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1 Draft EJ Report
The draft EJ Report is an initial look at the demographics and socioeconomics of a facility's surrounding community area. This includes information within a radius determined by the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality (Department or DEQ), race and ethnicity (decennial census year), poverty status, per capita income, and ability to speak English (most current American Community Survey (ACS) census range), the current North Carolina Department of Commerce county tier, and presence of Native American territory. The draft EJ Report does not include a reconnaissance of the community.

A draft EJ report will be conducted at the beginning of the permit application process when requested by the appropriate Division Director. This report will be distributed to interested community members (if known) and posted to the DEQ website with the relevant permit application before the close of the public comment period. The primary goal is to encourage feedback and suggestions from the surrounding community, industry, and environmental groups throughout the comment period.

It is important to keep in mind, that based on the data available, the following limitations of this evaluation exist: census data is from 2010 and may be outdated; the more recent American Community Survey data through 2018 are estimates; the U.S. EPA's EJSCREEN does not provide all of the data categories that were used in this analysis so the census tract and county data cannot be compared to the radius evaluating the facility boundary; census tracts can be large areas that do not identify exact locations of each population.

The Department has prepared this overview of the demographic and socioeconomic data of the communities surrounding the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill facility to foster communication prior to the Division of Air Quality's final action on the permit application.

## 2 Environmental Justice Evaluation

Environmental justice is the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income, with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies (US EPA). This evaluation examines the demographic and environmental conditions in Orange County, census tracts 107.03, 107.05, $113,114,116.01,116.02,117,122.02$, and the one-mile buffer around the property boundary of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH) facility. Finally, the demographics of the entire state of North Carolina are also considered as they compare to both the county and local census tract and radius settings.

The Department has assessed the permit application and the potential impact on communities surrounding the facility as proposed in the permit application. Accordingly, the draft Environmental Justice Report will include:

- Overview of the permit application submitted by UNC-CH
- Study of area demographics [determined by utilizing the US EPA Environmental Justice tool (EJSCREEN) https://ejscreen.epa.gov/mapper/ and current, available census data. http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml
- Comparison of local area demographics to both county and statewide census data
- County health assessment
- Surrounding sensitive receptors
- Local industrial sites (using the NCDEQ Community Mapping System https://ncdenr.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=1eb0fbe2bcfb4cccb3 cc212af8a0b8c8).

Demographics (including race and ethnicity, poverty status, and per capita incomes) for Orange County will be compared to the local (census tracts and project radius) level data to identify any disparities surrounding the project area. Using standard environmental justice guidelines from the EPA and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation, the following conditions will be flagged as potentially underserved communities:

- $10 \%$ or more in comparison to the county or state average
- $50 \%$ or more minority
- $5 \%$ or more in comparison to the county or state average for poverty


## 3 Proposed Project

This permitting action is the combination of four applications for The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH). Those applications include:

- Renewal of the facility's existing Title V air permit (6800043.15B)
- Modification to incorporate boiler operating limits into the Title V permit to match current federal Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT) standard (6800043.15A)
- Modification to supplement the baghouse emission control equipment to ensure compliance with federal MACT standard (6800043.18A)
- Modification to replace existing diesel-fired emergency generator engine (6800043.19A) Each is summarized below: ${ }^{1}$


## Application No. 6800043.15A (Title V Significant Application)

Air Permit Application No. 6800043.15A was received on May 18, 2015 for a significant modification to Boilers ID Nos. ES-001-Boiler \#6 and ES-002-Boiler \#7 to incorporate limestone injection rate and $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ trim concentration operating limits into the Title V permit within 60 -days following the N.C. Division of Air Quality's (DAQ) approval of the 112(j) performance test report. However, because the 112(j) permit condition sunset and as of May 20, 2019 all boilers at the facility are subject to 15A NCAC 02D .1111: Maximum Achievable Control Technology 40 CFR 63 , Subpart DDDDD. No further processing of this application will be necessary as part of this permitting action.

## Application No. 6800043.15B (Title V Renewal Application)

This permitting action is a renewal of an existing Title V permit pursuant to 15A NCAC 02Q .0513. The renewal application 6800043.15B was received on July 24, 2015, or at least nine months prior to the original expiration date April 30, 2016. Therefore, the existing permit shall not expire until the renewal permit has been issued or denied. All terms and conditions of the existing permit shall remain in effect until the renewal permit has been issued or denied.

## Application No. 6800043.18A (Title V Minor Modification Application)

Air Permit Application No. 6800043.18A was received on March 19, 2018 for a minor modification pursuant to 15A NCAC 02Q . 0515 to add a dry sorbent injection system (DSI) (ID Nos. CD-004.3 and CD-005.3) on each of ES-001-Boiler \#6 and ES-002-Boiler \#7 to supplement the existing hydrogen chloride ( HCl ) control provided by the limestone injection/baghouse systems to ensure compliance with the 15A NCAC 02D . 1111 Maximum Achievable Control Technology (MACT) 40 CFR 63, Subpart DDDDD, HCI emission limit. The following tables indicate the emissions change associated with this permit application on a per boiler basis:

[^0]Table 1. Boiler No. 6 - Coal Fired Emission Changes

| Pollutant | Potential Pre-DSI Installation |  |  | Potential Post-DSI Installation |  |  | Delta |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lb/MMbtu } \\ & \text { (CO-ppm) } \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{hr}$ | ton/yr | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{MMbtu} \\ & (\mathrm{CO}-\mathrm{ppm}) \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{hr}$ | ton/yr | $\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{hr}$ | ton/yr |
| PM | 0.004 | 1.29 | 5.66 | 0.00204 | 0.66 | 2.89 | -0.63 | -2.77 |
| HCl | 0.033 | 10.66 | 46.71 | 0.0195 | 6.30 | 27.60 | -4.36 | -19.11 |
| Hg | $4.30 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.39 \mathrm{E}- \\ & 04 \end{aligned}$ | 6.09E-04 | 6.5E-08 | $\begin{aligned} & 2.10 \mathrm{E}- \\ & 05 \end{aligned}$ | $9.2 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $\begin{aligned} & -1.18 \mathrm{E}- \\ & 04 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | -5.17E-04 |
| CO | 26.8 ppm | - | - | 29.6 ppm | - | - | - | 2.8 ppm |

Table 2. Boiler No. 7 - Coal Fired Emission Changes

| Pollutant | Potential Pre-DSI Installation |  |  | Potential Post-DSI Installation |  |  | Delta |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathrm{Ib} / \mathrm{MMbtu} \\ & (\mathrm{CO}-\mathrm{ppm}) \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{hr}$ | ton/yr | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ib/MMbtu } \\ & \text { (CO-ppm) } \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{hr}$ | ton/yr | $\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{hr}$ | ton/yr |
| PM | 0.0025 | 0.81 | 3.54 | 0.00185 | 0.60 | 2.62 | -0.21 | -0.92 |
| HCl | 0.033 | 10.66 | 46.71 | 0.015 | 4.85 | 21.23 | -5.81 | -25.48 |
| Hg | $2.75 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.89 \mathrm{E}- \\ & 05 \end{aligned}$ | 3.89E-04 | $6.70 \mathrm{E}-08$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.17 \mathrm{E}- \\ & 05 \end{aligned}$ | $9.48 \mathrm{E}-05$ | $\begin{aligned} & -6.72 \mathrm{E}- \\ & 05 \end{aligned}$ | -2.94E-04 |
| CO | 35.4 ppm | - | - | 35.5 ppm | - | - | - | 0.10 ppm |

Application No. 6800043.19A (Title V Minor Modification Application)
Air Permit Application No. 6800043.19A was received on June 5, 2019 for a minor modification pursuant to 15A NCAC 02Q .0515 to replace one existing $168 \mathrm{Hp}(125 \mathrm{~kW}$ ) diesel-fired emergency generator engine with one new $609 \mathrm{Hp}(400 \mathrm{~kW}$ ) diesel-fired emergency generator engine. In addition to this change, the Permittee also requested modifications to the list of insignificant activities to remove equipment no longer in service. The following table indicates the emissions change associated with this permit application (Table 3).

Table 3.Total Modeled Emission Changes

| Pollutant | Potential Emissions - 125kWEmergency Generator |  |  | Potential Emissions - 400kWEmergency Generator |  |  | Delta |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Emission Factor (lb/hphr) ${ }^{1,2}$ | $\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{hr}$ | ton/yr | Emission Factor (lb/hp$\mathrm{hr})^{3,4}$ | $\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{hr}$ | ton/yr | $\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{hr}$ | ton/yr |
| Criteria Air Pollutants Emissions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{NO}^{4}{ }^{4}$ | 3.10E-02 | 5.21 | 1.30 | 5.79E-03 | 3.10 | 0.78 | -2.11 | -0.52 |
| $\mathrm{CO}^{4}$ | 6.68E-03 | 1.12 | 0.28 | $5.75 \mathrm{E}-03$ | 3.09 | 0.77 | 1.97 | 0.49 |
| $\mathrm{SO}_{2}{ }^{2,4}$ | $1.21 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0.0020 | 0.0005 | $1.21 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0.0065 | 0.0016 | 0.0045 | 0.0011 |
| $\mathrm{PM}^{4}$ | $2.20 \mathrm{E}-03$ | 0.37 | 0.092 | $3.29 \mathrm{E}-04$ | 0.18 | 0.044 | -0.19 | -0.048 |
| VOC | $2.51 \mathrm{E}-03$ | 0.42 | 0.11 | 7.89E-04 | 0.42 | 0.11 | 0 | 0 |
| Hazardous Air Pollutants Emissions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acetaldehyde | 5.37E-06 | 9.02E-04 | 2.25E-04 | 1.76E-07 | 9.44E-05 | 2.36E-05 | -8.08E-04 | -2.01E-04 |
| Acrolein | $6.48 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 1.09E-04 | $2.72 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 5.52E-08 | 2.96E-05 | 7.40E-06 | -7.94E-05 | -1.98E-05 |
| Benzene | $6.53 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 1.10E-03 | 2.74E-04 | 5.43E-06 | 2.91E-03 | 7.28E-04 | $1.81 \mathrm{E}-03$ | $4.54 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| Benzolapyrene | 1.32E-09 | $2.21 \mathrm{E}-07$ | 5.53E-08 | 1.80E-09 | 9.66E-06 | $2.41 \mathrm{E}-07$ | $9.44 \mathrm{E}-06$ | $1.86 \mathrm{E}-07$ |
| Formaldehyde | 8.26E-06 | 1.39E-03 | 3.47E-04 | 5.52E-07 | 2.96E-04 | 7.40E-05 | -1.09E-03 | -2.73E-04 |
| Napthalene | 5.94E-07 | 9.97E-05 | $2.49 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 9.10E-07 | 4.88E-04 | $1.22 \mathrm{E}-04$ | $3.88 \mathrm{E}-04$ | 9.71E-05 |
| PAH | - | - | - | 1.48E-06 | 7.94E-04 | 1.98E-04 | 7.94E-04 | $1.98 \mathrm{E}-04$ |
| Toluene | 2.86E-06 | 4.81E-04 | 1.20E-04 | $1.97 \mathrm{E}-06$ | 1.06E-03 | $2.64 \mathrm{E}-04$ | 5.79E-04 | 1.44E-04 |
| Xylene | $2.00 \mathrm{E}-06$ | $3.35 \mathrm{E}-04$ | $8.38 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 1.35E-06 | 7.24E-04 | $1.81 \mathrm{E}-04$ | $3.89 \mathrm{E}-04$ | $9.72 \mathrm{E}-05$ |

