	24	0	24	0%	25	0	25	0%	52	0	52	0%	52	0	52	0%
Moravia	28	0	28	0%	31	0	31	0%	72	0	72	0%	72	0	72	0%
Muscatine	111	108	3	97%	125	122	3	98%	329	302	27	92%	329	302	27	92%
Mystic	1	0	1	0%	2	0	2	0%	13	0	13	0%	13	0	13	0%
Ottumwa	42	10	32	24%	50	11	39	22%	117	28	89	24%	117	28	89	24%
Princeton	116	0	116	0%	128	0	128	0%	206	0	206	0%	206	0	206	0%
Rathbun	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	8	0	8	0%	8	0	8	0%
Riverdale	41	0	41	0%	45	0	45	0%	55	0	55	0%	55	0	55	0%
Seymour	47	47	0	100%	51	51	0	100%	154	154	0	100%	154	154	0	100%
Washington	42	40	2	95%	49	47	2	96%	206	168	38	82%	206	168	38	82%
LOUISIANA													198	0	198	0%
<i>Unincorpor.</i>	<i>457</i>	<i>82</i>	<i>375</i>	<i>18%</i>	<i>608</i>	<i>109</i>	<i>499</i>	<i>18%</i>	<i>876</i>	<i>170</i>	<i>706</i>	<i>19%</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>0%</i>

Table P.3-1. Communities in the Study Area with Receptors Subject to Adverse Noise Impacts (65 dBA Ldn and 3 dBA Increase) under the Proposed Acquisition (Receptors within (65 dBA Ldn) under Existing Conditions, No Action, and Proposed Acquisition Provided for Context)

Community	EXISTING CONDITIONS Receptors within 65 dBA (Ldn)				NO ACTION Receptors within 65 dBA (Ldn)				PROPOSED ACQUISITION Receptors within 65 dBA (Ldn)				PROPOSED ACQUISITION Receptors Subject to an Adverse Noise Impact (65 dBA and 3 dBA Increase)			
	TOTAL	Within EJ Block Groups	Outside EJ Block Groups	Percent within EJ Block Groups	TOTAL	Within EJ Block Groups	Outside EJ Block Groups	Percent within EJ Block Groups	TOTAL	Within EJ Block Groups	Outside EJ Block Groups	Percent within EJ Block Groups	TOTAL	Within EJ Block Groups	Outside EJ Block Groups	Percent Within EJ Block Groups
DeQuincy	112	22	90	20%	127	28	99	22%	203	40	163	20%	113	0	113	0%
Starks	31	0	31	0%	42	0	42	0%	68	0	68	0%	68	0	68	0%
MISSOURI													1,005	309	696	31%
<i>Unincorpor.</i>	283	46	237	16%	366	51	315	14%	581	86	495	15%	123	23	100	19%
Birmingham	0	0	0	0%	2	0	2	0%	28	0	28	0%	28	0	28	0%
Braymer	1	0	1	0%	2	0	2	0%	17	0	17	0%	17	0	17	0%
Chillicothe	33	32	1	97%	42	41	1	98%	127	126	1	99%	127	126	1	99%
Chula	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	10	0	10	0%	10	0	10	0%
Cowgill	12	0	12	0%	12	0	12	0%	29	0	29	0%	29	0	29	0%
Elmira	1	0	1	0%	3	0	3	0%	9	0	9	0%	9	0	9	0%
Excelsior Estates	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	1	0	1	0%	1	0	1	0%
Excelsior Springs	66	44	22	67%	91	59	32	65%	218	138	80	63%	218	138	80	63%
Harris	3	0	3	0%	3	0	3	0%	22	0	22	0%	22	0	22	0%
Kansas City	139	128	11	92%	234	201	33	86%	305	257	48	84%	6	0	6	0%
Laredo	2	0	2	0%	3	0	3	0%	12	0	12	0%	12	0	12	0%
Lawson	84	0	84	0%	100	0	100	0%	215	0	215	0%	215	0	215	0%
Liberty	19	3	16	16%	53	8	45	15%	121	22	99	18%	121	22	99	18%
Lucerne	2	0	2	0%	2	0	2	0%	9	0	9	0%	9	0	9	0%
Ludlow	4	0	4	0%	5	0	5	0%	16	0	16	0%	16	0	16	0%
Mosby	1	0	1	0%	1	0	1	0%	1	0	1	0%	1	0	1	0%
Newtown	1	0	1	0%	1	0	1	0%	10	0	10	0%	10	0	10	0%
Osgood	1	0	1	0%	1	0	1	0%	3	0	3	0%	3	0	3	0%
Polo	1	0	1	0%	3	0	3	0%	7	0	7	0%	7	0	7	0%

Table P.3-1. Communities in the Study Area with Receptors Subject to Adverse Noise Impacts (65 dBA Ldn and 3 dBA Increase) under the Proposed Acquisition (Receptors within (65 dBA Ldn) under Existing Conditions, No Action, and Proposed Acquisition Provided for Context)

Community	EXISTING CONDITIONS Receptors within 65 dBA (Ldn)				NO ACTION Receptors within 65 dBA (Ldn)				PROPOSED ACQUISITION Receptors within 65 dBA (Ldn)				PROPOSED ACQUISITION Receptors Subject to an Adverse Noise Impact (65 dBA and 3 dBA Increase)			
	TOTAL	Within EJ Block Groups	Outside EJ Block Groups	Percent within EJ Block Groups	TOTAL	Within EJ Block Groups	Outside EJ Block Groups	Percent within EJ Block Groups	TOTAL	Within EJ Block Groups	Outside EJ Block Groups	Percent within EJ Block Groups	TOTAL	Within EJ Block Groups	Outside EJ Block Groups	Percent Within EJ Block Groups
Powersville	5	0	5	0%	7	0	7	0%	19	0	19	0%	19	0	19	0%
Prathersville	0	0	0	0%	0	0	0	0%	2	0	2	0%	2	0	2	0%
TEXAS													566	290	276	51%
<i>Unincorpor.</i>	518	259	259	50%	657	337	320	51%	903	447	456	50%	101	14	87	14%
Deweyville	1	1	0	100%	1	1	0	100%	3	3	0	100%	3	3	0	100%
Mauriceville	17	9	8	53%	25	11	14	44%	40	18	22	45%	21	10	11	48%
Rose City	37	37	0	100%	41	41	0	100%	70	70	0	100%	64	64	0	100%
Vidor	199	109	90	55%	230	128	102	56%	392	211	181	54%	377	199	178	53%