In addition to the four applications described above, UNC performed 1-hr facility-wide National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) modeling in response to third party modeling indicating potential 1-hr violations of both the NO2 and SO2 standards. UNC's approved modeling includes the following list of permit modifications reflecting actual operating conditions of the affected sources at the facility:

- Modification of the permit limit of hours of operation of the two non-emergency engines based on their historical usage and EPA's intermittent operation determination guidelines.
- Addition of a new pound per million Btu heat input limit per 30-day rolling average as part of a new 1-hr SO2 NAAQS condition.
- Addition of a maximum sulfur content of the No. 2 fuel oil fired in Boiler 8 for SO2 compliance with NSPS Subpart Dc.


## 4 Geographic Area

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill facility is located at 200 East Cameron Avenue, CB\#1000 Chapel Hill, NC 275991000 (Figure 1).


Figure 1. Facility location with one-mile radius.

## Regional Setting

The facility is located in Orange County, and the one-mile buffer surrounding the facility stays within Orange County. Orange County is designated as a Tier 3 County. Tier 3 counties encompass the 20 least distressed counties in the state based on average unemployment rate, median household income, percentage growth in population, and adjusted property tax per capita. The one-mile radius used in this analysis enters into eight census tracts, 107.03, 107.05, 113, 114, 116.01, 116.02, 117, and 122.02 (Figure 2). Census tracts are small, relatively permanent statistical subdivisions of a county with a unique numeric code (US Census Bureau). The one-mile buffer does not encompass any land within state designated tribal statistical areas, however, Orange County is recognized as one of the counties where the Occaneechi Band of the Saponi Nation resides, according to the N.C. Commission of Indian Affairs.


Figure 2. Census tracts surrounding facility location.

## 5. Regional and Local Settings

The following sections on race and ethnicity, age and sex, disability, poverty, household income, and Limited English Proficiency (LEP) populations are based on U.S. Census Bureau data, first at a state and county level (regional setting), and then at a census tract- and project-radius level (local setting). The surrounding census tracts included are those that overlap into the one-mile radius. Demographics of the county will be compared to the local level data to identify any disparities surrounding the project area. Using standard environmental justice guidelines from the EPA and NEPA documentation, the following conditions will be flagged as potentially underserved communities:

1. $10 \%$ or more in comparison to the county or state average
2. $50 \%$ or more minority
3. $5 \%$ or more in comparison to the county or state average for poverty

For example, if a census tract has $35 \%$ of the population classified as low income but the county consists of $30 \%$ low income, the census tract would exceed the county average by $16.7 \%$ and thus be flagged as a potential area of concern. For this report, census data from 2010 and census data estimates from 2011-2015 and 2018 were used. 2010 Census Bureau data is real
data gathered every ten years, whereas the estimates from the more recent years are modeled based on the real data. For the data gathered from the 2018 and 2011-2015 estimates, the margin of error (MOE) has been included. This value is a measure of the possible variation of the estimate around the population value (U.S. Census Bureau). The Census Bureau standard for the MOE is at the $90 \%$ confidence level and may be any number between 0 and the MOE value in either direction (indicated by +/-).

### 5.1 Race and Ethnicity

Regional Setting
According to the 2010 US Census Data Table 9: Hispanic or Latino, and Not Hispanic or Latino by Race, North Carolina's population totaled $9,535,483$ individuals (Table 4). The three most common racial groups across the state were White alone (65.3\%), Black or African-American (21.2\%), and Hispanic or Latino (of any race) at $8.4 \%$.

Orange County had a total population of 133,801 individuals (Table 4). The three most common racial or ethnic groups in Orange County were White (70.8\%), Black or African American (11.8\%), and Hispanic or Latino (of any race) (8.2\%). The Asian population in Orange County was greater than $10 \%$ different when compared to the state.

Table 4. Regional Setting - Race and Ethnicity

|  | North Carolina |  | Orange County |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Race and Ethnicity | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total Population | $9,535,483$ | 100.0 | 133,801 | 100 |
| White | $6,223,995$ | 65.3 | 94,671 | 70.8 |
| Black or African American | $2,019,854$ | 21.2 | 15,722 | 11.8 |
| American Indian or Alaska <br> Native | 108,829 | 1.1 | 383 | 0.3 |
| Asian | 206,579 | 2.2 | 8,996 | 6.7 |
| Native Hawaiian and Other <br> Pacific Islander | 5,259 | 0.1 | 35 | 0.0 |
| Some other Race | 15,088 | 0.2 | 316 | 0.2 |
| Two or More Races | 155,759 | 1.6 | 2,661 | 2.0 |
| HISPANIC OR LATINO (of any <br> race) |  |  |  |  |
| Source: US Census Bureau 2010 Consus | 800 | 8.4 | 11,017 | 8.2 |

Source: US Census Bureau, 2010 Census
All bolded and orange cells indicate a difference that is greater than $10 \%$ when compared to the state.

Local Setting

The one-mile radius had a total population of 22,082 individuals (Tables 5 and 5a). The three most common racial or ethnic groups were White (70\%), Black or African American (13\%), and Hispanic or Latino (of any race) (11\%). The Asian and Hispanic or Latino (of any race) population were both greater than $10 \%$ different when compared to the county and the state.

Census Tract 107.03 had a total population of 6,064 individuals. The three most common racial or ethnic groups were White (44.7\%), Hispanic or Latino (of any race) (28.6\%), and Black or African American (16.0\%). and The Hispanic or Latino (of any race) population was greater than $10 \%$ different when compared to the county and the state.

Census Tract 107.05 had a total population of 4,573 individuals. The three most common racial or ethnic groups were White (68.4\%), Black or African American (13.1\%), and Hispanic or Latino (of any race) (11\%).

Census Tract 113 had a total population of 2,926 individuals. The three most common racial or ethnic groups in this census tract were White (65.2\%), Black or African American (23.6\%), and Hispanic or Latino (of any race) (6.0\%).

Census Tract 114 had a total population of 3,607 individuals (Table 5a). The three most common racial or ethnic groups were White (87.2\%), Asian (6.6\%), and Black or African American (5.7\%). The Asian population was greater than $10 \%$ different when compared to the state.

Census Tract 116.01 had a total population of 2,350 individuals. The three most common racial or ethnic groups were White (79.3\%), Black or African American (9.1\%), and Asian (6.0\%). The Asian population was greater than $10 \%$ different when compared to the state.

Census Tract 116.02 had a total population of 5,786 individuals. The three most common racial or ethnic groups were White (66.2\%), Black or African American (14.3\%), and Asian (12.6\%). The Asian population was greater than $10 \%$ different when compared to the county and the state.

Census Tract 117 had a total population of 4,190 individuals. The three most common racial or ethnic groups were White (80.7\%), Black or African American (6.9\%), and Asian (5.9\%).

Census Tract 122.02 had a total population of 5,624 individuals. The three most common racial or ethnic groups were White (70.7\%), Asian (13.8\%), and Hispanic or Latino (8.0\%). The Asian population was greater than $10 \%$ different when compared to the state.

Table 5. Local Setting - Race and Ethnicity

| Subject | Project Area - Mile |  | Census Tract 107.03 |  | Census Tract 107.05 |  | Census Tract 113 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Race and Ethnicity | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total Population | 22,082 | 100 | 6,064 | 100 | 4,573 | 100 | 2,926 | 100 |
| White | 15,373 | 70 | 2,708 | 44.7 | 3,130 | 68.4 | 1,907 | 65.2 |
| Black or African American | 2,947 | 13 | 973 | 16.0 | 597 | 13.1 | 690 | 23.6 |
| American Indian or Alaska <br> Native | 79 | 1 | 18 | 0.3 | 11 | 0.2 | 4 | 0.1 |
| Asian | 1,818 | $\mathbf{8}$ | 490 | 8.1 | 198 | 4.3 | 85 | 2.9 |
| Native Hawaiian and Other <br> Pacific Islander | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0.0 | 4 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Some other Race | 1,293 | 6 | 20 | 0.3 | 26 | 0.6 | 85 | 2.9 |
| Two or More Races | 564 | 3 | 119 | 2.0 | 99 | 2.2 | 48 | 1.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HISPANIC OR LATINO (of any <br> race) | 2,480 | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | 1,734 | 28.6 | 508 | 11.0 | 182 | 6.0 |
| Sourc: US Cens Bur |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: US Census Bureau, 2010 Census
All bolded and orange cells indicate a difference that is greater than $10 \%$ when compared to the state.
All bolded and blue cells indicate a difference that is greater than $10 \%$ when compared to the county and state.

Table 5a. Local Setting - Race and Ethnicity (cont'd)

| Subject | Census Tract 114 |  | Census Tract 116.01 |  | Census Tract 116.02 |  | Census Tract 117 |  | Census Tract 122.02 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Race and Ethnicity | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Total Population | 3,607 | 100 | 2,350 | 100 | 5,786 | 100 | 4,190 | 100 | 5,624 | 100 |
| White | 3,144 | 87.2 | 1,864 | 79.3 | 3,833 | 66.2 | 3,382 | 80.7 | 3,978 | 70.7 |
| Black or African American | 204 | 5.7 | 213 | 9.1 | 829 | 14.3 | 289 | 6.9 | 256 | 4.6 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 11 | 0.3 | 4 | 0.2 | 25 | 0.4 | 10 | 0.2 | 6 | 0.1 |
| Asian | 238 | 6.6 | 142 | 6.0 | 729 | 12.6 | 248 | 5.9 | 775 | 13.8 |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander | 2 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.0 |
| Some other Race | 8 | 0.2 | 5 | 0.2 | 23 | 0.4 | 9 | 0.2 | 11 | 0.2 |
| Two or More Races | 66 | 1.8 | 42 | 1.8 | 113 | 2.0 | 91 | 2.2 | 152 | 2.7 |
| HISPANIC OR LATINO (of any race) | 161 | 4.0 | 80 | 3.0 | 234 | 4.0 | 160 | 4.0 | 445 | 8.0 |

Source: US Census Bureau, 2010 Census
All bolded and orange cells indicate a difference that is greater than $10 \%$ when compared to the state.
All bolded and blue cells indicate a difference that is greater than $10 \%$ when compared to the county and state.

### 5.2 Age and Sex

## Regional Setting

According to the 2010 US Census Data Table P 12: Sex by Age, and Table P13: Median Age, North Carolina had a total population of $9,535,483$ individuals (Table 6). The largest percentage of the total state population was between the ages of 18 and 64 (63.1\%), followed by under 18 years (23.9\%), and 65 years and older (12.9\%).

Orange County had a total population of 133,801 individuals. The largest percentage of the total county population was between the ages of 18 and 64 ( $69.5 \%$ ), followed by under 18 years (18.3\%). The median age was slightly lower in Orange County than the state.

Table 6. Regional Setting - Age Groups and Sex

|  | North Carolina |  |  |  |  |  | Orange County |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number |  |  | Percent |  |  | Number |  |  | Percent |  |  |
| Age | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both <br> Sexes | Male | Female | Both Sexes | Male | Female |
| Total Population | 9,535,483 | 4,645,492 | 4,889,991 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 133,801 | 63,954 | 69,847 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Under 5 years | 632,040 | 322,871 | 309,169 | 6.6 | 7 | 6.3 | 6,890 | 3,496 | 3,394 | 5.1 | 5.5 | 4.9 |
| Under 18 years | 2,281,635 | 1,167,303 | 1,114,332 | 23.9 | 25.1 | 22.8 | 24,473 | 10,792 | 13,681 | 18.3 | 16.9 | 19.6 |
| 18 to 64 years | 6,019,769 | 2,954,233 | 3,065,536 | 63.1 | 63.6 | 62.7 | 92,946 | 44,117 | 48,829 | 69.5 | 69.0 | 69.9 |
| 65 years and over | 1,234,079 | 523,956 | 710,123 | 12.9 | 11.3 | 14.5 | 12,889 | 5,549 | 7,340 | 9.6 | 8.7 | 10.5 |
| Median Age | 37.4 | 36 | 38.7 |  |  |  | 33.1 | 32.5 | 33.8 |  |  |  |

## Local Setting

According to the 2010 US Census Data Table P 12: Sex by Age, and Table P13: Median Age, all of the census tracts had a much younger median age than the state and in most cases, the county as well (Tables 7 and 7a).

Table 7. Local Setting - Age Groups and Sex

| Age | Census Tract 107.03 |  |  |  |  |  | Census Tract 107.05 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number |  |  | Percent |  |  | Number |  |  | Percent |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Both } \\ & \text { sexes } \end{aligned}$ | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Both } \\ & \text { sexes } \end{aligned}$ | Male | Female | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Both } \\ & \text { sexes } \end{aligned}$ | Male | Female |
| Total Population | 6,064 | 3,060 | 3,004 | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 4,573 | 2,224 | 2,349 | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Under 5 years | 401 | 214 | 187 | 6.6 | 7.0 | 6.2 | 261 | 121 | 140 | 5.7 | 5.4 | 6.0 |
| Under 18 years | 1,054 | 547 | 507 | 17.4 | 17.9 | 16.9 | 779 | 387 | 392 | 17.0 | 17.4 | 16.7 |
| 18 to 64 years | 4,665 | 2,407 | 2,258 | 76.9 | 78.7 | 75.2 | 3,508 | 1,724 | 1,784 | 76.7 | 77.5 | 75.9 |
| 65 years and over | 345 | 106 | 239 | 5.7 | 3.5 | 8.0 | 286 | 113 | 173 | 6.3 | 5.1 | 7.4 |
| Median Age | 28.6 | 28.7 | 28.5 |  |  |  | 30.9 | 31.5 | 30.4 |  |  |  |

Table 6a. Local Setting - Age Groups and Sex (cont'd)

| Age | Census Tract 113 |  |  |  |  |  | Census Tract 114 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number |  |  | Percent |  |  | Number |  |  | Percent |  |  |
|  | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female |
| Total Population | 2,926 | 1,423 | 1,503 | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 3,834 | 1,679 | 2,155 | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Under 5 years | 80 | 41 | 39 | 2.7 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 73 | 33 | 40 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 1.9 |
| Under 18 years | 279 | 143 | 136 | 9.5 | 10.0 | 9.0 | 273 | 143 | 130 | 7.1 | 8.5 | 6.0 |
| 18 to 64 years | 2,505 | 1,232 | 1,273 | 85.6 | 86.6 | 84.7 | 3,219 | 1,368 | 1,851 | 84.0 | 81.5 | 85.9 |
| 65 years and over | 142 | 48 | 94 | 4.9 | 3.4 | 6.3 | 342 | 168 | 174 | 8.9 | 10.0 | 8.1 |
| Median Age | 22.4 | 22.7 | 22.1 |  |  |  | 22.7 | 24.1 | 22.1 |  |  |  |


| Age | Census Tract 116.01 |  |  |  |  |  | Census Tract 116.02 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number |  |  | Percent |  |  | Number |  |  | Percent |  |  |
|  | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female |
| Total Population | 2,350 | 1,081 | 1,269 | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 5,786 | 2,404 | 3,382 | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Under 5 years | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 173 | 102 | 71 | 3.0 | 4.2 | 2.1 |
| Under 18 years | 6 | 3 | 3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 267 | 153 | 114 | 4.6 | 6.4 | 3.4 |
| 18 to 64 years | 2,344 | 1,078 | 1,266 | 99.7 | 99.7 | 99.8 | 5,510 | 2,248 | 3,262 | 95.2 | 93.5 | 96.5 |
| 65 years and over | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 9 | 3 | 6 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 |
| Median Age | 20.2 | 20.2 | 20.2 |  |  |  | 19.7 | 19.7 | 19.6 |  |  |  |


| Age | Census Tract 117 |  |  |  |  |  | Census Tract 122.02 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number |  |  | Percent |  |  | Number |  |  | Percent |  |  |
|  | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female | Both sexes | Male | Female |
| Total Population | 4,190 | 2,133 | 2,057 | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 5,624 | 2,684 | 2,940 | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Under 5 years | 81 | 47 | 34 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 1.7 | 377 | 204 | 173 | 6.7 | 7.6 | 5.9 |
| Under 18 years | 240 | 133 | 107 | 5.7 | 6.2 | 5.2 | 1,656 | 851 | 805 | 29.4 | 31.7 | 30.0 |
| 18 to 64 years | 3,768 | 1,920 | 1,848 | 89.9 | 90.0 | 89.8 | 3,579 | 1,699 | 1,880 | 63.6 | 63.3 | 70.0 |
| 65 years and over | 182 | 80 | 102 | 4.3 | 3.8 | 5.0 | 389 | 134 | 255 | 6.9 | 5.0 | 9.5 |
| Median Age | 22.1 | 22.1 | 22.1 |  |  |  | 32.1 | 31.1 | 33.4 |  |  |  |

## Project Radius

EJSCREEN identified a population of 19,809 individuals within the one-mile radius surrounding the UNC facility. The largest population was 18+ years ( $94 \%$ ), followed by under 18 years at 6\% (Table 8).

Table 7. Project Radius - Age Groups and Sex

| Age | Project Area - 1 Miles |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number |  |  | Percent |  |  |
|  | Both <br> sexes | Male | Female | Both <br> sexes | Male | Female |
| Total Population | 19,809 | 9,106 | 10,703 | 100 | 46 | 54 |
| Under 5 years | 453 |  |  | 2 |  |  |
| Under 18 years | 1,224 |  |  | 6 |  |  |
| 18 years and over | 18,585 |  |  | 94 |  |  |
| 65 years and over | 751 |  |  | 4 |  |  |
| Source: 2019 EJSCREEN, 2010 Census |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### 5.3 Disability

Regional Setting
According to the 2018 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S1810 Disability Characteristics from the US Census Bureau, the state of North Carolina had an estimated total population of $9,952,031$ noninstitutionalized citizens. Of those individuals, an estimated $13.6 \%$ (MOE +/- $0.1 \%$ ) had a disability. The largest population of disabled civilians were 75 years and over ( $50.1 \%$, MOE +/- 0.4\%). The second largest population was the 65 years to 74 years at 26.6\% (MOE +/- 0.3\%). By race, American Indian and Alaskan Native had the highest estimated disability rate of $18.5 \%$ (MOE +/- 0.8\%). Black or African-American, White alone, and Two or More Races had the next three highest population estimates with disabilities in North Carolina, at $14.8 \%$ (MOE +/-0.2\%), $14.6 \%$ (MOE +/- $0.1 \%$ ), and $11.4 \%$ (MOE +/- $0.5 \%$ ), respectively (Table 9).

Orange County had an estimated total population of 142,298 noninstitutionalized citizens. Of those, an estimated $8.8 \%$ (MOE +/- $0.6 \%$ ) had a disability. The largest population of disabled civilians by race was Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander (100.0\%, MOE +/- 100.0\%), followed by American Indian and Alaska Native (30.4\%, MOE +/- 12.4\%), both of which were greater than $10 \%$ different when compared to the state. The majority of the disabled population in Orange County have estimates that are smaller than those of the state.

Table 8. Disability Status - Regional Setting

| Subject | North Carolina |  |  |  |  |  | Orange County |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  | With a Disability |  | Percent with a Disability |  | Total |  | With a Disability |  | Percent with a Disability |  |
|  | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- |
| Total civilian noninstitutionalized population | 9,952,031 | 1,743 | 1,350,533 | 7,387 | 13.6 | 0.1 | 142,298 | 146 | 12,546 | 840 | 8.8 | 0.6 |
| Population under 5 years | 603,155 | 767 | 4,761 | 613 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 6,593 | 40 | 6,593 | 41 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| Population 5 to 17 years | 1,685,827 | 941 | 94,822 | 2,522 | 5.6 | 0.2 | 21,925 | 42 | 21,925 | 202 | 3.9 | 0.9 |
| Population 18 to 34 years | 2,216,915 | 1,791 | 146,329 | 3,165 | 6.6 | 0.1 | 43,925 | 110 | 43,295 | 407 | 4.9 | 0.9 |
| Population 35 to 64 years | 3,915,727 | 1,742 | 556,505 | 5,319 | 14.2 | 0.1 | 52,329 | 130 | 52,329 | 501 | 8.3 | 1.0 |
| Population 65 to 74 years | 932,178 | 1,157 | 248,418 | 2,902 | 26.6 | 0.3 | 11,697 | 98 | 11,697 | 251 | 21.6 | 2.2 |
| Population 75 years and over | 598,229 | 982 | 299,698 | 2,471 | 50.1 | 0.4 | 6,459 | 94 | 6,459 | 290 | 41.5 | 4.3 |
| SEX |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 4,786,233 | 2,284 | 647,158 | 4,946 | 13.5 | 0.1 | 67,773 | 114 | 5,749 | 460 | 8.5 | 0.7 |
| Female | 5,165,798 | 1,829 | 703,375 | 5,616 | 13.6 | 0.1 | 74,525 | 97 | 6,797 | 550 | 9.1 | 0.9 |
| RACE AND HISPANIC OR LATINO ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White (not Hispanic or Latino) | 6,316,065 | 2,254 | 920,269 | 6,535 | 14.6 | 0.1 | 98,846 | 136 | 98,846 | 655 | 9.3 | 0.7 |
| Black or African American | 2,123,353 | 5,762 | 314,216 | 3,706 | 14.8 | 0.2 | 16,250 | 523 | 16,250 | 337 | 12.0 | 2.0 |
| American Indian and Alaska Native | 118,231 | 1,604 | 21,874 | 929 | 18.5 | 0.8 | 784 | 174 | 784 | 90 | 30.4 | 12.4 |
| Asian | 279,615 | 2,022 | 13,450 | 961 | 4.8 | 0.3 | 11106 | 394 | 11,106 | 116 | 2.9 | 1.0 |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander | 6,447 | 668 | 635 | 178 | 9.8 | 2.7 | 8 | 12 | 8 | 12 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Some other Race | 303,837 | 7,743 | 16,218 | 1,100 | 5.3 | 0.4 | 3701 | 862 | 3,701 | 77 | 2.8 | 2.2 |
| Two or more races | 255,739 | 6,070 | 29,063 | 1,446 | 11.4 | 0.5 | 4213 | 599 | 4,213 | 117 | 5.8 | 2.7 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 916,366 | 863 | 57,239 | 1,970 | 6.2 | 0.2 | 11987 | 43 | 11,987 | 196 | 5.5 | 1.6 |

Source: American Community Survey 5-year Estimates (2014-2018)
All bolded and orange cells indicate a difference that is greater than $5 \%$ when compared to the state.

## Local Setting

According to the 2018 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, Table S1810 Disability Characteristics from the US Census Bureau, Census Tract 107.03 had an estimated total population of 6,539 noninstitutionalized citizens (Tables 10, 10a, 10b, and 10c). Of those individuals, an estimated $8.9 \%$ (MOE +/- 3.9\%) had a disability. The largest population of disabled civilians were 65 to 74 years $53.7 \%$ (MOE +/- 35.7\%). The second largest population of disabled civilians was White (not Hispanic or Latino) at 13.7\% (MOE +/- 5.2\%).

Census Tract 107.05 had an estimated total population of 5,210 noninstitutionalized citizens. Of those individuals, an estimated $9.1 \%$ (MOE +/- $3.3 \%$ ) had a disability. The largest population of disabled civilians were 75 years and over 72.6\%) (MOE +/- 18.2\%). The second largest population of disabled civilians was American Indian and Alaska Native at 41.7\% (MOE +/16.2\%).

Census Tract 113 had an estimated total population of 3,024 noninstitutionalized citizens. Of those individuals, an estimated $6.0 \%$ (MOE +/- 2.6\%) had a disability. The largest population of disabled civilians were 75 years and over $42.7 \%(\mathrm{MOE}+/-32.4 \%)$. The second largest population of disabled civilians was 5 to 17 years old at 19.7\% (MOE +/- 21.0\%).

Census Tract 114 had an estimated total population of 3,996 noninstitutionalized citizens. Of those individuals, an estimated $4.8 \%$ (MOE +/- $1.8 \%$ ) had a disability. The largest population of disabled civilians were 65 to 74 years $20.0 \%$ (MOE +/- 11.2\%). The second largest population of disabled civilians was 75 years and over at $11.2 \%$ (MOE +/- 10.6\%).

Census Tract 116.01 had an estimated total population of 2,315 noninstitutionalized citizens. Of those individuals, an estimated $1.9 \%$ (MOE +/-1.3\%) had a disability. The largest population of disabled civilians was Asian 2.9\% (MOE +/- 6.3\%).

Census Tract 116.02 had an estimated total population of 6,389 noninstitutionalized citizens. Of those individuals, an estimated $3.8 \%$ (MOE +/-1.8\%) had a disability. The largest population of disabled civilians were 35 to 64 years $6.8 \%(\mathrm{MOE}+/-7.5 \%)$.

Census Tract 117 had an estimated total population of 5,037 noninstitutionalized citizens. Of those individuals, an estimated $5.1 \%$ (MOE +/-1.8\%) had a disability. The largest population of disabled civilians were 75 years and over 80.2\% (MOE +/- 16.9\%).

Census Tract 122.02 had an estimated total population of 5,446 noninstitutionalized citizens. Of those individuals, an estimated $8.3 \%$ (MOE +/- $3.2 \%$ ) had a disability. The largest population of disabled civilians were American Indian and Alaska Native (100\%, MOE +/- 82.2\%).

Table 9. Disability - Local Setting

| Subject | Census Tract 107.03 |  |  |  |  |  | Census Tract 107.05 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  | With a Disability |  | Percent with a Disability |  | Total |  | With a Disability |  | Percent with a Disability |  |
|  | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- |
| Total civilian noninstitutionalized population | 6,539 | 580 | 582 | 252 | 8.9 | 3.9 | 5,210 | 444 | 476 | 157 | 9.1 | 3.3 |
| Population under 5 years | 297 | 179 | 0 | 17 | 0.0 | 11.1 | 121 | 65 | 0 | 17 | 0.0 | 24.7 |
| Population 5 to 17 years | 798 | 253 | 34 | 44 | 4.3 | 5.5 | 643.0 | 191 | 12 | 18 | 1.9 | 3.1 |
| Population 18 to 34 years | 3,272.0 | 380 | 315 | 209 | 9.6 | 6.2 | 1,795.0 | 422 | 39 | 45 | 2.2 | 2.7 |
| Population 35 to 64 years | 1,776.0 | 327 | 131 | 89 | 7.4 | 5.2 | 1,914.0 | 323 | 206 | 129 | 10.8 | 6.7 |
| Population 65 to 74 years | 149.0 | 87 | 80 | 77 | 53.7 | 35.7 | 467.0 | 205 | 23 | 37 | 4.9 | 8.1 |
| Population 75 years and over | 247.0 | 134 | 22 | 35 | 8.9 | 14.2 | 270.0 | 137 | 196 | 111 | 72.6 | 18.2 |
| SEX |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 3,149 | 458 | 263 | 161 | 8.4 | 5.0 | 2,367 | 382 | 179 | 69 | 7.6 | 3.0 |
| Female | 3,390 | 371 | 319 | 156 | 9.4 | 4.4 | 2,843 | 343 | 297 | 149 | 10.4 | 5.5 |
| RACE AND HISPANIC OR LATINO ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White (not Hispanic or Latino) | 3,415 | 439 | 468 | 200 | 13.7 | 5.2 | 3,662 | 447 | 340 | 120 | 9.3 | 3.5 |
| Black or African American | 889 | 354 | 53 | 64 | 6.0 | 8.5 | 780 | 173 | 101 | 118 | 12.9 | 16.0 |
| American Indian and Alaska Native | 0 | 17 | 0 | 17 | - | ** | 60 | 84 | 25 | 35 | 41.7 | 16.2 |
| Asian | 975 | 428 | 0 | 17 | 0.0 | 3.5 | 185 | 136 | 10 | 15 | 5.4 | 8.1 |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander | 0 | 17 | 0 | 17 | - | ** | 0 | 17 | 0 | 17 | - | ** |
| Some other Race | 412 | 508 | 2 | 13 | 0.5 | 4.2 | 191 | 177 | 0 | 17 | 0.0 | 16.7 |
| Two or more races | 293 | 159 | 0 | 17 | 0.0 | 11.2 | 162 | 98 | 0 | 17 | 0.0 | 19.3 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 989 | 574 | 61 | 90 | 6.2 | 10.9 | 342 | 240 | 0 | 17 | 0.0 | 9.7 |

Source: American Community Survey 5-year Estimates (2014-2018)

Table 10a. Disability - Local Setting (cont'd)

| Subject | Census Tract 113 |  |  |  |  |  | Census Tract 114 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  | With a Disability |  | Percent with a Disability |  | Total |  | With a Disability |  | Percent with a Disability |  |
|  | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- |
| Total civilian noninstitutionalized population | 3,024 | 348 | 181 | 79 | 6.0 | 2.6 | 3,996 | 315 | 191 | 76 | 4.8 | 1.8 |
| Population under 5 years | 69 | 33 | 69 | 12 | 0.0 | 37.0 | 108 | 36 | 0 | 12 | 0.0 | 27.1 |
| Population 5 to 17 years | 173.0 | 108 | 173 | 50 | 19.7 | 21.0 | 190.0 | 52 | 0 | 12 | 0.0 | 16.8 |
| Population 18 to 34 years | 2,195.0 | 381 | 2,195 | 46 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2,559.0 | 343 | 96 | 65 | 3.8 | 2.5 |
| Population 35 to 64 years | 456.0 | 111 | 456 | 38 | 11.2 | 8.5 | 736.0 | 139 | 31 | 23 | 4.2 | 3.0 |
| Population 65 to 74 years | 49.0 | 32 | 49 | 12 | 16.3 | 20.8 | 215.0 | 68 | 43 | 24 | 20.0 | 11.2 |
| Population 75 years and over | 82.0 | 49 | 82 | 32 | 42.7 | 32.4 | 188.0 | 53 | 21 | 19 | 11.2 | 10.6 |
| SEX |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 1,631 | 320 | 76 | 59 | 4.7 | 3.7 | 1,466 | 239 | 79 | 39 | 5.4 | 2.8 |
| Female | 1,393 | 287 | 105 | 55 | 7.0 | 4.2 | 2,530 | 290 | 112 | 66 | 4.4 | 2.5 |
| RACE AND HISPANIC OR LATINO ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White (not Hispanic or Latino) | 2,021 | 331 | 61 | 38 | 3.0 | 1.9 | 3,214 | 325 | 173 | 72 | 5.4 | 2.1 |
| Black or African American | 652 | 230 | 83 | 59 | 12.7 | 8.0 | 168 | 105 | 2 | 4 | 1.2 | 2.7 |
| American Indian and Alaska Native | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** |
| Asian | 234 | 121 | 37 | 41 | 15.8 | 12.8 | 302 | 132 | 0 | 12 | 0.0 | 10.9 |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** |
| Some other Race | 26 | 34 | 0 | 12 | 0.0 | 60.4 | 102 | 71 | 8 | 12 | 7.8 | 12.1 |
| Two or more races | 72 | 50 | 0 | 12 | 0.0 | 36.1 | 125 | 82 | 8 | 11 | 6.4 | 9.3 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 81 | 55 | 0 | 12 | 0.0 | 33.5 | 158 | 115 | 0 | 12 | 0.0 | 19.7 |

Source: American Community Survey 5-year Estimates (2014-2018)
All bolded and blue cells indicate a difference that is greater than $10 \%$ when compared to the state and county..

Table 10b. Disability - Local Setting (cont'd)

| Subject | Census Tract 116.01 |  |  |  |  |  | Census Tract 116.02 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  | With a Disability |  | Percent with a Disability |  | Total |  | With a Disability |  | Percent with a Disability |  |
|  | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- |
| Total civilian noninstitutionalized population | 2,315 | 259 | 44 | 32 | 1.9 | 1.3 | 6,389 | 676 | 242 | 126 | 3.8 | 1.8 |
| Population under 5 years | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** | 112 | 36 | 0 | 17 | 0.0 | 26.3 |
| Population 5 to 17 years | 16.0 | 24 | 0 | 12 | 0.0 | 76.9 | 88.0 | 46 | 0 | 17 | 0.0 | 31.6 |
| Population 18 to 34 years | 2,299 | 256 | 44 | 32 | 1.9 | 1.4 | 5,968 | 613 | 227 | 125 | 3.8 | 2.0 |
| Population 35 to 64 years | 0.0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** | 221.0 | 103 | 15 | 16 | 6.8 | 7.5 |
| Population 65 to 74 years | 0.0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** | 0.0 | 17 | 0 | 17 | - | ** |
| Population 75 years and over | 0.0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** | 0.0 | 17 | 0 | 17 | - | ** |
| SEX |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 1,034 | 175 | 24 | 27 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 2,829 | 552 | 121 | 104 | 4.3 | 3.1 |
| Female | 1,281 | 192 | 20 | 26 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 3,560 | 425 | 121 | 64 | 3.4 | 1.8 |
| RACE AND HISPANIC OR LATINO ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White (not Hispanic or Latino) | 1,641 | 237 | 35 | 31 | 2.1 | 1.9 | 3,967 | 445 | 179 | 121 | 4.5 | 2.9 |
| Black or African American | 195 | 68 | 3 | 7 | 1.5 | 3.7 | 616 | 319 | 18 | 24 | 2.9 | 4.1 |
| American Indian and Alaska Native | 3 | 6 | 0 | 12 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 5 | 11 | 0 | 17 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Asian | 206 | 85 | 6 | 13 | 2.9 | 6.3 | 919 | 190 | 23 | 23 | 2.5 | 2.5 |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** | 0 | 17 | 0 | 17 | - | ** |
| Some other Race | 8 | 14 | 0 | 12 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 79 | 55 | 0 | 17 | 0.0 | 34.0 |
| Two or more races | 98 | 47 | 0 | 12 | 0.0 | 29.2 | 313 | 142 | 9 | 17 | 2.9 | 5.7 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 202 | 78 | 0 | 12 | 0.0 | 15.9 | 624 | 212 | 21 | 24 | 3.4 | 4.1 |
| Source: American Community Survey 5-year Estimates (2014-2018) <br> All bolded and orange cells indicate a difference that is greater than $10 \%$ when compared to the state. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 10c. Disability - Local Setting (cont'd)

| Subject | Census Tract 117 |  |  |  |  |  | Census Tract 122.02 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  | With a Disability |  | Percent with a Disability |  | Total |  | With a Disability |  | Percent with a Disability |  |
|  | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- |
| Total civilian noninstitutionalized population | 5,037 | 535 | 257 | 78 | 5.1 | 1.8 | 5,446 | 391 | 454 | 181 | 8.3 | 3.2 |
| Population under 5 years | 71 | 45 | 0 | 17 | 0.0 | 36.4 | 352 | 132 | 0 | 17 | 0.0 | 9.5 |
| Population 5 to 17 years | 193 | 88 | 12 | 18 | 6.2 | 9.0 | 1,207 | 188 | 66 | 67 | 5.5 | 5.2 |
| Population 18 to 34 years | 3,932 | 543 | 89 | 50 | 2.3 | 1.3 | 1,023 | 268 | 29 | 35 | 2.8 | 3.3 |
| Population 35 to 64 years | 617.0 | 120 | 54 | 34 | 8.8 | 5.3 | 2,268 | 222 | 68 | 94 | 3.0 | 4.1 |
| Population 65 to 74 years | 133.0 | 47 | 29 | 24 | 21.8 | 17.4 | 376 | 98 | 169 | 86 | 44.9 | 19.2 |
| Population 75 years and over | 91.0 | 43 | 73 | 42 | 80.2 | 16.9 | 220 | 105 | 122 | 89 | 55.5 | 21.6 |
| SEX |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 2,696 | 519 | 137 | 59 | 5.1 | 2.7 | 2,516 | 229 | 129 | 64 | 5.1 | 2.6 |
| Female | 2,341 | 293 | 120 | 51 | 5.1 | 2.2 | 2,930 | 350 | 325 | 182 | 11.1 | 5.9 |
| RACE AND HISPANIC OR LATINO ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White (not Hispanic or Latino) | 3,869 | 463 | 199 | 66 | 5.1 | 2.0 | 4,082 | 361 | 321 | 171 | 7.9 | 4.0 |
| Black or African American | 461 | 146 | 41 | 34 | 8.9 | 7.1 | 260 | 135 | 65 | 68 | 25.0 | 22.8 |
| American Indian and Alaska Native | 16 | 35 | 0 | 17 | 0.0 | 76.9 | 14 | 23 | 14 | 23 | 100.0 | 82.2 |
| Asian | 311 | 97 | 4 | 7 | 1.3 | 2.2 | 474 | 142 | 0 | 17 | 0.0 | 7.1 |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander | 0 | 17 | 0 | 17 | - | ** | 0 | 17 | 0 | 17 | - | ** |
| Some other Race | 47 | 44 | 6 | 10 | 12.8 | 20.1 | 24 | 34 | 0 | 17 | 0.0 | 62.8 |
| Two or more races | 132 | 62 | 7 | 12 | 5.3 | 8.3 | 104 | 91 | 0 | 17 | 0.0 | 27.9 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 239 | 125 | 6 | 10 | 5.1 | 4.4 | 512 | 292 | 54 | 65 | 10.5 | 10.1 |

Source: American Community Survey 5-year Estimates (2014-2018)
All bolded and green cells indicate a difference that is greater than $10 \%$ when compared to the county; all bolded and blue cells indicate a difference that is greater than $10 \%$ when compared to the state and county.

### 5.4 Poverty

Regional Setting
According to the Census Table S1701, Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months, 2018 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, from the US Census Bureau, North Carolina had an estimated population of $9,881,292$, with $15.4 \%$ (MOE +/- $0.2 \%$ ) below the poverty level (Table 11). Across all subjects, Some Other Race had the highest percent living below the poverty level at $32.0 \%$ ( $\mathrm{MOE}+/-1.4 \%$ ). The next three subjects with the highest poverty level were Hispanic or Latino at 30.1\% (MOE +/- .8\%), American Indian and Alaska Native at 26.2\% (MOE +/-1.5\%), and Black or African-American at $24.9 \%$ (MOE +/- $0.4 \%$ ). The age group with the highest population living below poverty level was under 18 22.9\% (MOE +/- 0.4\%), followed by 18 to 64 years 15.3\% (MOE +/- 0.2\%).

Orange County had an estimated population of 131,789 with $13.4 \%$ (MOE $+/-1.1 \%$ ) living below the poverty level. Across all subjects, American Indian and Alaska Native had the highest percent living below the poverty level at $22.4 \%$ (MOE $+/-21.4 \%$ ). The next subjects with the highest poverty level were Black or African American at 20.3\% (MOE +/- 4.7\%), followed by Two or more races (18.3\%, MOE +/- 4.3\%). The majority of subject groups had smaller percentages experiencing poverty than for the state as a whole.

Table 11. Poverty- Regional Setting

| Subject | North Carolina |  |  |  |  |  | Orange County |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  | Below poverty level |  | Percent below poverty level |  | Total |  | Below poverty level |  | Percent below poverty level |  |
|  | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- |
| Population for whom poverty status is determined | 9,881,292 | 1,522 | 1,523,949 | 15,319 | 15.4 | 0.2 | 131,789 | 713 | 17,633 | 1,471 | 13.4 | 1.1 |
| AGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 18 | 2,258,876 | 1,607 | 498,013 | 7,632 | 22.0 | 0.3 | 28,136 | 180 | 2,601 | 294 | 9.2 | 2.3 |
| 18 to 64 | 6,092,009 | 1,103 | 884,618 | 9,282 | 14.5 | 0.2 | 6,427 | 127 | 14,071 | 976 | 16.5 | 1.1 |
| 65 years and over | 1,530,407 | 995 | 141,318 | 2,705 | 9.2 | 0.2 | 18,156 | 72 | 961 | 253 | 5.3 | 1.4 |
| SEX |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 4,779,533 | 2,237 | 669,307 | 8,648 | 14.0 | 0.2 | 63,183 | 591 | 7,722 | 840 | 12.2 | 1.3 |
| Female | 5,101,759 | 2,244 | 854,642 | 8,676 | 16.8 | 0.2 | 68,606 | 530 | 9,911 | 884 | 14.4 | 1.3 |
| RACE AND HISPANIC OR LATINO ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 6,281,258 | 2,576 | 668,925 | 9,394 | 10.6 | 0.2 | 91,624 | 503 | 10,499 | 820 | 11.5 | 0.9 |
| Black or African American | 2,096,490 | 5,812 | 493,496 | 8,392 | 23.5 | 0.4 | 15,105 | 600 | 3,064 | 737 | 20.3 | 4.7 |
| American Indian and Alaska Native | 117,702 | 1,595 | 29,577 | 1,585 | 25.1 | 1.3 | 760 | 169 | 170 | 158 | 22.4 | 21.4 |
| Asian | 275,301 | 1,983 | 32,712 | 2,356 | 11.9 | 0.9 | 10,195 | 413 | 1,391 | 323 | 13.6 | 3.2 |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander | 6,414 | 671 | 1,246 | 264 | 19.4 | 4.2 | 8 | 12 | - | 29 | 0.0 | 100.0 |
| Some other Race | 302,934 | 7,911 | 89,305 | 5,371 | 29.5 | 1.5 | 3,634 | 860 | 469 | 203 | 12.9 | 6.3 |
| Two or more races | 252,709 | 6,223 | 54,335 | 2,369 | 21.5 | 0.8 | 3,684 | 587 | 676 | 207 | 18.3 | 5.4 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 915,426 | 901 | 260,607 | 5,682 | 28.5 | 0.2 | 11,112 | 219 | 2,012 | 607 | 18.1 | 5.5 |
| All individuals below: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 percent of poverty level | 663,550 | 10,829 |  |  |  |  | 10,530 | 976 |  |  |  |  |
| 125 percent of poverty level | 2,034,827 | 19,447 |  |  |  |  | 22,283 | 1,742 |  |  |  |  |
| 150 percent of poverty level | 2,526,688 | 21,681 |  |  |  |  | 26,961 | 1,739 |  |  |  |  |
| 185 percent of poverty level | 3,227,889 | 24,339 |  |  |  |  | 34,388 | 1,931 |  |  |  |  |
| 200 percent of poverty level | 3,513,670 | 25,035 |  |  |  |  | 38,094 | 2,078 |  |  |  |  |

## Local Setting

According to the Census Table S1701, Poverty Status in the Past 12 Months, 2018 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates, from the US Census Bureau, Census Tract 107.03 had an estimated population of 6,539 , with $22.6 \%$ (MOE $+/-5.4 \%$ ) below the poverty level (Tables 12,12a. 12b, and 12c). Across all subjects, Black or African American had the highest percent living below the poverty level at $39.1 \%$ (MOE +/- 26.0\%). The next three subjects with the highest poverty levels were 18 to 64 years at $27.1 \%$ (MOE +/- $6.5 \%$ ), Asian at $26.3 \%$ (MOE +/- 20.2\%), and female at 26.3\% (MOE +/- 6.0\%).

Census Tract 107.05 had an estimated population of 5,210 , with $16.1 \%$ (MOE $+/-5.3 \%$ ) below the poverty level. Across all subjects, Two or more races had the highest percent living below the poverty level at 40.1\% (MOE +/- 33.5\%). The next subjects with the highest poverty levels were Hispanic or Latino (of any race) at $34.8 \%$ (MOE +/- 41.9\%) and Black or African American at $23.5 \%$ ( $\mathrm{MOE}+/-12.8 \%$ ).

Census Tract 113 had an estimated population of 3,024 , with $53.7 \%$ (MOE $+/-7.7 \%$ ) below the poverty level. Across all subjects, White had the highest percent living below the poverty level at $66.2 \%$ (MOE $+/-8.0 \%$ ). The next subjects with the highest poverty levels were 18 to 64 years at $58.4 \% ~(\mathrm{MOE}+/-7.3 \%)$ and female at $57.4 \%$ (MOE +/- 12.2\%).

Census Tract 114 had an estimated population of 3,488, with $42.8 \%$ (MOE +/- $6.5 \%$ ) below the poverty level. Across all subjects, Two or more races had the highest percent living below the poverty level at $54.9 \%$ (MOE $+/-36.0 \%$ ). The next subjects with the highest poverty levels were 18 to 64 years at $53.1 \%$ (MOE +/- 7.3\%), Black or African American at 46.3\% (MOE +/- 32.9\%), and female at $46.3 \%$ (MOE +/- 32.9\%).

Census Tract 116.01 had an estimated population of 0 , with no data available for poverty rates for 2018.

Census Tract 116.02 had an estimated population of 765, with 31.2\% (MOE +/- 8.9\%) living below the poverty level. Across all subjects, Black or African American tied with Some other race with the highest percent's living below the poverty level at 100\% (MOE +/-100\%, and 68.8\%, respectively). The next subjects with the highest poverty levels were female at $38.5 \%(\mathrm{MOE}+/-$ 11.2\%), followed by Asian at 35.9\% (MOE +/- 12.4\%).

Census Tract 117 had an estimated population of 3,289, with $47.1 \%$ (MOE +/- 10.1\%) living below the poverty level. Across all subjects, Hispanic or Latino had the highest percent living below the poverty level at 57.4\% (MOE +/- 32.5\%).

Census Tract 122.02 had an estimated population of 5,446, with $11.4 \%$ (MOE +/- $5.0 \%$ ) living below the poverty level. Across all subjects, American Indian and Alaska Native had the highest percent living below the poverty level at $100 \%$ (MOE +/- $82.2 \%$ ), followed by Black or African American at 66.2\% (MOE +/- 27.7\%).

Table 12. Poverty - Local Setting

| Subject | Census Tract 107.03 |  |  |  |  |  | Census Tract 107.05 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  | Below poverty level |  | Percent below poverty level |  | Total |  | Below poverty level |  | Percent below poverty level |  |
|  | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- |
| Population for whom poverty status is determined | 6,539 | 580 | 1,481 | 369 | 22.6 | 5.4 | 5,210 | 444 | 840 | 300 | 16.1 | 5.3 |
| AGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 18 years | 1,095 | 264 | 53 | 45 | 4.8 | 4.3 | 764 | 197 | 100 | 143 | 13.1 | 17.7 |
| 18 to 64 years | 5,048 | 459 | 1,369 | 365 | 27.1 | 6.5 | 3,709 | 458 | 719 | 234 | 19.4 | 5.4 |
| 65 years and over | 396 | 149 | 59 | 56 | 14.9 | 13.4 | 737 | 226 | 21 | 31 | 2.8 | 4.1 |
| SEX |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 3,149 | 458 | 590 | 265 | 18.7 | 8.2 | 2,367 | 382 | 359 | 185 | 15.2 | 6.2 |
| Female | 3,390 | 371 | 891 | 233 | 26.3 | 6.0 | 2,843 | 343 | 481 | 211 | 16.9 | 7.1 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 3,415 | 439 | 686 | 182 | 20.1 | 4.9 | 3,662 | 447 | 433 | 169 | 11.8 | 4.2 |
| Black or African American | 889 | 354 | 348 | 245 | 39.1 | 26.0 | 780 | 173 | 183 | 124 | 23.5 | 12.8 |
| American Indian and Alaska Native | 0 | 17 | 0 | 17 | - | ** | 60 | 84 | 0 | 17 | 0.0 | 39.7 |
| Asian | 975 | 428 | 256 | 161 | 26.3 | 20.2 | 185 | 136 | 40 | 46 | 21.6 | 25.5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Some other race | 412 | 508 | 19 | 33 | 4.6 | 13.3 | 191 | 177 | - | 17 | 0.0 | 16.7 |
| Two or more races | 293 | 159 | - | 17 | 0.0 | 11.2 | 162 | 98 | 65 | 74 | 40.1 | 33.5 |
| Hispanic or Latino origin (of any race) | 989 | 574 | 213 | 174 | 21.5 | 23.6 | 342 | 240 | 119 | 174 | 34.8 | 41.9 |
| All individuals below: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 percent of poverty level | 667 |  |  |  |  |  | 350 | 147 |  |  |  |  |
| 125 percent of poverty level | 2,259 |  |  |  |  |  | 1,173 | 340 |  |  |  |  |
| 150 percent of poverty level | 2,400 |  |  |  |  |  | 1,252 | 350 |  |  |  |  |
| 185 percent of poverty level | 3,406 |  |  |  |  |  | 1,567 | 394 |  |  |  |  |
| 200 percent of poverty level | 3,848 |  |  |  |  |  | 1,610 | 393 |  |  |  |  |
| Source: American Community Survey 5-year Estimates (2014-2018) <br> All bolded and orange cells indicate a difference that is greater than $5 \%$ when compared to the state; all bolded and blue cells indicate a difference that is greater than $5 \%$ when compared to the state and county. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 12a. Poverty - Local Setting (cont'd)

| Subject | Census Tract 113 |  |  |  |  |  | Census Tract 114 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  | Below poverty level |  | Percent below poverty level |  | Total |  | Below poverty level |  | Poverty level |  |
|  | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- |
| Population for whom poverty status is determined | 3,024 | 348 | 1,625 | 342 | 53.7 | 7.7 | 3,488 | 298 | 1,492 | 291 | 42.8 | 6.5 |
| AGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 18 years | 242 | 109 | 69 | 69 | 28.5 | 28.9 | 291 | 47 | - | 12 | 0.0 | 11.3 |
| 18 to 64 years | 2,651 | 355 | 1,549 | 321 | 58.4 | 7.3 | 2,794 | 298 | 1,484 | 292 | 53.1 | 7.3 |
| 65 years and over | 131 | 47 | 7 | 11 | 5.3 | 8.8 | 403 | 61 | 8 | 12 | 2.0 | 3.1 |
| SEX |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 1,631 | 320 | 825 | 256 | 50.6 | 9.9 | 1,385 | 239 | 458 | 213 | 43.3 | 7.6 |
| Female | 1,393 | 287 | 800 | 286 | 57.4 | 12.2 | 2,103 | 272 | 1,034 | 253 | 46.3 | 32.9 |
| RACE/ETHNICITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 2,021 | 331 | 1,338 | 303 | 66.2 | 8.0 | 2,800 | 317 | 1,235 | 287 | 44.1 | 7.9 |
| Black or African American | 652 | 230 | 144 | 113 | 22.1 | 16.1 | 162 | 101 | 75 | 65 | 46.3 | 32.9 |
| American Indian/Alaska Native | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** |
| Asian | 234 | 121 | 87 | 52 | 37.2 | 22.7 | 249 | 126 | 110 | 96 | 44.2 | 27.1 |
| Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander | - | 12 | - | 12 | - | ** | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** |
| Some other race | 26 | 34 | 11 | 24 | 42.3 | 57.7 | 102 | 71 | 8 | 16 | 7.8 | 15.8 |
| Two or more races | 72 | 50 | 34 | 33 | 47.2 | 39.4 | 102 | 77 | 56 | 63 | 54.9 | 36.0 |
| Hispanic or Latino origin (of any race) | 81 | 55 | 44 | 41 | 54.3 | 32.7 | 134 | 109 | 18 | 22 | 11.9 | 18.8 |
| All individuals below: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 percent of poverty level | 1,235 | 275 |  |  |  |  | 988 | 237 |  |  |  |  |
| 125 percent of poverty level | 1,902 | 327 |  |  |  |  | 1,683 | 313 |  |  |  |  |
| 150 percent of poverty level | 2,006 | 333 |  |  |  |  | 1,700 | 312 |  |  |  |  |
| 185 percent of poverty level | 2,156 | 318 |  |  |  |  | 1,756 | 324 |  |  |  |  |
| Source: American Community Survey 5-year Estimates (2014-2018) <br> All bolded and orange cells indicate a difference that is greater than $5 \%$ when compared to the state; all bolded and blue cells indicate a difference that is greater than $5 \%$ when compared to the state and county. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 102b. Poverty- Local Setting (cont'd)

| Subject | Census Tract 116.01 |  |  |  |  |  | Census Tract 116.02 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  | Below poverty level |  | Percent below poverty level |  | Total |  | Below poverty level |  | Percent below poverty level |  |
|  | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- |
| Population for whom poverty status is determined | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** | 765 | 111 | 239 | 70 | 31.2 | 8.9 |
| AGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 18 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** | 172 | 54 | 35 | 54 | 20.3 | 15.8 |
| 18 to 64 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** | 593 | 84 | 204 | 17 | 34.4 | 8.6 |
| 65 years and over | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** | - | 17 | - | 17 | - | ** |
| SEX |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** | 417 | 77 | 105 | 37 | 25.2 | 8.2 |
| Female | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** | 348 | 56 | 134 | 43 | 38.5 | 11.2 |
| RACE AND HISPANIC OR LATINO ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** | 221 | 58 | 71 | 33 | 32.1 | 15.0 |
| Black or African American | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** | 7 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| American Indian and Alaska Native | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** | 0 | 17 | 0 | 17 | - | ** |
| Asian | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** | 382 | 102 | 137 | 61 | 35.9 | 12.4 |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** | - | 17 | - | 17 | - | ** |
| Some other Race | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** | 20 | 34 | 20 | 34 | 100.0 | 68.8 |
| Two or more races | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** | 12 | 12 | - | 17 | 0.0 | 88.8 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 0 | 12 | 0 | 12 | - | ** | 134 | 80 | 15 | 19 | 11.2 | 14.7 |
| All individuals below: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 percent of poverty level | (X) | (X) |  |  |  |  | 191 | 74 |  |  |  |  |
| 125 percent of poverty level | (X) | (X) |  |  |  |  | 239 | 70 |  |  |  |  |
| 150 percent of poverty level | (X) | (X) |  |  |  |  | 279 | 76 |  |  |  |  |
| 185 percent of poverty level | (X) | (X) |  |  |  |  | 389 | 88 |  |  |  |  |
| 200 percent of poverty level | (X) | (X) |  |  |  |  | 489 | 104 |  |  |  |  |

Source: American Community Survey 5-year Estimates (2014-2018)
All bolded and orange cells indicate a difference that is greater than $5 \%$ when compared to the state; all bolded and blue cells indicate a difference that is greater than $5 \%$ when compared to the state and county.
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Table 112c. Poverty-Local Setting (cont'd)

| Subject | Census Tract 117 |  |  |  |  |  | Census Tract 122.02 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  | Below poverty level |  | Percent below poverty level |  | Total |  | Below poverty level |  | Percent below poverty level |  |
|  | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- |
| Population for whom poverty status is determined | 3,289 | 462 | 1,550 | 507 | 47.1 | 10.1 | 5,446 | 391 | 623 | 296 | 11.4 | 5.0 |
| AGE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 18 | 243 | 79 | - | 17 | 0.0 | 13.4 | 1,559 | 218 | 14 | 21 | 0.9 | 1.4 |
| 18 to 64 | 2,822 | 459 | 1,550 | 507 | 54.9 | 10.4 | 3,291 | 300 | 466 | 266 | 14.2 | 7.3 |
| 65 years and over | 224 | 37 | - | 17 | 0.0 | 14.4 | 596 | 111 | 143 | 102 | 24.0 | 15.7 |
| SEX |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Male | 1,793 | 494 | 1,011 | 535 | 56.4 | 15.6 | 2,516 | 229 | 76 | 53 | 3.0 | 2.1 |
| Female | 1,496 | 259 | 539 | 200 | 36.0 | 9.4 | 2,930 | 350 | 547 | 303 | 18.7 | 8.8 |
| RACE AND HISPANIC OR LATINO ORIGIN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 2,630 | 381 | 1272 | 398 | 48.4 | 10.1 | 4,082 | 361 | 402 | 232 | 9.8 | 5.5 |
| Black or African American | 226 | 125 | 67 | 83 | 29.6 | 32.1 | 260 | 135 | 172 | 119 | 66.2 | 27.7 |
| American Indian and Alaska Native | 0 | 17 | 0 | 17 | - | ** | 14 | 23 | 14 | 23 | 100.0 | 82.2 |
| Asian | 199 | 68 | 100 | 52 | 50.3 | 22.0 | 474 | 142 | 26 | 39 | 5.5 | 8.2 |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander | - | 17 | - | 17 | - | ** | - | 17 | - | 17 |  | ** |
| Some other Race | 47 | 44 | 23 | 23 | 48.9 | 32.0 | 24 | 34 | 5 | 8 | 20.8 | 41.5 |
| Two or more races | 47 | 31 | 11 | 14 | 23.4 | 27.2 | 104 | 91 | - | 17 | 0.0 | 27.9 |
| Hispanic or Latino | 162 | 110 | 93 | 74 | 57.4 | 32.5 | 512 | 292 | 9 | 16 | 1.8 | 3.4 |
| All individuals below: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 50 percent of poverty level | 1,308 | 420 |  |  |  |  | 345 | 201 |  |  |  |  |
| 125 percent of poverty level | 1,602 | 509 |  |  |  |  | 750 | 295 |  |  |  |  |
| 150 percent of poverty level | 1,634 | 509 |  |  |  |  | 1,027 | 332 |  |  |  |  |
| 185 percent of poverty level | 1,850 | 493 |  |  |  |  | 1,363 | 416 |  |  |  |  |
| 200 percent of poverty level | 1,866 | 492 |  |  |  |  | 1,363 | 416 |  |  |  |  |
| Source: American Community Survey 5 -year Estimates (2014-2018) <br> All bolded and orange cells indicate a difference that is greater than $5 \%$ when compared to the state; all bolded and blue cells indicate a difference that is greater than $5 \%$ when compared to the state and county. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### 5.5 Household Income

Regional Setting
The following table (Table 13) was compiled using data from the Census Table S1901, Income in the Past 12 Months (in 2018 Inflation-Adjusted Dollars) 2018 American Community Survey 5Year Estimates for North Carolina. The North Carolina household income range with the highest percent was for $\$ 50,000$ to $\$ 74,999$, at $18.1 \%$ (MOE $+/-0.1$ ). The state median household income was $\$ 52,413$ and the mean income was $\$ 73,753$.

The household income range for Orange County with the highest percent was $\$ 50,000$ to $\$ 74,999$ at $15.4 \%$ (MOE $+/-0.9 \%$ ). The median income was $\$ 68,211$ and the mean income was $\$ 107,834$. All income ranges above than $\$ 150,000$ had percentages that were more than $10 \%$ greater than the state ranges.

Table 123. Household Income-Regional Setting

| Subject | North Carolina |  | Orange County |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Households |  | Households |  |
|  | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- |
| Total | 3,918,597 | 8,585 | 52,529 | 609 |
| Less than \$10,000 | 6.8 | 0.1 | 6.1 | 0.7 |
| \$10,000 to \$14,999 | 5.4 | 0.1 | 3.7 | 0.6 |
| \$15,000 to \$24,999 | 10.7 | 0.1 | 8.1 | 0.9 |
| \$25,000 to \$34,999 | 10.7 | 0.1 | 7.9 | 0.9 |
| \$35,000 to \$49,999 | 14.2 | 0.1 | 12.6 | 0.9 |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999 | 18.1 | 0.1 | 15.4 | 0.9 |
| \$75,000 to \$99,999 | 12 | 0.1 | 11.8 | 0.9 |
| \$100,000 to \$149,999 | 12.5 | 0.1 | 13.2 | 0.9 |
| \$150,000 to \$199,999 | 4.7 | 0.1 | 7.6 | 0.8 |
| \$200,000 or more | 4.9 | 0.1 | 13.8 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Median income (dollars) | 52,413 | 224 | 68,211 | 3,011 |
| Mean income (dollars) | 73,753 | 332 | 107,834 | 4,818 |
| Per Capita Income | 29,456 | 143 | 40,650 | 1803 |
| Source: US Census, 2018 ACS 5-Year Estimates. <br> All orange and bolded highlighted cells indicate a difference that is greater than $10 \%$ when compared to the state |  |  |  |  |

## Local Setting

The following table (Table 14) was compiled using data from the Census Table S1901, Income in the Past 12 Months (in 2018 Inflation-Adjusted Dollars) 2018 American Community Survey 5Year Estimates. Almost all census tracts show greater than $10 \%$ differences for either the lowest income brackets or the highest income ranges.

| Subject | Census Tract 107.03 |  | Census Tract107.05 |  | Census Tract 113 |  | Census Tract 114 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Households |  | Households |  | Households |  | Households |  |
|  | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- |
| Total | 2,934 | 218 | 2,281 | 173 | 1,081 | 109 | 1,398 | 120 |
| Less than \$10,000 | 13.1\% | 5.3 | 6.2\% | 3.6 | 15.4\% | 5.7 | 15.8\% | 5.4 |
| \$10,000 to \$14,999 | 7.6\% | 4.1 | 3.4\% | 3.8 | 15.4\% | 5.9 | 4.7\% | 3.6 |
| \$15,000 to \$24,999 | 17.0\% | 6.5 | 8.4\% | 4.9 | 16.8\% | 6 | 18.2\% | 7 |
| \$25,000 to \$34,999 | 10.6\% | 5.5 | 12.9\% | 6.6 | 8.3\% | 5.2 | 8.9\% | 5.3 |
| \$35,000 to \$49,999 | 13.9\% | 5.5 | 9.2\% | 4.8 | 25.6\% | 7.8 | 9.7\% | 5.2 |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999 | 22.4\% | 6.9 | 13.9\% | 5.9 | 8.2\% | 4.8 | 5.9\% | 2.9 |
| \$75,000 to \$99,999 | 10.4\% | 4.8 | 17.6\% | 6.2 | 5.7\% | 3.2 | 4.9\% | 3 |
| \$100,000 to \$149,999 | 3.3\% | 2.3 | 14.4\% | 4.7 | 3.7\% | 3.3 | 8.9\% | 3.7 |
| \$150,000 to \$199,999 | 1.8\% | 1.9 | 8.7\% | 3.8 | 0.0\% | 3.2 | 6.2\% | 2.9 |
| \$200,000 or more | 0.0\% | 1.2 | 5.3\% | 3.1 | 0.7\% | 1.2 | 16.7\% | 4.7 |
| Median income (dollars) | 36,059 | 8,012 | 65,764 | 16,257 | 30,169 | 11,622 | 36,964 | 7,112 |
| Mean income (dollars) | 43,179 | 4,328 | 84,054 | 10,299 | 39,141 | 8,329 | 99,192 | 15,402 |
| Per Capita Income | 21,331 | 2,640 | 38,044 | 4,439 | 15,875 | 3,547 | 36,138 | 5,753 |

Source: US Census, 2018 ACS 5-Year Estimates.
All orange and bolded highlighted cells indicate a difference that is greater than $10 \%$ when compared to the state; all bolded and blue cells indicate a difference that is greater than $10 \%$ when compared to the state and county.

| Subject | Census Tract 116.01 |  | Census Tract 116.02 |  | Census Tract 117 |  | Census 122.02 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Households |  | Households |  | Households |  | Households |  |
|  | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- | Estimate | Margin of Error +/- |
| Total | 0 | 12 | 314 | 44 | 1,155 | 115 | 2,084 | 120 |
| Less than \$10,000 | - | ** | 23.6\% | 10.4 | 17.1\% | 6.7 | 9.5\% | 4.5 |
| \$10,000 to \$14,999 | - | ** | 9.9\% | 5.8 | 3.9\% | 2.9 | 5.4\% | 3.6 |
| \$15,000 to \$24,999 | - | ** | 8.3\% | 6.1 | 7.3\% | 3.7 | 3.9\% | 3.3 |
| \$25,000 to \$34,999 | - | ** | 13.7\% | 6.6 | 10.2\% | 5.5 | 4.4\% | 2.8 |
| \$35,000 to \$49,999 | - | ** | 10.5\% | 7.6 | 15.9\% | 6.4 | 9.7\% | 4.9 |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999 | - | ** | 19.4\% | 8.4 | 9.4\% | 3.9 | 12.9\% | 4.2 |
| \$75,000 to \$99,999 | - | ** | 8.3\% | 5.6 | 3.9\% | 2.7 | 7.1\% | 3.5 |
| \$100,000 to \$149,999 | - | ** | 2.5\% | 3.2 | 9.2\% | 4.2 | 9.5\% | 3.8 |
| \$150,000 to \$199,999 | - | ** | 2.2\% | 2.5 | 6.5\% | 3.9 | 8.6\% | 3.8 |
| \$200,000 or more | - | ** | 1.6\% | 2.3 | 16.6\% | 5.8 | 29.0\% | 5.9 |
| Median income (dollars) | (x) | (x) | 30,865 | 4,330 | 45,496 | 4,246 | 95,079 | 26,364 |
| Mean income (dollars) | (x) | (x) | 40,782 | 8,208 | 128,429 | 58,783 | 153,145 | 30,965 |
| Per Capita Income | 3,042 | 573 | 5,055 | 642 | 31,181 | 151,136 | 59,466 | 12,203 |

Source: US Census, 2018 ACS 5-Year Estimates.
All orange and bolded highlighted cells indicate a difference that is greater than $10 \%$ when compared to the state; all bolded and blue cells indicate a difference that is greater than $10 \%$ when compared to the state and county.

## 5 Limited English Proficiency (LEP)

Per the Safe Harbor Guidelines, should an LEP Group be identified during the permit application process, written translations of vital documents for each eligible LEP language group that constitutes five percent or includes 1,000 members (whichever is less) of the population of persons eligible to be served or likely to be affected or encountered. If there are fewer than 50 persons in a language group that reaches the five percent trigger, then DEQ will not translate vital written materials, but instead will provide written notice in the primary language of the LEP language group of the right to receive competent oral interpretation of those written materials, free of cost. The safe harbor provisions apply to the translation of written documents only. Safe harbor guidelines are per the EPA guidance for LEP persons, and implemented by DEQ when deemed appropriate.

The population of Spanish-speakers that speak English "less than very well" is greater than 5\% in Census Tract 107.03.

Several language groups were identified within the one-mile radius of the facility but did not reach the $5 \%$ threshold, including: French (Incl. Patois and Cajun), Greek, Russian, Gujarati, Hindi, other Indic languages, Other Indo European languages, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, other Asian languages, Tagalog, Arabic, Other Pacific Island languages, Thai, and African Languages.

Table 14. Limited English Proficiency

| LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME | Census Tract 107.03 |  | Census Tract 107.05 |  | Census Tract 113 |  | Census Tract 114 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Estimate | Margin of Error | Estimate | Margin of Error | Estimate | Margin of Error | Estimate | Margin of Error |
| Total (population 5 years and over): | 6,129 | 564 | 4,383 | 365 | 3,074 | 373 | 4,072 | 450 |
| Speak only English | 4,162 | 491 | 3,672 | 459 | 2,786 | 344 | 3,663 | 442 |
| Spanish or Spanish Creole: | 1,276 | 500 | 495 | 303 | 39 | 36 | 142 | 68 |
| Speak English "very well" | 310 | 151 | 280 | 204 | 27 | 29 | 131 | 67 |
| Speak English less than "very well" | 966 | 506 | 215 | 157 | 12 | 16 | 11 | 13 |

Table 15a. Limited English Proficiency (cont'd)

| LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME | Census Tract 116.01 |  | Census Tract 116.02 |  | Census Tract 117 |  | Census Tract 122.02 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Estimate | Margin of Error | Estimate | Margin of Error | Estimate | Margin of Error | Estimate | Margin of Error |
| Total (population 5 years and over): | 2,423 | 454 | 5,693 | 505 | 4,793 | 483 | 5,023 | 454 |
| Speak only English | 1,967 | 389 | 4,469 | 413 | 4,183 | 499 | 3,777 | 318 |
| Spanish or Spanish Creole: | 162 | 67 | 298 | 133 | 207 | 99 | 373 | 232 |
| Speak English "very well" | 162 | 67 | 268 | 135 | 207 | 99 | 148 | 123 |
| Speak English less than "very well" | 0 | 12 | 30 | 48 | 0 | 12 | 225 | 140 |

## 6 County Health

The University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute, in collaboration with the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, calculated a County Health Rankings system for all the States in the United States (www.countyhealthrankings.org). This ranking is based on health outcomes (such as lifespan and self-reported health status) and health factors (such as environmental, social and economic conditions). According to this 2020 report, out of all 100 counties in North Carolina (with 1 indicating the healthiest), Orange County ranks $1^{\text {st }}$ in health factors and $2^{\text {nd }}$ in health outcomes.


Figure 3. County Health Rankings for Health Factors in North Carolina provided by University of Wisconsin Public Health Institute.

According to the NC DEQ Community Mapping System Environmental Justice Tool, the health outcome causes of death in Orange County are lower than the corresponding state averages. Additionally, the hospitalizations due to asthma in Orange County is 67 (per 100,000 individuals), as compared to the state at 90 (per 100,000 individuals). The number of primary care physicians in Orange County ( 26.1 per 10,000 residents) is demonstrably higher than the state average (4.8 per 10,000 residents).

Table 16. Health Outcomes

| Cause of Death | Orange County | North Carolina |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Cancer | 152 | 169.1 |
| Heart Disease | 117.1 | 163.7 |
| Stroke | 32.5 | 43.1 |
| Cardiovascular Disease | 160.2 | 221.9 |
| Diabetes | 14.8 | 22.8 |
| Source: NCDEQ 2020 EJ Tool. Death rates are per 100,000 individuals |  |  |

## 7 Local Sensitive Receptors

The Environmental Protection Agency suggests that sensitive receptors include, but are not limited to, hospitals, schools, daycare facilities, elderly housing and convalescent facilities. These are areas where the occupants are more susceptible to the adverse effects of exposure to toxic chemicals, pesticides, and other pollutants. Extra care must be taken when dealing with contaminants and pollutants in close proximity to areas recognized as sensitive receptors. For instance, children and the elderly may have a higher risk of developing asthma from elevated levels of certain air pollutants than a healthy individual aged between 18 and 64.

Within the one-mile project radius from the UNC-CH facility, the following potential sensitive receptors were identified through EJSCREEN and Google Maps (Figure 4).

- UNC Hospitals
- Frank Porter Graham Elementary School
- Carborro Elementary School
- Phoenix Academy High
- Northside Elementary
- Multiple Town of Chapel Hill Subsidized and Public Housing units

Additional sensitive receptors may be identified during the permit application process, such as during the field reconnaissance visit, if one is conducted, or through public comment.


Figure 4. Sensitive receptors surrounding the UNC- CH facility.

## 8 Local Industrial Sites

Within the one-mile buffer, there are 203 facility permits or incident reports (as of November 16, 2020):

- 2 Air Quality Permit Sites (one of which belongs to UNC)
- 3 NPDES Stormwater Permits
- 7 Contaminated Dry-Cleaning Sites
- 4 Inactive Hazardous Sites
- 6 Brownfields Program Sites
- 9 Hazardous Waste Sites
- 132 Underground Storage Tank Incidents
- 6 Above Ground Storage Tanks Incidents
- 10 Underground Storage Tank Active Facilities
- 24 Land Use Restriction and/or Notices


Figure 5. Permitted facilities and incidents with the one-mile radius surrounding the UNC facility.

## 9. Conclusion

The Draft EJ Report is an initial evaluation of the demographics and socioeconomics of the community area surrounding a proposed facility or permit modification. This includes information within a determined radius by the Department (one mile for this project) on race and ethnicity (decennial census year), poverty, per capita income, and ability to speak English (most current ACS census range), current NC Commerce county tier, and presence or absence of American Indian Tribal areas. The Draft EJ Report does not include a reconnaissance of the community. The UNC facility is located in an area with generally better health factors and outcomes in comparison to other counties in the state.

The study area displays a generally younger population as compared to the state, and in most cases, the county as well. The study area also exhibits higher percentages of Asian and in some census tracts, Hispanic or Latino (of any race). One potential LEP language group (Spanish) was identified that reaches the 5\% threshold for Safe Harbor Guidelines. Extra attention will also be given to ensure language data is accurate and translation or interpretation services will be considered for essential documents and any public hearings or meetings. Given the presence of the university campus younger and more diverse racial and ethnic populations generally move into and out of this area to attend college. These student populations also appear to have, in general, lower household income levels.

Based on the results from this Draft EJ Report, DEQ will conduct the following outreach:

1) Inform the Occaneechi Band of the Saponi Nation of the permit renewal application and continue to update the Occaneechi Band throughout the permitting process.
2) Conduct outreach to students and student organizations at UNC-Chapel Hill.
3) Announce reminders through social media.

[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ These are subject to change throughout the permitting process before any final action is taken by DEQ.
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